

EXPERTS IN POST-IMPERIAL TRANSITIONS

**Entanglements and Diverging Trajectories of Eugenicians between the
Habsburg Empire and the ‘Miniature Empires,’ c. 1900–1939**

By
Vojtěch Pojar

Submitted to Central European University
Doctoral Program in Comparative History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Supervisors: Professor Balázs Trencsényi
Professor Emese Lafferton

Budapest, Hungary and Vienna, Austria
2024

COPYRIGHT NOTICE / AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, **Vojtěch Pojar**, candidate for the PhD degree in Comparative History declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Copyright in the text of this dissertation rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Budapest, 31 May 2024

Signature

ABSTRACT

This dissertation proposes a new perspective on eugenics in Austria-Hungary and the post-Habsburg territories. It begins by tracing the circulation of eugenic knowledge in the late imperial context, well before the consolidation of nation-states. It argues that in this imperial setting, eugenics was adopted and retooled as a conceptual framework for managing the empire's ethnocultural diversity. While some resulting eugenic blueprints were dark or ambiguous, others paradoxically sought to affirm this diversity. In line with their imperial focus, proponents of eugenics also established supra-national and sub-national networks alongside, if not earlier than, the national ones.

Building on these findings, the second part of this dissertation turns to the interwar period, analyzing eugenic networks, concepts, and practices across various post-Habsburg territories—in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia. It reveals their striking persistence since the imperial period, particularly during the first decade following World War I. The analysis suggests that the networks, concepts, and practices inherited from the imperial context were repurposed to navigate the post-imperial transitions, strategically addressing the mini-imperial nature of these states. However, by the beginning of the second interwar decade, these legacies disintegrated, giving way to overtly racist, radical nationalist, and authoritarian eugenic discourses, which became dominant in the region.

Transnational in scope and focused on entanglements, this dissertation presents a new integrative narrative about eugenics in Habsburg and post-Habsburg territories, interpreted through imperial and post-imperial lenses. In doing so, it seeks to bridge the largely separated fields of Habsburg Studies and the history of eugenics in East Central Europe.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation was conceived, researched, and written during a period marked by multiple overlapping crises, where general and personal dimensions often intersected. I am all the more grateful to those who supported my work at various stages of this project and to the institutions whose generosity made its completion possible.

The text bears an imprint of the intellectual and institutional environment at the Central European University in Budapest and Vienna. The transnational nature of this university ensures that negotiating between different contexts and detecting shared patterns is not just an abstract postulate of introductory chapters. It also becomes an ethos and a lived, emotional experience.

I extend my sincere gratitude to my advisors, Prof. Balázs Trencsényi and Prof. Emese Lafferton, for encouraging me to confront the challenges of this project and for patiently providing me with time and space to experiment. I am also thankful to my former teachers at Charles University in Prague, Prof. Michal Kopeček and Prof. Jiří Štaif, who sparked my interest in intellectual history, social history, and their intersections.

Numerous individuals, more than I can list here, contributed to this project at various stages through their constructive criticism. I particularly acknowledge the members of the comprehensive and complex exam committees, including Gábor Egry, the late Mária Kovács, and Marius Turda. Their feedback prompted me to fundamentally rethink my initial theoretical framing. Later, the questions, objections, suggestions, and challenges at numerous conferences in East Central Europe and beyond compelled me to refine my argument and address its blind spots. Equally important were the various moments when my research benefitted from conversations with the members of the *Intellectual History in East Central Europe* research

network. Finally, my involvement in the projects leading to the publication of special issues in the journals *East Central Europe* and *European Review of History* opened my horizons to different contexts and periods.

I am indebted to CEU for its continuous support at every stage of my research, starting with a Master's scholarship that allowed me to pursue an M.A. degree at this institution. This dissertation would not be possible without CEU granting me a doctoral stipend and awarding me research and travel funds and a write-up grant. I am also grateful for funding that allowed me to link my teaching in Vienna with additional research in local archives and libraries, as well as the university's support during the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, CEU's involvement in Princeton's Global History Lab gave me invaluable experience in working with learners beyond the Global North.

A two-year PhD fellowship at the French Research Center in Humanities and Social Sciences (CEFRES) in Prague was equally instrumental in my intellectual development. Participating in its vibrant research community made me realize that intellectual curiosity may be linked to a wonderful sense of sociability. Furthermore, CEFRES significantly advanced my research by providing generous funding and infrastructural support for a conference on Biopolitics and Mass Gymnastics that I co-organized there with Lucija Balikić and John Paul Newman.

While conducting the final corrections of the manuscript, I had the privilege of benefiting from the hospitality of the Collegium Carolinum in Munich as a recipient of its Fellowship for Early Career Researchers.

Earlier and abridged versions of some chapters (or their sections) in this dissertation had already appeared in scientific journals *East Central Europe*, *European Review of History*, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften*, and *Střed/Centre*, as well as in two

Czech-language volumes. I am grateful to the editors of these journals and books, anonymous reviewers, and other contributors for their valuable feedback.

Last but not least, throughout the project, I cherished the unwavering support of my family and my wife, Anna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Eugenics	3
Biopolitics	13
Expertise, States, and Voluntary Associations	22
Contested Imperial Legacies	31
Theory, Methodology, and Sources	38
Thesis Structure	51
Managing Diversity: Eugenics in the Late Habsburg Empire, c. 1900-1914.....	55
Empire of Symbiosis: Social Reform, Popular Education, and a Eugenic Blueprint for a Multiethnic Empire	62
Eugenics of Segregation: Special Education, Provincial Professionals, and Non-Territorial Autonomy	86
Race against National Indifference: Nationalist Activism, Language Frontiers of the Empire, and Eugenics.....	102
Alcoholism: A Boundary Object for Eugenics Supporters	120
Conclusion.....	138
Battlefront vs. Home Front: Eugenics and an Empire at War, 1914-1918.....	143
Battlefront Biopolitics: Bacteria and Internal Enemies.....	149
From Battlefront to the Hinterland, from Bacteria to Genes.....	164
Home Front Biopolitics: Food, Children, and the Renewal of the “Organic Capital”	183
From Voluntary Associations to the Civil Administration and Back Again.....	193
Conclusion.....	209

The Paradox of State Consolidation: Eugenics Between the Empire and its Miniatures, 1917-1923	213
Regenerating Mitteleuropa: Biopolitics in Wartime Inter-Imperial Networks	220
Echoes of Imperial Institution-Building: The Transnational Making of Public Health Ministries.....	242
Choosing Imperial Models, Choosing Biopolitics	261
Patterns of Failure: Eugenic Legislation in Post-Habsburg Countries in the 1920s	266
A Fading Legacy: Public Health Ministries	288
Conclusion.....	292
Imperial Legacies, Post-Imperial Spaces: Eugenic Practices in Post-Habsburg Countries, 1918-c. 1929	294
Multiple Red Viennas: Modernist Biopolitics in Post-Habsburg Metropolitan Areas.....	298
Dominate, “Civilize,” and Purify: Anti-Modernist Biopolitics in the Post-Habsburg Borderlands	312
Forging the Post-Imperial Peasant: Eugenics in the Rural Spaces Between Modernism and Anti-Modernism.....	336
Alternative States: Voluntary Associations, Eugenics, and the Central Authorities.....	351
Conclusion.....	377
Eugenic Concepts in Transition, c. 1920-1930s.....	379
Cooperative Mini-Empires: Thinking through Imperial Collapse, Conceptualizing State-Building.....	384
Human Economy: The Many Uses of a Technocratic Concept	411
Biological Constitution: Between National Indifference and National Homogenization	435
From Biological Constitution to Race: A Path Toward Radicalization	445
Conclusion.....	482

Persisting Regional Links: Post-Habsburg Networks and the Resistance against Nazi Racial Theories	485
At the Interface of Resistance: Czechoslovakia and The Critics of Nazi Racial Theories	494
From the Margins: Affirming Post-Imperial Hybridity through Anti-Racist Education	510
Contesting the Social Role of the Racial Anthropologist: A Polemic in Yugoslavia.....	525
Catholicism, Racial Theories, and Eugenics: Austrian Variations.....	532
Beyond the Post-Habsburg Context: Reception in Romania	545
No Circulation Despite Persisting Connections: Hungary and Poland	553
Conclusion.....	560
Post-Habsburg Eugenicists Go Global: Transnational Networks Beyond the Former Empire	563
Learning to Speak Internationalist: Eugenics and Scientific Internationalism in a Post-Imperial Context.....	569
The Margins of Colonialism: Internationalist Turn in Colonialism, Post-Imperial State-Building, and Mobility Control.....	576
Convenient Go-Betweens: The International Eugenics Movement and the Post-Habsburg Countries	587
Genetics and Radical Politics: The Dark Side of Transnationalism in the 1930s	594
Conclusion: Transnational Networks of Eugenicists in Post-Habsburg Countries in Comparative Perspective.....	602
Conclusion.....	618
Bibliography.....	625
Newspapers and Periodicals	625
Archival Sources	634
Edited Primary Sources	636

Primary Sources 637

Secondary Sources 687

Online Sources 724

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Four Strategies of Rural Regeneration 339

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASTRA	<i>Asociația Transilvană pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român</i> (Transylvanian Association for Romanian Literature and the Culture of the Romanian People)
CIWF	<i>Centralny Instytut Wychowania Fizycznego</i> (Central Institute of Physical Education)
IFEO	<i>International Federation of Eugenic Organizations</i>
IIA	<i>Institut International d'Anthropologie</i>
LICA	<i>Ligue internationale contre l'antisémitisme</i>
LNHO	<i>League of Nations Health Organisation</i>
MBS	<i>Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség</i> (Hungarian Fraternal Military Association)
ÖWV	<i>Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung</i>
PIEC	<i>Permanent International Eugenics Committee</i>
POW	Prisoner of War
RF	<i>Rockefeller Foundation</i>
RWV	<i>Reichsdeutsche Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung</i>
STIs	Sexually Transmitted Infections

INTRODUCTION

“[The Austrian liberal legal scholar, Karl] Brockhausen referred to the old Austria-Hungary as a ‘testing ground’ for Europe, a place where it could learn how to keep the most diverse ethnic groups [Völkerschaften] together. [...] Although these ethnic groups have since separated, the ‘testing ground’ persists [...].”¹ In 1919, when this observation appeared in an essay published in Vienna, it was as insightful as it was optimistic. The subtitle of the volume in which the essay appeared, “Wanderings in the Border Area between Politics and Science,” suggested it was written by a well-known scientist aware of the political implications of his ideas, and vice versa. This was a fitting characteristic of Viennese biologist Paul Kammerer, the author of this essay. His observation, portraying the Habsburg Empire and the states that replaced it after its demise as a laboratory for managing ethnocultural difference, was one among many similar statements that Kammerer made between the 1900s and the 1920s.

Things become even more intriguing when one considers that the author of these statements not only researched the complex issue of heredity but was also a vocal supporter of eugenics and co-founder of Austria-Hungary’s first society explicitly dedicated to this ambiguous body of knowledge. How could these seemingly contradictory views be reconciled? This dissertation sheds light on the peculiar connection between an emphasis on imperial diversity and advocacy for eugenics. It reveals that this connection was neither paradoxical nor exceptional but provides the long-sought key for interpreting the early history of eugenics in Vienna and the Habsburg Empire more broadly.

¹ Paul Kammerer, *Menschheitswende: Wanderungen im Grenzgebiet von Politik und Wissenschaft* (Vienna: Der Friede, 1919), 90.

This dissertation delves into the history of eugenics in the late Habsburg Empire and investigates its legacies in post-Habsburg countries. It argues that eugenics in Austria-Hungary represented a complex attempt to conceptualize and manage the ethnocultural diversity of the empire. This agenda was negotiated within networks, many of which had an imperial scope, and was eventually implemented through a dynamic interplay between voluntary associations and the state. Thus, this dissertation challenges the prevailing interpretation of eugenics in this context, which tends to be exclusively associated with national territories, networks, and ideologies. It argues that before the constitution of the nation-states in the interwar period, the empire appeared as preponderant as the nation, if not more so.

After the collapse of the empire, the states that succeeded it inherited not only its ethnocultural diversity but also other imperial legacies. Building on the reconsideration of the dynamic relationship of eugenics with the empire before 1918, this dissertation raises the question of whether this ambiguous body of knowledge constituted one of these legacies. It examines eugenics in various post-Habsburg territories, including in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia, revealing their surprising degree of entanglement. Moreover, it unveils the striking continuities of discourses, practices, and networks behind eugenics between the imperial setting and various post-imperial contexts. Rather than being abandoned, these elements were repurposed, albeit in increasingly divergent ways. The dissertation thus highlights that even in terms of their biopolitics, these self-described nation-states rather constituted miniature empires, particularly in the 1920s.

Thus, this dissertation presents an integrative history of eugenics in the Habsburg and post-Habsburg settings spanning over more than three decades of the twentieth century. The resulting analysis systematically decenters the nation by highlighting both trans- and sub-national contexts, linkages, and points of reference of eugenics in the area. This perspective

sheds new light on state-building, its intertwinement with scientific expertise, and political modernity in this region more broadly.

Historical scholarship has created two parallel images of this part of the globe: one informed by area studies, revolving around nations and nationalism, and the other by imperial history, highlighting ethnocultural diversity, fluidity of identities, and the limits of nationalist mobilization. Reflecting this divide, Habsburg Studies and the history of eugenics in East Central Europe refer to many of the same spaces and actors, yet they subscribe to different symbolic geographies, and their theoretical assumptions differ as well. In effect, they have not yet substantially engaged with each other, to mutual detriment. This dissertation aims to bridge the gap between them. On the one hand, I suggest that the history of eugenics may benefit from the more complex theorizing of nationalism and state-building, as well as from the fine-grained empirical analysis of their local negotiations characterizing recent scholarship in Habsburg Studies. On the other hand, historians of the Habsburg Empire should not remain oblivious to discourses of “race,” as well as biopolitics more broadly, particularly (but not exclusively) as they extend their analytical focus to the interwar period.

Eugenics

The term “eugenics” first appeared in 1883, having been coined by the British polymath Francis Galton. According to one of the definitions that Galton put forth in the course of his career as its advocate and patron, eugenics was “the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage.”² While eugenic ideas saw a “phenomenal transnational uptake” by the early

² Francis Galton, “Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope and Aims,” in *Essays in Eugenics* (London: The Eugenics Education Society, 1909), 35.

twentieth century, reverberating far beyond the particular context where Galton coined this word, their meanings varied and often significantly differed from Galton's definition.³

The transnational character of eugenics poses an analytical challenge for historians, nearly as much as its often-dark effects. By the late 1980s, contributors to a volume edited by Mark B. Adams concurred that they had identified several distinctive styles of eugenics. (Their debt to Ludwik Fleck was evident in these conclusions.) However, while Adams spoke broadly about "characteristic regional, national, or cultural styles," the actual focus was squarely on national case studies.⁴ Furthermore, when outlining the national styles of eugenics they identified, these studies did not evade a certain essentialism. This essentialism was particularly palpable in cases where scholars sought to emphasize the perceived coherence and distinctiveness of these styles, along with their synergies with the broader national culture.

Subsequent scholarship went beyond such national framing. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics* from 2010, for example, made "transnational themes in eugenics" its main subject while also highlighting the "place-based differences" of eugenic agendas, strategies, and their effects.⁵ As the editors of the Handbook, Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine, signaled through their choice of these deliberately open-ended analytical terms, historians gradually made their definition of eugenics less prescriptive to reflect its transnational character and internal differences.

Instead of listing the supposed essential features of eugenics, Bashford and Levine usefully highlight that it constituted "a shared language and ambition" across otherwise

³ Philippa Levine and Alison Bashford, "Introduction: Eugenics and the Modern World," in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, ed. Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine (Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 15.

⁴ Mark B. Adams, "Towards a Comparative History of Eugenics," in *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil, and Russia*, ed. Mark B. Adams (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 224.

⁵ Levine and Bashford, "Introduction," 15.

different contexts.⁶ In a more recent book that embeds the history of eugenics in the conceptual apparatus of global historians, Levine usefully clarifies that eugenics also had a materiality of its own, constituting a diffuse “set of both scientific and social practices.”⁷ In light of this scholarship, this dissertation embraces an operational definition of eugenics that is both flexible and sensitive to the particularities of historical contexts. Eugenics – both as a shared language and a shared practice – is all what historical actors perceive as such in a given setting. Its supporters, or eugenicists, are those individuals who approve of and engage with eugenics thus defined, even though the extent of their engagement may vary.

Was there eugenics in the Habsburg Empire, and what constituted it? Answering such a question means grappling with the fact that Austria-Hungary was a multiethnic continental empire. Moreover, recent scholarship has established, beyond any doubt, that the impact of nationalism was substantially more limited than previously assumed, with crucial ramifications for both everyday social experience and on a more epistemological level. In a flurry of local studies, social historians have demonstrated that nationalist ideology did not determine individual practices; instead, they were often marked by national indifference and other creative ways of negotiating ethnocultural differences.⁸ Furthermore, historians of science have discovered Habsburg imperial diversity and the composite nature of the Habsburg state, and set out to explore various scientific theories designed to conceptualize, legitimize, and administer

⁶ Levine and Bashford, “Introduction,” 1.

⁷ Philippa Levine, *Eugenics: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 2.

⁸ Pieter M. Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Lucian N. Leustean, “Eastern Orthodoxy and National Indifference in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774–1873,” *Nations and Nationalism* 24, no. 4 (2018): 1117–41; Rok Stergar, “National Indifference in the Heyday of Nationalist Mobilization? Ljubljana Military Veterans and the Language of Command,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 43 (2012): 45–58; Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008). For a critique of the concept, see Maarten van Ginderachter, “Possibilities and Pitfalls of the Concept of National Indifference,” *Nations and Nationalism* 29, no. 3 (2023): 831–36.

them.⁹ Franz Fillafer and Johannes Feichtinger encapsulate the central feature of these theories when they label them as strategies of “cognitive management” of imperial diversity.¹⁰

Historian of science Deborah Coen argues that, while it holds true for empires more broadly that they have been “experimental sites for exploring ties of interdependence among far-flung humans, nonhumans, and the inorganic world,” continental empires, such as the Habsburg, stood out due to the fluid boundaries between their centers and peripheries.¹¹ One cognitive response to this contiguous diversity, she argues, was the emergence of “late imperial sciences” in these continental empires during the nineteenth century. These sciences sought to establish “the hybridity of [Austria-Hungary’s] populations and territories as empirical facts.”¹² In doing so, these late imperial sciences developed new “languages of self-description” for the Habsburg Empire that were distinctly modern, yet they avoided the pitfalls of nationalism, providing an alternative to some of its most corrosive elements.¹³

Interestingly, historians of the late Tsarist Empire draw on some similar assumptions and concepts. Embracing what they call “new imperial history,” they center their research around the concept of imperial situation, positing “diversity as the fundamental and preexisting condition.”¹⁴ This concept exhibits significant overlaps with the assumptions underpinning the

⁹ For three different disciplines, see Deborah R. Coen, “The Storm Lab: Meteorology in the Austrian Alps,” *Science in Context* 22, no. 3 (2009): 463–86; Franz Leander Fillafer, “Imperial Diversity, Fractured Sovereignty, and Legal Universals: Hans Kelsen and Eugen Ehrlich in Their Habsburg Context,” *Modern Intellectual History* 19, no. 2 (2022): 421–43; Thomas R. Prendergast, “The Sociological Idea of the State: Legal Education, Austrian Multinationalism, and the Future of Continental Empire, 1880–1914,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 62, no. 2 (2020): 327–58.

¹⁰ Franz Leander Fillafer and Johannes Feichtinger, “How to Rethink the Global History of Knowledge Making from a Central European Perspective,” *History of Knowledge: Research, Resources, and Perspectives*, published October 9, 2019, on-line, accessed May 10, 2023. <https://historyofknowledge.net/2019/10/09/global-history-of-knowledge-making-from-central-european-perspective/>.

¹¹ Deborah R. Coen, *Climate in Motion: Science, Empire, and the Problem of Scale* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2018), 5 and 47.

¹² Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 9.

¹³ Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 9.

¹⁴ Ilya Gerasimov, Sergey Glebov, and Marina Mogilner, “Hybridity: Marrism and the Problems of Language of the Imperial Situation,” *Ab Imperio* 2016, no. 1 (2016): 28.

notion of the cognitive management of imperial diversity, particularly given the strong epistemic bent of the historians engaging with either of these notions.

Crucially, going beyond the findings of the Habsburg Studies, the research of historians such as Marina Mogilner has revealed that the concept of “race,” as well as the sciences conducted in a liberal key that made it its object, played a crucial role in the imperial setting that is her focus. It provided, Mogilner explains, a modern language of description for grappling with the challenges of the imperial situation.¹⁵ Even though there were substantial differences between the Tsarist and the Habsburg imperial situations, Mogilner’s arguments serve as a helpful reminder that eugenics in Austria-Hungary does not have to be interpreted as a medley of essentialized, self-enclosed national styles. Rather, this dissertation approaches it as one of the discourses adapted for the cognitive management of imperial diversity.

This dissertation takes these observations as a starting point to reexamine the history of eugenics in the Habsburg Empire. It begins with a meticulous mapping of several emerging networks that connected supporters of eugenics in Austria-Hungary before 1914. The analysis reveals that networks with both supra-national and sub-national dimensions, emerged simultaneously with, or even preceded, the national ones. Moreover, within some of these networks, with imperial or metropolitan scopes, supporters of eugenics developed concepts and strategies to grapple with the ethnocultural diversity of the empire.

Some of these eugenic blueprints for the cognitive management of imperial diversity were explicitly critical of nationalism, disavowing conflict in a social Darwinist key in favor of Darwinian concepts of cooperation such as mutual aid and symbiosis. Kammerer’s arguments were an example of these attempts, clearly directed against escalating nationalism in the area.

¹⁵ Marina Mogilner, *Homo Imperii: A History of Physical Anthropology in Russia* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press), 2013.

Interestingly, however, many socialist, liberal, and even some conservative intellectuals who subscribed to more moderate formulations of the manifold nationalist projects in Austria-Hungary chose to adopt and adapt these eugenic categories as well.¹⁶ Conversely, while radical nationalist eugenic blueprints also thrived in Austria-Hungary before 1914, notably in the various language frontiers of the empire contested by nationalist activist associations, the supporters of this racial, nationalist package were far from occupying a central and hegemonic position; instead, they were dispersed, and their audience was as limited as it was radical.

Thus, this analysis gives rise to a novel narrative about the emergence of eugenics in the context of Austria-Hungary, predating the consolidation of nation-states. This narrative, illustrating the entangled character of emerging eugenics in the area, as well as its surprisingly dynamic engagement with the idea of the empire and its diversity, aligns well with Pieter Judson's portrayal of Austria-Hungary as "a regularized and integrated imperial space."¹⁷ Importantly, the onset of World War I and the eventual collapse of the Habsburg Empire did not mark the end of the empire-oriented eugenic blueprints; instead, it signaled the beginning of their career as an imperial legacy.

While the empire disintegrated in 1918, its legacies persisted. Ranging from discourses to practices, the empire's legacies proved surprisingly tenacious, as recent scholarship revealed through illuminating local studies, as well as through the analysis of the transnational reverberations of these legacies.¹⁸ In effect, it is now broadly accepted that the states which incorporated various parts of the empire's territory faced many similar challenges, of which the ethnocultural diversity of their populations was one of the most striking. Pursuing various, often ambiguous, strategies of managing such populations, they resembled miniatures of Austria-

¹⁶ On the varieties of nationalist ideologies in Austria-Hungary, see Philipp Decker, "Varieties of Nationalism in the Political Discourses of Habsburg Austria," *Nations and Nationalism* 29, no. 3 (2023): 888–905.

¹⁷ Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 8.

¹⁸ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 446.

Hungary, despite their nationalist rhetoric claiming a radical break with the imperial past. In effect, “each of these self-styled nation states in fact acted like a small empire,” as Pieter Judson acutely observes.¹⁹

The process out of which these polities emerged, moreover, cannot be reduced to a top-down dynamic of state building emanating from the new national metropolis. Instead, as Gábor Egry suggests, there was also a state-building process from below, in which “a patchwork of local transitions” impinged back on the state.²⁰ Strikingly, the role of scientific experts in this process – both at the central and local levels – remains surprisingly unexplored. Through an analysis of the role of eugenicists in the post-imperial transitions, this dissertation argues that they, along with other actors analogously claiming expertise, were involved at various moments in this complex process at either central or local levels. Indeed, moving between these two levels, they often played a role as a switchboard connecting them. Crucially, in doing so, they did not develop entirely new languages of self-description but rather adopted and repurposed the imperial ones.

An analysis of eugenic practices, concepts, and networks in early interwar Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia reveals a significant degree of continuity with the imperial past. First, the biopolitical practices spearheaded in the 1920s reflected the differentiated rule that characterized these states and constituted an imperial legacy in itself. In effect, eugenic practices did not flow from a single, coherent body of national eugenics but rather differed widely within these post-Habsburg states. (However, stark similarities between similar types of spaces – large urban areas, rural countryside, or post-imperial borderlands, respectively – across these states testified to their shared genealogy and

¹⁹ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 448.

²⁰ Gábor Egry, “Negotiating Post-Imperial Transitions: Local Societies and Nationalizing States in East Central Europe,” in *Embers of Empire: Continuity and Rupture in the Habsburg Successor States after 1918*, ed. Claire Morelon and Paul Miller (Oxford: Berghahn, 2019), 33.

often persisting linkages). Second, a significant number of eugenicists in the 1920s drew on repurposed concepts inherited from the context of the defunct empire and used them for the management of the “mini-imperial diversity” of their countries. Thirdly, many networks of eugenicists that emerged in the late imperial context and crossed linguistic or national boundaries continued to matter well into the interwar period. This was particularly striking in the case of informal networks. In light of these continuities, I suggest that the eugenics that characterized the last years of Austria-Hungary had transformed itself into a post-imperial, or “mini-imperial” eugenics of the 1920s.

The persistence, and even active incorporation, of imperial legacies in post-Habsburg countries often walked hand in hand with a language stressing a radical break from the imperial past. Having adopted concepts, networks, and practices formerly linked to the empire, many eugenicists were not exempt from this dissonance, as they simultaneously promoted narratives about the national distinctiveness of their eugenic blueprints. Moreover, it was precisely the imperial concepts that, in some cases, constituted a core part of these claimed nationally distinctive approaches. For example, the most vocal promoter of the narrative of eugenics as the Czech national science, biologist Vladislav Růžička, incorporated into its core several concepts adopted from left-leaning Viennese eugenicists. Not less paradoxically, he also argued that there was a fundamental social continuity between the empire and its successor state. “Let us not confuse the form of the state with the social order, even if they are related to a certain extent,” the eugenicist wrote in 1923.²¹ “Both empires [císařství] and republics may preserve the same social order,” Růžička argued.²² He then claimed his national eugenics as a strategy for reinforcing it.

²¹ Vladislav Růžička, *Biologické základy eugeniky* [Biological Foundations of Eugenics]. (Prague: Borový, 1923), 598.

²² Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 598.

Let us take a moment to present the argument more systematically. This dissertation proposes distinguishing three phases of eugenics in Austria-Hungary and the post-Habsburg countries. The first phase, commencing around the year 1900 and concluding with the violent collapse of the empire in the Autumn of 1918, was distinctly imperial. It was characterized by various and contested attempts to establish a biosocial framework for the cognitive management of imperial diversity. The second phase, spanning from the imperial collapse to roughly the peak of the Great Depression in the region, can be described as post-imperial, or more accurately, “mini-imperial.” During this period, practices, concepts, and networks inherited from the imperial setting were adapted for various political agendas. This adaptation aimed to cognitively grapple with the persistent ethnocultural diversity and complex state frameworks, making the post-Habsburg states resemble miniature empires. While these two phases were distinct, and the second produced multiple disturbing nationalist appropriations of the imperial concepts, there was a significant degree of continuity between them.

This continuity, however, cannot be claimed for the third phase of eugenics in post-Habsburg territories, which marked the 1930s and can tentatively be labeled as “de-imperial.”²³ The break with the past was both material and discursive. The central driving force behind this phase was a young generation of scientists and activists socialized already in the post-imperial context, who, in some cases, even defined themselves through a generational discourse. They often encountered eugenics in nationalist associations and the eugenic projects that, in the 1920s, targeted the borderlands or other rural areas. However, they increasingly perceived these local attempts at collective regeneration as unsuccessful, contributing to a sense of disappointment with post-imperial state-building more broadly. In addition, many embedded this dissatisfaction within an overarching discourse of crisis. Their typical conclusion from this

²³ I am borrowing this term from Johana Wyss, “New Settlers as Implicated Subjects: Case Study of Collective Amnesia in Czech Silesia,” in *No Neighbors' Lands in Postwar Europe: Vanishing Others*, ed. Anna Wylegała, Sabine Rutar, and Małgorzata Łukianow (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2023), 359–81.

perceived failure of mini-imperial eugenics was that crafting new humans had to be preceded by building a new state, one purged of its imperial legacies and with significantly expanded capacity.

Drawing on earlier radical eugenic blueprints pioneered by nationalist activists at the language frontiers of the empire and repurposed by the new nationalist authorities for the post-imperial borderlands and some rural areas in the 1920s, the resulting eugenic packages tended to further radicalize these sources. They achieved this by linking them to a vision of state-building that was no longer local but totalizing. A key characteristic of these visions of the new state was their effective purification from imperial legacies. For these eugenicists, this could involve prioritizing clear-cut top-down processes over negotiations on the ground and dealings with local societies. Even more ominously, it could imply a radical reordering of the population, and in its most extreme manifestations, an erasure of diversity. However, the effective break with the Habsburg imperial past did not preclude an engagement with blueprints of imperial or colonial expansion, either in theory or even in practice.²⁴ Instead, as the last chapter of this dissertation will make clear, purging the Leviathan could walk hand in hand with an escalation of such engagement.

The destructive and, simultaneously, self-destructive potential of these de-imperial eugenic discourses, which became salient in the 1930s, serves as a bridge between the narrower discussion of eugenics and the broader perspective provided by the concept of biopolitics. Their rise not only marked a rift in the history of eugenics in this context but also signaled a fundamental change in the underlying biopolitical paradigms, as the following section will seek to illuminate.

²⁴ Marius Turda and Bolaji Balogun, “Colonialism, Eugenics and ‘Race’ in Central and Eastern Europe,” *Global Social Challenges Journal* 20, no. 1 (2023): 5.

Biopolitics

In 1976, Michel Foucault concluded the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* with a section titled “Right of Death and Power over Life.” It was here that Foucault presented an early outline of his concept of biopolitics. In his understanding, biopolitics referred to the various strategies of population management in modern states that target not only the life processes of individuals but also those of broader collectivities. Alongside this concept, Foucault introduced a narrative that closely linked the birth of biopolitics to the emergence of modernity. He asserted that it was in early modern Europe where

[f]or the first time in history, no doubt, biological existence was reflected in political existence; the fact of living [...] passed into knowledge’s field of control and power’s sphere of intervention. Power would [...] be applied at the level of life itself; it was the taking charge of life, more than the threat of death, that gave power its access even to the body.²⁵

What is more, Foucault posited that biopolitics was not merely a modern phenomenon but a defining characteristic of modernity itself: “what might be called a society’s threshold of modernity,” he argued, “has been reached when the life of the species is wagered on its own political strategies.”²⁶

Foucault’s foundational observations serve as a reminder that eugenics is embedded in a broader set of biopolitical discourses and practices. Although eugenics is an integral part of biopolitics, it is crucial to note that the latter emerged long before eugenics and continued after its demise. Consequently, while every eugenic idea and racial ideology is biopolitical, it would be misleading to reduce biopolitics to eugenics, as some historical scholarship on eugenics in East Central Europe tends to do.²⁷ Nevertheless, with these reservations, the history of eugenics

²⁵ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality I: An Introduction* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 142.

²⁶ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 143.

²⁷ A recent volume edited by Immo Rebitschek, Barbara Klich-Kluczewska, and Joachim Puttkamer point precisely in this direction when they criticize an influential part of the scholarship on eugenics in East Central Europe that tends to conflate eugenics with biopolitics, thus digressing from contemporary theorizing on biopolitics. Barbara Klich-Kluczewska, “Is Biopower Something to Be Afraid Of? Biopolitics as a Research

provides a useful lens through which one can detect changes in the broader biopolitical landscape in the early twentieth century.

As Foucault's various writings on biopolitics were gradually being published by their editors, they not only sparked numerous attempts at exegesis but also highly original theorizing. In particular, Foucault's work resonated strongly among Anglophone and Italian theorists who ventured beyond his legacy in the 1980s and 1990s.²⁸ Since the turn of the century, moreover, French, Anglophone, and Italian Foucauldian views were increasingly brought into conversation and cross-pollinated in manifold ways. It is the Italian and, to a lesser extent, the Anglophone Foucauldian theorizing that informs the approach to biopolitics in this dissertation.

The "paradigm of immunization," proposed by the philosopher Roberto Esposito, reveals itself as particularly useful for the analysis in this dissertation. Esposito does not see biopolitics as a homogeneous whole but rather as containing at least two fundamentally different "internal possibilities."²⁹ Esposito's analysis focuses particularly on one of these modes of biopolitics, which he terms "immunitarian." The key features of this mode include conceptualizing bodies – both individual and collective – as "non-communicating circles or enclosures" and the subsequent political drive for their self-preservation.³⁰ This often goes hand in hand with an epistemic and political preference for an initial state in which it is claimed that these bodies had not yet been contaminated by outside influences. In Esposito's argument, the rise of this mode of biopolitics is closely tied to modernity, which made "self-preservation the

Category in Historiography," in *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Fearing for the Nation*, ed. Barbara Klich-Kluczevska, Joachim Puttkamer, and Immo Rebitschek (London: Routledge, 2022), 13.

²⁸ Andrew Zimmerman, "Foucault in Berkeley and Magnitogorsk: Totalitarianism and the Limits of Liberal Critique," *Contemporary European History* 23, no. 2 (2014): 225–36.

²⁹ Roberto Esposito, "Community, Immunity, Biopolitics," *Angelaki* 18, no. 3 (2013): 86.

³⁰ Esposito, "Community, Immunity, Biopolitics," 85.

presupposition of all other political categories” and repeatedly unleashed the destructive potential inherent in this mode of biopolitics.³¹

Esposito brings to light another crucial dimension of immunitarian biopolitics by emphasizing that its destructive power is not confined solely to external targets but can also turn inward. As this form of biopolitics escalates, it turns against itself, culminating in what he terms a “self-destructive revolt of immunity against itself.”³² Elsewhere, Esposito encapsulates this dynamic in even more graphic metaphors, describing its culmination as the “absolute coincidence of homicide and suicide.”³³ He detects the darkest actualization of these destructive and self-destructive potentials in the biopolitics of 20th-century totalitarian dictatorships, particularly in Nazism. Thus, Esposito’s insights unveil a dual nature of the immunitarian mode of biopolitics: its external manifestations, often characterized by destructive power, and its internal contradictions, which may drive a trajectory of self-destruction.

While the immunitary mode became increasingly dominant in modernity, particularly in the twentieth century, it is only one form of biopolitics that Esposito identifies. He suggests that other forms of biopolitics existed within modernity, or even before it. In particular, Esposito is interested in what he labels as “affirmative” biopolitics, which he sees as fundamentally different from the biopolitics of immunization.³⁴ Even though Esposito’s definition of this mode of biopolitics is more nebulous than his clear-sighted analysis of its immunitary counterpart, it is evident that its defining feature is the “non-excluding relation” it establishes between human bodies and the various alterities that surround them. In short, it is a biopolitical framework in which bodies – both individual and politic – are not self-enclosed but rather

³¹ Roberto Esposito, *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 9.

³² Timothy Campbell, “Bíos, Immunity, Life: The Thought of Roberto Esposito,” in *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, by Roberto Esposito (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), xix.

³³ Esposito, *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, 111.

³⁴ Esposito, “Community, Immunity, Biopolitics,” 87.

“understood as a functioning construct that is open to continuous exchange” with their human and non-human environment.³⁵

Scholars should not shy away from discussing biopolitics in the Habsburg Empire. Numerous empirical case studies exploring various facets of biopolitics in this region before World War I provide sufficient evidence for its presence, even though they often implicitly project later nation-state boundaries into the imperial past.³⁶ It is all the more surprising, then, that there is no synthetic narrative convincingly linking biopolitics in Austria-Hungary to its imperial setting.³⁷ Tellingly, the recently completed monumental series *Die Habsburgermonarchie, 1848–1918*, addresses various discourses and practices of population management, such as social policy, demography, and statistics, without any significant engagement with the concept of biopolitics. One possible explanation for this striking blind spot is the formerly widely held belief in the non-modernity of the Habsburg Empire, which made it incompatible with the assumed fundamental modernity of biopolitics. However, both of these assumptions have been recently challenged. While more recent historiography discredited the narrative about the empire’s backwardness, philosophers and social theorists

³⁵ Roberto Esposito, *Immunitas: The Protection and Negation of Life* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011), 17.

³⁶ For Austria, for example, see the arguments and literature cited in Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer and Thomas Mayer, *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900–1945* (Vienna: Czernin, 2007); Doris Byer, *Rassenhygiene und Wohlfahrtspflege: Zur Entstehung eines Sozialdemokratischen Machtdispositivs in Österreich bis 1934* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1988); Thomas Mayer, “Austria,” in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900–1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 4–18; Herwig Czech, “Regenerating the Nation: Eugenics and Racial Hygiene in Early Twentieth-Century Austria,” in *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Fearing for the Nation*, ed. Barbara Klich-Kluczewska, Joachim Puttkamer, and Immo Rebitschek (London: Routledge, 2022), 23–42; Monika Löscher, “... dergesunden Vernunft nicht zuwider...”: katholische Eugenik in Österreich vor 1938 (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2009).

³⁷ Significant exceptions are, above all, Emese Lafferton, “The Magyar Moustache: The Faces of Hungarian State Formation, 1867–1918,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 38, no. 4 (2007): 706–32; Tatjana Buklijaš and Emese Lafferton, “Science, Medicine and Nationalism in the Habsburg Empire from the 1840s to 1918,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 38, no. 4 (2007): 679–86.

have rethought biopolitics in a way that is now more attentive to its pre-modern – and non-European – forms.³⁸

The history of biopolitics spotlights the modernity of the Habsburg Empire from a hitherto unexplored angle. Following Esposito's arguments about the escalation and eventual ascendancy of a specific, immunitarian mode of biopolitics in the modern era, this dissertation reveals its upsurge in the late imperial context, particularly among the radical nationalists, along with mapping some of the networks that propelled it. Thus, in this dissertation, the view of the dynamic modernity of the empire is corroborated through its disturbing and unintended consequences.

Even more importantly, the dissertation demonstrates that this type of biopolitics did not dominate in Austria-Hungary. It highlights that a surprisingly high number of interconnected actors within the empire attempted to craft a modern affirmative mode of biopolitics that would be amenable to the empire's diversity and the complex entanglements of its subjects. Only in the course of the interwar period, specifically by the end of the 1920s, did this mode of biopolitics become visibly marginalized and ultimately disintegrated. Contrary to Esposito, the dissertation suggests that modernization did not lead to immunization in an automatic, impersonal process, but rather through contestations and the closing off of different options.

While Esposito's distinction between these two modalities of biopolitics is analytically fruitful, his assumption that affirmative biopolitics is a benign and creative alternative to its immunitary counterpart raises some doubts. The historical analysis conducted in this dissertation highlights that both modalities have the potential for repression, although it was

³⁸ For an overview of the debates on biopolitics, see Maurizio Meloni, "The Politics of Environments before the Environment: Biopolitics in the Longue Durée," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 88 (2021): 334–44.

immunitarian biopolitics in which this potential more often actualized into reality. In putting forth this argument, the dissertation echoes the sociologist Maurizio Meloni, who warns that “a politics of life – even if conceived into a non-immunitarian medical framework – can always be taken up in strategies of optimization, normalization and conservatio vitae.”³⁹ Although the resulting biopolitical practices may promote “entanglement with others or the power of the milieu,” they cannot entirely extricate themselves from “structural violence, strategies of colonial protection or even collective hostility.”⁴⁰

The historical examination of both modalities of biopolitics in the late Habsburg and postimperial contexts reveals partial overlaps in their targets. Already in the late Habsburg Empire, promoters of both modalities coalesced in singling out the medical, as well as moral and class-related, concept of alcoholism. Darkly, during the war and after the empire’s collapse, they also partially coincided in targeting mobile and displaced people, as well as those deemed insufficiently productive. Despite being rooted in conflicting assumptions about the plasticity of human nature and the power of cooperation – often coupled with fundamentally different perceptions of modernity – some of their targets thus remained disturbingly invariable.

Deeper still was the fact that their approaches were underpinned by a shared embrace of whiteness. While this assumption often remained tacit, it forcefully resurfaced in moments when the arguments of local supporters of eugenics had been radically contested, such as during World War I or after the rise of Nazi racial ideology in Germany. In these cases, the emphasis on their positioning on the “white side of the global color line” revealed itself clearly as a core

³⁹ Maurizio Meloni, “Porous Bodies: Environmental Biopower and the Politics of Life in Ancient Rome,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 38, no. 3 (2021): 112.

⁴⁰ Meloni, “Porous Bodies,” 112.

aspect of their arguments.⁴¹ Only a few biopolitical thinkers in post-Habsburg countries were capable of breaking with this racial imaginary.

Beyond offering a new perspective on biopolitics, Esposito's paradigm of immunization has also been fruitfully employed to enhance the toolkit for analyzing eugenics, more specifically. Echoes of his distinction between immunitarian and affirmative biopolitics can be detected in a useful typology of ideal-typical configurations between political and epistemic values in eugenics suggested by Maurizio Meloni. In essence, the sociologist oriented towards science and technology studies suggests distinguishing four "political-epistemic options" in eugenics, each embodying a different fusion of politics and theories of heredity.⁴² The two main contemporary theories of heredity, namely (neo-)Lamarckism and Mendelism, were complex, exhibited a significant degree of internal diversity, and evolved over time. For the sake of simplicity, "soft heredity," emphasizing the power of the environment in shaping a plastic human nature can be seen as one defining feature of Lamarckism. Conversely, the emerging Mendelism was marked by the idea that human characteristics are genetic, discrete, and fixed.⁴³

The first political-epistemic option in eugenics that Meloni identifies is what he calls "Left" Lamarckism. Joining soft heredity with affirmative biopolitics, this type of eugenics placed its bets on the developmental plasticity of humans, hoping that a changed environment could regenerate society more broadly, including some marginalized social groups. Conversely, a "Right," or immunitarian, Lamarckism, based its pessimistic vision of growing human degeneration on the notion that exposure to an unsuitable environment produced persistent

⁴¹ I am borrowing this paraphrase of Du Bois' essential concept from Devin Pendas, "Racial States in Comparative Perspective," in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 116–43. For Du Bois' classical statement of the concept, see W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, ed. Brent Hayes Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

⁴² Maurizio Meloni, *Political Biology: Science and Social Values in Human Heredity from Eugenics to Epigenetics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 94–96.

⁴³ Maurizio Meloni, *Impressionable Biologies: From the Archaeology of Plasticity to the Sociology of Epigenetics* (New York: Routledge, 2019).

negative effects. For the Mendelians, the environment mattered less, as it could not normally change human nature. However, whether this theory was a source of hope or despair was a political question. For “Left” Mendelians, inflected towards affirmative biopolitics, the permanence of hereditary abilities in humans meant that individuals could actualize their hidden potential if provided with the opportunity to do so. For “Right” Mendelians, embodying the most radical form of immunitarian biopolitics, this permanence meant that the individuals and groups labeled as inferior had no hope of changing their lot. Even if an individual managed to overcome their alleged inherited burden, they would pass it undiminished to their progeny.⁴⁴

This typology provides a more fruitful approach to eugenics than the commonly and uncritically used dichotomy between “positive” and “negative” eugenics found in a significant part of the scholarship on the subject. The fundamental problem with this dichotomy – resting on different assumptions than Esposito’s categories and essentially contrasting pro-natalist strategies with selection through elimination – is that it was proposed by the supporters of eugenics themselves. Indeed, it was commonly used to promote eugenics as early as the 1910s.⁴⁵ In the terminology of the sociologist Rogers Brubaker, therefore, it is clearly a category of practice rather than a category of analysis. Brubaker’s methodological suggestion to avoid “reproducing or reinforcing reification [of concepts] by uncritically adopting categories of practice as categories of analysis” is particularly urgent in this regard, given the original association of this category with the racial discourse of eugenics.⁴⁶

Thus, in approaching biopolitics, this dissertation engages with contemporary theoretical discussions surrounding this influential concept. However, it also draws valuable insights from the pioneering generation of Foucauldians who, from the 1980s onwards,

⁴⁴ Meloni, *Political Biology*, 93–135.

⁴⁵ One early proponent of this distinction was the British physician, Caleb Saleeby. Caleb W. Saleeby, “The Methods of Eugenics,” *The Sociological Review* a3, no. 4 (October 1910): 277.

⁴⁶ Brubaker and Cooper, “Beyond ‘Identity’,” *Theory and Society* 29, no. 1 (2000): 5.

introduced and rethought his ideas in the Anglophone context.⁴⁷ Particularly influential among these early scholars are Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, whose work offers a practical strategy for translating Foucault's experimental and tentative way of thinking into a concrete research program.

Designing “operational tools for critical inquiry” into biopolitics, Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose suggest that a point of departure should be the recognition that it does not constitute a homogeneous and coherent body of knowledge.⁴⁸ Instead, they highlight the multiplicity of social actors, strategies, and agendas that mark biopolitics, even in its various, historically specific manifestations.⁴⁹ At the same time, they make it clear that their emphasis on the diffuse and contingent character of biopolitics, as well as on the discrepancies between its discourses and practices, does not collapse into a relativizing agenda.⁵⁰ Given the complexity of biopolitics, therefore, Rabinow and Rose suggest that its mapping cannot start with sweeping claims but rather with what they call “modest empiricism.” This approach, “attentive to peculiarities, to small differences, to the moments when shifts in truth, authority, spatiality or ethics make a difference” resonates well with history's own methodology.⁵¹

In particular, Rabinow and Rose delineate three key concrete research areas for a grounded, historical analysis of biopolitics.⁵² Firstly, such analysis should unveil the multiple “truth discourses about the ‘vital’ character of living human beings” that are simultaneously at work in a given historical context, as well as trace the various authorities claiming expertise to voice such ideas.⁵³ The second area they identify involves the “strategies for intervention”

⁴⁷ For a political and epistemic context of this reception, see Zimmerman, “Foucault in Berkeley and Magnitogorsk,” *passim*.

⁴⁸ Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, “Biopower Today,” *BioSocieties* 1, no. 2 (2006): 197.

⁴⁹ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 203.

⁵⁰ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 205.

⁵¹ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 205.

⁵² Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 199.

⁵³ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 197.

driven by concerns with the life, health, and efficiency of real or imagined collectives. Importantly, these collectivities are not intrinsically linked to the idea of the nation or its claimed territory.⁵⁴ Finally, the “modes of subjectivization,” in which individuals relate to biopolitical discourses and turn them into technologies of the self, constitute the third area to which researchers should pay attention.⁵⁵

This dissertation heeds Rabinow’s and Rose’s advice in tracing the first two areas, mapping eugenic discourses at a concrete historical juncture, pinpointing their supporters, and tracing their interactions with various institutions. It also gestures towards the third through several forays into analyzing social practices within voluntary associations. These associations, as will become apparent, were a key context for eugenic discourses and practices in Austria-Hungary and in post-Habsburg contexts. The section that follows discusses some theoretical offers for analyzing the interactions between truth discourses, experts, various state agencies, and the voluntary associations.

Expertise, States, and Voluntary Associations

“Human nature is the point at which the human and the natural intersect,” as Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal perceptively observe. For this reason, human nature remains a recurrent subject of disputes regarding “whether, why, and when nature’s authority may be hauled into human affairs.”⁵⁶ In the course of these controversies, a special group of actors, whom Daston and Vidal term the “experts in the natural,” emerged in the early modern period.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 197.

⁵⁵ Rabinow and Rose, “Biopower Today,” 197.

⁵⁶ Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal, “Introduction: Doing What Comes Naturally,” in *The Moral Authority of Nature*, ed. Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 10.

⁵⁷ Daston and Vidal, “Introduction,” 7.

These experts claimed authority in elucidating nature, including human nature, especially in instances where these interpretations were entangled in political controversies.⁵⁸

Vidal and Daston argue that the claims of the experts in the natural gained ever broader acceptance in the course of the modern era. By the early 1800s, they inaugurated mutually reinforcing notions of “nature as an allegedly neutral judge” and of scientific experts as “allegedly disinterested interpreters of nature’s verdict.”⁵⁹ However, far from being neutral, portrayals of nature, and of human nature in particular, also embody a program. Interpreting it, therefore, means “at once a description and a prescription for how to act, think, and feel.”⁶⁰ Moreover, the boundaries that are thus delineated, such as between the biological and the social or the “normal” and the “pathological,” “are almost always simultaneously hierarchies.”⁶¹ This dissertation approaches the supporters of eugenics as a striking instance of such modern, scientific “experts in the natural,” laying and contesting claims to interpreting the nature of humans and their societies.

Daston’s and Vidal’s observations align with the sophisticated sociological approach to experts, expertise, and their functions in modern societies proposed by Gil Eyal. Sociologist of science Eyal approaches expertise from a constructivist perspective while simultaneously highlighting the close entanglement of experts with both the state and civil society. In his understanding, expertise is a category of analysis that refers to “a historically specific way of talking” rather than “a thing, [or] a set of skills possessed by an individual or even by a group.”⁶² This specific way of talking, Eyal argues, emerges in societies where there is a demand for scientific solutions to political and practical challenges connected to uncertainty and risk, yet

⁵⁸ Daston and Vidal, “Introduction,” 7.

⁵⁹ Daston and Vidal, “Introduction,” 7.

⁶⁰ Daston and Vidal, “Introduction,” 10.

⁶¹ Daston and Vidal, “Introduction,” 10.

⁶² Gil Eyal, *The Crisis of Expertise* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019), 19.

multiple scientific networks stake competing claims to authority over the elucidation of these problems. Expertise, Eyal argues, is the language in which these competing claims are formulated.⁶³

Eyal also illuminates how those who claim such expertise, or experts, operate within modern societies.⁶⁴ Drawing on the sociological theories of both Pierre Bourdieu and Bruno Latour, Eyal argues that experts and their networks do not operate within a single, self-enclosed social field. Instead, they exert their power within the interstitial spaces that mediate between and connect various social fields. The state, in particular, is one of the central recipients of their interventions. While interacting with the state, experts create “fuzzy and thick interfaces” between the state and the civil society in which experts and state institutions intertwine, up to the point of becoming indistinct.⁶⁵ It is within these interstitial spaces that “things can be done, combinations and conversions could be established, that are not possible to do within fields.”⁶⁶ This dissertation highlights the complex and non-linear process in which these “ports into the Leviathan” were established in the late imperial and post-Habsburg contexts.⁶⁷ Eyal’s observation that such spaces often open in moments of perceived crisis, triggered by abrupt changes, and that they, in turn, can produce further changes will prove important in this regard.⁶⁸ At the same time, the links of experts to civil society are also brought into sharp relief in this dissertation, creating a kind of tripartite analytical scheme.

⁶³ In English, the term expertise was already used in the interwar period, albeit infrequently. However, it became more widespread only around the 1960s. For my purposes, the term expertise, therefore, serves as a category of analysis, and only rarely appeared as a category of practice in my sources. Eyal, *The Crisis*, 22.

⁶⁴ Gil Eyal, “Plugging into the Body of the Leviathan: Proposal for a New Sociology of Public Interventions,” *Middle East – Topics & Arguments* 2, no. 1 (2013): 10.

⁶⁵ Eyal, “Plugging into the Body,” 20.

⁶⁶ Gil Eyal, “Spaces between Fields,” in *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*, ed. Philip S. Gorski (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013), 177.

⁶⁷ Eyal, “Plugging into the Body,” 20.

⁶⁸ Eyal, “Spaces between Fields,” 177.

Given the particular position of experts between the state and civil society, a revisiting of Foucault's views on both categories by Mitchell Dean and Kaspar Villadsen, both Foucauldian social theorists focusing on governmentality, is particularly illuminating. They explain that Foucault's main theoretical move regarding the state, breaking away from both Marxist and Weberian theories, was to radically decenter it. Foucault, therefore, emphasized the dispersion of power within society rather than its exclusive centralization in the hands of a single Leviathan (or a single class).⁶⁹ To this extent, Foucault's approach is helpful as it directs the analysis towards recognizing that eugenics in the area under consideration was not simply a result of a top-down process but was negotiated by varied sets of social actors, enabled by their temporary and shifting alliances with and within different institutions, and materialized in concrete, situated, and embodied practices.

However, Dean and Villadsen warn that, in an exaggerated form, an emphasis on the dispersed nature of power runs the risk of entirely dissolving the notion of the state – a risk, they argue, that even Foucault sometimes succumbed to. From this perspective, the state may “become nothing but the fragile effect of multiple governmentalities.”⁷⁰ This would mean discarding much of what other theorists saw as defining features of the state, questioning, for instance, its specific relationship with law and the legitimate use of force. Crucially, such a move would also deny the state “its own regime of veridiction, that is, its specific forms of truth pertaining to bureaucracy and public service as a set of institutions and practices.”⁷¹

While this dissertation does not view the state – be it imperial or national – as the singular center of power, but rather highlights its dispersion, it also emphasizes the knowledge production taking place within various state bodies, as well as their degree of agency. In this

⁶⁹ Mitchell Dean and Kaspar Villadsen, *State Phobia and Civil Society: The Political Legacy of Michel Foucault* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016), 2.

⁷⁰ Dean and Villadsen, *State Phobia*, 114.

⁷¹ Dean and Villadsen, *State Phobia*, 186.

regard, it aligns with recent calls by historians of science, such as Theodore Porter, to seriously engage with bureaucracy as the key site of knowledge production.⁷² By using eugenics as an example, this dissertation argues that, during the broadly defined post-imperial transitions, the interpenetration between the state and scientific expertise grew significantly. However, it was not a linear or predetermined process, nor was there always contiguity between bureaucratic and expert knowledge production.

The broad backdrop for such intertwining was the advanced process of the formation of states in 19th-century Europe, which, as the historical sociologist Charles Tilly argues, brought about an expansion of the states' capacity and an increase in the scope of state intervention.⁷³ The continental empires in the East and Southeast of Europe followed this trend, expanded the purview of their activity, and initiated new forms of biopolitical measures.⁷⁴ This expansion of the state, as will be shown, gave an impulse to much of the initial debates about eugenics in Austria-Hungary. More precisely, these discussions were motivated by the expectation that the expanding state would integrate this claimed biopolitical expertise into its decision-making, and that its producers would thus plug themselves into the body of the Leviathan. Yet, the dissertation also reveals that for a significant period, public administration in the empire, and initially, even the central authorities in the nation-states, remained reluctant to systematically embrace and integrate eugenics. Unlike their counterparts in colonial empires, Habsburg imperial administrators were skeptical of natural scientific arguments and instead prioritized

⁷² Theodore M. Porter, "Revenge of the Humdrum: Bureaucracy as Profession and as a Site of Science," *Journal for the History of Knowledge* 1, no. 1 (2020): 1–5.

⁷³ Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 117–22.

⁷⁴ Hannes Grandits, Pieter Judson, and Malte Rolf, "Towards a New Quality of Statehood: Bureaucratization and State-Building in Empires and Nation States before 1914," in *The Routledge History Handbook of Central and Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century. Volume 2: Statehood*, ed. Włodzimierz Borodziej, Sabina Ferhadbegović and Joachim von Puttkamer (London: Routledge, 2020), passim.

legal knowledge.⁷⁵ Instead, as far as eugenics impinged on concrete practices, these practices for a long time took place primarily in the local contexts of voluntary associations.

Besides reconsidering Foucault's perspectives on the state, a return to his actual views on the relationship between the state and civil society is another essential precondition for a compelling interpretation of the social functions and impact of eugenics in the Habsburg Empire and beyond. While it is often asserted that Foucault prioritized civil society as the driver of political action over the state, Dean and Villadsen argue that this constitutes a misconception. Instead, a close reading of his texts reveals Foucault as a thinker who is much more wary of its mechanisms and its ambiguous role as a political actor.⁷⁶ This skepticism stems from Foucault's aforementioned decentered understanding of power relations. If power is dispersed across the entire polity, then no main part of the social body saves itself from being implicated in its functioning and becomes painfully complicit in its transgressions. Thus, Dean and Villadsen conclude that both in theory and in practice, Foucault refused to simply "take the side of society against the state" and to portray the former as the key actor capable of thwarting the state's repressive power.⁷⁷

Indeed, this dissertation reveals that voluntary associations, rather than the state, initially played a crucial role in producing and promoting eugenics in Habsburg and post-Habsburg contexts. The state did not overshadow them at least until the late 1920s, if not later. The analysis of the interplay between these associations and eugenics can fruitfully draw on Foucault's skepticism towards civil society, which arises from his realization of its repressive, exclusivist, and even violent potentials.⁷⁸ In effect, Dean and Villadsen argue, Foucault realized

⁷⁵ Peter Becker, "The Administrative Apparatus under Reconstruction," in *The Habsburg Civil Service and Beyond: Bureaucracy and Civil Servants from the Vormärz to the Inter-War Years*, ed. Franz Adlgasser and Fredrik Lindström (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2019), 233–58.

⁷⁶ Dean and Villadsen, *State Phobia*, 3.

⁷⁷ Dean and Villadsen, *State Phobia*, 60.

⁷⁸ Dean and Villadsen, *State Phobia*, 61.

that repression did not trickle down from above but could be pioneered in “localized social domains,” such as voluntary associations. Paradoxically, these small social domains could thus become a crucial laboratory that pioneered “policing mechanisms ‘from below’ that would pave the way for the subsequent state-controlled apparatuses of order, hygiene, and discipline.”⁷⁹ The history of eugenics – and biopolitics more broadly – across Austria-Hungary and various post-Habsburg contexts provides a disturbingly clear-cut illustration of these observations.

Nevertheless, it is important to stress that not all parts of civil society were implicated with eugenics, but rather a small, yet significant, part of voluntary associations. The high significance of these associations – notably including, but not limited to, nationalist activist bodies or mass gymnastics associations – stemmed from their mass membership, their level of penetration of society manifesting itself in the enormous spread of their local branches, as well as their increasing synergy with the state, particularly in the 1930s. Aside from Foucault’s general picture, theorizing about “uncivil civil society” by political scientist Leonardo Avritzer is helpful for grasping the concrete form and political functions of this part of voluntary associations. Uncivil civil society, Avritzer argues, is “a result of society’s need to produce the primary ‘public goods’ usually provided by the state,” such as education, healthcare, security, or food supply.⁸⁰ Its emergence, according to Avritzer, is propelled by factors that reduce the state’s capacity to provide such goods, often caused by “weak state structures,” “damage caused by civil war,” or a “fractured political society.”⁸¹

Even though Avritzer’s analysis was developed on empirical material from Latin America, I argue that some of his observations are also helpful for the late Habsburg Empire. In this latter setting, nationalist activists started setting up structures that ran parallel or

⁷⁹ Dean and Villadsen, *State Phobia*, 63.

⁸⁰ Leonardo Avritzer, “Civil Society in Latin America: Uncivil, Liberal and Participatory Models,” in *Exploring Civil Society*, ed. Marlies Glasius (London: Routledge, 2004), 56.

⁸¹ Avritzer, “Civil Society,” 58.

complemented imperial state institutions, which were increasingly delivering public goods but were not willing to provide them in a nationalist key. These alternative structures were mass, voluntary associations that provided goods such as education, military training, or welfare, yet only to perceived co-nationals, and in an attempt to facilitate their mobilization for nationalist agendas. (Various socialist, civic radical, and agrarian populist actors also established similar institutions to pursue their respective political goals.) Yet, the label “uncivil civil society” that Avritzer proposes is both unwieldy and problematic in its normative assumptions.⁸² For the sake of convenience and to better highlight the function of these associations, this dissertation thus refers to them as “alternative states,” and demonstrates their deep implication with eugenics.

If these voluntary associations preceded the state in embracing eugenics, the question arises: when did the state choose to embrace this body of knowledge, and what motivations drove this choice? The analysis in this dissertation highlights the importance of a perceived crisis as the key trigger that repeatedly propelled a search for new technologies of governing, ultimately including eugenics. The first, albeit temporary, embrace of eugenics by the state took place in response to the massive challenges posed by World War I to Austria-Hungary. As the war carried on, both the civil administration and the military of the imperial state increasingly engaged with eugenic knowledge and its producers, who promised technical solutions to the mounting crisis phenomena. However, the practical effects of this embrace were partly offset by the declining capacity of the imperial state to implement most resulting eugenically oriented policies on a large scale. After the collapse of the empire and the stabilization of the post-Habsburg countries, moreover, this alliance between the central state authorities and the

⁸² Marlies Glasius, “Uncivil Society,” in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*, ed. Helmut K. Anheier and Stefan Toepler (New York: Springer, 2010), 1583–88.

eugenicists unraveled. In effect, eugenicists scaled down their activity from central to local contexts for most of the 1920s.

That changed in the subsequent decade as central authorities started scrambling for technocratic solutions to the Great Depression and the social and political challenges that went hand in hand with it. Eugenics and its advocates emerged as one source of such solutions. Consequently, as Marius Turda observes, in the course of the 1930s “eugenics became socially relevant and politically important,” even with the central authorities.⁸³ However, it was not the eugenics that marked the imperial and early post-imperial contexts that now won a higher profile. No longer moderate and with a complex attitude towards diversity, the rising eugenic blueprints were often drafted by a new generation of eugenicists that became radical in response to the perceived failure of its predecessors. Moreover, negotiating with contemporary theories of heredity, these eugenicists often no longer spearheaded social reformist, public-health oriented approaches, but rather radical strategies, such as eugenic sterilization, which became a much-discussed (and much-resisted) issue during the 1930s.⁸⁴ Finally, they were also exploring different models of linking eugenics with various forms of statism, including in contemporary authoritarian and colonial contexts.

One additional factor crucially contributed to the radicalization of eugenics in most post-Habsburg countries. By the mid-1930s, nearly all these countries were marked by or heading towards authoritarian regimes. As Iván T. Berend perceptively points out, these regimes

chose not to mobilize the fascist mass parties but rather to base their power on the army, state bureaucracy, exclusive elite organizations, and paramilitary forces. All the regimes followed extreme nationalist economic policies, with

⁸³ Marius Turda, “Introduction,” in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), xv.

⁸⁴ Turda, “Introduction,” xvi.

state-run modernization programs that tended to exclude ethnic-national minorities and to treat neighboring countries as adversaries.⁸⁵

This political configuration, intertwining authoritarianism, a preference for technocratic governance, and a commitment to enhance state capacity, emerged as both attractive to and supportive of many local networks of eugenicists. It was within this political context that expertise in eugenics not only became intricately linked with the state during the 1930s but also became embroiled in a disconcerting process of mutual radicalization with the central administration.

Contested Imperial Legacies

A discussion of imperial legacies must come into terms with the fact that views on the legacies of empires substantially differ. Historians of the Habsburg Empire recently turned towards studying the interwar period and detecting various ways that the imperial past continued to matter after the empire's demise. In doing so, they underline the “surprisingly positive” character of these legacies, arguing, for instance, that it was these legacies that “kept the successor states running” or that they informed the nascent transnational institutions.⁸⁶ Conversely, many other historians, particularly those focused on colonial empires like Laura Stoler, view imperial legacies through a post-colonial lens. In her view, the durability of imperial legacies even after their end in a particular location perpetuates, and even radicalizes,

⁸⁵ Iván T. Berend, *Decades of Crisis: Central and Eastern Europe before World War II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 359.

⁸⁶ Peter Becker and Natasha Wheatley, “Introduction: Central Europe and the New International Order,” in *Remaking Central Europe: The League of Nations and the Former Habsburg Lands*, ed. Peter Becker and Natasha Wheatley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 1–15; Gábor Egry, *The Empire's New Clothes: How Austria-Hungary's Legacy Kept the Successor States Running* (Leiden: Foundation for Austrian Studies, 2020); Tomasz Pudłocki and Kamil Ruszała, “The War That Never Ended: East-Central Europe After 1918,” in *Postwar Continuity and New Challenges in Central Europe, 1918–1923: The War That Never Ended*, ed. Tomasz Pudłocki and Kamil Ruszała (New York: Routledge, 2021), 1–6.

the structural violence of the old imperial formations. Tellingly, her book dealing most explicitly with this topic is titled “Duress.”⁸⁷

These assumptions are rooted in varying interpretations of the 20th century as the Age of Extremes.⁸⁸ While the former authors portray the imperial past and its legacies against the foil of the century of extremes that followed them, for the latter, the colonial empires were a part and parcel of these extremes, and their vestiges perpetuate this past into the present. Concomitantly, these approaches also locate the space for individual and collective agency vis-à-vis imperial legacies at different moments: in their acceptance in the first case, and in “creative and critical—and sometimes costly” resistance to them in the second.⁸⁹ These two views are difficult to reconcile. This dissertation proposes to go one step beyond them by emphasizing the dynamic, contested, and contradictory nature of imperial legacies, as well as the agency of historical actors in reshaping them.

The first step is to recognize that while the notion of historical legacies has become widespread, it remains largely undefined. This is true not only in historical scholarship and other humanities but even in theory-driven fields such as political science. A representative of the latter field covering the issue of “historical legacies” in the recent *Oxford Handbook of Political, Social, and Economic Transformation*, for example, highlights the striking “conceptual and theoretical vagueness of the term” and notes that it constitutes an impediment “hindering both theory building and empirical analysis.”⁹⁰ Even though the same author subsequently proposes such theoretical underpinnings, his sophisticated attempt only underscores the steep obstacles for adopting a concept of historical legacies from contemporary

⁸⁷ Ann Laura Stoler, *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016).

⁸⁸ Eric J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991* (London: Abacus, 1994).

⁸⁹ Stoler, *Duress*, 346.

⁹⁰ Aurel Croissant, “Historical Legacies,” in *The Handbook of Political, Social, and Economic Transformation*, ed. Wolfgang Merkel, Raj Kollmorgen, and Hans-Jürgen Wagoner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 515.

transformation studies for analyzing the legacies of the Habsburg Empire. A notion of historical legacies geared towards causal explanations, revolving around differences between regime types, and primarily reflecting the modern dictatorships of the twentieth century in its structure would be of little help.⁹¹ Instead, I suggest that historians may find more inspiration in older sociological debates on tradition, even if they do not accept these arguments wholesale.

The central point of this older sociological approach to tradition is the emphasis on the dynamic nature of the process that makes legacies possible. Challenging the colloquial usage of the term “tradition,” which assumes its fixed content, the sociologist Edward Shils stresses that “the mechanisms of persistence are not utterly distinct from the mechanisms of change.”⁹² Contrasting such a process of transmission through time – which he labels tradition – to its outcomes, which one may term legacies, Shils emphasizes that these legacies are constantly modified in the process of being re-enunciated and re-transmitted.⁹³ Or, as another sociologist participating in this debate put it, “The statement that an institution or an idea has lasted for centuries is largely only metaphorical in nature, since change and adjustment to new conditions always are prerequisites of duration.”⁹⁴ Consequently, when I speak about imperial legacies in this dissertation, I do not assume their identity before and after the collapse of the empire but rather explore the conditions and modalities of their transmission.

The transmission of historical legacies is not only a dynamic process but also a contested one. As individuals have agency in adopting traditions, they also often differ in their goals,

⁹¹ Croissant, “Historical Legacies,” 515.

⁹² Shils, “Tradition,” 122.

⁹³ Shils, “Tradition,” 152.

⁹⁴ Interestingly, while Shils drew on structural functionalism, identified as a traditionalist, and wrote in response to the generational revolts of the 1960s, the dynamic understanding of tradition also appealed to sociologists subscribing to a Marxist methodology, such as Jerzy Szacki. The latter even found a citation from Marx supporting this approach: “every attainment of an earlier age adopted by a later one is a misunderstanding of the past,” Marx wrote in a letter to Ferdinand Lassalle from 1861, yet “the misunderstood form is precisely the general one. It is the one that lends itself to general use at a certain stage in the development of society.” Jerzy Szacki, “Three Concepts of Tradition,” *The Polish Sociological Bulletin* 9, no. 20 (1969): 21.

disputing what elements of a legacy should be kept and adapted, and what, in turn, should be abandoned. Thus, questioning Edmund Burke's assumptions about tradition as a gradual and accumulative process, the philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre convincingly encapsulates a more agonistic understanding: "traditions, when vital, embody continuities of conflict. Indeed, when a tradition becomes Burkean, it is always dying or dead."⁹⁵ As a result, even shared legacies can be ambiguous, or better, they may assume divergent forms in the various hands that embrace them. Focusing on the often-dark example of eugenics, this dissertation reveals that even though many of its concepts in post-Habsburg countries had a shared genealogy in the imperial situation, they had diverging interpretations in the post-imperial setting. Indeed, this fact is interpreted as evidence of their persisting sway.

Historical legacies are manifold. Historians Mark Salber Phillips and Gordon Schochet reveal some of this diversity when they contrast the ways in which traditions are conceptualized in different fields of historical research. On the one hand, they observe that for social historians who approach them at the local level, "tradition is identified with enduring social practices, and tacitness is often regarded as its signature."⁹⁶ On the other hand, historical fields focusing on intellectual practices are confronted with "highly self-conscious bodies of ideas as they are transmitted over time," even though there is a significant tacit dimension to this knowledge as well, as historians of science were early to recognize, learning from Michael Polányi.⁹⁷ Due to their discursive and self-reflexive nature, intellectual legacies, in particular, are invaluable for revealing a complex dialectic of change and persistence in a historical context traditionally approached by historians as demarcated by radical breaks.

⁹⁵ Alasdair C. MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 222.

⁹⁶ Mark Salber Phillips and Gordon Schochet, "Preface," in *Questions of Tradition*, ed. Mark Salber Phillips and Gordon Schochet (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), ix.

⁹⁷ Phillips and Schochet, "Preface," ix.

Given their contested character and the multiplicity of their various manifestations, legacies cannot be conceptualized as constituting a coherent, harmonious whole. Drawing on this observation, this dissertation explores the growing divergences between various Habsburg legacies and reveals that in multiple cases, they found different, sometimes opposing, backers. As a result of this appropriation, these diverging legacies could even clash. The consequences were particularly striking in territories such as Burgenland or Subcarpathian Ruthenia, where the local post-Habsburg societies were incorporated into new, yet also post-Habsburg, states. In effect, the local imperial legacies in these contexts clashed with the imperial legacies of the new administrators. Thus, the dissertation reveals that far from being exclusively pacific, imperial legacies were dragged into new social conflicts, fueling them further as an unintended consequence of their multiplicity and increasing divergence.

Finally, by revealing that the inherited imperial tools of cognitive diversity management served as convenient instruments even for a part of the nationalists, this dissertation complicates the relationship between imperial legacies and nationalism. As Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller argue, in many of Europe's empires in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the imperial was, in many cases, "closely entangled with the national."⁹⁸ This was the case, they explain, even in the continental realms of the Habsburg, the Tsarist, and the Ottoman empires. On the one hand, having developed strategies for accommodating nationalism, albeit to different extents and in various modalities, these empires subsequently provided "the incentives and (broadly understood) resources [...] for building nations at the core of empires."⁹⁹ On the other hand, and much more pertinent to the Habsburg context, was that even many of the various "non-core" nationalisms were not strictly anti-imperial and oriented towards independence. Instead,

⁹⁸ Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, "Building Nations In and With Empires: A Reassessment," in *Nationalizing Empires*, ed. Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015), 5.

⁹⁹ Berger and Miller, "Building Nations," 5.

they negotiated and compromised with the empire and accommodated themselves to it.¹⁰⁰ The case of eugenics is a stark reminder that this entanglement had a cognitive dimension. It highlights racial discourses as one such interface where connections between the imperial and the national were being negotiated. Delineating geographies that were rarely coterminous with the cultural or political boundaries of nationalist projects, the concept of “race” facilitated, rather than thwarted, such interactions. This interpretation complicates Maria Bucur’s sharp distinction between eugenics in East Central Europe as an instrument for “imperial control,” on the one hand, and for “nationalist anti-imperial challenges,” on the other hand.¹⁰¹

Marina Mogilner highlights the “basic colonial dilemma” that faced nationalists in the late Tsarist Empire in their negotiation with the language of race and their imperial situation. On the one hand, she argues, there was the empire and its “hybrid, situational, layered, and even local forms of belonging.”¹⁰² On the other hand, anti-imperial nationalists adopted a rhetoric of “primordial purity and authenticity framed by scientific concepts of evolutionism and kinship and expressed in rigid identity categories.”¹⁰³ However, a comparison with another imperial context reveals this seemingly universal dichotomy as a particular effect of the Tsarist imperial situation.

In imperial Austria, an opposition between hybridity and purity was associated with strikingly different political stakes. True, the emphasis on “racial purity” and the social technologies of its rationalized production were closely linked to nationalism, primarily to its most radical manifestations. However, nationalists who embraced the tropes of racial purity, while discontent with the Habsburg Empire, were not anti-imperialist; instead, they pursued a

¹⁰⁰ Philipp Ther, “‘Imperial Nationalism’ as a Challenge for the Study of Nationalism,” in *Nationalizing Empires*, ed. Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015), 577.

¹⁰¹ Maria Bucur, “Eugenics in Eastern Europe, 1870s–1945,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, ed. Philippa Levine and Alison Bashford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 398.

¹⁰² Marina Mogilner, “When Race Is a Language and Empire Is a Context,” *Slavic Review* 80, no. 2 (2021): 209.

¹⁰³ Mogilner, “When Race,” 209.

competing imperial project of their own. In effect, these nationalists aimed not only to purify but also to expand the territories held by their claimed co-nationals. In many cases, their ambitions extended to dominating a part of the empire itself or integrating their claimed territories into a different imperial formation. In the interwar period, those who drew on the legacy of these discourses did not resist a forceful embrace of fantasies of imperial or colonial expansion; rather, they were mutually reinforcing. The “de-imperial” eugenics of the 1930s was a radicalized reformulation of this legacy.

Conversely, the imperial-oriented authors using the language of race to naturalize hybridity and compositeness were joined by many moderate nationalists, even among eugenicists. Accepting ethnocultural difference as a fact of nature, the latter embraced this overall framing while locating their claimed specific identity within this larger whole. This linkage between a part of the nationalists and the naturalization of hybridity had significant ramifications in the post-Habsburg settings for the engagement with eugenic ideas developed in the imperial situation. The positions taken in the late imperial context continued to matter after the empire’s demise, even among some nationalists. Strikingly, many eugenicists who had embraced the imperial eugenic concepts in the past now utilized them to cognitively manage the “mini-imperial” ethnocultural diversity of their post-Habsburg countries. The results were ambiguous. In many instances, their continued embrace of imperial hybridity had a moderating effect on their nationalism. In a handful of cases of thinkers who experienced marginalization or exile in the interwar period, as we will see, they even coupled their emphasis on imperial hybridity with a more global anti-colonial position. However, in other cases, the embrace of imperial diversity management paradoxically radicalized the eugenicists’ nationalism, underpinning ideas of forced assimilation into the nation or hierarchical visions of the country’s population.

Theory, Methodology, and Sources

While the entangled and comparative approach adopted in this dissertation allows for an innovative re-reading of the history of eugenics in this area through imperial and post-imperial lenses, it presents a methodological challenge of studying genealogically linked discourses, practices, and networks across multiple temporal and spatial contexts.

In terms of periodization, this dissertation aligns with recent social histories of the Habsburg Empire by challenging the long-held assumption that its collapse in 1918 represented a fundamental historical break.¹⁰⁴ Instead, it reveals striking continuities between the late imperial and interwar periods in the area. However, this does not imply that historical periodization is entirely fluid. Rather, this dissertation argues that the history of biopolitics in the region – of which eugenics is an emblematic part – had a different dynamic than political history and, therefore, does not share the same periodization. In particular, the early 1900s and the 1930s emerge as much more significant moments of change from the perspective of biopolitics in Habsburg and post-Habsburg contexts than the year 1918, which had long been foregrounded by political historians. The latter appears to be rather a moment of significant continuity, and the emerging scholarship on biopolitics in the region stands to gain much from refraining from its use for the purposes of periodization.

At the same time, this dissertation advocates for a history of eugenics in East Central Europe that de-centers the nation by systematically tracing eugenic ideas, practices, and networks across various subnational and supra-national contexts. In the situation of the late

¹⁰⁴ See, for instance, Gábor Egry, “Fallen between Two Stools? Imperial Legacies, State-Society Relationships, and the Limits of Building a Nation-State in Romania after the First World War,” *Südostforschungen* 79, no. 1 (2020): 4–31; Pieter M. Judson, “‘Where Our Commonality Is Necessary...’: Rethinking the End of the Habsburg Monarchy,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 48 (2017): 1–21; Jernej Kosi and Elisabeth Haid, “State-Building and Democratisation on the Fringes of Interwar Poland and Yugoslavia. Prekmurje and Eastern Galicia from Empire to Nation State,” *Südostforschungen* 79, no. 1 (2020): 29–67; Dominique Kirchner Reill, *The Fiume Crisis: Life in the Wake of the Habsburg Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020.

Habsburg Empire, this involves taking its internal diversity seriously and encompassing many of its varied territories. In the post-imperial transitions, it means analyzing synchronically the various states that now stood in the place of the defunct Austria-Hungary, again with an emphasis on the differences within the collage of territories that constituted these states.

This goal requires some terminological clarification. To start with, this dissertation employs the symmetrical labels of “imperial Austria” and “royal Hungary” as simplified shortcuts, referencing the Lands Represented in the Imperial Council and the Lands of the Crown of Saint Stephen, respectively.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, when addressing the post-imperial context, the dissertation utilizes the terms post-Habsburg spaces or territories to signify the lands of the former empire, and post-Habsburg states or countries to denote the polities that incorporated any of these lands, often entwining them with territories possessing other historical legacies. Reflecting the emerging historiographical consensus regarding their inherent ethnocultural diversity, and the ambition of some of its inhabitants to recreate the nation states in the form resembling their imperial predecessor, finally, these polities are also characterized as miniature, little, or small empires.¹⁰⁶

The dissertation illuminates the intertwining of what was perceived as science and what constituted politics in these contexts. Moreover, it emphasizes the historicity and situatedness of both political and scientific languages. In examining these languages, the dissertation relies on the legacy of linguistic contextualism in intellectual history associated with Quentin Skinner and John Pocock. Taking a more methodologically individualistic approach, the former views political thinking as a series of performative acts (or “moves”) occurring within a specific

¹⁰⁵ No further clarification is needed for their shared “proximate colony” of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on whose status see Robert Donia, “Bosnia-Herzegovina under Austria-Hungary: From Occupation to Assassination, 1878–1914,” in *The Routledge Handbook of Balkan and Southeast European History*, ed. John R. Lampe and Ulf Brunnbauer (New York: Routledge, 2021), 135–43.

¹⁰⁶ Reill, *The Fiume Crisis*, 17.

linguistic context.¹⁰⁷ In doing so, Skinner challenges the preceding tradition of the history of ideas, pinpointing, with a polemical intent, four “mythologies” that this tradition generated.

Skinner’s rejection of the “mythology of prolepsis,” which criticizes approaches reducing past political thinkers to mere bundles of influences from earlier writers or interpreting their work solely through the lens of its later impact, remains pertinent to this dissertation.¹⁰⁸ This serves as a valuable reminder that an analysis of eugenic thinking in Austria-Hungary and post-Habsburg contexts would lack analytical depth if it confined itself to parsing its influences, whether derived from biometrics, Mendelism, racial hygiene, or puericulture. Instead, the region emerges as a laboratory for a profoundly original yet ultimately unsuccessful attempt to cognitively manage, and in some cases, even affirm, ethnocultural diversity through biopolitical categories.

Skinner’s criticism of the “mythology of coherence” also retains some of its power. This term was coined to challenge the idea that intellectual historians should seek a consistent and comprehensive system in the work of past thinkers, even when it is ostensibly not present or intended.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, attempting to find deep coherence in the works of eugenics proponents would often be misleading, given the nature of eugenics as a shared language and ambition, coupled with its dual status as claimed science and policy prescription. In effect, its advocates addressed many different audiences at various historical junctures, and their arguments changed significantly. For example, while the observation by one historian that “one can always refute [the Viennese eugenically oriented anatomist Julius] Tandler with Tandler” may be an exaggeration, as there are both epistemic and political continuities in his thinking, it points in

¹⁰⁷ Significantly, as a student of early modern political thinking, Skinner does not identify these linguistic contexts with what would later be claimed as national languages. Instead, he defines linguistic contexts through the ideas that are expressed within them in a multiplicity and mixture of various languages. Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53.

¹⁰⁸ Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding,” 24.

¹⁰⁹ Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding,” 31.

the right direction.¹¹⁰ It highlights that even the works of single eugenicists are but fragmented wholes, and that is all the truer for broader networks. In brief, given this fragmentation, nation-centered case studies and the overarching notion of coherent national eugenic styles deserve to be finally laid to rest.

Operationalizing intellectual history to analyze the intricate mosaic of late Habsburg and post-Habsburg contexts demands a nuanced approach that extends beyond a singular, seemingly self-contained, and often nationally framed perspective.¹¹¹ The concept of “serial contextualism,” as proposed by David Armitage, proves instrumental in encompassing and interlinking a multitude of local, imperial, and transnational contexts. Armitage defines serial contextualism as a historical practice that reconstructs “a sequence of distinct contexts in which identifiable agents strategically deployed existing languages to effect definable goals such as legitimation and delegitimation, persuasion and dissuasion, consensus-building and radical innovation.”¹¹² While Armitage primarily emphasizes what he terms the “transtemporal” dimension of serial contextualism, which crosses conventional historical periodization, the series of contexts can also span across space. Notably, Armitage’s notion intersects with the recent transnational research practices of intellectual historians in East Central Europe. These scholars have similarly grappled with the challenges posed by the diversity and superimposition of various contexts while crafting a synthetic history of political thought in this part of the world.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Cheryl A. Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race: Spectacular Failure in Interwar Vienna* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2013), 144.

¹¹¹ The need to go beyond self-enclosed contexts is emphasized by Rosario López, “The Quest for the Global: Remapping Intellectual History,” *History of European Ideas* 42, no. 1 (2016): 155–60.

¹¹² David Armitage, “What’s the Big Idea? Intellectual History and the *Longue Durée*,” *History of European Ideas* 38, no. 4 (2012): 498.

¹¹³ Balázs Trencsényi, Maciej Janowski, Monika Baár, Maria Falina, and Michal Kopeček, *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe. Volume I: Negotiating Modernity in the “Long Nineteenth Century”* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

The central focus of this dissertation on eugenics, a field perceived as a scientific endeavor by its contemporaries, necessitates one further recalibration of linguistic contextualism. Intellectual historians operating within this tradition have not only delved into canonical political thinking but also navigated the broader linguistic context and various genres and media where such thinking manifested itself. However, they often refrained from venturing into what Skinner once tellingly referred to as “wider fields or, I should say, the explanatory swamps, of social history.”¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, crafting a purely intellectual history of eugenics, devoid of its materiality, embodiments, practices, and networks, would pose challenges on both analytical and ethical fronts.

Fortunately, a newer cohort of historians engaging with the legacy of linguistic contextualism, suggests departing from Skinner by linking intellectual and social history more closely. Samuel Moyn, for instance, makes a sophisticated plea for a “turn toward the interface between concepts and practices.”¹¹⁵ He argues that a non-reductionist social history of ideas, based on this assumption, is “the only plausible kind of history of ideas there is.”¹¹⁶ (Moyn clarifies that this suggestion differs from the more common emphasis on intellectual activity as a practice itself and calls for a more profound engagement with social theory.)¹¹⁷ Among the theoretical approaches seeking to reconnect these domains, those that simultaneously bring intellectual history closer to the history of science are particularly enlightening.

John Tresch, a historian of science, argues that what allows the building of bridges between these two fields is their shared interest in the ways concepts about the natural and

¹¹⁴ Transcribed from Quentin Skinner, “Belief, Truth and Interpretation,” Keynote Address presented at the conference *Ideengeschichte. Traditionen und Perspektiven*, Ruhr-University Bochum, November 18, 2014. <https://youtu.be/VJYsTJt8vvg>.

¹¹⁵ Samuel Moyn, “Imaginary Intellectual History,” in *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, ed. Samuel Moyn and Darrin M. McMahon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 117 and 118.

¹¹⁶ Moyn, “Imaginary,” 117 and 118.

¹¹⁷ Moyn, “Imaginary,” 118.

social world are developed and negotiated at the intersection of science and politics.¹¹⁸ Both fields, therefore, engage in what Tresch acutely describes as a “comparative study of materialized cosmologies” – charting how notions of the natural and social order are “enacted, embodied, elaborated, and contested in concrete settings, institutions, representations, instruments, and practices.”¹¹⁹ Importantly, the use of the word cosmology in this context does not imply a return to the search for a uniform, coherent, and broadly accepted set of abstract ideas that characterized earlier intellectual history. Rather, the terms now come with the realization that they remain, by necessity, concrete and fragmented.¹²⁰ Thus, inspired by Tresch, this dissertation approaches eugenics in Austria-Hungary as an example of such “embodied, concrete, totalizing but unavoidably incomplete and equivocal” notions of natural and social order while at the same time highlighting their disturbing and often dark consequences.¹²¹

As Tresch’s arguments make clear, a conjunction with the history of science may increase intellectual history’s sensitivity to the ways in which concepts intertwine with various social practices. It highlights, on the level of methodology, the locality, materiality, and embodied nature of this process. Simultaneously, historians of science have developed flexible tools that enable the linking of “the concomitant situatedness and movement of science,” while emphasizing the agency of the various involved parties and avoiding the pitfalls of diffusionism or the history of transfers.¹²²

Inspiring in this regard is the philosopher of science Bruno Latour, whose approach connects the production of knowledge with the building of networks that link various human

¹¹⁸ John Tresch, “Cosmologies Materialized: History of Science and History of Ideas,” in *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, ed. Samuel Moyn and Darrin M. McMahon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 153–72.

¹¹⁹ Tresch, “Cosmologies Materialized,” 155.

¹²⁰ Tresch, “Cosmologies Materialized,” 160.

¹²¹ Tresch, “Cosmologies Materialized,” 163.

¹²² Kapil Raj, “Beyond Postcolonialism ... and Postpositivism: Circulation and the Global History of Science,” *Isis* 104, no. 2 (2013): 337.

actors – scientific, bureaucratic, industrial, and so forth – as well as non-human actants. Concomitantly, with this emphasis on actors and their networks, Latour crafted a method of investigation influenced by cultural anthropology. His proposal to “follow scientists and engineers through society” aligns well with the open-ended, ethnographic definition of eugenics in this dissertation.¹²³ In a parallel vein to Latour, and working on early modern South Asia, the historian of science Kapil Raj stresses the creative and productive character of the movement of knowledge – or “circulation” – itself.¹²⁴ Mapping the networks of eugenics supporters and showing how eugenic knowledge changed when it crossed boundaries between different contexts, this dissertation is a reminder that connections and circulations can produce technologies that not only bring people together but also those that divide and hierarchize them.

Importantly, for Latour and his followers, these networks span across the divide between human actors and non-human actants, such as measuring instruments, skulls, or scallops.¹²⁵ While this dissertation cannot systematically weave such actants into the resulting narrative, it heeds Latour’s emphasis in a different way. It historicizes the changing relationship between what was considered natural and what was seen as social in this particular setting. Redrawing borders between territories in post-imperial Central and Eastern Europe, it argues, walked hand in hand with renegotiating the boundaries between society and biology.

Taken together, these theoretical and methodological choices guide the selection of primary sources that underpin this argument. The dissertation is grounded in detailed and extensive empirical research, yielding a large pool of primary sources. These sources include archival materials from nearly a dozen countries, several hundred titles of periodicals published

¹²³ Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987).

¹²⁴ Raj, “Beyond Postcolonialism,” 337–47.

¹²⁵ Michel Callon, “Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay,” in *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. John Law (London: Routledge, 1986), 196–233.

throughout late Habsburg and post-imperial contexts, as well as a substantial and equally multilingual array of books and pamphlets. While the dissertation emphasizes the overarching picture, transnational entanglements, and comparisons, the systematic investigations in the local archives and libraries from which it emerged were so extensive that many of these primary sources are referenced here for the first time. Others are brought into a new perspective and into a striking dialogue with similar sources from different contexts.

To start with, stand-alone publications and periodical articles, both those that catered for a general audience, as well as those that were specialized and technical, constitute an irreplaceable resource for reconstructing the arguments put forth by the supporters of eugenics, as well as by others who engaged with eugenic knowledge. They are also invaluable for identifying their differences and public clashes. As the historians of eugenics have already documented, there were several specialized eugenics journals in the region, including the *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* (published in Cluj, Romania), *Evgenika* (published in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia), *Nemzetvédelem* (published in Budapest, Hungary), and *Zagadnienia rasy* (published in Warsaw, Poland). While this dissertation, of course, draws on these eugenic journals in the narrow sense, it also suggests that their importance for the study of eugenics has been overestimated and proposes to go far beyond them.

There are both empirical and theoretical issues with foregrounding these journals, or even limiting one's research to them. Many, such as *Evgenika* and *Nemzetvédelem*, were short-lived, and they engaged, as their authors, only a certain fraction of individuals who supported eugenics in the local context. Moreover, even the long-term existence of a specialized eugenic publication outlet did not automatically translate to an influence of eugenic ideas among professionals, not to mention within the broader public sphere, as the case of the Polish-

language journal illustrates.¹²⁶ Conversely, there were also contexts with thriving eugenic networks where a self-identified central eugenic periodical was absent for much of the time. A journal of this kind was not even necessary in contexts such as interwar Austria, as eugenics had already permeated debates across various fields and social contexts. Thus, the diffusion of eugenic ideas across various publications was indicative of its influence, if not more so, than the existence of a central outlet.

This brings me to the theoretical objection. If we accept Bashford's and Levine's observation that eugenics was less of a clearly delineated body of knowledge with internal coherence than a language and ambition shared by otherwise different actors, then the net for mapping the impact of eugenics must be cast wider. Only a careful sifting through of various publications can reveal which actors eugenics reverberated with in a given context and where it failed to resonate. A brief glance at the bibliographies of some supporters of eugenics in Austria-Hungary or in the post-Habsburg states, such as the public health expert Andrija Štampar, reveals how many audiences they engaged with and how dispersed their publications became as a consequence. Often using these bibliographies as a kind of signpost, and then extending the focus further, I sifted through as many publications as possible. The list of cited journals and books at the end of this dissertation partly reveals the scope of this search.

While printed media are crucial for reconstructing the eugenicists' arguments, their personal papers are vital for an analysis of their transnational networks, whether on the imperial, regional, or global scale. This is not to say that journals are not a useful source in this regard, particularly those used as forums for communication across language or national boundaries. Nevertheless, the correspondence preserved in the papers of influential supporters of eugenics is unique, as it allows for the reconstruction of not only formal networks but also informal

¹²⁶ Magdalena Gawin, *Race and Modernity: A History of the Polish Eugenics Movement* (Warsaw: IHPAN, 2018), 172.

exchanges. These informal exchanges are all the more important given that informality was a defining feature of the experience in Austria-Hungary and a crucial post-imperial legacy.¹²⁷ Indeed, as the dissertation shows, it was the informal networks that were more consequential, particularly in the case of regional networks in post-imperial contexts. Focusing on them further decenters the nation in the resulting narrative.

There are several collections of personal papers which belonged to eugenics supporters active in Austria-Hungary and various post-Habsburg contexts, and some of these collections contain a significant number of their letters. Fortunately, in a few rare cases, notably those of Jaroslav Kříženecký, Jindřich Matiegka, Vladislav Růžička, Bohumil Sekla, and Božo Škerlj, bulky, nearly complete, and cross-referenced collections of letters have been preserved, covering most of these authors' lifetime. In some other instances, the correspondence covers slightly over a decade; this is true for the papers of István Apáthy, Andrija Štampar, or Sabin Manuilă, for example. (Small fragments of correspondence are available in the archival papers related to eugenicists such as Hugo Iltis, Iuliu Moldovan, or Julius Tandler.) Unfortunately, as this brief overview suggests, for historically contingent reasons, these sources have been preserved very asymmetrically. Nevertheless, those that are available shed a unique light on their makers' networks, making it possible to single out their imperial and post-imperial dimensions.

Finally, mapping the practical impact of eugenics in concrete social contexts can also draw on published texts of eugenicists and their personal papers, which, in some cases, contain unpublished confidential reports, memorandums, and other documents used in communication with associational or bureaucratic actors. Alongside these, however, the sources produced by

¹²⁷ Gábor Egry, "The Leftover Empire? Imperial Legacies and Statehood in the Successor States of Austria-Hungary," in *Postwar Continuity and New Challenges in Central Europe, 1918–1923: The War That Never Ended*, ed. Tomasz Pudłocki and Kamil Rusała (New York: Routledge, 2021), 93.

these institutions themselves must be brought in. In this regard, my transnational research required a distinctive strategy. Far from attempting to cover such a vast set of issues comprehensively, I embarked on targeted probes into a few carefully selected sets of cases. Giving serial contextualism a social-historical twist, I identified a few sets of analogous, transnationally spread, and genealogically connected institutions in Habsburg and post-imperial contexts, such as nationalist activist associations, mass gymnastic societies, rural health demonstration centers, and health ministries. By exploring their negotiations with eugenics, this dissertation reveals both a significant degree of their entanglement and the differences emerging from their comparison. (The papers of the budding transnational bodies such as the League of Nations Health Organization were also vital for my research.)

Given the large scale and scope of this dissertation, I was fortunate to benefit significantly from the groundbreaking work of previous scholars. Their studies dispelled the myth that there was little in terms of eugenics in East Central Europe, providing a tentative mapping of leading actors and networks supporting eugenics, along with reconstructing some of their arguments.¹²⁸ These rich empirical findings were invaluable to my research, and my

¹²⁸ For some of these national case studies focusing on parts of Austria-Hungary and post-Habsburg contexts, see Maria Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002); Ana Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika na Slovenskem* [Eugenics in Slovenia] (Ljubljana: Sophia, 2016); Gawin, *Race and Modernity*; Tudor Georgescu, *The Eugenic Fortress: The Transylvanian Saxon Experiment in Interwar Romania* (New York: Central European University Press, 2016); Martin Kuhar, “Eugenika u hrvatskoj medicini i njezin utjecaj na javnost u razdoblju od 1859. do 1945” [Eugenics in Croatian Medicine and Its Influence on the Public in the Period from 1859 to 1945] (PhD Thesis, University of Zagreb, 2015); Veronika Lipphardt, *Biologie der Juden: Jüdische Wissenschaftler über “Rasse” und Vererbung, 1900-1935* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008); Martin Rohde, *Nationale Wissenschaft zwischen zwei Imperien: Die Ševčenko-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1892–1918* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2021); Victoria Shmidt, ed. *The Politics of Disability in Interwar and Socialist Czechoslovakia* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2019); Michal Šimůnek and Uwe Hoßfeld, “Selected Bibliography on Heredity, Medicine, and Eugenics in Bohemia and Moravia, 1900–1950,” *Folia Mendeliana* 49, no. 2 (2013): 5–31; Marius Turda, *Eugenics and Nation in Early 20th Century Hungary* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). For the most important collective volumes, see Christian Promitzer, Marius Turda, and Sevasti Trubeta, eds. *Health, Hygiene, and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011); Marius Turda, ed., *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015); Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, eds., *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007).

frequent citations of these authors serve as a testimony of my debt to their work.¹²⁹ However, it is also apparent that this pioneering research had some limits, primarily derived from its focus on the nation. Seeking to identify distinctive national styles of eugenics, it posited the nation as the key scale, context, and object of analysis.

While such national framing did not collapse into a crude methodological nationalism, it did not avoid some analytical pitfalls. First, in seeking to populate the analysis with historical actors, this research tended to overestimate the number of persons supporting eugenics within a single linguistically defined national context, even if it meant invoking individuals whose links to eugenics were tangential. Conversely, it remained oblivious to the numerous actors and networks in East Central Europe's multiethnic polities who straddled linguistic or ethnic boundaries or were located in between. My dissertation suggests the vital importance of the latter. Moreover, this research had a tendency to reduce the political and epistemic stakes of various eugenic arguments to nationalist ideology, even in cases where such interpretation appeared unlikely. This dissertation foregrounds imperial diversity as another challenge that was equally, if not more, important. Finally, in seeking to put a Foucauldian twist on their arguments, this research highlighted the decisive and dominant role of the state in the history of eugenics in the region. It never fully resolved the tension posed by the fact that before 1918 the state in question was imperial, and that the central authorities of interwar, post-Habsburg states appeared to warm up only very slowly to the eugenicists' proposals.

¹²⁹ The literature focusing primarily on other cases in Eastern, Southeastern, and Southern Europe, beyond the Habsburg and post-Habsburg spaces, is also insightful. Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man: Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth Century Italy* (New York: Central European University Press, 2011); Indira Duraković, *Serbien und das Modernisierungsproblem. Die Entwicklung der Gesundheitspolitik und sozialen Kontrolle bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014); Björn M. Felder and Paul J. Weindling, eds., *Baltic Eugenics: Bio-Politics, Race and Nation in Interwar Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania 1918-1940* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013); Keely Stauter-Halsted, *The Devil's Chain: Prostitution and Social Control in Partitioned Poland* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015); Sevasti Trubeta, *Physical Anthropology, Race and Eugenics in Greece, 1880s-1970s* (Boston: Brill, 2013).

Ultimately, the most telling effect of the choice to prioritize the nation is that even the most sophisticated historians of eugenics in East Central Europe remarkably oscillate in their assessments of the impact of eugenics in the area. One such scholar, for instance, first argued that eugenics was “central to various programs of social reform and national progress elaborated by Hungarian intellectuals, scientists, and politicians after 1900,” before insisting a few years later that “eugenics did not gain major traction” in East Central Europe until the interwar period.¹³⁰ While historians of eugenics in this part of the world have, in some cases, attempted to embed their national case studies within a transnational, post-colonial, and recently also decolonial framework, they have done so while maintaining a nation-centric perspective. Consequently, these creative reformulations could not hope to amend the underlying fundamental conceptual challenges.¹³¹

By proposing to go beyond essentialized national models, this dissertation does not advise to portray eugenics in post-Habsburg countries as a mere eastward and southward peripheral extension of the German model of racial hygiene.¹³² Neither does it advocate approaching it as a simple transfer and imitation of hegemonic models produced elsewhere. Instead of these interpretative dead ends, this dissertation offers a reading of eugenics in post-Habsburg countries as refracted through the imperial situation of its inception and by the empire’s long-lasting legacies. It puts forth a flexible yet concrete theoretical and methodological framework, in the hope that other researchers on eugenics in Austria-Hungary

¹³⁰ The subsequent analysis will question both views. Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 1; Turda and Balogun, “Colonialism,” 5.

¹³¹ Bucur, “Eugenics in Eastern Europe,” 398–410; Marius Turda and Aaron Gillette, *Latin Eugenics in Comparative Perspective* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014); Turda and Balogun, “Colonialism.”

¹³² For some foundational works on racial hygiene in Germany, see Robert Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics, 1927–1945: Crossing Boundaries* (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2008); Paul J. Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll, and Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992); Sheila Faith Weiss, *Race Hygiene and National Efficiency: The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

may find it useful. Through the lens of eugenics, such research can rethink the narratives on nation- and state-building in the region and, ultimately, on the political modernity in the area.

Thesis Structure

Spanning from the early 1900s to the 1930s, this dissertation aims to construct an entangled history of eugenics in Austria-Hungary and the post-Habsburg contexts. The seven research chapters offer an integrative, transnational analysis of eugenics in this area, emphasizing its imperial or post-imperial character. Instead of presenting consecutive national case studies, the chapters are organized chronologically, beginning with the late imperial context, progressing through the wartime setting, and concluding with the interwar period. The chapters covering the interwar period are further divided along thematic lines, each highlighting a specific theme – eugenic concepts, networks, and practices – and exploring the extent to which imperial legacies influenced them.

The first chapter argues that there were several eugenic networks in the late Habsburg Empire that operated on an imperial scale and emerged simultaneously with, or even before, nation-centered networks. Far from being inconsistent assemblages of several national styles of eugenics, these networks creatively experimented with eugenics as a tool for managing imperial diversity. Strikingly, some resulting eugenic blueprints aimed to affirm this diversity, while others were darker (yet still within an imperial horizon). The chapter explores four selected networks – metropolitan social reformists, segregationist special educators, nationalist activists, and temperance advocates – to support this argument. Even various nationalist activists scattered across the rural language frontiers of the empire mirrored each other's projects transnationally, creating a paradoxical case of the imperial circulation of nationalist eugenic knowledge across claimed national boundaries. A careful analysis, however, also reveals that

attempts to link these varied eugenic blueprints to the expanding social policies in the empire largely ended in failure before 1914. This changed only after the outbreak of World War I.

The second chapter analyzes how World War I impacted eugenic networks, discourses, and practices in Austria-Hungary. Building on recent scholarship that highlights the struggle within the empire between the military and the civil administration as the defining and fateful feature of the wartime period, the chapter argues that eugenic knowledge became entwined with the imperial state in the course of these clashes. Increasingly, eugenicists established alliances with both. Consequently, eugenics influenced the formulation of policies within the military as well as the civil administration, albeit in different forms. To both, it offered technocratic solutions to the real and imaginary mounting challenges posed by the war. However, a granular analysis of practices on the ground resulting from policies informed by eugenics also suggests that, in this local implementation, eugenics often proved unable to override persisting older practices at this juncture, revealing the limits of its impact on individual bodies.

The third chapter focuses on the post-imperial transition in the narrow sense, spanning from the final years of the empire's existence until the stabilization of post-Habsburg states around 1923. It argues that during these years, eugenicists engaged in intensive networking, institution building, and lobbying for legislation reflecting their biopolitical demands. Reflecting on the results of this process, the chapter highlights what it terms, for lack of a better term, the paradox of state consolidation. It emphasizes that while eugenics and the networks of its supporters had a non-negligible impact on policy-making and institution-building during the war and the earliest post-war years, this influence was not permanent. While eugenics offered a convenient technocratic response to a sense of crisis among various political and administrative actors during the war and the postwar turmoil, the consolidation of post-Habsburg states in the early 1920s enabled these actors largely to return to their prewar wariness towards natural-scientific discourses. Consequently, the numerous attempts in the early years

of these states to introduce eugenic legislation exhibited a consistent pattern of failure; the eugenic policies, where extant, were scaled down, and many of the public health institutions created during the wartime and the early post-war period were abandoned.

While little in terms of eugenic legislation materialized in post-Habsburg Central Europe during the 1920s, eugenics increasingly informed local-level state-building practices. However, the backgrounds of eugenicists, along with their strategies and practices, differed significantly depending on whether they were linked to urban contexts, post-imperial borderlands, rural areas, or nationalist voluntary associations. Zooming in on these local contexts, the fourth chapter argues that these differences show that these states practiced differential rule, a defining characteristic of empires, even in the sphere of biopolitics. Moreover, while there was significant diversity in eugenic discourses and practices within individual states, a transnational analysis comparing specific local spatial and institutional contexts, such as the borderlands, reveals striking patterns across post-Habsburg Europe. This suggests the vital importance of imperial legacies in shaping them. As a result, the differences between various eugenic discourses and practices within single post-Habsburg countries were larger than those between these countries as a whole.

The fifth chapter demonstrates the continuity of eugenic concepts between the imperial and post-imperial contexts. To this end, it focuses on the most counter-intuitive examples, specifically the concepts such as “symbiosis,” “human economy,” and the “constitution/condition” dichotomy that were developed or adapted in Austria-Hungary as tools to imagine and manage imperial diversity. The chapter argues that these eugenic concepts have been transformed into a biopolitical toolkit for negotiating post-imperial transitions, managing ethnocultural diversity, constructing national identities, and grappling with mass politics within the new mini-imperial states.

The sixth and seventh chapters, dealing with regional and global eugenic networks, respectively, maintain a transnational framing. However, the sources allowing for an in-depth analysis of not merely formal but also the much more vital informal networks have been preserved very asymmetrically, primarily covering eugenicists based in interwar Czechoslovakia. Consequently, using these unique sources, both chapters take the analysis of the regional and global network-building of actors based in this particular context as a point of departure before highlighting their broader post-imperial context and locating them within it.

Thus, the sixth chapter reveals the remarkable continuity of Habsburg imperial networks of eugenicists in interwar Central Europe. It does so by examining the transnational circulation of several programmatic texts published in Czechoslovakia that challenged Nazi racial theories in the early 1930s and by tracing the heated polemic exchanges they sparked in various post-Habsburg countries. The seventh chapter, finally, explores the interactions of eugenicists in post-Habsburg Central Europe with transnational networks that extended beyond the region and, in many cases, also beyond Europe. Primarily through the stories of the eugenicists based in Czechoslovakia, the chapter demonstrates that these actors actively participated in, and in some cases even co-created, various transnational networks in the 1920s. By the 1930s, these global connections had been reconfigured, with dark ramifications. Taken together, both chapters also highlight how a generational change, the political challenges posed by the experience of the Great Depression and the discourses of generalized crisis, as well as an epistemic change associated with the rise of Mendelism, contributed to a significant break in eugenic discourses. As the 1930s proceed, Habsburg imperial legacies thus cease to shed light on the increasingly radical biopolitics in this part of the world.

MANAGING DIVERSITY: EUGENICS IN THE LATE HABSBURG EMPIRE, C. 1900-1914

On May 30th, 1914, a conference dedicated to medical and sociological reflections on the phenomena of alcohol and alcoholism commenced in Brno/Brünn, the provincial capital of Habsburg Moravia. By this point, these issues had been thoroughly medicalized and linked with rising anxieties about the alleged biological degeneration brought about by the effects of modern culture. It was, therefore, not surprising that a significant portion of those who actively participated in the conference embraced eugenic ideas. The speakers, with varying emphases, articulated concerns about the biological harm caused by alcohol consumption. They cautioned that these effects extended beyond individual lives, as the consequences of alcoholism accumulated and manifested in future generations. In essence, they fueled fears that these consequences would lead to irreparable damage to what they referred to as “the race.” The consensus was that combating alcoholism was integral to a broader project of collective biological and moral regeneration.¹³³ In this sense, the conference stands as one of the many events infused with eugenic thought that proliferated in Austria-Hungary in the decade preceding World War I.

Things become more intriguing upon closer examination. The conference was multiethnic in its scope. Among the attendees and speakers were medical doctors embracing various nationalisms within imperial Austria and beyond, as well as those with more complex identifications. Numerous contemporary reports indicated that the participants included physicians, psychiatrists, sociologists, and temperance activists whom they categorized as

¹³³ “Vierter österreichischer Alkoholgegnertag in Brünn,” *Brünner Zeitung* 49, no. 123 (May 30, 1914): 4.

Germans, Czechs, Slovenes, and even Croats.¹³⁴ There were occasions when representatives from these different backgrounds took turns serving as chairs. Furthermore, the conference was also multilingual, even though German and Czech dominated the debates due to its venue. Yet, despite these potential ethnic and linguistic divides, the conference proceeded without conflicts. The interactions were “smooth, warm, and friendly,” according to one reporter’s account. “Scientific debates such as these,” the reporter observed, “were the best soil from which peace between the nationalities [of imperial Austria] may sprout.”¹³⁵

This chapter sheds light on this seemingly paradoxical statement. It reveals how debates about eugenics erupted in the late Habsburg Empire, almost simultaneously in its various regions and in multiple distinctive social settings. Networks that chose to adopt and promote eugenics proliferated, connecting this emerging, ambiguous knowledge to different agendas and practices, with temperance activism being just one notable example. Most of the scientific and activist networks that embraced eugenics were multidisciplinary, straddling the boundaries between the social and the biological, as well as between science and social policy. In fact, the embrace of eugenics not only facilitated but encouraged such boundary-crossing, providing individuals from diverse backgrounds with a mutually comprehensible idiom. Ironically, this also applied to the real or perceived barriers between the empire’s various language speakers.

When the conference of temperance activists that met in Moravia’s provincial capital included various language speakers, it merely reflected the multiethnic and empire-wide network that stood behind it. This chapter argues that this was no isolated case, but rather the rule. The imperial scope and/or multi-nationality were characteristic features of many crucial

¹³⁴ “IV. austrijski protualkoholni kongres” [Fourth Austrian Anti-Alcohol Congress], *Novi život* 2, no. 7 (June 1914): 109–10; “Az osztrák alkoholelőné nap” [The Austrian Anti-Alcohol Day], *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 7 (July 1914): 77–8.

¹³⁵ “IV. rakouský sjezd protialkoholní v Brně” [Fourth Austrian Anti-Alcohol Congress in Brno], *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 6, no. 13 (1914): 78–9.

eugenic networks that thrived in the late Habsburg context, long before the stabilization of nation-states in the interwar period. Moreover, the chapter makes it clear that these multiethnic entanglements were not a late or marginal side-effect of networking among eugenics supporters tied to one or another of the competing nationalist projects within the empire. In fact, as this chapter documents, these transnational institutionalized or informal entanglements emerged at the same time as the nationalist networks, in a process of co-constitution, or even preceded them. By examining four early networks of eugenicists, revolving around sociology, special education, nationalist activism, and temperance, as well as the ideas that they circulated, this chapter thus reveals the crucial importance of the imperial circulation of eugenic knowledge in the late Habsburg Empire.

It is now widely accepted that eugenics was a transnational discourse that, by the first decade of the 20th century, had established itself as a “wide-ranging practice across the globe,” as Philippa Levine puts it.¹³⁶ While existing scholarship has conclusively demonstrated that this was also the case in Austria-Hungary, with nearly synchronized echoes of eugenics in various parts of the Habsburg Empire, the reasons behind these echoes have been only partially explained.¹³⁷ I argue that one heretofore unacknowledged reason lies in the dynamic of Habsburg state-making.

Around the year 1900, as recently proposed by Hannes Grandits, Pieter Judson, and Malte Rolf, the continental empires at the eastern edge of the European continent developed

¹³⁶ Levine, *Eugenics*, 2.

¹³⁷ Baader, Hofer and Mayer, *Eugenik in Österreich*; Magdalena Gawin, “Progressivism and Eugenic Thinking in Poland, 1905–1939,” in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 167–83; Martin Kuhar, and Stella Fatović-Ferenčić, “Antropologija jedinke, spolnosti i rase u djelima Frana Gundruma Oriovčanina (1856.–1919.)” [Anthropology of the Individual, Society, and Race in the Works of Fran Gundrum Oriovčanin, 1856–1919], *Acta medico-historica Adriatica* 13, no. Suppl. 1 (2015): 79–96; Šimůnek and Hoßfeld, “Selected Bibliography,” 5–31; Marius Turda, “The First Debates on Eugenics in Hungary, 1910–1918,” in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 185–221.

what they refer to as a “new quality of statehood.”¹³⁸ Like these other continental empires, Austria-Hungary also embarked on a process in which its bureaucratic statehood was gradually expanded and modernized.¹³⁹ The “new understanding of the state” that was materializing at this time opened up “new fields of state activity,” which increasingly significantly impacted various aspects of its subjects’ everyday lives.¹⁴⁰ Many of these emerging domains of state activity can indeed be classified under the Foucauldian concept of biopolitics. They operated on populations as well as individual bodies through measures such as constructing hygienic infrastructure, ensuring the safety of food products, and conducting public health surveillance.¹⁴¹

Importantly, these historians argue that such expansion of state activity, “one approaching the interventionist welfare state,” was far from being a top-down process.¹⁴² Instead, it was driven to a significant extent by the initiatives of provincial and municipal governments, as well as by other local authorities, both state-run and autonomous.¹⁴³ As a result, the drive toward these outcomes can be observed simultaneously in various parts of the empire. Additionally, the bureaucracy pursuing these agendas became more interconnected and engaged in negotiations with local societies, their voluntary associations, and political representatives.¹⁴⁴ The forceful rise of eugenics in Austria-Hungary was an unintended consequence of this expanded state capacity.

As its reach expanded and the complex issues it now dealt with were more specialized, the bureaucratic state became more inclined to seek expert advice from professionals.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 86.

¹³⁹ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 86.

¹⁴⁰ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 86.

¹⁴¹ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 104.

¹⁴² Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 86.

¹⁴³ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 104.

¹⁴⁴ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 105.

¹⁴⁵ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 104.

Concurrently, an increasing number of scientists and other professionals identified interfaces where they hoped to contribute their expert knowledge. At the point of contact between the state and society, they anticipated that these interfaces would connect public policy with expert knowledge. The supporters of eugenics were one emerging group of actors who claimed expertise, with the expectation that they could create a future administrative demand for it. Although the state's demand for their expertise ultimately proved to be quite limited before World War I, they nevertheless developed various conceptual toolkits tailored for different applications. The expectations generated by the new quality of imperial statehood thus ignited eugenic debates across various disciplines, as well as across the empire's regions and language groups.

While eugenics was indeed a transnational and even global discourse, it also followed “markedly different paths” in different places, giving rise to multiple context-dependent varieties of eugenics.¹⁴⁶ Austria-Hungary was no exception. This chapter argues that the crucial context that shaped the content and functions of eugenics in this imperial setting was the empire's diversity. Several historians have recently emphasized the dynamic nature of knowledge production in Austria-Hungary and linked it to this experience of diversity. Franz Fillafer and Johannes Feichtinger eloquently outline the core of this emerging consensus. Such imperial diversity, they argue, spurred various approaches that aimed at its “cognitive management,” or, in other words, at the developing of “the capacity to mold the coexisting and overlapping lifeworlds of Central Europe with their respective languages and practices.”¹⁴⁷ These attempts shaped ideas about the state, society, and nature. To wit, the Habsburg Empire resembled other, otherwise vastly different, continental empires which served as sites for

¹⁴⁶ Levine, *Eugenics*, 7.

¹⁴⁷ Franz Leander Fillafer and Johannes Feichtinger, “How to Rethink the Global History of Knowledge Making from a Central European Perspective,” *History of Knowledge: Research, Resources, and Perspectives*, published October 9, 2019, On-line, accessed May 10, 2023, <https://historyofknowledge.net/2019/10/09/global-history-of-knowledge-making-from-central-european-perspective/>.

experimentation with “a modern language to name, describe, and politically legitimize the human diversity in the imperial situation.”¹⁴⁸

One such language, as shown by Deborah Coen, emerged in the decades after 1848 in the form of what she calls “late imperial sciences.”¹⁴⁹ While these sciences endorsed a narrative of Austria-Hungary’s distinctiveness, it did not center around homogeneity and isolation, but rather depicted the empire as a product of its internal diversity and mutual dependence. Indeed, Coen emphasizes that the interdependence between an empire’s constituent regions and the vital need to preserve its human and natural diversity were their primary areas of focus.¹⁵⁰ To this end, these late imperial sciences “traced histories of migration, mixing, and cultural transfer.”¹⁵¹ In effect, this modern, scientific endeavor “breathed life into the Habsburg idea of transnational interdependence.”¹⁵² However, by the early 20th century, the imperial state these sciences had legitimized had undergone substantial changes.

As mentioned earlier, around 1900, the Habsburg Empire was shifting towards a new quality of statehood characterized by a more profound intertwining of the state and society, as well as increased state involvement in the welfare of its subjects. Such a step towards political modernity was not without its risks, however, as the increased state capacity could be harnessed for various objectives, including a biopolitical homogenization. Consequently, a question that Ilya Gerasimov, Sergey Glebov, and Marina Mogilner astutely raised with a different imperial context in mind becomes even more relevant for Austria-Hungary after 1900: What happens to imperial diversity “in modern mass societies, which develop elaborate analytical devices of comprehensive self-conscience and disciplinary practices to enforce these rational visions of

¹⁴⁸ Marina Mogilner, “Russian Physical Anthropology in Search of ‘Imperial Race’: Liberalism and Modern Scientific Imagination in the Imperial Situation,” *Ab Imperio* 2007, no. 1 (2007): 222.

¹⁴⁹ Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 9.

¹⁵⁰ Deborah R. Coen, “Imperial Climatographies from Tyrol to Turkestan,” *Osiris* 26, no. 1 (2011): 55.

¹⁵¹ Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 9.

¹⁵² Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 4.

social order?”¹⁵³ At first glance, eugenics seems to encapsulate a modern discourse and normalizing practice that would make the erasure of imperial diversity all but inevitable. However, as this chapter shows, the outcome was open-ended in the late Habsburg Empire, as even eugenics was a fundamentally contested area.

Eugenic knowledge not only circulated across various regions of Austria-Hungary, with its representatives forming empire-wide networks, but the empire also influenced their agendas. However, the responses to the imperial situation diverged. Most notably, some supporters of eugenics tried to reshape this science into a tool for cognitive management of imperial diversity. Instead of undermining the portrayal of the empire’s interdependence and hybridity promoted by the late imperial sciences, they aligned themselves with that perspective. By engaging with concepts such as symbiosis, they endeavored to develop a distinctively modern, scientific language that affirmed imperial diversity, both in nature and society. Interestingly, while this emerging body of knowledge was intended to offer an alternative to radical projects of nationalist homogenization, many nationalist-minded yet moderate scientists and intellectuals who envisioned the future of their imagined communities within the imperial framework engaged with these biopolitical frameworks.

The second notable position on eugenics in Austria-Hungary aimed to strike a balance between the empire and nationalism, resonating with contemporary, innovative political theories of non-territorial autonomy. However, when the supporters of eugenics translated these political notions into natural-scientific categories, the outcome was disturbing, as the second section of this chapter will explain in detail. In essence, by emphasizing the purportedly biologically determined disparities in the development of the various groups they had identified,

¹⁵³ Gerasimov, Glebov, and Mogilner, “Hybridity,” 28.

they advocated for the separation of these groups in schools, and possibly beyond. While they did not promote ethnic homogenization, theirs was a eugenics of segregation.

Finally, eugenics began to make its way into nationalist activist networks. Some physicians within these networks were quick to seize upon the ideas of race hygiene that were coming from imperial Germany for their own purposes. Their primary focus was on the nationalist contestations of the empire's manifold language frontiers, which they now reframed as a biopolitical project. They adapted these ideas to serve their nationalist activism in these local settings, culminating in visions of their ethnic unmixing. In a broader sense, they aligned themselves with a lineage of racial discourses centered around the racist notion of "racial purity," extending from Count Gobineau to Houston Stewart Chamberlain (the latter being based in the Habsburg metropolis in the early 20th century).¹⁵⁴ Drawing from these discourses, these nationalist activists fundamentally challenged the imperial narrative of hybridity and interconnectedness, replacing it with a notion of purity and self-sufficiency.

Empire of Symbiosis: Social Reform, Popular Education, and a Eugenic Blueprint for a Multiethnic Empire

In the course of the nineteenth century, an organicist-evolutionist framework "turned into a meta-disciplinary tenet, colored the rhetoric and the epistemic assumptions of other disciplines, and imparted an almost homogeneous appearance to many sciences," as Snait Gissis observes.¹⁵⁵ Sociology was one of them. Drawing on Lamarckism, early sociologists defined their research object – the social – as enmeshed with biology and governed by identical laws. Importantly, advocating fluid boundaries between these spheres was not clearly associated with

¹⁵⁴ Paul Weindling, "A City Regenerated: Eugenics, Race, and Welfare in Interwar Vienna," in *Interwar Vienna: Culture between Tradition and Modernity*, ed. Lisa Silverman and Deborah Holmes (Camden House, Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 2009), passim.

¹⁵⁵ Snait Gissis, "Late Nineteenth Century Lamarckism and French Sociology," *Perspectives on Science* 10, no. 1 (March 2002): 82.

any political ideology. It could serve left- and right-wing political projects alike. As the leading Hungarian left-leaning sociologist Oszkár Jászi put it in his programmatic text *Mi a szociológia?* (What is Sociology?), “the key to the society is hidden at the boundary of sociology and biology.”¹⁵⁶ Even though not every sociologist who saw this boundary as fluid became a eugenicist, sociology did provide a platform for a vivid, interdisciplinary discussion on eugenics and social reform.

In the late Habsburg Empire, emerging sociology was crucial for the rise of eugenic thinking, both institutionally and intellectually. To start with, the *Arbeitssektion für Sozialbiologie und Eugenik* (Working Section for Social Biology and Eugenics) was launched in November 1913 within the Sociological Society in Vienna. Rather than a turn of the Sociological Society toward eugenics, the founding of the first self-described eugenic association in the Habsburg Empire was a culmination of an interest in this discipline that went back to the 1900s.¹⁵⁷ In Hungary, there were two associations of sociologists and the eugenically inflected members of both attempted to establish a eugenic association. Marius Turda shows that in the case of the left-leaning *Társadalomtudományi Társaság* (Society for Social Sciences), these attempts came from René Berkovits who in 1912 considered setting up a eugenic association in Nagyvárad/Großwardein/Oradea, a large town with a sprawling modernist culture. However, his attempt ran aground. The first Hungarian eugenic association thus saw light only in January 1914 and emerged from within the other organization of sociologists in Hungary, the *Társadalomtudományi Egyesület* (Association for Social

¹⁵⁶ Tellingly, the book was published as the first volume of the series called *Természet és társadalom* [Nature and Society]. Oszkár Jászi, *Mi a szociológia?* [What is Sociology?] (Budapest: Huszadik század, 1908), 32.

¹⁵⁷ Gudrun Exner, *Die “Soziologische Gesellschaft in Wien” (1907-1934) und die Bedeutung Rudolf Goldscheids für ihre Vereinstätigkeit* (Vienna: New AcadPress, 2013), 22-124. Since its inception in 1907, the Sociological Society hosted more than a dozen lectures on eugenic and racial issues. The lectures featured, inter alia, Friedrich Hertz and Ignaz Zollschan, both of whom were pioneering Viennese critics of anti-Semitic racial theories. See Friedrich Hertz, *Moderne Rassentheorien: Kritische Essays* (Vienna: C. W. Stern, 1904); Ignaz Zollschan, *Das Rassenproblem: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der theoretischen Grundlagen der jüdischen Rassenfrage* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1910).

Sciences).¹⁵⁸ Finally, in Prague, the *Česká společnost eugenická* (Czech Eugenics Society) held its first public assembly in May 1915 and counted sociologists among its founding members. Conversely, one of the founding members of the eugenics society, the sociologist Břetislav Foustka, would later become the first president of the *Masarykova sociologická společnost* (Masaryk Sociological Society).¹⁵⁹ Even some of the biologists involved the *Czech Eugenics Society* labelled their approach as “sociological eugenics.”¹⁶⁰ All the earliest self-described eugenic associations in Austria-Hungary thus emerged from within the communities of sociologists in the largest urban centers of the empire.

While these communities of sociologists – following Spencer, Ostwald, or Comte, respectively – drew on different varieties of positivism, they pursued similar practical endeavors.¹⁶¹ Popular education programs were paramount among them. These practices shaped their eugenic blueprints. Veronika Hofer explains that the commitment of left-leaning Viennese eugenicists to the notion of developmental plasticity can be traced back to their practical involvement in popular education. Only if such education shaped more than just individual bodies and minds, they believed, could it truly contribute toward the socialist goal of molding a new generation of humans.¹⁶² An argument along the same lines can be made about the involvement in popular science of some of the early eugenicists in Prague and

¹⁵⁸ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 119–122.

¹⁵⁹ Michal Šimůnek, “Eugenics, Social Genetics and Racial Hygiene: Plans for the Scientific Regulation of Human Heredity in the Czech Lands, 1900–1925,” in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 145–66.

¹⁶⁰ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Eugenika a ženské hnutí: Několik kritických a polemických poznámek” [Eugenics and the Women’s Movement: Several Critical and Polemical Remarks], *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fyzikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 14, no. 1–2 (February 25, 1917): 86–94.

¹⁶¹ Jan Surman, Franz Leander Fillafer, and Johannes Feichtinger, *The Worlds of Positivism: A Global Intellectual History, 1770–1930* (New York: Springer, 2018), passim.

¹⁶² Veronika Hofer, “Rudolf Goldscheid, Paul Kammerer und die Biologen des Prater-Vivariums in der liberalen Volksbildung der Wiener Moderne,” in *Wissenschaft, Politik und Öffentlichkeit*, ed. Mitchell G. Ash and Christian H. Stifter (Vienna: WUV, 2002), 149–84.

Brno/Brünn.¹⁶³ Similarly, Hungarian left-leaning sociologists launched the *Társadalomtudományok Szabad Iskolája* (Free School of Social Sciences) in Budapest, “one of their most lasting achievements.”¹⁶⁴ Driven by positivism, the school’s curriculum not only incorporated eugenics but also reflected beliefs in intergenerational human improvement.¹⁶⁵ Crucially, these popular education programs served metropolitan working- and middle-class audiences that were pronouncedly multiethnic. Instead of emphasizing the divides between these communities and calling for a struggle between nations or “races” in a social Darwinist key, these eugenicists sought concepts that enabled them to move beyond nationalism. Central to the shared agendas of many sociologists-turned-eugenicists and their allies was the effort to conceptualize and legitimize imperial diversity.

Biology provided these eugenicists the categories that allowed them to construct analytical frameworks transcending cultural differences. In other words, it paradoxically enabled them to think about imperial diversity. Consider the eugenicists Paul Kammerer, Rudolf Goldscheid, and Julius Tandler, who congregated in the *Arbeitssektion* of the Sociological Society in Vienna. Significantly, Kammerer delved into the concept of symbiosis in nature and employed it increasingly as a direct metaphor for the diverse Austria-Hungary. Equally important was the concept of “human economy” (*Menschenökonomie*) coined by Goldscheid. Encapsulating various biopolitical strategies, Goldscheid’s notion of the economy

¹⁶³ Vojtěch Pojar, “Quality over Quantity: Expert Knowledge and the Politics of Food in Prague, 1914-1918” (M.A. Thesis, Central European University, 2017), 71–110.

¹⁶⁴ György Litván, *A Twentieth-Century Prophet: Oscar Jászi 1875-1957* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006), 46.

¹⁶⁵ As early as 1906, eugenics was incorporated into the curriculum. During that school year, the physician József Madzsar delivered lectures on eugenics within his course on social hygiene. Concurrently, the journalist Zsigmond Fülöp conducted a course on heredity. A report from the organizers indicates that both courses were well-received, each drawing more than 100 participants. In another testament to the significance attributed to biological discourses for the school’s mission, the inaugural lecture for the academic year 1908, presented by the eugenically-inclined Madzsar, was titled “Lamarck and Darwin.” *Jelentés a társadalomtudományok szabad iskolájának 1906-1907-ik évi működéséről* [Report on the Activities of the Free School of Social Sciences for the Academic Year 1906-1907] (Budapest: Az iskolaigazgatósága, 1907), 10 and 12; József Madzsar, “Lamarck és Darwin” [Lamarck and Darwin], in *Jelentés a társadalomtudományok szabad iskolájának 1908-1909-ik évi működéséről* [Report on the Activities of the Free School of Social Sciences for the Academic Year 1908-1909] (Budapest: Az iskolaigazgatósága, 1909), 3–11.

of humans aimed to shift the focus of eugenics from nationalist preoccupations with belonging and “purity” towards economic perspectives of utility and efficiency.¹⁶⁶ Lastly, in a somewhat ambiguous manner, Tandler attempted to decenter the notion of “race” and emphasize the individual “condition” and “constitution” as the most important targets of eugenic intervention.¹⁶⁷ All these concepts were underpinned by a neo-Lamarckian emphasis on biological plasticity that seemingly allowed them to mold human nature as if it was no more than “soft wax in our hands.”¹⁶⁸

Eugenic concepts circulated among the sociologists not only in Vienna, but also in other urban centers of the empire. These exchanges were facilitated by a constant movement of knowledge, people, and material artifacts. Viennese eugenicists, for example, repeatedly lectured in the Hungarian capital while local periodicals published their papers and reviewed their work. For instance, Paul Kammerer, whose mother hailed from Budapest, delivered lectures before the *Társadalomtudományi Társaság* in 1912 and again in 1914.¹⁶⁹ These lectures were subsequently published in the society’s flagship journal, *Huszadik Század* (Twentieth Century), alongside other articles by Kammerer.¹⁷⁰ In a testimony to Kammerer’s close connections to Hungary, a local popular science journal, *Darwin*, described him as “the

¹⁶⁶ Gudrun Exner, “Rudolf Goldscheids »Menschenökonomie« im Kontext von Julius Tandler’s Wohlfahrtskonzepten, lamarckistisch motivierter Reformeugenik, Soziologie, Monismus, Pazifismus und der Frauenfrage,” in *Strukturen und Netzwerke: Medizin und Wissenschaft in Wien 1848–1955*, ed. Daniela Angetter, Birgit Nemec, Herbert Posch, Christiane Druml, and Paul Weindling (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2018), 393–408.

¹⁶⁷ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 129–35.

¹⁶⁸ Sander Gliboff, “‘Protoplasm...is Soft Wax in Our Hands’: Paul Kammerer and the Art of Biological Transformation,” *Endeavour* 29, no. 4 (December 2005): 162–67; Klaus Taschwer, “Darwin und die frühe Eugenik in Wien: Wie und warum der Soziallamarckismus in Österreich die biopolitischen Diskussionen rund um den Ersten Weltkrieg bestimmte,” in *Darwin in Zentraleuropa: Die wissenschaftliche, weltanschauliche und populäre Rezeption im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Wolfgang L. Reiter and Herbert Matis (Vienna: Lit, 2018), 343–60.

¹⁶⁹ “Társulati ügyek: Társadalomtudományi Társaság” [Association’s Affairs: Society for Social Sciences], *Huszadik Század* 14, no. 1 (1913): 136–37; “Haeckel jubilál: A Társadalomtudományi Társaság ünnepe” [Haeckel Celebrates: The Celebration of the Society for Social Sciences], *Világ* 5, no. 40 (February 15, 1914): 14.

¹⁷⁰ Paul Kammerer, “A szerzett tulajdonságok átöröklése és annak szociológiai jelentősége” [The Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics and Its Sociological Significance], *Huszadik Század* 14, no. 3 (1913): 305–24; Paul Kammerer, “Ernst Haeckel,” *Huszadik Század* 15, no. 2 (1914): 137–50.

ingenious Viennese biologist who is also well known in our country.”¹⁷¹ In turn, Rudolf Goldscheid served as the keynote speaker at the jubilee session celebrating the first decade of the *Társadalomtudományi Társaság*’s existence; notably, he was the only representative from a sociological society outside of Hungary.¹⁷² Moreover, these Viennese eugenicists maintained a close connection to Moravia and Bohemia as well. Apart from touring both provinces and lecturing there on some occasions, Kammerer, for instance, also exchanged letters with the secretary of the *Czech Eugenic Society* and swapped offprints of each other’s papers.¹⁷³ Felicitas Kammerer, his bilingual wife, facilitated this exchange by her translations.¹⁷⁴ The involvement of these eugenicists in knowledge circulation across the empire’s major urban centers further reinforced their view of the empire as a collaborative space.

The biological concepts of cooperation based on mutual benefit were hotly debated by eugenicists in Austria-Hungary. In the early years of the twentieth century, the theories of Pyotr Kropotkin and Franklin Giddings were particularly influential. Drawing on the mutualist traditions in the Tsarist and British Empires, the geographer, zoologist, and anarchist theorist Kropotkin suggested that cooperation, or “mutual aid,” was widespread both in nature and in society. It provided an advantage to organisms that faced hostile environment, facilitating their survival and further development. Consequently, it was a crucial factor of evolution. Indeed, Kropotkin’s main aim was to prove that cooperation played an equally fundamental role in

¹⁷¹ Zsigmond Fülöp, “A kísérleti biológia újabb diadala” [The New Triumph of Experimental Biology], *Darwin* 3, no. 10 (May 15, 1914): 151–52.

¹⁷² “A Társadalomtudományi Társaság jubiláris ülése” [The Jubilee Session of the Society for Social Sciences], *Huszadik Század* 13, no. 8 (1912): 866–71; Rudolf Goldscheid, “Kultúrperspektívák” [Cultural Perspectives], *Huszadik Század* 14, no. 9 (September 1913): 177–99.

¹⁷³ Kammerer lectured to German-speaking audiences. For some of his lectures in Moravia, both before and after the empire’s collapse, see Paul Kammerer, “Mendelsche Regeln und Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften,” *Verhandlungen des naturforschenden Vereines in Brünn* 49 (1910): 72–110; “Dr Paul Kammerer,” *Volksfreund* 39, no. 275 (December 12, 1919): 5.

¹⁷⁴ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Jaroslav Kříženecký Papers, Inv. No. 2762, Letter, Paul Kammerer to Jaroslav Kříženecký, April 23, 1915.

evolution as the struggle for existence.¹⁷⁵ The sociologist Giddings, in turn, sought to find a psychological explanation for such cooperative behavior.¹⁷⁶ It is striking that eugenicists played a major role in mediating these theories to various audiences in Austria-Hungary in a plethora of lectures, articles and, importantly, translations.

In Budapest, a Hungarian translation of Kropotkin's key book *Mutual Aid* was published by the eugenicist József Madzsar.¹⁷⁷ István Apáthy, the head of the first Hungarian eugenics society, also followed Kropotkin in emphasizing mutual aid.¹⁷⁸ In Prague, Břetislav Foustka translated Giddings' *Principles of Sociology* in 1900, and repeatedly invoked them in his influential 1904 book on eugenics.¹⁷⁹ Meanwhile in Zagreb, the eugenically inspired sociologist Ernest Miler discussed Kropotkin's arguments about mutual aid with approval and later went on to translate Giddings' textbook.¹⁸⁰ Andrija Štampar, a student of Tandler who would play a key role in shaping public health in interwar Yugoslavia, also echoed Kropotkin.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁵ Daniel P. Todes, *Darwin without Malthus: The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Piers J. Hale, *Political Descent: Malthus, Mutualism, and the Politics of Evolution in Victorian England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), 206–51.

¹⁷⁶ Daniel Breslau, "The American Spencerians: Theorizing a New Science," in *Sociology in America: A History*, by Craig Calhoun (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 39–62.

¹⁷⁷ Pyotr Alexeyevich Kropotkin, *A kölcsönös segítség mint természettörvény* [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution], trans. József Madzsar, Szociológiai Könyvtár (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1908). Note the emphasis on the naturalness of mutual aid in the title of Madzsar's translation of Kropotkin's book *Mutual Aid*, which replaced the original subtitle "A Factor of Evolution" with "A Law of Nature."

¹⁷⁸ Apáthy's ideas about mutual aid primarily underpinned a vision of social cooperation within a national community but were not confined to it. In a testimony to his confidence in his biological and progressive credentials, he sent some of his articles on mutual aid to the lawyer and journalist Zsombor Szász, who resided in England and had a connection to Kropotkin, expressing the hope that "maybe you could talk to Kropotkin" about these papers. István Apáthy, "A társas erkölcsről" [On Social Ethics], *Világ* 4, no. 304 (December 25, 1913): 65–66; National Széchényi Library, Budapest, Manuscript Collection, István Apáthy Papers, Quart. Hung. 2454/I, Inv. No. 268, Letter, István Apáthy to Zsombor Szász, March 6, 1912.

¹⁷⁹ Franklin Henry Giddings, *Základy sociologie: rozbor jevů, týkajících se asociace a společenské organizace* [The Principles of Sociology: An Analysis of the Phenomena of Association and of Social Organization], trans. Břetislav Foustka (Prague: Laichter, 1900); Břetislav Foustka, *Slabí v lidské společnosti: Ideály humanitní a degenerace národů* [The Weak in a Human Society: Humanitarian Ideals and the Degeneration of Nations] (Prague: Laichter, 1904), passim.

¹⁸⁰ Ernest Miler, "Anarkista Kropotkin o medjusobnoj pomoći kao glavnom zakonu ljudskog društva" [Anarchist Kropotkin on Mutual Aid as the Main Law of Human Society], *Mjesečnik Pravničkoga društva u Zagrebu* 38 (1912): 106–13, 193–99.

¹⁸¹ Martin Kuhar, "'From an Impure Source, All Is Impure': The Rise and Fall of Andrija Štampar's Public Health Eugenics in Yugoslavia," *Social History of Medicine* 30, no. 1 (February 2017): 95.

Even though neither of these theories originated in Austria-Hungary, they had a particular reception in the context of this multiethnic empire. While Kropotkin and Giddings were mainly interested in the cooperation within or between social classes, their Habsburg readers also grappled with the question whether mutual aid takes place mainly within ethnic groups, or if different groups can cooperate as well. The human norms that the “moral authority of nature” was invoked to justify in this context were varied and multifaceted.¹⁸² The answers encompassed negotiations with the Habsburg imperial project as well as internationalism, federalism, and nationalism, and their various combinations.

Around 1910, biologist and eugenicist Paul Kammerer fundamentally reframed this debate. Going beyond mutual aid, Kammerer drew on theories of symbiosis. From the late 1870s, some biologists had posited that symbiosis was a significant driver of evolutionary innovation. These biologists suggested that organisms formed symbiotic relationships, and from such intimate associations of two or more organisms, entirely new, composite “individuals” could evolve.¹⁸³ In his exploration of the history of this scientific concept, Jan Sapp has shown that the debate surrounding these theories pitted those who viewed symbiosis as a rare and often imperfect phenomenon against those who believed it was more widespread. The latter identified various degrees of interdependence in nature and highlighted an entire spectrum of entanglements between organisms.¹⁸⁴ Kammerer positioned himself squarely within the latter camp.

In several articles and in his 1913 book titled *Genossenschaften von Lebewesen auf Grund gegenseitiger Vorteile: Symbiose* (Cooperatives of Living Beings based on Mutual

¹⁸² Daston and Vidal, “Introduction,” 2–5.

¹⁸³ Jan Sapp, *Evolution by Association: A History of Symbiosis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), xiv.

¹⁸⁴ The spectrum of these entanglements ranged from mutual aid through non-harmful commensalism to parasitism. Sapp, *Evolution by Association*, xiv.

Benefit: Symbiosis), Kammerer meticulously documented various cases of such integration.¹⁸⁵ In doing so, he repeatedly referenced the experimental research he and his colleagues undertook at the Viennese *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, his home institution.¹⁸⁶ Kammerer posited that symbiosis occurred among both simple and complex organisms and was nearly universally widespread: “It is rare, if not unheard of, for an organism to exist entirely on its own — without granting a place to foreign organisms within it, on it, and beside it, and creating a closest community in which these organisms now share both joy and sorrow.”¹⁸⁷ In order to grasp this interconnectedness of living beings, Kammerer at times spoke about “general symbiosis,” or even *Pansymbiose*.¹⁸⁸

For a neo-Lamarckian like Kammerer, a crucial takeaway about symbiosis was the assumption that such behavior was driven by instincts. These instincts could be acquired and subsequently inherited by offspring. In a conducive environment, therefore, organisms would increasingly engage in symbiotic behavior. Another important takeaway was that symbiotic organisms could become more intertwined if they cooperated for an extended period and could even fuse into a composite entity fundamentally different from both (or more) of its constituent parts.¹⁸⁹ Like many proponents of symbiosis, Kammerer used the notion as a metaphor for human society.

Viewing society as an organism and emphasizing the intimate relationships among diverse living beings, Kammerer pursued distinctly political objectives. It was evident that

¹⁸⁵ Paul Kammerer, *Genossenschaften von Lebewesen auf Grund gegenseitiger Vorteile (Symbiose)* (Bern: R. Dech & Co., 1913).

¹⁸⁶ Paul Kammerer, “Symbiose zwischen Libellenlarve und Fadenalge,” *Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen* 25, no. 1 (1907): 52–81; Paul Kammerer, “Ausnützung dütenförmig gedrehter junger Blätter von Canna, Musa und Aspidistra durch kleinere Tiere,” *Österreichische botanische Zeitschrift* 58, no. 1 (January 1908): 19–27; Jovan Hadži, “Vorversuche zur Biologie von Hydra,” *Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen* 22, no. 1–2 (1906): 38–47.

¹⁸⁷ Paul Kammerer, “Allgemeine Symbiose und Kampf ums Dasein als gleichberechtigte Triebkräfte der Evolution,” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 6, no. 5 (1909): 599.

¹⁸⁸ Paul Kammerer, “Pansymbiose,” *Naturwissenschaften* 1, no. 50 (December 1, 1913): 1222–25.

¹⁸⁹ Kammerer, *Genossenschaften von Lebewesen*, passim.

racial nationalism was Kammerer's primary target. For instance, in a 1914 essay aptly titled *Nationalismus und Biologie* (Nationalism and Biology), Kammerer chastised nationalists for overvaluing the struggle for existence, for discounting cooperation, and for "regarding parasitism as a more perfect and widespread occurrence than the reciprocally beneficial symbiosis or mutual aid."¹⁹⁰ The reason Kammerer opted for such a stark contrast between these two terms was that "parasitism" was a prevalent trope in contemporary nationalist and, more specifically, anti-Semitic discourse.¹⁹¹ Although Kammerer acknowledged that "symbiosis" and "parasitism" in nature were connected by a spectrum of intermediate phenomena, in political debates, he positioned these biological notions as asymmetrical counter-concepts.¹⁹² Kammerer's engagement with the concept of symbiosis sought to offer a contrasting biological narrative to the surging racial nationalism in Central Europe, one that centered on interdependence, interpenetration, and compositeness as opposed to conflict and purity.

While Kammerer's narrative of cooperation in nature and society drew on a transnational debate and was initially articulated in general terms, it arose from a distinct imperial situation. Indeed, it was increasingly evident that the Habsburg Empire was his primary point of reference. His exploration of "symbiosis" resonated with the efforts of Habsburg imperial scientists to conceptualize and chart the empire's natural and human diversity, and of the sociologists who sought to legitimize the composite nature of the imperial state.¹⁹³ One implicit point of reference for Kammerer was the Austrian liberal racial

¹⁹⁰ Paul Kammerer, "Nationalismus und Biologie," *Das monistische Jahrhundert* 2, no. 42 (January 17, 1914): 1179.

¹⁹¹ Sander L. Gilman, *The Jew's Body* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 136; Nadia Valman, "Dracula," in *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution*, ed. Richard S. Levy (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005), 188–89.

¹⁹² Reinhart Koselleck, "Zur historisch-politischen Semantik der asymmetrischen Gegenbegriffe," in *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*, ed. Reinhart Koselleck (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1979), 211–59.

¹⁹³ Deborah R. Coen, "Climate and Circulation in Imperial Austria," *The Journal of Modern History* 82, no. 4 (2010): 839; Prendergast, "The Sociological Idea," 327–58.

anthropology and ethnology, which at the time were seen as largely intertwined disciplines.¹⁹⁴ They “established a paradigm of imperial diversity,” as Maria Rhode aptly observes, and saw the empire’s hybridity mirrored in its purported “mixed racial type.”¹⁹⁵ They also cited environmental differences as a major causal factor behind this diversity.¹⁹⁶ While these approaches professed to be descriptive, Kammerer’s ideas about symbiosis were prescriptive and future-oriented, envisioning an ever-increasing interdependence and hybridity. Consequently, it was not by accident that Kammerer in his 1914 article identified both the environment and intermarriage as major forces shaping human nature and strongly contested the nationalist fear of racial contamination. When it came to the factors that could alter human biology, he observed, “what the nationalists are most likely to acknowledge is the impact of crossbreeding; and since they, in their egocentric perception, always consider their own race superior, they prohibit crossbreeding, the mixing with foreign blood, in the interest of preserving the purity of the race.”¹⁹⁷ In short, Kammerer translated the empire’s official trope of unity in diversity into biology and utilized it to reimagine Austria-Hungary as an empire of symbiosis.

The emergence of the Sociological Society in Vienna was intertwined with social reform and with the doctrine of Monism. Tellingly, Rudolf Goldscheid, who founded and led the Society, also headed the Austrian *Monistenbund*. While Monism in Wilhelmine Germany was strongly linked with the Kulturkampf and national liberalism, Todd Weir contends that it was an intrinsically versatile concept. Various actors used it to advocate for a broad array of political

¹⁹⁴ Andre Gingrich, “Science, Race, and Empire: Ethnography in Vienna before 1918,” *East Central Europe* 43, no. 1–2 (2016): 41–63.

¹⁹⁵ Maria Rhode, “A Matter of Place, Space, and People,” in *National Races: Transnational Power Struggles in the Sciences and Politics of Human Diversity, 1840–1945*, ed. Richard McMahon (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), 108–10. See also Irene Ranzmaier, *Die Anthropologische Gesellschaft in Wien und die akademische Etablierung anthropologischer Disziplinen an der Universität Wien, 1870–1930* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2013).

¹⁹⁶ Rhode, “A Matter of Place, Space, and People,” 108–10. For an exploration of the imperial and neo-Lamarckian framework of race anthropologists in royal Hungary, see Lafferton, “The Magyar Moustache,” 706–32.

¹⁹⁷ Kammerer, “Nationalismus und Biologie,” 1183.

projects, giving rise to a plethora of interpretations. Due to its secular and scientific attributes, Monism frequently found favor among progressives, attracting socialists, pacifists, and feminists alike.¹⁹⁸ Certainly, this was true for Goldscheid, who championed all these causes. However, Goldscheid's modernist, left-wing interpretation of Monism also underpinned his eugenic ideas.

The German-speaking Monist milieu acquainted Goldscheid with turn-of-the-century social energetics. Anson Rabinbach has traced social energetics from its origins in the physical and biological sciences and shown how “the discovery of the laws of thermodynamics and the formulation of conservation of force” reverberated across into a plethora of other discourses.¹⁹⁹ Wilhelm Ostwald, the chemist and second president of the German *Monistenbund*, forcefully embraced these ideas and aimed to make them a cornerstone of Monist worldview. The basic principle was that no energy should be allowed to go to waste. Instead, it was imperative to search for the most efficient uses of the available energy. Goldscheid wholeheartedly agreed, elevating this notion to the alleged foundation of all politics: “The imperative of energetics, applied to all that is organic and spiritual, is the true Monist politics.”²⁰⁰ Goldscheid's sociology and his eugenic plans were heavily influenced by Ostwald's energetics.

Following Ostwald, Goldscheid perceived society through the lens of energy conservation and employed this motif to underpin his call for social reform. While many early socialists underscored the abundance in nature, suggesting it could fulfill everyone's needs, Goldscheid's energetic perspective led him to see the natural resources powering the economy as limited. Given that the volume of these natural resources, akin to energy, was finite and could only dissipate, Goldscheid stressed the importance of not merely extracting and exhausting

¹⁹⁸ Todd H. Weir, “The Riddles of Monism,” in *Monism: Science, Philosophy, Religion, and the History of a Worldview*, ed. Todd H. Weir (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 6.

¹⁹⁹ Anson Rabinbach, *The Eclipse of the Utopias of Labor* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018), 28.

²⁰⁰ Rudolf Goldscheid, *Monismus und Politik* (Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1912), 29.

them but of maintaining and managing them rationally. This ecological approach, however, had a biopolitical twist. Goldscheid approached human labor, and human lives more broadly, as a natural resource comparable to coal or iron ore. Consequently, he claimed that they also needed to be managed economically: “We cannot exploit our resources ruthlessly because plunder is the very opposite of rational management. The most valuable resource we have is the humans themselves.”²⁰¹ If the ultimate goal, according to Goldscheid, was the rational management of available natural resources, the move to extend their definition to include human lives made this management into an eminently biopolitical endeavor.

Goldscheid’s theory, formulated in the first decade of the twentieth century, was contemporary with the early theories of the scientific management of labor. This emerging movement, exemplified by Taylorism, sought to amplify industrial productivity and to profoundly reshape social relations according to the blueprint provided by the engineers.²⁰² The tropes of social energetics were important for this movement, Rabinbach argues, offering it “a rationale for conserving the health and safety of the worker which, reformers argued, would inevitably lead to greater productivity and profit.”²⁰³ Comparing human bodies to engines, these reformers advocated for optimizing their performance. This was also the turn that Goldscheid’s arguments took. As technology increasingly shaped both the shop floor and society at large in vital ways, he posited, the alleged economic value of humans would rise significantly, as would the imperative to optimize them further.²⁰⁴ To articulate this instrumental value of human lives, Goldscheid introduced the notion of “biological capital,” using it interchangeably with the concept of “human capital” which he also coined.²⁰⁵ Arguing that rationalized labor required

²⁰¹ Goldscheid, *Monismus und Politik*, 23.

²⁰² Charles Maier, “Between Taylorism and Technocracy: European Ideologies and the Vision of Industrial Productivity in the 1920s,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 5, no. 2 (April 1970): 27–61.

²⁰³ Rabinbach, *The Eclipse*, 28.

²⁰⁴ The political and epistemic privileging of skilled industrial labor, shared by many Austro-Marxists, was quite palpable in Goldscheid’s approach.

²⁰⁵ Rudolf Goldscheid, *Höherentwicklung und Menschenökonomie: Grundlegung der Sozialbiologie* (Leipzig: Klinkhardt, 1911), 487–597.

rationalized bodies, Goldscheid endorsed various welfare measures affirming and allegedly enhancing human lives.

Goldscheid's notion of rationalization of the "biological capital" extended beyond the behavior and skills of individual workers. It primarily encompassed what he perceived as their biology, or "race." His approach drew its foundation and content from Neo-Lamarckian eugenics and proposed various strategies that sought to manipulate and control the environmental influences for the alleged biological enhancement of human bodies. These diverse biopolitical strategies that he advocated were captured in Goldscheid's pivotal concept: the "human economy," which he envisioned as the technocratic management and investment into biological capital.²⁰⁶ While the human economy, centered on assumptions about the instrumental value of human lives, might seem inherently pronatalist, such was not Goldscheid's interpretation. Rather than advocating for pro-natalism, the sociologist used the concept of human economy to strongly support neo-Malthusian positions.²⁰⁷ Nevertheless, eugenics was a significant component of what Goldscheid labeled as the human economy; he often equated it with eugenics, and his peers agreed.

Human economy was more than just a narrative that linked scientific labor management and social reform. Crucially, Goldscheid sought to harness human economy to increase the value of imperial citizenship and to reinforce a multiethnic state. Assumptions about an evolving relationship between the state and society at the turn of the twentieth century underpinned this goal. Goldscheid observed that at the time he was writing, the state's scope was broadening to encompass a growing array of social policies. The expansion of citizens' rights that walked hand in hand with this process, he argued, set the groundwork for the goals of human economy to become feasible. "The altered status of individuals in society, of citizens

²⁰⁶ Goldscheid, *Höherentwicklung und Menschenökonomie*, 487–597.

²⁰⁷ Rudolf Goldscheid, *Frauenfrage und Menschenökonomie* (Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1913).

within the state, their enhanced legal protections, and the broader insurance coverage they secured,” Goldscheid noted, “emphasize the growing acknowledgment of the economic value of human life, human labor power, and public health.”²⁰⁸ While Goldscheid portrayed this profound shift as an abstract social process, his observations closely reflected his particular imperial context.

Let us recall that Austria-Hungary at the turn of the century was shifting towards a new quality of statehood, marking the emergence of a state that pursued welfare policies and intervened in new policy areas.²⁰⁹ For a pioneering sociologist like Goldscheid, this transformation was evident. Consequently, he envisioned the expanding imperial state as the principal institutional steward of human economy, and as the prospective key backer of medical expertise. Notably, seeking to portray the state as the entity that benefited most from the wealth created by the human economy, he claimed that under the state’s direction, medical doctors would emerge as the primary administrators of the biological capital. By assuming that the extension of the responsibilities of the imperial state to cover various forms of welfare would ultimately strengthen the diverse empire, Goldscheid’s concept of the human economy was a discourse about economic efficiency beyond the nation.

Like Kammerer, Goldscheid employed eugenics not only to support his calls for social reform but also to transcend nationalism. Goldscheid’s posture was pragmatic. In Goldscheid’s view, the driving force behind the interdependence of human groups was economic. Echoing classical political economists, he argued, “The exchange of goods has swelled immeasurably, which means that every nation is mutually interested and co-involved in the prosperity of other nations.”²¹⁰ Behind this vision of interdependence, one can discern not only the increasingly

²⁰⁸ Rudolf Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie* (Berlin: Friedenswarte, 1912), 21.

²⁰⁹ Grandits, Judson, and Rolf, “Towards a New Quality,” 86.

²¹⁰ Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie*, 6.

globalized world economy of the early 1900s, but also the imperial common market.²¹¹ Significantly, Goldscheid advocated for a more equitable distribution of the benefits of this interdependence, made possible through welfare initiatives grounded in the tenets of human economy. Tying citizenship to entitlements from various welfare initiatives, he assumed, would strengthen, and enhance, the unity of multiethnic nations like Austria-Hungary.

Goldscheid also hoped that the growing interdependence, hand in hand with the welfare brought by human economy, would undermine and counteract nationalism. The more closely intertwined relations between nations became, he asserted, “the more vehemently the forces of history push towards organizational internationalism, towards a cultural patriotism which brands all aggressive national sentiment as narrow-minded particularism.”²¹² If not, he warned that “the particularistic nationalism of our times” would result in a collapse of diversity, as nothing could then prevent “a major general homogenization of individuals and of nations.”²¹³ Goldscheid thus saw the human economy as playing a pivotal role in supplanting corrosive nationalism with a broader sense of commonality, in Austria-Hungary and beyond.

Zooming in on individuals, Goldscheid’s human economy did not attribute value based on one’s ethnicity; it was entirely indifferent to it. Instead, it primarily foregrounded ability, with a particular emphasis on the capacity to work. This choice was influenced by Goldscheid’s admiration for the scientific management of labor. It was also guided by his pragmatic attempt to convince authorities to promote welfare policies for economic purposes, with the aim of affirming, enhancing, and optimizing the performance of human bodies in industrial production. In effect, this epistemic and political choice gave human economy a somber productivist twist.

²¹¹ Andrea Komlosy, “Imperial Cohesion, Nation-Building and Regional Integration in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1804–1918,” in *Nationalizing Empires*, by Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015), 369–428.

²¹² Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie*, 57.

²¹³ Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie*, 57.

The resulting emphasis on ability, and particularly on the capacity to work, was only partially alleviated by the fact that Goldscheid refused to link ability to ethnic identity at the conceptual level. Moreover, even though the stipulated norm towards which working individuals should evolve with the aid of human economy had nothing to do with the notion of “purity” promoted by emerging racial nationalists—and even though it only partially overlapped with the medically defined concept of normalcy—managing the human economy still became a matter for physicians. Nor was this focus on ability and its medicalization rendered entirely harmless by Goldscheid’s pronounced neo-Lamarckism. Granted, the emphasis on human plasticity made each individual seem capable of perfection. It also prioritized biopolitical strategies that acted on humans through their environment, rather than resorting to violent interventions within their bodies.²¹⁴ Yet, while this approach suspended some salient exclusivist and repressive potentials of the human economy, it did not entirely immunize the concept against these inherent risks. Thus, Goldscheid’s concept of the human economy circumvented racial nationalism, but only at the cost of placing the capacity to work as the primary eugenic concern.

The ideas of the anatomist Julius Tandler can be interpreted as another, and related, attempt to navigate imperial diversity via eugenics, but with an emphasis on the individual person. To this end, Tandler leveraged the emerging framework of constitutional medicine, which gained popularity among German-speaking doctors from the early 1910s.²¹⁵ As historian Nadine Metzger describes, this emerging field of constitutional medicine defined itself by “the proclaimed return to the individuality of patients.”²¹⁶ Initially, this emphasis was paired with “a pronounced attention to scientifically accurate clinical, anatomical, and physiological

²¹⁴ Goldscheid, *Höherentwicklung und Menschenökonomie*, passim.

²¹⁵ Even though many of these doctors used more modest terms like “Konstitutionslehre” or even “konstitutionelle Gedanke,” I will consistently use the term “constitutional medicine” to make it clear that this is a medical, and not a juridical discourse. Nadine Metzger, “Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher Grundlage: Die Etablierungsphase der modernen Konstitutionslehre 1911 bis 1921,” *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 51, no. 3 (2016): 209; Carsten Timmermann, “Constitutional Medicine, Neoromanticism, and the Politics of Antimechanism in Interwar Germany,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 75, no. 4 (2001): 723.

²¹⁶ Metzger, “Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher,” 212.

research,” setting apart modern constitutional medicine from the older Hippocratic understanding of human constitution.²¹⁷ The focus on individuality and scientific rigor resonated well with Tandler’s objectives.

Before World War I, various interpretations of constitutional medicine existed, but they all converged on an interest in causes of disease intrinsic to the body, rather than external agents such as bacteria.²¹⁸ This interest in the physical state of individual bodies was interdisciplinary, encompassing fields as varied as anatomy, psychiatry, and the emerging disciplines of genetics and endocrinology.²¹⁹ Crucially, as Carsten Timmermann highlights, constitutional medicine became split between the “rationalists” and the “neoromantics.” The latter, with their anti-mechanistic and holistic stance, portrayed physicians as charismatic leaders, advocating for constitutional medicine as a solution to the perceived crisis of medicine. Their influence was particularly pronounced during the interwar period. Conversely, the pre-war founders of constitutional medicine and its interwar modernist proponents gravitated towards the “rationalist” viewpoint and prioritized precise scientific research.²²⁰ As Timmermann explains, to the “rationalists,” constitutional medicine was “the attempt to make individuality an object of rational science” and to use this knowledge to optimize human bodies, often with a focus on increasing industrial productivity.²²¹ Tandler, who embraced constitutional medicine as early as in the first decade of the twentieth century, was clearly committed to the rationalist camp.

Constitutional medicine echoed early and significantly in imperial Austria due to the particular institutional and disciplinary dynamics at its universities.²²² Tandler, in particular,

²¹⁷ Metzger, “Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher,” 212.

²¹⁸ Metzger, “Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher,” 232.

²¹⁹ Metzger, “Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher,” 212.

²²⁰ Timmermann, “Constitutional Medicine,” 721.

²²¹ Timmermann, “Constitutional Medicine,” 725.

²²² Gerhard Baader, “Eugenische Programme in der sozialistischen Parteienlandschaft in Deutschland und Österreich im Vergleich,” in *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900-1945*, ed. Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer, and Thomas Mayer (Vienna: Czernin, 2007), 84–95.

played a significant role in institutionalizing this emerging field, as the founder and co-editor of its first specialized journal, the *Zeitschrift für angewandte Anatomie und Konstitutionslehre* (Journal for applied Anatomy and Constitutional Science), established in Vienna in 1913.²²³ Furthermore, the subjects Tandler investigated in his studies at that time were intimately connected with constitutional medicine.²²⁴ Significantly, Tandler positioned constitutional medicine at the heart of his eugenic vision. Tandler's lectures delivered in 1913 and 1914 in front of the eugenic section of the Sociological Society in Vienna – the former was at its inaugural session – made this link evident. Tandler also fused constitutional medicine with eugenics in an invited lecture he delivered in 1913 in Munich in front of the German Society of Race Hygiene, which politely but firmly highlighted the differing epistemic agendas between imperial Austrian and German nationalist proponents of eugenics.²²⁵ Together with Kammerer's emphasis on symbiosis, and Goldscheid's human economy, Tandler's approach to constitutional medicine represented the interlocking parts of an emerging eugenic discourse tailored for a multiethnic empire.

“Constitution,” along with “condition” and “race,” were critical to Tandler's eugenic toolkit. Theorizing a complex interplay among these three concepts, Tandler centered his approach on the individual person and used human constitution to decenter the notion of “race.” While Tandler held a biologically deterministic view, he contended that an individual's traits were chiefly determined by their innate constitution rather than “race.”²²⁶ Tandler strongly demarcated the two notions, defining constitution as all “those individual variations, those

²²³ Metzger, “Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher,” 219.

²²⁴ Baader, “Eugenische Programme,” 104-108. See also Cheryl A. Logan, “Cases and Prototypes: Constitutionalism and Photographic Portrayal of the Person in Freud's Vienna,” *Visual Resources* 23, no. 1-2 (March 2007): 65-83.

²²⁵ The lectures for the eugenic section took place in November 1913 and March 1914. See Exner, *Die “Soziologische Gesellschaft,”* 116 and 121. The lecture delivered to the German Society of Race Hygiene was later republished as a programmatic article in Tandler's *Zeitschrift*: Julius Tandler, “Konstitution und Rassenhygiene,” *Zeitschrift für angewandte Anatomie und Konstitutionslehre* 1, no. 1 (1914): 11-26.

²²⁶ Tandler, “Konstitution und Rassenhygiene,” 18.

morphological and functional characteristics of the new individual, which remain after deducting the characteristics of the species and race.”²²⁷ Having conceptualized the supposed constitution as every fixed individual trait that was not “racial,” the anatomist posited that these individual characteristics exhibited great diversity within a population and were combined in various ways. He also asserted that these traits outnumbered those that the eugenicists identified as “racial,” and that many of these so-called “racial” attributes were actually individual constitutional characteristics: “A significant portion of what we refer to as racial differences will be revealed as constitutional differences.”²²⁸ From this conceptual rearrangement, constitution emerged as the focal point of Tandler’s attention, with “race” being pushed more to the periphery.

Crucially, as Cheryl Logan notes, within this framework that centered on individual constitution, “one could not take the collective attributes of a race or species and extend them from the group to the individual.”²²⁹ In other words, the Viennese anatomist underscored that “race” could not adequately define individual identity, as the latter was much more complex. Tandler’s perspective, which prioritized individual persons over their alleged “race,” enabled him to craft a eugenic proposal that did not portray individuals as determined by reified ethnic categories, and thus did not interfere with the fluid identities of many of Austria-Hungary’s subjects. It mirrored his imperial situation.

The malleability of human biology was another central element of Tandler’s ideas about eugenics. The anatomist assigned great importance in this regard to the individual condition. This third key concept in Tandler’s analytical framework encompassed all that “can be altered in an individual due to environmental influences.”²³⁰ While the individual constitution

²²⁷ Tandler, “Konstitution und Rassenhygiene,” 13.

²²⁸ Tandler, “Konstitution und Rassenhygiene,” 21.

²²⁹ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 131.

²³⁰ Tandler, “Konstitution und Rassenhygiene,” 13.

remained largely constant from the cradle to the grave, Tandler argued, the individual condition changed in manifold ways during one's lifetime, responding to various external impulses such as nutrition and education, and to aging.²³¹ Significantly, Tandler did not believe that these changes would vanish with the individuals themselves. Instead, he embraced the idea of inheritance of acquired characteristics.

Arguing that traits acquired during an individual's lifetime could be transmitted to the subsequent generations, Tandler suggested a complex mechanism underpinning this process. In the language of Tandler's theory, alterations in individual condition could integrate into the inborn constitution of the individual's descendants. Furthermore, if multiple individuals acquired the same constitutional trait, this characteristic became more prevalent in the population. Tandler went as far as to claim that if such a trait became widely distributed within a group, it could eventually evolve into a defining feature of its "race": "Acquired through the condition, inherited through the constitution and generalized, characteristics of both functional and morphological nature can become racial traits."²³² In Tandler's perspective, not only did "race" not fully determine individuals, but their actions could actively reshape it, even intentionally so.

After outlining pathways for altering human biology and connecting the mutable condition with the fixed constitution, and subsequently with "race," Tandler delved into eugenic strategies from this perspective. He maintained that eugenics should prioritize influencing individual condition by methodically molding human bodies via their environment. Such changes, he believed, would eventually manifest in the constitution of future generations and, in the end, even influence their purported "race": "Hygiene, in the form of condition hygiene, remains the most powerful factor for improving the individual constitution of the next

²³¹ Tandler, "Konstitution und Rassenhygiene," 13.

²³² Tandler, "Konstitution und Rassenhygiene," 25.

generation, and by extension, the state of the race.”²³³ While the sociologist Goldscheid employed his concept of human economy to champion eugenically-oriented social reforms, Tandler, as a leading anatomist and a pioneering proponent of constitutional medicine, lent authoritative support to this view.

Among the three proponents of eugenics at the Sociological Society in Vienna, Tandler’s engagement with the concept of “race” was the most ambiguous, as this analysis highlights. Although Tandler, within his intricate framework, initially de-emphasized what he termed “race,” he still attributed great importance to it and positioned the enhancement of its perceived fitness as the paramount objective of eugenics. But the most significant problem was with the way Tandler constructed his central analytical concept of constitution. Instead of offering a distinct alternative to racial nationalism, as he perhaps intended, he essentially bifurcated the notion of “race.” In effect, within his framework, he worked with a group-inherent “race,” and alongside it, with a denationalized and more individual-focused “race” that he termed constitution.²³⁴ That the latter could transform into the former added to the ambiguity. Tandler’s eugenic thinking concerning “race,” constitution, and condition illustrates that trying to intellectually navigate imperial diversity through eugenic categories had serious pitfalls.

All three of these Viennese proponents of eugenics embraced the inheritance of acquired characteristics which was crucial for their arguments. The notion of human plasticity was pivotal for their calls for social reform. It allowed them to envisage a gradual and progressive transformation of human nature that would give rise to the new, modern individuals. This neo-Lamarckist perspective was also foundational for their vision of Austria-Hungary as a cooperative empire. “Very recently, biologists made two significant discoveries that will have

²³³ Tandler, “Konstitution und Rassenhygiene,” 25.

²³⁴ There is a disturbing analogy between Tandler’s differentiation of “race” and “constitution” and Ploetz’s distinction between “systemic race” and “vital race.” Yet, Tandler’s two concepts were rooted in fundamentally different assumptions about nationalism, heredity, and selection.

enduring effects on human social life,” Kammerer asserted in an essay published in Budapest’s liberal German-language daily, the *Pester Lloyd*.²³⁵ According to the Viennese biologist, the first discovery was “conclusive evidence that qualities acquired by individuals are transmitted to their offspring,” and the second was the recognition “that, along with the struggle for existence, mutual aid also plays a crucial role in governing the entire living nature.”²³⁶ These introductory remarks of Kammerer’s essay suggest that underscoring the importance of cooperation in nature was nearly as vital for him as producing experimental evidence for biological plasticity.

Kammerer performed notable and controversial breeding experiments on organisms such as salamanders and midwife toads in an attempt to substantiate the theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. While his midwife toad experiments were alleged to be fraudulent in the 1920s—an accusation recently reexamined and contextualized by historians—numerous supporters of eugenics in late Austria-Hungary accepted Kammerer’s findings at face value and used them as a foundation for their eugenic blueprints.²³⁷ This was notably the case with sociologist Goldscheid, whose concept of human economy hinged on neo-Lamarckism.²³⁸ The anatomist Tandler also sought a plausible explanation for the inheritance of acquired characteristics, as documented by Cheryl Logan. Expanding his anatomical research on sexuality into an innovative exploration of the role of endocrine glands, Tandler aimed to demonstrate not only how internal secretion shaped what he saw as the constitution and condition of individuals but also how hormones served as the invisible force behind the transmission of individual changes to the hereditary matter.²³⁹

²³⁵ Paul Kammerer, “Gegenseitige Hilfe und erbliche Entlastung,” *Pester Lloyd* 60, no. 27 (January 31, 1913): 1–2.

²³⁶ Kammerer, “Gegenseitige Hilfe,” 1–2.

²³⁷ For the literature on this debate, see the discussion of Kammerer’s interwar ideas in the chapter 5 of this dissertation.

²³⁸ Exner, “Rudolf Goldscheids Menschenökonomie,” 393–408.

²³⁹ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 124–132.

The concepts promoted by the eugenicists based at the Viennese society of sociology circulated within Austria-Hungary. As a result, references to symbiosis, human economy, as well as constitution and condition were not uncommon among supporters of eugenics in the major cities of Austria-Hungary. However, it would be misleading to represent the echoes of these discussions beyond Vienna as a result of a linear or hierarchical process. Eszter Gantner, Heidi Hein-Kircher, and Oliver Hochadel recently argued that the “second” or “emerging” cities, such as the provincial capitals of Austria-Hungary, did not simply replicate the metropolis. Instead, they engaged in multidirectional knowledge exchanges that were “highly eclectic” and shaped by local factors.²⁴⁰ These exchanges were, moreover, facilitated by new, horizontal expert networks that often combined institutional and personal dimensions.²⁴¹ As a result, these arguments were “altered, combined, hybridized, and adapted” as they circulated through the urban contexts of Austria-Hungary.²⁴²

The circulation of ideas about symbiosis among supporters of eugenics in various parts of Austria-Hungary is a case in point. To begin with, some German-speaking eugenicists in the Bohemian Lands, such as Hugo Iltis in Brünn/Brno, swiftly embraced Kammerer’s arguments. However, Iltis was even more systematic than Kammerer in embedding the concept of symbiosis within Austro-Marxist political ideology.²⁴³ In Budapest, left-leaning sociologists also discussed Kammerer’s ideas, and republished some of his papers, including *Nationalismus und Biologie*.²⁴⁴ However, some of these Hungarian eugenicists, such as René Berkovits, were more open to arguments about cooperation than to neo-Lamarckism, and they instead supported

²⁴⁰ Eszter Gantner, Heidi Hein-Kircher, and Oliver Hochadel, “Introduction: Searching for Best Practices in Interurban Networks,” in *Interurban Knowledge Exchange in Southern and Eastern Europe, 1870–1950*, ed. Eszter Gantner, Heidi Hein-Kircher, and Oliver Hochadel (New York: Routledge, 2021), 18.

²⁴¹ Gantner, Hein-Kircher, and Hochadel, “Introduction,” 18.

²⁴² Gantner, Hein-Kircher, and Hochadel, “Introduction,” 3.

²⁴³ Paul Weindling, “Introduction,” in *Race, Genetics, and Science: Resisting Racism in the 1930s*, ed. Iltis Hugo (Brno: Masaryk University Press, 2017), 25–42.

²⁴⁴ Paul Kammerer, “Nacionalizmus és biológia” [Nationalism and Biology], *Huszadik Század* 15, no. 5 (1914): 625–31.

the concept of hard heredity.²⁴⁵ Finally, some of the key figures of the emerging *Czech Eugenic Society* in Prague subscribed to Kammerer's arguments on the inheritance of acquired characteristics, as well as his notion of symbiosis, while negotiating them with Czech nationalism.²⁴⁶ In other words, the circulation of concepts such as mutual aid and symbiosis in the Habsburg Empire shows that some individuals adopted eugenics to pursue an unlikely goal. Kammerer and others utilized eugenics to imagine, and indeed to promote, imperial diversity. Strikingly, these eugenicists continued using concepts of mutual aid and symbiosis even after the collapse of Austria-Hungary, having creatively repurposed them as a toolkit to negotiate the post-imperial transitions.²⁴⁷

Eugenics of Segregation: Special Education, Provincial Professionals, and Non-Territorial Autonomy

Matthew Thomson observes that “mental disability was at the very forefront of eugenic anxieties and actions in the first decades of the twentieth century.”²⁴⁸ Austria-Hungary was no exception. In this empire, an interdisciplinary association comprising special educators, psychiatrists, medical doctors, physical anthropologists, and even lawyers played a pivotal role in disseminating what Thomson refers to as “the eugenics of segregation.”²⁴⁹ The *Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische* (Association for the Welfare of the Feeble-minded and Epileptics), as the association was named, was founded in 1902. One of its main stated objectives was to establish special schools where mentally disabled children would

²⁴⁵ For instance, in a comprehensive review article published in the journal *Husadik Század* in 1913, Berkovits favorably reviewed both Kammerer's recent book on symbiosis as well as Géza von Hoffmann's new book on eugenics in the United States. René Berkovits, “Újabb tanulmányok a szociálbiológia köréből” [New Studies in the Field of Sociobiology], *Husadik Század* 14, no. 12 (1913): 610–21.

²⁴⁶ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Otázka dědičnosti získaných vlastností, její význam pro praxi eugenickou a úkoly politiky sociální” [The Question of the Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics, Its Significance for Eugenic Practice, and the Tasks of Social Policy], *Česká revue* 8, no. 12 (September 1915): 719–39.

²⁴⁷ For a detailed analysis of the uses of these concepts in various post-Habsburg contexts, consult the chapter 5 of this dissertation.

²⁴⁸ Mathew Thomson, “Disability, Psychiatry, and Eugenics,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, ed. Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 128.

²⁴⁹ Thomson, “Disability, Psychiatry, and Eugenics,” 128.

be segregated. In addition, the association advocated specialized training for teachers who worked in these schools. By 1914, partly owing to the association's influence, there were around forty such special schools in imperial Austria, and specialized courses for their teachers were available in Vienna, Graz, and Prague.²⁵⁰ The association had a eugenic outlook, an imperial scope, and produced a disturbing conceptual framework for managing imperial Austria's diversity.

Shortly after its founding, the *Verein* adopted a eugenic agenda. Reflecting on a decade of the *Verein*'s efforts, Hans Schiner, a Viennese educator and leading figure within the association, succinctly articulated its relationship with eugenics:

The times when caring for the feeble-minded was viewed purely as charity are over. We now understand that this care should be approached from a social and national perspective [...]. The battle against the causes of physical and mental degeneration is waged in the interest of the state.²⁵¹

Even though it did not include eugenics in its official name, the *Verein* was one of the few voluntary associations in imperial Austria that not only engaged with eugenic ideas but also embraced this body of knowledge as a central framework for its activities.

The association established several platforms to promote its agenda and, more broadly, eugenic ideas. To start with, it published scientific journals on special education. One such periodical closely aligned with the *Verein* was the journal *Eos*, which ran from 1905 to 1919. It had an international focus and became a transnational forum for eugenic debates about mental disability.²⁵² Others, like the *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* (Journal on Remedial

²⁵⁰ "Zehnjähriger Bestand des Vereines Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische," *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung: Herausgegeben vom österreichischen Vereine Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische* 4, no. 2 (February 1913): 34–39.

²⁵¹ Hans Schiner, "Der Stand der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Österreich," in *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Band 3: Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*, (Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912), 28–32.

²⁵² An attempt to relaunch the journal, now under the name *Levana*, took place in the late 1920s. Mátyás Életes, "Levana: Internationale wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur gesamten Heilpädagogik," *Magyar Gyógypedagógia* 18, no. 3–4 (1930): 52.

Education for Schools and Parents), edited in Vienna by pediatrician Erwin Lazar from 1910 onward, targeted primarily German-speaking middle-class audiences, mostly in the Alpine provinces. However, the collaborators from Austria-Hungary who worked with these journals were diverse, including not only German Austrians but also contributors with other linguistic or national identities.²⁵³ Their involvement was intentional and mirrored the reality that the *Verein* was not merely a nationalist entity but had evolved into a network that extended across almost all provinces of imperial Austria.

In her insightful study, Jana Osterkamp demonstrates that provinces of imperial Austria frequently collaborated and advanced shared objectives, often bypassing the intervention of the imperial center.²⁵⁴ This was clearly evident in the case of the *Verein*. Imperial Austria was a place where the provinces had a degree of autonomy and tended to play a significant role in shaping public health and education infrastructure. For example, psychiatric hospitals and schools, including special schools, were often created and funded by provincial or municipal bodies.²⁵⁵ Consequently, the *Verein* portrayed itself as an association uniting the professionals from these institutions who stemmed from various provinces of the empire.

The imperial scope of the *Verein* was most notable during the periodic conferences it hosted. Five such conferences were held prior to World War I, from 1904 to 1912.²⁵⁶ The

²⁵³ See, for instance, Mátyás Éltés, “Lehrplan für staatliche Hilfsschulen in Ungarn,” *Eos* 3, no. 2 (April 1907): 127–40; Pál Ranschburg, “Leicht Schwachsinnige als Zeugen,” *Eos* 3, no. 2 (April 1907): 81–101; Josef Zeman, “Die Fürsorge für abnorme Kinder in Böhmen,” *Eos* 3, no. 3 (July 1907): 214–23; František Sedláček, “Das Hilfsschulwesen in Prag,” *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* 2, no. 1 (January 1911): 16–20; Prokop Toman, “Die Schwachsinnigen vom Standpunkte des Zivilrechts,” *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* 2, no. 10 (October 1911): 181–86.

²⁵⁴ Jana Osterkamp, “Cooperative Empires: Provincial Initiatives in Imperial Austria,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 47 (April 2016): passim.

²⁵⁵ Ernst C. Hellbling, “Die Landesverwaltung in Cisleithanien,” in *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918: Verwaltung und Rechtswesen*, ed. Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003), 190–269; Jiří Klabouch, *Die Gemeindeselbstverwaltung in Österreich 1848-1918* (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1968).

²⁵⁶ The debate about the discourses of disability in Austria focuses mainly on their local and national contexts. The institutions enabling a broader circulation of this knowledge have received less attention. Ina Friedmann, “Die Heilpädagogische Abteilung der Wiener Universitätskinderklinik zwischen 1911 und 1977,” *Monatsschrift*

association's conferences, even more so than its journals, saw participation from professionals connected to different provincial administrations. While most presenters hailed from the Alpine and Bohemian Lands, some attendees also came from provinces as varied as Bukovina, Carniola, Galicia, and the Austrian Littoral. Importantly, these attendees were not restricted to German-speaking Austrians. They also included self-identified Czechs, Poles, and Slovenes. There were also a few Italians, Romanians, Rusyns, and even a handful of Croats and Hungarians.²⁵⁷ Czech-speaking researchers were particularly influential within the association; for example, psychiatrist and educator Karel Herfort served as its vice president and contributed to its specialist periodicals.²⁵⁸ Thus, a transnational circulation of eugenic ideas emerged, structured around the provinces and extending into most parts of imperial Austria.

The *Verein's* members incorporated Haeckel's influential "biogenetic law" into their eugenic framework. According to this theory, individual development recapitulated the evolutionary history of the species. Or, to put it differently, the developmental stages an individual went through during their lifetime were thought to mimic the stages of development that the entire species had undergone in the course of its evolution.²⁵⁹ The *Verein's* members retooled this concept for an educational setting, with a nationalist twist. They reasoned that by this logic, even at birth, individuals could be said to carry distinctive markers of their "racial" and national belonging. As one special educator from Moravia put it, the assumption that the

Kinderheilkunde 168, no. Supplement 3 (September 2020): 154–62; Reinhard Sieder, "Das Dispositiv der Fürsorgeerziehung in Wien," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 25, no. 1–2 (2014): 156–93.

²⁵⁷ *Bericht der vierten österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Wien am 21. und 22. März 1910*, Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung 2 (Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1910), 162–167; *Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*, Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung 3 (Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912), 184–188.

²⁵⁸ See, for instance, Karel Herfort, "Die pathologische Anatomie der Idiotie," *Eos* 4, no. 4 (October 1908): 233–42; Karel Herfort, "Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der Biologie," *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* 1, no. 4 (April 1910): 17.

²⁵⁹ Robert J. Richards, *The Tragic Sense of Life: Ernst Haeckel and the Struggle over Evolutionary Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), passim.

development of individual humans allegedly mirrored the development of their “race,” had far reaching consequences for determining one’s identity:

A newborn [...] ontogenetically retraces the evolution of the human species. He [...] is hardwired to become a member of his closest kin, race, nation [Volk], nature [...]. Many believe that children at such an [early] age are not very different as long as they belong to the same race or to a mixture of races that are extremely close to each other [...]. Nonetheless, inherent tendencies align with race, enabling a discerning observer to detect subtle differences even in a newborn. Moreover, [...] the face of some newborns starts exhibiting a certain intelligence, while others make a duller impression. If one then correlates the intelligence of children with their physical properties, one also sees [...] that those with duller facial expressions are more animalistic, i.e., ontogenetically more backward.²⁶⁰

Haeckel’s racially charged theory enabled these eugenic-leaning special educators to claim expertise in determining not just the child’s physical and mental ability, but also its supposed national identity.

A crucial context for this eugenic project was the experimentation with non-territorial autonomy in imperial Austria, particularly the compromise reached by provincial politicians in Moravia in 1905. This compromise aimed to defuse nationalist tensions in the province. While the crux of the compromise involved introducing national registers of voters for elections, it also brought transformative changes to education.²⁶¹ As Tara Zahra highlights, in 1910 the compromise was revised to permit local officials to “assign both parents and children to a single national community” based on “objective characteristics.”²⁶² This change, she explains, reinforced the argument that schools, and by extension, the schoolchildren themselves, were a “property of nationalist movements” and that nationality was “an inherited quality.”²⁶³ It is thus

²⁶⁰ Franz Riedl, “Wann und wieso wird Schwachsinn zur erblichen Abartung? Besserungsaussichten hiefür,” in *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Band 3: Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912* (Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912), 162.

²⁶¹ Börries Kuzmany, “Habsburg Austria: Experiments in Non-Territorial Autonomy,” *Ethnopolitics* 15, no. 1 (2016): 43–65.

²⁶² Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*, 14.

²⁶³ Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*, 14.

not coincidental that two congresses focusing on special education were held in Brünn/Brno, the capital of Moravia, shortly after the compromise was updated.

At the two congresses, the language of discourse varied. One, organized by the *Verein*, conducted discussions in German, while the other used Czech. Intriguingly, there was a partially shared roster in terms of organizers—including Herfort—and participants across both events.²⁶⁴ Moreover, high-ranking delegations from Bukovina and Galicia attended one of these congresses. (In the former case, the delegation was notably multiethnic).²⁶⁵ While Bukovina adopted a compromise resembling the Moravian model in 1909, Galician politicians reached their compromise in 1914.²⁶⁶ An unintended consequence of these experiments in reforming the empire, therefore, was that they fueled a demand for biopolitical discourses. The potential for political compromises between nationalists across different provinces of the empire not only fostered collaboration among professionals but also spurred the inter-provincial dissemination of eugenic knowledge.

The advocates of eugenics within the *Verein* looked to the arguments of certain American eugenicists to imbue their perspectives with an air of the latest scientific research on human heredity. In the United States, figures like Charles Davenport from the Eugenics Record Office championed Mendelism and asserted that this theory could clarify the hereditary nature of various mental traits. As Theodor Porter has illustrated, their writings had a profound influence in Europe during the 1900s, particularly in propagating the concept of hard heredity

²⁶⁴ *Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz*, 184–188; *Druhý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 29. a 30. září 1911 v Brně* [The Second Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on September 29 and 30, 1911, in Brno] (Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1912), 223–234.

²⁶⁵ The five-member delegation to the congress from Bukovina included the Rusyn politician Emilian Popowicz, German teacher Alfred Guntram Pawlitschek, Romanian school inspector Dionisie Simionovici, the Polish composer and teacher Otto Mieczysław Żukowski, and the teacher Mihai Chisanovici, another Romanian. Among the representatives from Galicia were the psychiatrist Jan Mazurkiewicz, mathematician Kazimierz Bruchnalski, special educator Albin Gawlik, the municipal physician of Krakow Tomasz Janiszewski, and the female special educators Klementyna Sternalówna, Wanda Szybalska, and Maria Emilia de Teisseyre; all of these participants were Poles, mostly from Lviv/Lwów/Lemberg and Krakow. *Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz*, 183–188.

²⁶⁶ Kuzmany, “Habsburg Austria,” 52–58.

in mental medicine.²⁶⁷ Of the circle of eugenicists around Davenport, the *Verein* members took particular interest in Herbert A. Goddard, an institutional psychologist at a special school in Vineland, New Jersey. A staunch proponent of the hereditary nature of mental ability, Goddard also popularized early techniques of intelligence testing. Indeed, he restructured the French Binet-Simon intelligence test to create a toolkit that purportedly measured one's intelligence, ranking it along a single scale of mental ability and disability.²⁶⁸ The *Verein* was instrumental in disseminating Goddard's eugenic theories in Austria-Hungary. He frequently wrote for the *Eos*, addressing topics like eugenic sterilizations and intelligence testing.²⁶⁹ His notorious eugenic study on the Kallikaks, in which he charted the lineage of a family and contended that "feeble-mindedness"—a term he introduced—was hereditary, garnered significant recognition among special educators in the Habsburg Empire, facilitated in part by the *Verein*.²⁷⁰ Beyond his writings, Goddard agreed to serve as a representative of the *Verein* in the United States. Consequently, in addition to embracing Haeckel's "biogenetic law," many eugenics proponents associated with the *Verein* delved into the emerging realms of Mendelian genetics and intelligence testing techniques.

Eugenics supporters within the *Verein* sought a global model that interwove ability, ethnicity, and "race," and they found this model in Goddard. While his study on the Kallikaks racialized poverty, Goddard also delved into American immigration policy, administering intelligence tests to immigrants. Significantly, the research spearheaded by Goddard's

²⁶⁷ Theodore Porter, *Genetics in the Madhouse: The Unknown History of Human Heredity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018), 281.

²⁶⁸ Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1981), 158-174; Douglas Baynton, *Defectives in the Land: Disability and Immigration in the Age of Eugenics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016), 26an.

²⁶⁹ Henry H. Goddard, "Die Konferenz der Nationalvereinigung für das Studium der Schwachsinnigen und der Epileptiker vom 3. bis 5. Juni 1912 in Vineland, N.J." *Eos* 9, no. 1 (1913): 78-80; Henry H. Goddard, "Sterilisation und Segregation," *Eos* 10, no. 1 (1914): 11-18; Henry H. Goddard, "Wie sollen wir die geistig Schwachen erziehen?" *Eos* 11, no. 3 (1915): 213-24; Henry H. Goddard, "Die Formentafel als Maßstab der intellektuellen Entwicklung der Kinder," *Eos* 12, no. 1 (1916): 72-75. However, the *Eos* also translated some texts favorable to biometric approaches, including, e.g., a speech by Leonard Darwin, "Das Wesen der Eugenic Education," *Eos* 9, no. 2 (1913): 81-93.

²⁷⁰ A. C. Rogers, Review of *The Kallikak Family*, by Henry H. Goddard, *Eos* 9, no. 3 (1913): 231-32.

assistants included immigrants from Austria-Hungary and yielded different results for various nationalities.²⁷¹ Although this area of study occupied a peripheral position in Goddard's larger body of work, the potential for nationalist reinterpretation may be one of the reasons why his work found resonance in Austria-Hungary. By associating disability with ethnicity, the eugenicists at the *Verein* ultimately crafted a framework that legitimized the segregation of schoolchildren based on these markers.²⁷²

It was special educators and their allies in Bohemia who transformed this eugenic package into a specialized research institution, the Central Eugenic Bureau (eugenická stanice in Czech, eugenische Zentrale in German), the first institution of its kind in Austria-Hungary.²⁷³ The Bureau was established in July 1913 by psychiatrist Karel Herfort and plant geneticist Artur Brožek, and was later joined by physical anthropologist Jindřich Matiegka and philosopher-educator František Čáda. It was headquartered at the *Ernestinum*, a private special school and psychiatric asylum for mentally disabled children in Prague.²⁷⁴ Benefiting from the patronage of Bohemia's aristocrats and church officials, and employing Swiss nuns as nurses, *Ernestinum* was a bilingual institution, largely indifferent to the language or ascribed nationality of its inmates.²⁷⁵ One reason for the unlikely association of this institution with eugenic research was the person of its long-term director, the psychiatrist Herfort. The other, and more fundamental, reason is the extensive database of medical and genealogical data on its inmates that the

²⁷¹ Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, 158-174.

²⁷² In her seminal book, Schmidt emphasizes the intersections between disability and ethnicity in certain eugenic discussions in interwar Czechoslovakia. However, I posit that the roots of this discourse run deeper than previously considered. I contend that it emerged in the imperial context and was intrinsically linked to the particular imperial situation of the eugenically-oriented professionals who developed it. Schmidt, ed. *The Politics of Disability*, 61-75 and passim.

²⁷³ The name of the eugenic institution varies in different languages. I utilize the Czech and German names found in historical sources, as well as the English title commonly used in secondary literature.

²⁷⁴ Šimůnek and Hoßfeld, "Selected Bibliography," 6.

²⁷⁵ Karel Herfort, ed., "Geschichtlicher Rückblick," in *Festbericht des St. Anna-Frauen-Vereines für das Jahr 1911. Ernestinum; Festbericht 1871-1911; Zur Feier des 14 jähr. Bestehens der Anstalt zur Erziehung u. Pflege von Schwachsinnigen "Ernestinum,"* (Prague: St. Anna-Frauen-Verein, 1912), 9-13.

Ernestinum had gathered by the early twentieth century. This database not only made eugenic research possible but greatly facilitated it.

In his recent book, Theodore Porter proposes an alternative genealogy for the history of genetics and eugenics. Beyond the laboratories of experimentalists and the stables of animal breeders, he argues, knowledge about heredity was also generated in psychiatric hospitals and special schools.²⁷⁶ These institutions collected vast amounts of data about their inmates. Porter asserts that “[a]sylum management was a quantitative business,” and he demonstrates that as early as the 1830s, discussions about human heredity in Europe drew upon data extracted from systematic records maintained within certain mental asylums.²⁷⁷ This data could encompass the individual’s apparent health status, psychological composition, or, later, their assessed intelligence quotient. During a period when the human genotype remained inaccessible to early researchers on heredity, this phenotypic data assumed greater significance than previously acknowledged.²⁷⁸

The eugenic imperative to restrict the reproduction of those deemed degenerate was nearly as old as these data collection practices. Jacques Donzelot was among the first to observe that the psychiatrist Benedict Morel’s *Traité des dégénérescences* in 1857 quickly prompted French doctors to offer “advice regarding indications and contraindications for matrimony.”²⁷⁹ “Eugenics was not far in the future,” Donzelot perceptively adds.²⁸⁰ The phenotypic research conducted in psychiatric hospitals and special schools thus constituted one of the contexts from which eugenic ideas gradually emerged during the nineteenth century.

²⁷⁶ Porter, *Genetics in the Madhouse*, 4.

²⁷⁷ Porter, *Genetics in the Madhouse*, 15.

²⁷⁸ Porter, *Genetics in the Madhouse*, 2.

²⁷⁹ Jacques Donzelot, *The Policing of Families* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977), 173.

²⁸⁰ Donzelot, *The Policing of Families*, 173.

The *Ernestinum*, housing the Central Eugenic Bureau, serves as a prime example of this trend. Admittedly, it was not the sole institution in Austria-Hungary harboring extensive data that could be harnessed by the burgeoning field of eugenics. For instance, the psychiatric hospital *Am Steinhof* in Vienna, the largest in Europe at the time, had been collecting such data about its inmates since its inception in 1907, and similar records were already available from its predecessors, dating back at least as far as 1847.²⁸¹ Provincial hospitals in Bohemia, including psychiatric institutions, also possessed databases dating back to the 1820s. However, as noted by one of the leading Czech psychiatrists, the records from the latter were in disarray, requiring significant additional work for standardization, a task that extended as late as the 1920s.²⁸² Herfort's *Ernestinum* did not face such challenges.

From its inception in the early 1870s, the *Ernestinum* systematically collected phenotypic data on its inmates, along with information about their pedigrees. Data collection already played a pivotal role in the foundation of this institution. In 1871, the Anthropological-Statistical Committee of the Physiocratic Society in Bohemia initiated a research program in the countryside, aiming to record the distribution of various illnesses and to investigate their hereditary nature. The research outline drafted by the committee members indicates a pronounced concern regarding human heredity and the alleged biological decline of the population:

It will be of utmost benefit if our anthropological measurements begin by observing and recording phenomena that are backward and retrograde, that is, of physical and mental defects of individuals, families, and entire populations [obyvatelstev].²⁸³

²⁸¹ Sophie Ledebur, *Das Wissen der Anstaltspsychiatrie in der Moderne: Zur Geschichte der Heil- und Pflegeanstalten Am Steinhof in Wien* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2015), 163.

²⁸² "Schůze komise eugenické" [Session of the Eugenics Committee], *Věstník Masarykovy Akademie Práce* 2, no. 8 (December 1922): 152.

²⁸³ J. A. Comenius National Pedagogical Museum, Prague, Inv. No. S2/IVi 495/68, Provolání anthropologicko-statistického komitétu Společnosti fysiokratické v Čechách [Declaration of the Anthropological-Statistical Committee of the Physiocratic Society in Bohemia]. Reprinted in Martina Strnadová, "Karel Slavoj Amerling

Upon obtaining the research results, they reported an alarming prevalence of hereditary illnesses. Consequently, they advocated for the establishment of a large special school, one of the first in the empire. The *Ernestinum* was founded as a result of this initiative.²⁸⁴

From the outset, the institution collected and analyzed data about its inmates and conducted anthropometric measurements on them.²⁸⁵ Even before the Central Eugenic Bureau was established within the *Ernestinum*, the special school had already amassed a sizeable database about its past and present inmates. (Other special schools that were founded in Bohemia in the early twentieth century, such as the institutes in Slatiňany and Opařany, also began collecting similar data.)²⁸⁶ When Karel Herfort assumed the role of director at the *Ernestinum* in 1902, one of his first actions was to modernize the data collection practices, so that they aligned with the latest advances in the budding field of genetics.

The primary inspirations for the revamped research on heredity at the institute, led by Herfort and Brožek, were the Austrian *Verein*, Mendelian genetics championed by American eugenicists like Davenport and Goddard, and studies conducted at the psychiatric institute for minors in Dalldorf near Berlin.²⁸⁷ Specifically, the Central Eugenic Bureau aimed to build an extensive database of inmate pedigrees to investigate the alleged hereditary causes of mental disability.²⁸⁸ To gather additional data on the inmates' pedigrees, Herfort and Brožek distributed a bilingual questionnaire among the families. This questionnaire included an extensive array of questions concerning both past and present alleged pathological traits of the

očima jeho pokračovatelů" [Karel Slavoj Amerling Through the Eyes of His Successors] (B.A. Thesis, Charles University in Prague, 2014), unpaginated annex.

²⁸⁴ Karel Amerling, "Idioten-Albums mit Casus Complexen – Einige interessante Idioten-Familien als Beispiele ihres Sinkens," in *Die Idiotenanstalt des Sct. Anna-Frauen-Vereines in Prag nach ihrem zwölfjährigen Bestande vom J. 1871-1883* (Prague: Bellmann, 1883), 119–32.

²⁸⁵ Eva Hoffmannová, *Karel Slavoj Amerling* (Prague: Melantrich, 1982), 108–116, 133–145.

²⁸⁶ Elizabeth Ryšavá Alvarezová, "Dětství mimo svět a rozum: Institucionalizace mentálních chorob a psychopatologie dětí v 1. polovině 20. století" [Childhood Outside the World and Reason: Institutionalization of Mental Illnesses and Psychopathology of Children in the First Half of the 20th Century] (M.A. Thesis, University of Pardubice, 2018), 22.

²⁸⁷ Karel Herfort and Artur Brožek, "Die eugenische Zentrale des Ernestinums," *Eos* 10, no. 3 (1914): 161–73.

²⁸⁸ Herfort and Brožek, "Die eugenische Zentrale," 161–73.

inmates. Moreover, the questionnaire sought information about the environments in which the parents and more distant relatives had lived, as well as their health histories and causes of death, if applicable.²⁸⁹

Based on approximately sixty questionnaires that Herfort and Brožek obtained, the researchers argued that mental disability was innate and represented a manifestation of an inherited “neuropathological burden.”²⁹⁰ They echoed Goddard in their use of the term “feeble-mindedness” and posited that this tendency was a single-gene recessive trait, inherited according to Mendelian principles.²⁹¹ In 1915, these researchers joined the nascent Czech Eugenics Society. If a specific strand of eugenics developed from the practice of collecting phenotypic data at psychiatric hospitals and special schools, then institutions such as *Ernestinum* had become one of its hotbeds in Austria-Hungary.

These Czech researchers not only established the Central Eugenic Bureau and co-founded the Czech Eugenics Society, but they also organized a series of eugenic conferences centered on special education. These conferences mirrored those organized by the Austrian *Verein*. This similarity is evident in their name, the “český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné” (Czech Conference on the Welfare of the Feeble-minded and on Special Schools), which closely reflects the “österreichische Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge (Austrian Conference on the Welfare of the Feeble-minded).”

Three such conferences took place before World War I, spanning across all the crownlands of the Bohemian lands. The first was held in 1909 in Prague (Bohemia), the second,

²⁸⁹ Karel Herfort, “Eugenický význam vrozené slabomyslnosti a první výsledky prací v tom směru vykonaných eugenickou stanicí při Ernestinu” [The Eugenic Significance of Congenital Feeble-mindedness and the First Results of Research in that Direction Carried Out by the Central Eugenic Station at the Ernestinum], *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 12, no. 11–12 (1915): 447–60.

²⁹⁰ Herfort, “Eugenický význam,” 447–60.

²⁹¹ Herfort, “Eugenický význam,” 447–60.

as previously mentioned, in 1911 in Brno/Brünn (Moravia), and the third in 1913 in Ostrava/Ostrau (Silesia). Even though Czech nationalism was high on the agenda — as the venues for the conference underscored — the lists of participants indicate the conferences sought a broader scope. On the one hand, there was an effort to involve participants without clear national identification. On the other, the conferences had an Austro-Slavic dimension, drawing students from other areas of Austria-Hungary studying at Prague University and professionals from these areas who spoke a Slavic language.²⁹²

The conferences drew a diverse audience, including special educators, psychiatrists like Ladislav Haškovec and Antonín Heveroch, other medical professionals, and lawyers. Eugenics provided the underlying framework for their debates. One of the keynote speakers at the 1911 conference posited that the formulation of eugenic strategies to combat alleged degeneracy was a primary objective of the interdisciplinary encounters that the conferences facilitated:

If we truly aim to reduce the number of the feeble-minded, then prevention is the only path forward. The most effective solution is to prevent the birth of such individuals at all costs. Left unchecked, they will reproduce. They will proliferate until they reach a point where ‘merciless’ nature alleviates the societal burden and danger they represent by letting them to go extinct. To put it positively, there is no better method to combat feeble-mindedness than contemporary eugenics, based particularly on the scientific study of the inheritance of physical and mental traits.²⁹³

These Czech special educators and other related professionals, therefore, embraced eugenics as foundational to their perspective and an integral component of special education.

²⁹² *Prvý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 27., 28. a 29. června 1909 v Praze* [The First Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on June 27, 28, and 29, 1909, in Prague] (Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1909), 246–50; *Druhý český sjezd*, 223–234; *Třetí český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné 5. a 6. října 1913 v Polské Ostravě* [The Third Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on October 5 and 6, 1913, in Polská Ostrava] (Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1914), 261–74.

²⁹³ František Čáda, “Moderní péče o slabomyslné a důležitost našich sjezdů” [Modern Care for the Mentally Disabled and the Importance of Our Congresses], in *Druhý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 29. a 30. září 1911 v Brně*, 11–21 (Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1912), 19–20.

While the imperial Austrian conferences shifted to a national focus after 1918, the Czech conferences expanded their international reach. Under the banner of pan-Slavism, these events essentially convened professionals from various post-Habsburg regions of interwar Europe, primarily those in Yugoslavia and Poland.²⁹⁴ Within this network and the eugenic framework that lent it coherence, support gradually emerged among these professionals for segregation based on ability, and increasingly also on ethnicity.

Seeking to reshape special education in Austria-Hungary along eugenic lines, the Verein successfully enlisted multiple actors from various regions of imperial Austria. However, both the structure of the Verein and the arguments it advanced emphasized the provinces, closely aligning with the specific structure of the Austrian half of the Habsburg Empire. This had a profound impact on the Verein's relationship with the empire's Hungarian half. Efforts to engage special educators, psychiatrists, and physicians from Hungary, as well as from Croatia and Slavonia, largely proved unsuccessful.

In Hungary, the *Verein* secured the cooperation of Sándor Náray-Szabó, a medical doctor and educator. Even though he was not the most prominent figure of the emerging Hungarian child research, his contemporaries praised him for his “significant contribution to the emergence and wonderfully fast growth” of its institutions.²⁹⁵ Indeed, he was one of the founders of the *Magyar Gyermektanulmányi Társaság*, a Hungarian society devoted to child research, and a co-editor of its journal *A Gyermek* (The Child). Studying the influence of environment as well as of heredity on child development, Náray-Szabó claimed that while public health and personal hygiene had a positive impact on the fate of children, the effects of

²⁹⁴ Jan Uher, ed., *Pátý sjezd (první slovanský) pro výzkum dítěte v Brně 28.-31. října 1933* [The Fifth Congress (First Slavic) for Child Research in Brno, October 28-31, 1933] (Prague: Stálý výbor pro pořádání sjezdů pro výzkum dítěte, 1934); Maks Samec, *Program in navodila: II. vseslovanski pedološki kongres Ljubljana* [Program and Instructions: II. All-Slavic Pedological Congress in Ljubljana] (Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna, 1937).

²⁹⁵ “Náray-Szabó Sándor, 1861–1914” [Sándor Náray-Szabó, 1861–1914], *A Gyermek* 8, no. 7–10 (1914): 497–98.

alcohol, the alleged inherited burdens, and the purported consequences of “inbreeding” also impacted their lives.²⁹⁶ Although he did not describe himself as a eugenicist, his research bordered on it. Yet, while making these arguments, Náray-Szabó opted to draw on other sources than on those produced by Austrian special educators.

The *Verein*’s interest in intelligence testing was echoed by another special educator from Hungary, Mátyás Éltes. Trained under the psychologist Pál Ranschburg, Éltes emerged as a pioneer of intelligence testing in Hungary, publishing the initial results of his experiments in 1914.²⁹⁷ Significantly, Éltes was knowledgeable about the prior Austrian experiments and attended the *Verein*’s 1910 and 1912 congresses, where intelligence testing was a topic of thorough discussion.²⁹⁸ However, this emerging experimental psychologist from Hungary did not concur with the *Verein* members’ inclination to link mental ability to ethnicity. Thus, despite some overlapping epistemic interests, neither Náray-Szabó nor Éltes shared the particular political motivations that drove eugenicists from various provinces of imperial Austria to collaborate. In a telling sign of the *Verein*’s inability to foster connections with the other half of the empire, the *Verein*’s members were notably missing from the First Hungarian Congress for Child Studies held in Budapest in 1913, absent both as attendees as well as theoretical references.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁶ Imre Varga, “Náray-Szabó Sándor reformtevékenysége és hatása a szegedi és a debreceni gyógypedagógiai intézetekre” [The Reform Activities of Sándor Náray-Szabó and His Impact on the Special Education Institutes in Szeged and Debrecen], *Különleges Bánásmód* 1, no. 1 (2015): 7–24.

²⁹⁷ Mátyás Éltes, “A Binet-Simon féle intelligencia vizsgálat eredménye magyar gyermekeken” [Results of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test on Hungarian Children], *A Gyermekek* 8, no. 4 (1914): 257–66.

²⁹⁸ Erwin Lazar, “Die Intelligenzprüfung bei Kindern und ihre Verwertbarkeit zur Beurteilung krankhafter Geisteszustände,” in *Bericht der vierten österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Wien am 21. und 22. März 1910*, *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung* 2 (Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1910), 84–90; Konrad Sellner, “Benennung und Einteilung von Schwachsinnigen unter Anwendung der Binet’schen Tests,” in *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Band 3: Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*, 66–73 (Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912).

²⁹⁹ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 132–33 and 277; Ballai, Károly, and Dániel Répay. *Az első magyar országos gyermektanulmányi kongresszus naplója s a vele kapcsolatos kiállítás leírása* [The Diary of the First Hungarian National Congress on Child Study and Description of the Associated Exhibition] (Budapest: Armin Fritz, 1913), *passim*.

The lack of robust exchanges with the imperial Austrian *Verein* does not imply that Hungarian researchers in child studies were entirely disinterested in the burgeoning field of genetics and its eugenic applications. Intriguingly, it was the Hungarian nationalist eugenicist, Géza von Hoffmann, who introduced them to Mendelian research on heredity. Writing in the flagship journal of Hungarian child studies, *A Gyermekek*, Hoffmann emphasized that special schools must play a critical role in eugenic research. He asserted that their primary function should be to gather data on phenotypic traits and the genealogies of their wards, and invoked institutions like the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor as models for this role.³⁰⁰ “In addition to the above-mentioned Child Studies Society,” Hoffmann also proposed, “I envision our state correctional facilities and similar establishments where this data collection can commence effortlessly and without special measures, given sufficient interest.”³⁰¹ This advice was heeded shortly afterward, and plans emerged to create a database along these lines at the correctional institution in the Budapest suburb of Erzsébetfalva.³⁰² In brief, when American Mendelian eugenics entered the debates in Hungarian special education, it was not mediated through Vienna.

In Croatia and Slavonia, demand for the eugenic ideas from the *Verein* was notably low. Still, the *Verein* managed to recruit Josip Medved, a prominent special educator and director of what was essentially the region’s sole special school, as their liaison.³⁰³ Although Medved cooperated with the network, hereditarian arguments were conspicuously absent from his writings, both before and after 1918. Nor did his institution leverage its residents for data on

³⁰⁰ Géza von. Hoffmann, “Gyermektanulmány és fajegészségtani (eugenikai) adatok gyűjtése” [Child Study and Data Collection on Racial Hygiene (Eugenics)], *A Gyermekek* 8, no. 2 (1914): 86–91.

³⁰¹ Hoffmann, “Gyermektanulmány,” 89.

³⁰² “Kriminalpädagogisches Institut in Budapest Erzsébetfalva (Elisabethdorf),” *Eos* 12, no. 2 (1916): 233–36.

³⁰³ See Antun Cuvaj, “Povjesne crtice o obuci gluhonijeme djece u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji” [Historical Notes on the Education of Deaf-Mute Children in Croatia and Slavonia], in *Grada za povijest školstva kraljevina Hrvatske i Slavonije od najstarijih vremena do danas* [Materials for the History of Education in the Kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia from the Earliest Times to the Present Day] (Zagreb: Kr. zemaljska tiskara, 1913), 77–131.

phenotypic heredity.³⁰⁴ Despite his involvement with the network, Medved's impact on local debates appeared minimal. Yet again, the *Verein's* eugenic package, specifically tailored for the institutional framework of imperial Austria, struggled to gain traction outside its borders.

In the initial network explored in this chapter, eugenics supporters predominantly leaned towards progressive or socialist political ideologies. In contrast, the politics of the *Verein* were more nebulous, comprising a mix of diverse political stances. Many of the *Verein's* associates from provincial institutions held conservative views. Moreover, some of its key members, such as the Austrian educator Leopold Miklas, were closely aligned with the Christian Social movement. The network also included nationalist eugenicists, exemplified by individuals such as the psychiatrist Alexander Pilcz, an assistant to Julius Wagner-Jauregg.³⁰⁵ Yet, liberals and a few socialists had their place in this mixed collective as well. Thus, one can infer that, before 1914, the political underpinnings of eugenic ideas linked to the *Verein* remained uncrystallized, bearing some resemblance to the evolving politics surrounding the concept of non-territorial autonomy.

Race against National Indifference: Nationalist Activism, Language Frontiers of the Empire, and Eugenics

It is striking how many individuals in the rural areas of the Habsburg Empire embraced eugenics. Nationalist activism was a critical backdrop for the circulation of eugenic knowledge in these areas.³⁰⁶ Pieter Judson illustrates how nationalist activists on the language frontiers of the empire sought to claim the rural populace for their own groups. However, they frequently encountered a reality of widespread multilingualism and cultural hybridity. Subsuming them

³⁰⁴ Josip Medved, "Zdravstveno-pedagoške ustanove u Jugoslaviji" [Health-Pedagogical Institutions in Yugoslavia], *Liječnički vjesnik* 48, no. 10 (October 1926): 623–34.

³⁰⁵ The nationalist psychiatrist Wagner-Jauregg did present a lecture at one of the conferences, but his overall engagement with the *Verein* remained tangential.

³⁰⁶ Judson, *Guardians*, passim.

under the concept of “national indifference,” Tara Zahra argues that the “tensions between nationalist aspirations and popular responses to their demands often propelled political change and radicalization in modern East Central Europe.”³⁰⁷ In this section, I argue that the language frontiers served as incubators for some of the earliest and most extreme eugenic projects of ethnic disentanglement in the Habsburg setting.

Faced with the challenge of national indifference, and frustrated by it, some nationalist physicians resorted to the knowledge provided by the emerging science of eugenics. Rather than carrying on with the cultural strategies favored by liberal nationalist activists, they claimed, nationalists had to act directly on the sphere of biology. Their texts marked a fundamental rethinking of frontier activist discourse and practice, reframing it along racial and eugenic lines. While they largely drew upon race hygiene from Imperial Germany, they retooled its concepts for the purposes of unmaking national indifference on the language frontiers of Austria-Hungary. I will refer to these eugenic initiatives as “frontier eugenics.”

Even though frontier eugenics varied in many ways, it shared four essential features that were connected to the practice of nationalist activism out of which it emerged. First, these activists identified the imagined national community with “race.” They followed race hygienists in arguing that such alleged “races” were distinct and hierarchically ordered. Crucially, they also asserted that these races should not mix in order to maintain their purported purity. In other words, they sought to employ racial knowledge to assign identities to previously fluid individuals and communities, but also co-opted race hygiene to draw insurmountable borders between them. These nationalist medical doctors, therefore, transformed race hygiene into a biopolitical tool for disentangling local populations.

³⁰⁷ Tara Zahra, “Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis,” *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 98.

In the racialized portrayal of the language frontiers produced by these physicians, nations were not only separate and unequal, but they also possessed fundamentally conflicting interests. Adopting the rhetoric of the national ownership from their liberal nationalist predecessors, they reframed it along racial lines.³⁰⁸ Employing Darwinist tropes, they framed the language frontiers as battlegrounds in a fierce struggle for existence and asserted that their victory was vital for the survival of the entire community. This purported struggle, they claimed, manifested itself most pronouncedly in the scramble for land. The German-speaking nationalist activists, in particular, tended to draw on the notion of living space, or *Lebensraum*, coined by the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel:

Like solid bodies, nations [Völker] cannot share a common space. Ownership of the living space [Lebensraum], which includes the feeding area, is always exclusive. This struggle can be fought through economic competition and does not always escalate to armed conflict.³⁰⁹

Viewing the expansion of the land as the main biopolitical aim of nationalist movements, these activists aimed to catalogue what they deemed national ownership. They advocated for its enlargement through purchase or settlement projects and lamented its potential loss to rival nationalists. Economic and racial anxieties thus became indistinct in these nationalists' writings.

Second, frontier eugenicists strove to transform peasants in these areas into nationalists. They espoused the idea that physical and mental qualities were hereditary and closely correlated. The national consciousness they found lacking on the language frontiers was also a biological feature, they argued. Thus, it could be artificially created. They believed that the countryside could be effectively nationalized through a deliberate breeding of nationally

³⁰⁸ For a broader context, see Pieter M. Judson, "'Not Another Square Foot!' German Liberalism and the Rhetoric of National Ownership in Nineteenth-Century Austria," *Austrian History Yearbook* 26 (January 1995): 83–97.

³⁰⁹ Heinrich Siegmund, "Vernichtung und Verdrängung im Lebenskampf des sächsischen Volkes," *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 6, no. 6 (December 15, 1912): 170.

conscious individuals based on the principles of race hygiene, or by modifying the environment to shape their bodies. Where cultural activism failed, they claimed, the biological knowledge provided by this emerging scientific discipline was to prevail.

Third, these eugenicists shared a broad anti-modernist outlook. The national indifference they encountered was, in their view, merely one symptom of the alleged degeneration ushered in by modernity which had infiltrated the frontier spaces. However, as we will see, while these eugenicists concurred that local communities had been disrupted by modernity, they differed on the specific causes and manifestations of these disruptions. Often, these disruptions manifested as the weakening of traditional family structures, changing consumption patterns, and increased mobility, though they were rarely confined to these factors alone.

Lastly, these nationalist eugenicists viewed women's emancipation as another negative aspect of modernity. An anti-feminism that sought to control women's behavior was commonplace among these eugenicists. A Czech nationalist from eastern Bohemia, František Lašek, exemplifies this last feature prevalent among the nationalist activists from the language frontiers. Having singled out feminism as the alleged primary biological threat for the national community, Lašek contended that:

Eugenics opposes the eccentric demands of women's movement, or feminism. Women's movement seriously affects eugenics and racial hygiene. [...] The nation pays with a loss of several children for every step towards the independence of women.³¹⁰

Thus, the anti-feminism of these nationalist eugenicists intersected with their emphasis on racial purity and with their pro-natalism.

³¹⁰ František Lašek, *Zušlechtění lidstva: Eugenika* [Breeding Humanity: Eugenics] (Prague: Vilímek, 1916), 24–25.

Throughout the empire, nationalist activists at the language frontiers echoed these arguments. Heinrich Siegmund, a medical doctor whom Tudor Georgescu rightly identifies as “the founding father of Saxon eugenics,” serves as a poignant example.³¹¹ After graduating from the medical school at Vienna University in imperial Austria, Siegmund established a private medical practice in Mediasch/Medgyes/Mediaș, located in Transylvania, then a part of royal Hungary.³¹² Georgescu demonstrates that to contextualize an individual like Siegmund, one must trace the flow of eugenic knowledge from Imperial Germany and examine its interplay with the local dynamics of Transylvanian Saxon nationalism. Indeed, Georgescu details how Siegmund negotiated with the German Society for Racial Hygiene and eventually joined it in 1911. He also outlines Siegmund’s multifaceted nationalist engagement, including the establishment in 1906 of the *Bodenschutzverein* (Land Preservation Society), a nationalist association that fused the rhetoric of national land ownership with a eugenic agenda.³¹³ My discussion of Siegmund merely adds another layer to this interpretation, connecting Siegmund’s early eugenic initiatives to the Habsburg imperial context.

Siegmund’s early writings exemplify what I refer to as frontier eugenics. His perspective was decidedly anti-modernist. He viewed the rising mobility and intermarriage among rural populations, coupled with the escalating alcohol consumption, as distressing hallmarks of modernity. He portrayed them as ominous indicators, as well as causes, of the supposed degeneration that came in tandem with modern development. One of Siegmund’s primary concerns was that this biological decline would sap the vitality of Saxon peasants,

³¹¹ Tudor Georgescu, “The Eugenic Fortress: Alfred Csallner and the Saxon Eugenic Discourse in Interwar Romania,” in *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, ed. Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta, and Marius Turda (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011), 354. The definitive account is Georgescu, *The Eugenic Fortress: The Transylvanian Saxon*.

³¹² Tudor Georgescu, “Saxon Eugenics in Transylvania,” in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 561–2.

³¹³ Georgescu, *The Eugenic Fortress*, passim.

leading them to abandon rural areas.³¹⁴ This would further diminish the Saxon community's share of land, to the benefit of competing nationalist agendas. Indeed, a significant portion of the periodical *Volksgesundheits* (Health of the Nation), which Siegmund published in the first decade of the twentieth century, meticulously catalogued and analyzed changes in peasant land holdings at the language frontiers.³¹⁵ Race hygiene and Friedrich Ratzel's concept of *Lebensraum* served as both the foundation and biological framework for this rhetoric of national ownership.³¹⁶ Siegmund thus actively engaged with frontier activist discourses, aiming to reshape them through the lens of the emerging discipline of racial hygiene.

According to Siegmund, racial hygiene offered more than just a means to purify the national body by eliminating supposed detrimental influences; it also supplied essential tools for fortifying national consciousness. Influenced by a form of Monism, Siegmund believed that physical and mental traits were closely interconnected. Increasingly committed to the doctrine of hard heredity, he maintained that these traits were hereditary and immutable. Consequently, mental attributes could be systematically enhanced through artificial selection, much like any other physical characteristic. "If, to choose a striking example, we emphasized increasing national consciousness," he wrote, "it would have to be ensured that those individuals marry in whom national consciousness is most clearly manifest."³¹⁷ Siegmund frequently underscored that there was scant difference between the artificial selection of the purportedly "superior" physical and mental traits in humans and the practices employed by animal breeders. "Race

³¹⁴ Heinrich Siegmund, "Der Rückkehr zur Scholle," *Volksgesundheits: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 5, no. 7 (1907): 97–101.

³¹⁵ See, for instance, Heinrich Siegmund, "Grundbesitzwechsel der Jahre 1907, 08 und 09 in 27 sächsischen Orten," *Volksgesundheits: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 8, no. 3 (1910): 32–38; Robert Csallner, "Die deutschen Siedlungen im Norden Siebenbürgens mit Rücksicht auf die Ursachen ihres Blühens und Welkens," *Volksgesundheits: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 8, no. 8 (1910): 122–26. Both of these articles were the first iterations in a long series.

³¹⁶ Heinrich Siegmund, "Der sächsische Lebensraum und die Bedingungen seiner Ausgestaltung," *Volksgesundheits: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 7, no. 3 (March 1908): 33–37.

³¹⁷ Heinrich Siegmund, "Zur sächsischen Hygiene IV," *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt* 28, no. 8274 (March 3, 1901): 1.

hygiene, followed and observed in animal breeding down to the smallest details,” Siegmund lamented, “has not yet been consciously applied to humans, to our people/nation [Volk].”³¹⁸ Siegmund suggested that Saxon peasants who were not nationally indifferent should be bred much like their cattle, implying that this would be the most effective method for amplifying their nationalist zeal.

Siegmund was unwavering in his belief that populations at the language frontier should remain separate. Saxon nationalist activists looked on with disapproval as the religious differences between the Lutheran Saxons and their neighbors ceased to deter mixed marriages, which were occurring at what they deemed an alarming rate. Consequently, Siegmund advocated for “race” to supplant these older markers of identity, elevating the concept of “racial purity” to a cornerstone of his eugenic blueprint:

The purer the German race remains, the purer can it actualize and express higher talents. Mixing with an inferior race leads the race to degeneration. Each and every nation that possesses mental qualities suffers irreparable losses when it mixes with individuals of inferior racial stock³¹⁹

Siegmund thus adapted the rhetoric of race hygienists to serve his own ends—namely, to unravel the complexities of hybridity along the language frontier that extended through the Transylvanian countryside.

In his texts, Siegmund occasionally referred to a nationalist physician Gustav Rösler, based in Northern Bohemia, on another language frontier.³²⁰ From the outset, Rösler was deeply

³¹⁸ Heinrich Siegmund, “Zur sächsischen Hygiene V,” *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt* 28, no. 8276 (March 8, 1901): 1.

³¹⁹ Heinrich Siegmund, “Über Rassenreinheit und Wert einer guten Abstammung,” in *Sächsisches Wehr- und Mehrbuch: Ein Volksbuch*, ed. Heinrich Siegmund, Michael Englisch, and Rudolf Schuster (Mediasch: Selbstverlag, 1914), 77.

³²⁰ For some of the reports from 1907, for example, see Heinrich Siegmund, “Dr. Gustav Rösler: Neue Wege deutscher Volkspolitik,” *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 6, no. 1 (1907): 15–16; “Ein Neudeutscher Kulturverein,” *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 6, no. 8 (1907): 117–18; “Dr. Gustav Rösler,” *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 5, no. 8 (1907): 127–28; “Goethe über die Raucher und Trinker,” *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 6, no. 9 (1907): 128–29; “Gustav Rösler - Über die nationale Bedeutung unserer

immersed in nationalist activism, advocating a form of racial nationalism even more extreme than that of Siegmund.³²¹ In 1908, Rösler, residing in Reichenberg/Liberec, founded the *Neudeutscher Kulturbund in Österreich* (New German Cultural League in Austria). The *Kulturbund* not only endorsed race hygiene but also harbored a strong interest in reverting to the purported initial state of nature, coupled with an obsession over the nation's supposed "racial purity."³²² Jitka Balcarová, Rösler's biographer, compellingly documents how the *Kulturbund* drew support from existing nationalist associations such as the *Deutscher Schulverein* and from the *Deutschradikale Partei*, a German nationalist political party in imperial Austria.³²³ Embodying a *völkisch* interpretation of German nationalism, both the *Kulturbund* and Rösler propagated views steeped in racial anti-Semitism, as soon as in the early 1900s.³²⁴ The organization also promoted nationalist internal colonization, inspired by the "race-breeding" settlements proposed by Willibald Hentschel, an Aryanist agrarian and race hygienist in Imperial Germany.³²⁵ At its zenith, the association counted over six hundred members.³²⁶ Rösler thus epitomized the nexus that emerged between nationalist activism and the most extreme strains of eugenics in Austria-Hungary.

Numerous individuals could be introduced in this context. For instance, frontier eugenics gained momentum in the southern stretches of the Alpine Lands. Prominent figures emerged in these areas as pioneering advocates of eugenics. Among them were the physician Albert Reibmayr from Tyrol—an Aryanist racial hygienist working in Meran/Merano and

Enthaltsamkeitsbewegung," *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 5, no. 9 (1907): 143–44; "Neues Leben," *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 6, no. 11 (1907): 166–67.

³²¹ See, for instance, Gustav Rösler, *Zur Organisation der Deutschgesinnten in Österreich: ein Vortrag* (Reichenberg: Neudeutscher Kulturverlag, 1911).

³²² Jitka Balcarová, "MUDr. Gustav Rösler a Neudeutscher Kulturbund in Österreich: 'Pionýři' rasové hygieny v českých zemích" [Dr. Gustav Rösler and the Neudeutscher Kulturbund in Austria: 'Pioneers' of Racial Hygiene in the Czech Lands], *Historica* 7, no. 2 (2016): 142–55.

³²³ Balcarová, "MUDr. Gustav Rösler," 151.

³²⁴ Balcarová, "MUDr. Gustav Rösler," 148.

³²⁵ Balcarová, "MUDr. Gustav Rösler," 151.

³²⁶ Balcarová, "MUDr. Gustav Rösler," 149.

Brixen/Bressanone—and Michael Hainisch, a statistician, economist, and landowner from Styria. Both were deeply embedded in nationalist activism within these regions.³²⁷ Hainisch, as a case in point, echoed several tenets of frontier eugenics, such as the advocacy for an internal colonization drive.³²⁸ However, the objective of this subchapter is not to provide a comprehensive roster of German-speaking frontier eugenicists in Austria-Hungary or of the territories they disputed. Rather, it seeks to explore the structure and circulation of this particular discourse.

Nationalist associations functioned as intermediaries of frontier eugenics, linking the activists inspired by it. In January 1914, informal conversations among some of these associations led to the establishment of the *Deutschösterreichische Beratungsstelle für Volkswohlfahrt* (German-Austrian Advice Center for National Welfare). Merging biopolitical ambitions with *völkisch* ideology, this entity was founded jointly by representatives from the *Südmark*—a nationalist voluntary association intent on contesting territories also claimed by Slovene and/or Italian nationalists—and their Bohemian counterparts, including the *Böhmerwaldbund* and *Bund der Deutschen in Böhmen*. Michael Hainisch was one of the leading actors involved in this association. The *Beratungsstelle* aimed to coordinate nationalist welfare initiatives across various language frontiers of the empire. It placed a high emphasis on race hygiene alongside related issues like child and youth welfare, temperance, and nationalist

³²⁷ Albert Reibmayr, “Über den Einfluss der Inzucht und Vermischung auf den politischen Charakter einer Bevölkerung,” *Politisch-anthropologische Revue* 1, no. 1 (1902): 21–37; Albert Reibmayr, “Die wichtigsten biologischen Ursachen der heutigen Landflucht,” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 8, no. 3 (1911): 349–76; Michael Hainisch, *Einige neue Zahlen zur Statistik der Deutschösterreicher* (Leipzig: Deuticke, 1909); Michael Hainisch, *Die Landflucht: ihr Wesen und ihre Bekämpfung im Rahmen einer Agrarreform* (Jena: Fischer, 1924).

³²⁸ Michael Hainisch, “Ein Ausflug nach St. Egydi,” *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* 1, no. 20 (May 1, 1912): 686–89.

tourism.³²⁹ By orchestrating these biopolitical objectives, the *Beratungsstelle* amplified the spread of eugenic ideas throughout imperial Austria shortly before World War I.

Informal networks connecting nationalist activists in Austria-Hungary extended even further. The *Sächsisches Wehr- und Mehrbuch* (The Saxon Book of Defense and Multiplication), a calendar published in 1914 by Transylvanian Saxon nationalists, including Heinrich Siegmund, underscored this inter-regional circulation. Notably, an entire chapter was penned by an author from Graz, delving into the objectives and practices of the *Südmark*.³³⁰ Eugenic content figured prominently in the calendar. In response, the calendar received an immediate review in the *Deutsche Arbeit* (German Labor), a leading journal for German nationalist activists in Bohemia. The reviewer lauded the book as “a model demonstrating how to undertake journalistic nationalist education in our region.”³³¹ A tightly knit, interconnected web of nationalist activists thus circulated eugenic knowledge across different language frontiers, in all parts of Austria-Hungary.

It might seem paradoxical that the circulation of frontier eugenics took on a transnational character. However, nationalist activism at language frontiers of the empire was itself a transnational phenomenon, just as national indifference was. Driven by symbolic competition, nationalist activists from various backgrounds, including Serb and Czech nationalists in analogous settings, drew upon comparable intellectual resources as their rivals vying for the same spaces. As a result, their texts displayed striking family resemblances.

³²⁹ “Gründung einer deutschösterreichischen Beratungsstelle für Volkswohlfahrt,” *Mitteilungen des Vereines Südmark* 9, no. 1–2 (January 3, 1914): 9–11.

³³⁰ Wilhelm Heinz, “Der deutsch-wirtschaftliche Schutzverein Südmark,” in *Sächsisches Wehr- und Mehrbuch: Ein Volksbuch*, ed. Heinrich Siegmund, Michael Englisch, and Rudolf Schuster (Mediasch: Selbstverlag, 1914), 147–54.

³³¹ Hermann Ullmann, “Ein vorbildliches Volksbuch aus dem nationalen Kampf,” *Deutsche Arbeit* 13, no. 12 (September 1914): 766.

For instance, very similar arguments were presented by Laza Marković, a Serb physician. Armed with a medical degree from the University of Budapest, he established his private practice in Újvidék/Novi Sad, located in the multiethnic Vajdaság/Vojvodina region, then part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Owning a successful private clinic, Marković quickly earned a reputation as a respected citizen, while also immersing himself in nationalist activities. Notably, from the early 1900s, Marković began to leverage the popular science genre, encompassing theater plays, to advocate for hygienic habits. Targeted mainly at rural communities, his interventions increasingly included elements of race hygiene.³³²

Already in the 1900s, Marković began formulating a version of frontier eugenics. One of his primary concerns revolved around the alleged corrosive moral and biological impact of capitalism on rural areas. He warned that the increasing orientation of agrarian production toward the market disrupted traditional peasant family structures and customs. Crucially, Marković was troubled by the trend where peasants started selecting their spouses primarily based on economic considerations. Consequently, he asserted that many of them were choosing unhealthy partners. In a 1913 pamphlet published by the nationalist cultural association *Matica srpska*, for instance, Marković issued the following caution:

Our ancestors valued health more than we do. They had better customs, as well, and it is only to our detriment that we have abandoned them and introduced new, harmful ones. [...] Your children believe that money is all that makes you happy and that money is the only thing that matters in this world. So, they pursue financial gain and revere money as if it were sacred.³³³

However, Marković argued that there was a cost to this mindset. He contended that the purported physical and moral deficiencies carried by these unhealthy spouses were hereditary.

³³² Isidora Grubački, “Emancipating Rural Women in Interwar Yugoslavia: Analysis of Discourses on Rural Women in Two 1930s Women’s Periodicals” (M.A. Thesis, Central European University, 2017), 50-6.

³³³ I am grateful to Isidora Grubački for providing me with copies of several Marković’s writings. Laza Marković, *Ženidba i udadba ili kako će narod doći do dobrog podmlatka* [Marriage or How the Nation Will Get Good Offspring] (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1913), 45.

Thus, not only did they harm the current generation, but they were also unavoidably passed down to their offspring. Embracing the concept of hard heredity, he further cautioned that the damage inflicted on the family and the nation through marriages with unhealthy individuals could not be easily undone.³³⁴ Drawing inspiration from eugenic arguments put forth by figures such as Wilhelm Schallmayer and Max von Gruber, Marković thus contended that modern culture was fostering degeneration, even within the countryside, which he deemed a vital repository of the nation's strength.³³⁵

Enter the language frontier. This alleged weakening of the national body was alarming, Marković claimed, as the Serb peasant families struggled against other groups to retain and extend their share of the land. Prioritizing further extension of the territory claimed by his co-nationals, he proposed race hygiene as a way forward:

As long as every Serb family stays healthy, and blessed with healthy and agile children, then the entire Serb nation will be healthy, agile, progressing, and happy. Then the Serb nation will protect its homes and its lands and will expand them. Then it will defend its place in a [...] struggle that every nation wages with its neighbors.³³⁶

Highlighting the parallels between animal breeding and eugenics, Marković advocated for a biopolitical strategy that included the surveillance of peasant families by physicians, the introduction of marriage certificates, and a moral campaign against alcohol and other substances believed to jeopardize the health of the peasants and the presumed purity of their “race.”³³⁷ Additionally, the nationalist physician from Novi Sad maintained the belief that both the body and the mind were shaped by heredity and intricately linked. Consequently, Marković argued that if race hygiene could encourage not only the healthiest but also the most zealous

³³⁴ Marković, *Ženidba i udadba*, passim.

³³⁵ While Marković rarely accompanied his prewar eugenic texts with citations, his early postwar pamphlet contains a short bibliography that consists largely of German-speaking advocates of race hygiene. Laza Marković, *Zadaci narodne uprave za unapređenje rasne higijene i evgenike* [Tasks of Public Administration for the Improvement of Racial Hygiene and Eugenics] (Novi Sad: Štamparija Supeka i Jovanović, 1919), 31.

³³⁶ Marković, *Ženidba i udadba*, 50-1.

³³⁷ Marković, *Ženidba i udadba*, passim.

compatriots to intermarry, it would further strengthen their sense of nationalism. While for Marković, race hygiene was primarily a strategy enabling the Serbs to settle more land, he also implied that it additionally served as a tool to reinforce national consciousness.

Similar to Siegmund, the trope of racial purity held great significance for Marković. Remarkably, following the establishment of Yugoslavia, he emerged as the most ardent proponent of legislation aimed at prohibiting intermarriage between Yugoslav citizens and what he referred to as “alien races.” Interestingly, his proposal shocked some other early eugenicists in Yugoslavia who did not share Marković’s background in frontier nationalist activism.³³⁸ In essence, Marković’s eugenic agenda, characterized by anti-modernism and racism, was intimately linked to the practices of frontier nationalism in which he was engaged.

Writing in Bosnia at about the same time, the Serb nationalist physician Uroš Krulj drafted a eugenic project that bore many similarities to Marković’s arguments. While race hygiene provided the fundamental framework for Krulj’s nationalist arguments, an anti-modernist stance provided him with a point of departure. In his argument, modernity was portrayed as a force that pitted individual and collective interests against each other. What he labeled as exaggerated individualism harmed not only the collective economic interests but also the purported biological body of the nation, he claimed. The advancement of culture, according to Krulj, consequently led to degeneration. This phenomenon applied even to romantic nationalism, which he deemed too subjective and thus detrimental to the community. In contrast to the older form of nationalism, termed “sentimental” by Krulj, a “modern” nationalism was envisioned to be rooted in positivist science, with its core agenda constituted by racial hygiene

³³⁸ Kuhar, “Eugenika,” 42.

and eugenics.³³⁹ Thus, Krulj's objective was to reframe Serbian nationalism along organicist, biological, and ultimately, racial lines.

Eugenic knowledge, according to Krulj, served a dual purpose. On one hand, and more explicitly, it provided a blueprint for rejuvenating the physical makeup of the nation:

Based on modern sciences and a modern healthy outlook, modern patriotism aims to make the nation more vigorous, great, and excellent. [...] Following the requirements of racial hygiene, it takes the ideal of family life as the basis for the quantitative and qualitative strengthening of the nation. A strong, good, healthy, and wealthy family is the nation's best foundation.³⁴⁰

On the other hand, and more subtly, it aimed at constructing a new national consciousness in an emerging mass society. Following Richard Semon's neo-Lamarckian theory stipulating a common mechanism underlying both memory and heredity, Krulj argued that the influences of the environment leave heritable traces imprinted into human bodies in the same way as past experiences are recorded in human memory. Importantly, Semon was a Monist for whom the mind-body distinction mattered little. Consequently, also for Krulj, physical and mental characteristics were both plastic and closely correlated. Announcing its break away from cultural politics, Krulj's eugenics-infused "modern patriotism" claimed it would change individual minds by acting on their bodies. Like many other frontier eugenicists, Krulj ultimately enlisted biology to transform individuals into nationalists.

There are some analogies in the biographies of Marković and Krulj. Both were part of a small group of middle-class professionals who returned to their provincial origins after completing their degrees in an imperial center. In Krulj's case, Vienna was the imperial center in question, while the province was Bosnia and Herzegovina, a "proximate colony" jointly ruled

³³⁹ Uroš Krulj, "Moderni patriotizam" [Modern Patriotism], *Pregled* 3, no. 3 (August 15, 1912): 122.

³⁴⁰ Krulj, "Moderni patriotizam," 124.

by Austria and Hungary.³⁴¹ Krulj established his private practice in Mostar in 1906 and embarked on a political career, aligning himself with a group of radical nationalist intellectuals.³⁴² However, it is improbable that the two men directly influenced each other's writings back in the first decade of the twentieth century.³⁴³ Instead, we observe two independent circulations of racial hygienic ideas from imperial Germany.

Tellingly, tropes concerning national property, in the form of capital and land, were prominent in Krulj's writings during this period.³⁴⁴ Notably, Krulj also embraced the trope of racial purity and cautioned against hybridity. He castigated an alleged "misconception" prevalent among "the uneducated public," which assumed "that racial mixing is always beneficial for the race and that it only produces good results."³⁴⁵ Instead, he claimed that "experiments and growing experience absolutely refute this."³⁴⁶ Even though Krulj resided in a different geographical location than Marković, their frontier eugenics, in both cases, was fundamentally shaped by the context of nationalist activism. Far from being confined to a single region, nationalist activism on the language frontiers of the Habsburg Empire was a transnational phenomenon. In a rather disturbing way, it fostered homologues and even interactions between various nationalist groups.

³⁴¹ Robert Donia, "Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Proximate Colony in the Twilight of Empire," *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja* 42 (2014): 197–202.

³⁴² For Krulj's place in the intellectual context of Habsburg Bosnia and Herzegovina, see Elvis Fejzić, "Political Thought in Bosnia and Herzegovina During Austro-Hungarian Rule, 1878–1918," *East Central Europe* 39, no. 2–3 (2012): 204–36. An overview of nationalist agendas shared by Krulj can be found in Uroš Krulj, Risto Radulović, Svetozar Ćorović, Vladimir Gaćinović, Šćepan Grđić, Vojislav Besarović, and Đoka Perin, *Spomenica o proslavi desetogodišnjice Prosvjete: pregled prosvjetnog i kulturnog rada Srba Bosne i Hercegovine od 1902 do 1912* [Memorial about the Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of the Prosvjeta Association: Overview of Educational and Cultural Activities of Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1902 to 1912] (Sarajevo: Prosvjeta, 1912).

³⁴³ After 1918, Krulj and Marković emerged as allies in interwar Yugoslavia, likely due to their shared formative experience in nationalist activism on the language frontiers.

³⁴⁴ Uroš Krulj, "Nacionalna rasna higijena" [National Racial Hygiene], *Pregled* 1, no. 5 (September 15, 1910): 262–74.

³⁴⁵ Uroš Krulj, *Politika i rasa: rasni nacionalizam* [Politics and Race: Racial Nationalism] (Sarajevo: Državna štamparija, 1925), 20–1.

³⁴⁶ Krulj, *Politika i rasa*, 20–1. Similar statements, however, can be found in his earlier texts, as well.

Frontier eugenics, with its inherent nationalist and racial premises, served as a potent vehicle for anti-feminist sentiment during the early twentieth century. Through the years, supporters of frontier eugenics used many occasions to harp on this sentiment, continually increasing the hostility of their attacks. Their coverage of the lecture *Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene* (Girl's Education and Race Hygiene) by the hygienist Max von Gruber was one such significant moment of escalation. Gruber, an Austrian who relocated to imperial Germany and became a key figure in the race hygiene movement, delivered this lecture in Munich in 1910. In his lecture, he used eugenic tropes to attack feminism, alleging it contributed to the decline of the "race." Gruber particularly criticized the feminist call for admitting women to higher education, asserting that women's education should prioritize marriage and motherhood.³⁴⁷ For his eugenically oriented readers in Austria-Hungary, Gruber's lecture concretized and systematized the relationship between their anti-feminist sentiment and their "racial" concerns. It helped them integrate their anti-feminism with their pro-natalism, as well as with their obsession with "racial purity."

The ideas from Gruber's lecture circulated throughout the Habsburg Empire. The nationalist physician Rösler, for instance, immediately wrote a review praising Gruber's lecture in his journal *Neues Leben* (New Life). In his review, Rösler asserted that "Gruber's writings should be read diligently in German Austria," and prescribed the lecture particularly to "women's and girls' local groups of our national associations."³⁴⁸ Rösler was not the only frontier eugenicist who shared that view, and nationalist associations played a key part in promoting this text in Austria-Hungary.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁷ Max von Gruber, *Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene: Vortrag, gehalten anläßig der generalversammlung des Verbandes zur Hebung hauswirtschaftlicher Frauenbildung am 4. Juli 1910 im alten Rathaussaale in München* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1910).

³⁴⁸ Gustav Rösler, Review of *Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene*, by Max von Gruber, *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 5, no. 3 (September 1, 1910): 47.

³⁴⁹ For a similar reaction among Transylvanian Saxon supporters of eugenics, see Karl Jickeli, "Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene," *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 5, no. 14 (April 15, 1911): 424–29.

This escalating anti-feminism among frontier eugenicists posed a conundrum for women involved in nationalist activism. Tellingly, several of these women responded critically to texts that either paraphrased or promoted the ideas voiced in Gruber's lecture. However, the arguments of these conservative nationalist women diverged from those of the feminists who also reacted to Gruber's ideas. Feminists, like the Viennese Maria Leopoldine Klausberger, retorted to Gruber that unmarried and childless women were "free people filled with new opportunities for happiness."³⁵⁰ Conversely, nationalist activists like Marianne Tuma von Waldkampf from Bohemia argued that women deserved access to higher education and the public sphere specifically as preparation for their prospective roles as multipliers and nurturers of the nation's strength.³⁵¹ These nationalist women thus refused to be constrained to the household while reinforcing the perceived link between motherhood and citizenship.³⁵²

Some frontier eugenicists in Austria-Hungary went beyond circulating ideas of race hygiene, connecting directly with its supporters in imperial Germany. The efforts of race hygienists in imperial Germany to create and manage a transnational and trans-imperial network, as described by Stefan Kühl, provided a crucial context for these connections. In 1907, race hygienists in Germany founded the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene* (International Society for Race Hygiene), aimed at rallying eugenicists around a Greater-

and Heinrich Siegmund, "Sächsische Volksvermehrung und Frauenbewegung," *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 7, no. 17 (September 1, 1913): 731–35. František Lašek, a provincial physician supporting eugenics, was instrumental in promoting Gruber's arguments among Czech-speaking readers: Lašek, *Zušlechtění lidstva*.

³⁵⁰ Maria Leopoldine Klausberger, "Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene: Zum Vortrag des Prof. Max von Gruber, München," *Österreichische Frauen-Rundschau* 8, no. 78 (October 1, 1910): 6.

³⁵¹ Marianne Tuma von Waldkampf, "Regeneration und Frauenbewegung," *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 5, no. 3 (September 1, 1910): 38–39; Marianne Tuma von Waldkampf, "Die nationale Bedeutung des Mutterschutzes," *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* 1, no. 19 (April 15, 1912): 650–53. For a similar response from a Czech nationalist woman from Bohemia, see Juliana Lancová, "Česká eugenika a její hlasatel" [Czech Eugenics and Its Advocate], *Ženský svět* 20, no. 11 (May 24, 1916): 246–47. See also the voices of Transylvanian Saxon nationalist women, such as Meta Römer-Teubner, "Frauenbewegung und Rassenhygiene: Eine Antwort und Rechenschaft," *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 5, no. 16 (May 15, 1911): 507–11; Grete Deutsch, "Dr. H. Siegmund und die Frauenbewegung," *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 7, no. 20 (October 15, 1913): 40–42.

³⁵² Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender & Nation* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), passim.

German, Nordicist program. Initially focused on German-speaking areas, these hygienists later expanded their reach to Scandinavia, the British Empire, and France, integrating them into what Kühl describes as a “primarily racist-oriented, transnational organization.”³⁵³ Yet, networking in the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire posed a surprising challenge for these German advocates of race hygiene.

Supporters of race hygiene from Imperial Germany actively pursued support within Austria-Hungary to bolster their network. However, when leading German race hygienist Alfred Ploetz sought allies in Vienna in 1909, he ultimately withdrew.³⁵⁴ Similarly, in the same year, when Max von Gruber visited Budapest to enlist Hungarian eugenicists for the network, not one chose to join, as documented by Marius Turda.³⁵⁵ Despite having 440 members by the end of July 1911, the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene* counted only seven members residing in Austria-Hungary.³⁵⁶ These challenges were unexpected, especially considering that the imperial capital was a temporary home to the influential, British-born anti-Semitic racial theorist Houston Stewart Chamberlain.³⁵⁷

What is more, several early proponents of racial hygiene, including hygienists Max von Gruber and Ignaz Kaup, hailed from the Habsburg Empire. However, these Austrians intensified their commitment to race hygiene primarily after relocating to Imperial Germany. Ethnologist Richard Thurnwald and physical anthropologist Felix von Luschan followed similar paths, fully embracing race hygiene only after becoming expatriates.³⁵⁸ Similarly, Géza von Hoffmann, a conservative Hungarian nationalist who acted as a liaison between early

³⁵³ Stefan Kühl, *For the Betterment of the Race: The Rise and Fall of the International Movement for Eugenics and Racial Hygiene* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 17.

³⁵⁴ Weindling, “A City Regenerated,” 86.

³⁵⁵ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 83.

³⁵⁶ Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry, Munich, Alfred Ploetz Papers, Inv. no. PL 5/9, Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene, Mitgliederliste vom 31. Dezember 1910 and Anhang zur Mitgliederliste, Neuaufnahmen vom 1. Januar bis 22. Juli 1911.

³⁵⁷ Weindling, “A City Regenerated,” 81.

³⁵⁸ Baader, “Eugenische Programme,” 66–139.

American and German eugenics advocates, started foregrounding these ideas only during his diplomatic missions in the United States and Imperial Germany; he did not permanently return to Hungary before the outbreak of World War I.³⁵⁹ While some leading figures in Imperial Germany's race hygiene movement hailed from Austria-Hungary, most had left the latter empire before 1914.

The very first individuals in Austria-Hungary to join the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene*, namely physical anthropologist Rudolf Pösch, explorer Johann Nepomuk Wilczek, and pathological anatomist Anton Weichselbaum, were connected to colonial contexts and/or had ties to the temperance movement.³⁶⁰ Moreover, the budding interest in race hygiene along the empire's language frontiers also became crucial for Imperial German race hygienists' attempts to expand their networks in the neighboring empire. Several frontier eugenicists from Austria-Hungary, including Hainisch and Reibmayr, contributed to the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie*, the flagship journal of the German Society for Race Hygiene. Some, like Hainisch, Siegmund, and Heinrich Müller, a Saxon medical doctor in Reps/Köhalom/Rupea in Transylvania, even joined the association.³⁶¹ While their interest in race hygiene stemmed from local nationalist activism, therefore, the consequences of their radicalization extended beyond local confines. Frontier eugenicists from Austria-Hungary thus transcended their regional boundaries, aligning with other pioneers of racial nationalism on an inter-imperial stage.

Alcoholism: A Boundary Object for Eugenics Supporters

After mapping three empire-wide networks of eugenics supporters in Austria-Hungary, it is worthwhile to consider the relationship between them. How strong were their boundaries,

³⁵⁹ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 110–18.

³⁶⁰ Interestingly, unlike Tandler, Kammerer, or their Hungarian allies, the sociologist Goldscheid was also featured on the member list. Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry, Munich, Alfred Ploetz Papers, Inv. no. 5/9, Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene, Mitgliederliste, September 1908, and Mitgliederliste vom 10. Dezember 1909.

³⁶¹ Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry, Munich, Alfred Ploetz Papers, Inv. no. 5/4, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene, Mitgliederliste vom 31. Dezember 1913.

and were there any links between their members? In their classical article, Susan Leigh Star and James Griesemer coined the concept of “boundary objects,” which they define as “plastic enough to adapt to local needs and the constraints of the several parties employing them, yet robust enough to maintain a common identity across situations.”³⁶² In this section, I argue that in prewar Austria-Hungary the notion of “alcoholism” served as a critical boundary object that connected various individuals and scientific networks embracing eugenics.

Medical historians agree that alcohol abuse has been medicalized in the modern era. According to Waltraud Ernst and Thomas Müller who summarize this thesis, the idea of “intemperance” as a moral issue transformed into the medical concept of “alcoholism” around the start of the twentieth century, portraying excessive drinking as a “disease requiring medical therapeutic intervention.”³⁶³ With this shift from intemperance to alcoholism, therefore, “debates on alcohol [moved] from the moral sphere to the realm of science-based medicine.”³⁶⁴ Moving away from the moral sphere, yet never entirely abandoning moral judgment, the concept of alcoholism served as a point of connection that allowed different groups in Austria-Hungary to interact within the framework of temperance associations.

Eugenic ideas became closely intertwined with the medicalization of alcohol abuse, gradually permeating the discussions surrounding alcoholism. As a result, many proponents of eugenics found themselves deeply engaged in the temperance movement. Building upon a perspective that had been widely accepted in European medicine, psychiatry, and broader social thinking since the nineteenth century, temperance activists typically depicted alcohol as one of

³⁶² Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer, “Institutional Ecology, ‘Translations’ and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39,” *Social Studies of Science* 19, no. 3 (August 1989): 393.

³⁶³ Waltraud Ernst and Thomas Müller, “Introduction: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives on Alcohol, Psychiatry and Society, c. 1500–1991,” in *Alcohol, Psychiatry and Society: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives, c. 1700–1990s*, ed. Waltraud Ernst and Thomas Müller (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022), 7.

³⁶⁴ Ernst and Müller, “Introduction,” 7.

the factors contributing to the perceived “degeneration” of individuals and the imagined collective body.³⁶⁵ Furthermore, they attempted to establish a causal connection between alcoholism and various social issues that were the subject of moral panic around the turn of the century, such as prostitution, violent crime, juvenile delinquency, and so on. To portray alcoholism as a cause, as well as a product of a purported biological decline, many of these temperance activists embraced a hereditary degenerationist perspective, and a notion of alcoholic degeneration in particular.³⁶⁶ This view often relied on neo-Lamarckian assumptions, although it is worth noting that some early proponents of hard heredity, such as József Madzsar, were also involved in the temperance movement.

The shared concern with alcoholism transformed temperance associations in Austria-Hungary into trading zones for supporters of eugenics from various national, political, and disciplinary backgrounds. Many people involved in the networks mapped earlier, regardless of their professional background, supported anti-alcohol initiatives and sometimes made temperance their principal concern. Crucially, their use of boundary objects, exemplified by the broad acceptance of the concept of alcoholism, highlights the distinct nature of the three networks described above. While permeable, their boundaries were not entirely fluid and required boundary objects for exchanges to occur across them. However, the members of these networks were not the only proponents of eugenics within these associations.

Even some of those who were otherwise critical of eugenics or reluctant to accept it in other circumstances incorporated eugenic ideas into their arguments. As they explored the effects of alcohol on individuals and society, ideas of heredity, “degeneration,” and eugenics came to the forefront of their arguments. An illustrative example is Tomáš Masaryk, a professor

³⁶⁵ William F. Bynum, “Alcoholism and Degeneration in 19th Century European Medicine and Psychiatry,” *British Journal of Addiction* 79 (1984): 59–70.

³⁶⁶ Bynum, “Alcoholism and Degeneration,” 59–70.

of philosophy at Prague's University and a seminal figure in Czech sociology. Masaryk was among the modern sociologists who grappled with the challenges posed by the burgeoning mass society and intensifying social conflicts.³⁶⁷ Broadly speaking, biology was downplayed in his analysis; in fact, Masaryk contended that "Comte and Spencer use a lot of biology in their sociology, but I believe it is improper."³⁶⁸ Instead, he aimed to address the challenges of modernity by establishing a secularized ethics that could act as a pre-political foundation for a new social consensus. These ethical principles were essentially a revised interpretation of the Herderian concept of humanity.³⁶⁹

On the surface, Masaryk was highly critical of eugenics and regarded it, together with Darwinism more broadly, as contradicting his ethical framework. A case in point is the discussion of these issues in his paradigmatic work *Ideály humanitní* (The Ideals of Humanity) from 1901. In this book, Masaryk sought to systematically outline his ethics and contrast them with other ethical frameworks. While acknowledging that he drew insights from socialism, utilitarianism, and positivism, Masaryk was more critical of certain other perspectives. However, no ethical framework faced more severe criticism from him than evolutionism. He was particularly troubled by the deployment of evolutionism to endorse nationalist and socially conservative agendas. Masaryk argued that despite Darwinism's radical or liberal origins, evolutionism evolved into something he viewed as "anti-humanist," "undemocratic," "aristocratic," and even "reactionary." He concluded, "This is not the only instance of the unfortunate demise of radicalism."³⁷⁰ Eugenics, he then went on to emphasize, was a

³⁶⁷ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Ideály humanitní: Několik kapitol* [Humanitarian Ideals: Several Chapters], (Prague: Čas, 1901), 56.

³⁶⁸ Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Rukověť sociologie" [Handbook of Sociology], *Naše doba* 8, no. 1 (1900): 9.

³⁶⁹ Trencsényi, Janowski, Baár, Falina, and Kopeček, *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe. Volume I*, 432–4.

³⁷⁰ Masaryk, *Ideály humanitní*, 47.

manifestation of all that he saw as despicable about evolutionism.³⁷¹ In other words, Masaryk regarded eugenics as the very antithesis of his “ideals of humanity.”

Even though Masaryk forcefully rejected eugenics, the gap between his sociology and eugenics narrowed in his texts dealing with alcoholism. Consider, for instance, his speech at the Seventh International Congress against Alcoholism that took place in Vienna in 1901. While Masaryk argued for a moral reform informed by sociological analysis, based on a qualitative, psychological approach, and did not share the strong emphasis on medicine that characterized many other speakers at the event, he did not deny the validity of “objective,” natural scientific methods and contended that the conclusions of the two needed to overlap. He even treated “degeneration” as a real biological phenomenon, although he insisted that its effects were partial and reversible.³⁷²

Later, Masaryk was even more explicit in his endorsement of the eugenic dimension of the temperance movement. For instance, in 1906, he wrote a foreword for a translation of a lecture by Gustav von Bunge, a Basel-based physiological chemist. Eugenic ideas were salient in the lecture, as Bunge was strongly committed to this body of knowledge as well as to the Lebensreform movement, spearheading their influence on the early 20th-century temperance movement, for whom he became one of the key references.³⁷³ In his foreword, Masaryk expressed his satisfaction in learning about “the detrimental effects of alcohol on individuals and society” from Bunge’s lecture as well as from his other writings.³⁷⁴ Equally noteworthy, furthermore, was the fact that the lecture was translated into Czech by Masaryk’s daughter

³⁷¹ Masaryk, *Ideály humanitní*, 42–8.

³⁷² Tomáš G. Masaryk, “Sociologische Bemerkungen zur socialen Frage des Alkoholismus,” in *Bericht über den VIII. Internationalen Congress gegen den Alkoholismus*, ed. Rudolf Wlassak (Leipzig: Deuticke, 1902), 231–35.

³⁷³ Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics*, 71.

³⁷⁴ Tomáš G. Masaryk, “Úvod” [Introduction], in *K otázce alkoholu: přednáška: slovo k dělníkům* [On the Question of Alcohol: Lecture: A Word to Workers], by Gustav von Bunge, trans. Alice Masaryková (Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1906).

Alice, who was a social reformist and temperance activist in her own right.³⁷⁵ Despite his criticism, Masaryk was thus inclined to accept eugenic ideas underpinning temperance.

Masaryk's students and followers drew on eugenics even more forcefully. The sociologist Břetislav Foustka, who founded and led one of the most influential temperance associations in Bohemia, was one of them. Even more so than his teacher, Foustka viewed alcoholism as not only a moral concern but also a distinctly biopolitical issue. While considering the societal ramifications of practices such as alcoholism, Foustka engaged in discussions with Spencerian evolutionism. He contended that ethics must consistently adapt to respond to evolving historical circumstances. This also held true for the secularized form of ethics championed by Masaryk, which Foustka aimed to modernize in his significant 1904 book *Slabí v lidské společnosti* (The Weak in a Human Society).

In his book, Foustka attempted to synthesize Masaryk's concept of humanity with contemporary theories of degeneration and eugenics. Although he emphasized that most of the pressing issues of the time, such as suicide, crime, and tuberculosis, were primarily rooted in social causes, he also asserted that in the cases of alcoholism and venereal diseases, heredity played a major role and warranted some eugenic measures. After reviewing and rejecting various eugenic interventions, including extreme measures such as euthanasia and forced sterilization, Foustka suggested that the central solution lies in public health reforms. However, he believed these reforms needed to be coupled with certain eugenic policies. The crux of these policies centered around marriage certificates that would prohibit certain individuals labeled as "degenerate" from procreating.³⁷⁶ Foustka obtained his habilitation thanks to this work and later became the first professor of sociology at the Czech section of Prague University. In the years

³⁷⁵ Alice Masaryková, "Alkohol, Abstinenz und die Frauenbewegung," *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 5, no. 4 (April 1, 1906): 1–3.

³⁷⁶ Foustka, *Slabí v lidské společnosti*, passim.

that followed, Foustka continued to publish on various eugenic issues. Significantly, despite his embrace of evolutionism and eugenics, his arguments did not lead to a break with Masaryk.³⁷⁷

As a result of the broad interest in the issue of alcoholism among various professionals, intellectuals, and activists, the temperance movement in Austria-Hungary encompassed a diverse range of associations with fundamentally different political and national orientations. Notably, there was substantial support for temperance within the socialist movement, which viewed alcoholism as an impediment to strengthening the class consciousness of the working people. They framed the effects of alcoholism as both cultural and biological.³⁷⁸ In effect, many left-leaning eugenicists, including the Viennese anatomist Julius Tandler and his Croatian student Andrija Štampar, actively promoted temperance.

Nationalist activists on the language frontiers of the empire depicted alcoholism as a threat to the purity of the “race” of the imagined communities they claimed to represent. They also saw it as a source of economic impoverishment that hindered their efforts to expand their territory. In essence, they portrayed alcoholism as a source of weakness in the Social Darwinist struggle for existence and strongly supported the temperance movement as a consequence. These ideas were shared by almost all of these activists, and physicians like Gustav Rösler, Uroš Krulj, Laza Marković, or Heinrich Siegmund were at the forefront of the temperance movement in their respective regions of Austria-Hungary.³⁷⁹

³⁷⁷ Indeed, before World War I, Masaryk’s other students and followers – including Edvard Beneš and Vasil Škrach – were also involved in the temperance movement and engaged with some eugenic ideas. Edvard Beneš, *Problém alkoholové výroby a abstinence* [The Problem of Alcohol Production and Abstinence] (Prague: Československý abstinentský svaz, 1915); Vasil Škrach, “Abstinenzbewegung an den tschechischen Hochschulen und über die Teilnahme der Mittelschulen an der Antialkoholbewegung,” in *Bericht über den 2. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Graz am 8. und 9. October 1911*, ed. Friedrich I. Neumann (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1912), 72–74.

³⁷⁸ Viktor Adler, “Alkohol und Befreiungskampf,” *Der Abstinents: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 3, no. 5 (May 1, 1904): 1.

³⁷⁹ For arguments along these lines, see Gustav Rösler, *Über die nationale Bedeutung unserer Enthaltensamkeits-Bewegung: ein Vortrag* (Reichenberg: Selbstverlag, 1905); Krulj, “Nacionalna rasna higijena,” 273; Laza Marković, *Zašto Srbi pre vremena umiru?* [Why do Serbs Die Prematurely?] (Zagreb: Privrednik, 1914), 21–41; Heinrich Siegmund, “Der Kampf gegen den Alkoholismus als Mittel der Volkserhaltung,” *Siebenbürgisch-*

Alcoholism also held a prominent place on the agenda for eugenically inclined special educators in imperial Austria. This was because the temperance movement enjoyed strong support among teachers, and psychiatrists had long believed that alcohol was one of the primary causes of pathological heredity.³⁸⁰ Nonetheless, pre-World War I Austria-Hungary was home to a multitude of anti-alcohol networks that encompassed an even broader spectrum of ideologies. Significant enthusiasm for temperance existed among feminists in Austria-Hungary, as well as among certain members of the Catholic clergy, including the priest Johannes Ude and his temperance network in Styria, and the Slovene-speaking temperance association *Sveta Vojska* (Holy Army) in Carniola.³⁸¹ As the last example indicates, the temperance activists also had numerous national identifications.

Various ethnic and nationalist groups were broadly involved in temperance associations in the Habsburg Empire. These associations thrived among German speakers, but also among self-identified Croats, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles, Serbs, and Slovenes. Most of these associations engaged with nationalist rhetoric. In their rhetoric, the purported cultural and biological degeneration they ascribed to alcoholism gravely threatened the nation. This emphasis is evident, for instance, in the by-laws of the Polish temperance association *Eleuterya*, founded in Krakow in 1902, which defined its mission as the promotion and adherence to

Deutsches Tageblatt 35, no. 10473 (June 12, 1908): 4–5; Heinrich Siegmund, “Ist die alkoholfreie Zukunft des sächsischen Volkes möglich?” *Mitteilungen der Grossloge Ungarns des Internationalen Guttemplerordens (I.O.G.T.) und des Alkohol Enthaltensamkeits-Vereins (A.E.V.)* 2, no. 1 (January 20, 1913): 1–2.

³⁸⁰ Jan Šimsa, “Alkoholismus a jeho vliv na slabomyslnost mládeže” [Alcoholism and its Influence on the Feeble-mindedness of Youth], in *Prvý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 27., 28. a 29. června 1909 v Praze* [The First Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on June 27, 28, and 29, 1909, in Prague] (Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1909), 113–17.

³⁸¹ Reinhard Farkas, “Die Anfänge der steirischen Abstinenzbewegung,” *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereines für Steiermark* 26 (2010): 546–61; Johannes Ude, “Der katholische Priester und das Problem der Aufklärung der Jugend über die Antialkoholbewegung,” in *Bericht über den 2. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Graz am 8. und 9. October 1911*, ed. Friedrich I. Neumann (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1912), 92–97; Johannes Ude, “Über Trinkerfürsorge vom katholische Standpunkte aus,” in *Bericht über den 3. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Salzburg am 22. und 23. September 1912*, ed. Friedrich I. Neumann (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1914), 48–53; “Walka z alkoholem u Słowenów: Wykład księdza Dra Leopolda Lénarda z Lublany w Krakowie 14 października 1906” [The Struggle Against Alcoholism among the Slovenes: Lecture by Father Dr. Leopold Lénard from Ljubljana in Kraków on October 14, 1906], *Wyzwolenie* 1, no. 12 (December 1906): 5–7.

“complete abstinence from alcoholic beverages,” considering it an essential factor for the “spiritual, physical, and material regeneration of the nation.”³⁸² In a paradoxical manner, these associations simultaneously stressed their focus on alcoholism as a unifying concern, which made them willing to collaborate across linguistic boundaries, irrespective of the national affiliations of their potential allies. The temperance associations in Austria-Hungary, therefore, were nationalist in their content and nationally indifferent in their form.

Despite the multitude and sheer diversity of temperance associations in the late Habsburg Empire, ideas circulated freely between them, transcending both national and political boundaries. Dozens of anti-alcoholic periodicals were published in Austria-Hungary before 1914, covering a majority of the empire’s languages. A significant number of these journals negotiated with eugenic ideas, with some promoting them overtly and systematically, while in other cases, their engagement with such concepts was more transient. These periodicals affiliated with anti-alcohol associations played a pivotal role in disseminating eugenic ideas linked to temperance initiatives within the empire and beyond.

The case of two individuals who played pivotal roles as advocates of temperance initiatives in Austria-Hungary before 1914, serves as a compelling illustration of this interconnectedness. A prominent example is Arnold Holitscher, a spa doctor hailing from Pirkenhammer/Březová near Karlsbad in Bohemia. Starting in the early 1900s, Holitscher emerged as a prominent figure among medical practitioners involved in the temperance movement within imperial Austria. He presented his arguments against alcoholism within a distinct eugenic framework. Notably, his writings resonated within the circle of German-

³⁸² *Statut Towarzystwa Zupelnej Wstrzemięźliwości od Napojów Alkoholowych “Eleuterya”*: zatwierdzony reskryptem c.k. Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnętrznych z dnia 13 stycznia 1906 r. L. 58475/05 [By-Laws of the Eleuterya, Society of Complete Abstinence from Alcoholic Beverages: Approved by the Rescript of the Imperial and Royal Ministry of Internal Affairs from January 13, 1906, L. 58475/05]. Kraków: Towarzystwo Zupelnej Wstrzemięźliwości od Napojów Alkoholowych “Eleuterya,” 1906, §4.

speaking social democratic anti-alcohol activists, among whom Holitscher held a prominent position.³⁸³

Holitscher's eugenically-oriented arguments about temperance had reverberations that extended well beyond the German-speaking socialist sphere. His writings were featured in a diverse range of publications related to temperance in Austria-Hungary and beyond, occasionally forging unexpected alliances. Disturbingly, Holitscher's writings were often showcased in nationalist publications, including the German radical nationalist temperance journal *Neues Leben*, and also appeared in Czech-speaking nationalist temperance journals.³⁸⁴ Furthermore, his ideas resonated within royal Hungary as well. Holitscher's arguments not only found their way into Hungarian-language temperance publications but he also took a direct role by delivering a lecture in Budapest during a celebratory event of one of Hungary's main anti-alcohol associations in 1911.³⁸⁵ (The extensive lecture, which delved into the potential for state involvement in promoting temperance, was later published in an issue of the *Társadalmi Múzeum Értesítője* [Bulletin of the Social Museum].)³⁸⁶ The journals of Transylvanian Saxon and Croatian temperance activists also introduced Holitscher's texts to their readership.³⁸⁷ In fact, Holitscher became one of the most cited temperance activists from imperial Austria.

Similarly, the texts on alcohol penned by the reformist sociologist Masaryk circulated through the empire, despite his Czech nationalism. Partly, this was due to his influence on his

³⁸³ Arnold Holitscher, "Abstinenz und Bourgeoisie," *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 4, no. 4 (April 1, 1905): 4.

³⁸⁴ Arnold Holitscher, "Weshalb jeder deutsche Arzt am Kampfe gegen den Alkoholismus sich beteiligen müsste," *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 2, no. 2 (July 1, 1907): 15.

³⁸⁵ "Antialkoholisták ünnepe – A magyar Good Templar-rend tízéves jubileuma" [Celebration of the Anti-Alcoholists - The Ten-Year Jubilee of the Hungarian Good Templar Order], *Világ* 2, no. 107 (May 7, 1911): 15–16. Holitscher's writings were frequently translated and reviewed in Hungarian-language temperance journals. An example of this can be seen in the Review of Alkoholsitte-Opiumsritte, by Arnold Holitscher, *Az Alkoholkérdés: Alkoholelleses folyóirat* 2, no. 2 (February 1, 1911): 7.

³⁸⁶ Arnold Holitscher, "Az állam jelenlegi feladatai az alkoholelleses küzdelemben" [The Current Tasks of the State in the Fight Against Alcohol], *A Társadalmi Múzeum Értesítője* 3, no. 3 (May 1, 1911): 177–95.

³⁸⁷ Arnold Holitscher, "Alkohol und Infektionskrankheiten," *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 9, no. 12 (1911): 188–89.

Slovene-speaking and Croatian-speaking students in Prague, and beyond, who forcefully subscribed to Masaryk's ideas on temperance, and also brought them to their home audiences through translations and paraphrases.³⁸⁸ However, Masaryk's writings reached even wider audiences, spreading among German-speaking socialist temperance advocates, extending into Hungarian-language anti-alcohol periodicals, and even finding their way into radical German nationalist publications.³⁸⁹ On the other hand, the prominent Viennese periodical with socialist inclinations that advocated temperance, *Der Abstinente*, featured articles not only by individuals who identified as socialists, but also by *völkisch* proponents of racial hygiene in Germany, such as Max von Gruber, Alfred Ploetz, and Richard Thurnwald.³⁹⁰ In brief, the political ideology or national affiliation of temperance activists did not hinder the dissemination of their writings within Austria-Hungary, as long as they asserted their stance in the fight against alcoholism. This occasionally led to unsettling connections and alliances. While these journals facilitated the exchange of ideas, other platforms facilitated the physical movement and interaction of eugenically oriented temperance activists across national boundaries.

The medicalization of alcohol abuse was a process that transcended national boundaries. Starting from the late nineteenth century, temperance activists, their associations, and government representatives regularly convened at international congresses against alcoholism. The first of these congresses was held in 1885. These congresses aimed to foster exchanges among scientific experts regarding the effects of alcohol on human bodies and societies, as well

³⁸⁸ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Etika i alkoholizam* [Ethics and Alcoholism], trans. Dragan Šašel, Knjižnica proti alkoholu 6. (Karlovac: Knjižara St. Jelača, 1912); Irena Gantar Godina, "Slovensko dijaštvo, alkohol, burševstvo in ženske" [Slovenian Students, Alcohol, Fraternities, and Women], *Zgodovina za vse* 15, no. 2 (2008): 37–44.

³⁸⁹ Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Ethika és alkoholizmus" [Ethics and Alcoholism], *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 1 (January 1914): 2–4; "Ethik und Alkoholismus," *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 1, no. 1 (May 27, 1906): 7–8.

³⁹⁰ Max von Gruber, "Das Schreiben Hofrats Prof. Max Gruber an die Redaktion des Abstinente über Prof. Hueppes Vortrag am österreichischen Brauertag," *Der Abstinente* 3, no. Extra-Ausgabe (June 6, 1904): 1–2; Max von Gruber, "Professor Max Gruber über Hueppes Vortrag am österreichischen Brauertag," *Der Abstinente* 3, no. 7 (July 1, 1904): 1–2; Max von Gruber, "An unsere studierende Jugend," *Der Abstinente* 7, no. 6 (June 1, 1908): 2–4; Max von Gruber, F. Grützner, and Emil Kraepelin, "Wissenschaft und Geschäft," *Der Abstinente* 7, no. 4 (April 1, 1908): 1–2; Alfred Ploetz, "Darwinismus und Rassenhygiene," *Der Abstinente* 8, no. 3 (March 1, 1909): 1–4; Richard Thurnwald, "Reiseeindrücke aus Norwegen," *Der Abstinente* 2, no. 1 (January 1, 1903): 3–4.

as to promote both individual temperance and governmental policies for regulating alcohol consumption. By 1914, fourteen such temperance congresses had been held. The congresses before the war were transnational, though notably Eurocentric, as each of them unfolded in a major European metropolis.³⁹¹

The Habsburg Empire hosted two of these congresses in the early 1900s: one in 1901 in Vienna and another in 1905 in Budapest. Among the international attendees were prominent temperance activists of the era who also supported eugenics. For example, the keynote lecture at the congress in Vienna was delivered by Auguste Forel, a Swiss psychiatrist and prominent figure in the eugenics movement.³⁹² His lecture, titled “The Alcohol Question as a Problem of Culture and Race,” was indicative of the link that had been forged between temperance activism and eugenics.³⁹³ In effect, these conferences allowed emerging temperance activists from the Habsburg Empire to become more deeply integrated into transnational networks for both temperance and eugenics.

German-speaking temperance activists from Austria had a substantial presence at the 1901 congress. Notable speakers included Viennese physicians such as Max Kassowitz, Anton Weichselbaum, and Rudolf Wlassak, as well as the psychiatrist Julius Wagner-Jauregg. Nonetheless, it is important to note that there were also numerous attendees from Bohemia, Carniola, Galicia, and Hungary among the nearly 1,100 participants at the congress. The Polish-speaking reformist Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska, the Slovene-speaking psychiatrist Ivan Robida,

³⁹¹ George Snow, “International Congresses on Alcoholism,” in *Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History: An International Encyclopedia*, ed. Jack Blocker, David Fahey, and Ian Tyrrell (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 318–19.

³⁹² Francesco Spöring, “Du musst Apostel der Wahrheit werden: Auguste Forel und der sozialhygienische Antialkoholdiskurs, 1886–1931,” in *Biopolitik und Sittlichkeitsreform: Kampagnen gegen Alkohol, Drogen und Prostitution 1880–1950*, ed. Judith Grosse, Francesco Spöring, and Jana Tschurennev (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2014), 111–44.

³⁹³ The keynote address at the Budapest conference was delivered by Max von Gruber, a prominent proponent of race hygiene. Rudolf Wlassak, ed. *Bericht über den VIII. Internationalen Congress gegen den Alkoholismus abgehalten in Wien, 9.-14. April 1901* (Leipzig: Deuticke, 1902); Fülöp Stein, *Dixième Congrès international contre l'alcoolisme, tenu à Budapest du 11 au 16 septembre 1905* (Budapest: Frédéric Kilián successeur, 1906).

and the nationalist Czech physical anthropologist Jindřich Matiegka were among the presenters.³⁹⁴ (The sociologist Masaryk also had a response to contribute to the discussion.) Conversely, at the 1905 congress in Budapest, there were numerous participants and several speakers from imperial Austria, including Daszyńska-Golińska, Holitscher, Kassowitz and Wlassak. Indeed, in addition to enhancing the international networks of temperance activists, these congresses also significantly facilitated exchanges among activists within the Habsburg Empire, even across national boundaries.

The robustness of the anti-alcohol movement and its substantial grassroots support enabled these activists to orchestrate a multitude of events at both the provincial and local levels before World War I. Interestingly, some of these gatherings brought together an unexpectedly wide array of participants. An illustration of this is a temperance exhibition that was inaugurated in Zagreb in 1914. Alongside local eugenically oriented temperance advocates such as the physicians Fran Gundrum and Andrija Štampar, as well as the jurist Josip Šilović, anti-alcohol activists from Ljubljana and Belgrade also participated in the event. Notably, the leader of a Slovene-speaking temperance association, *Sveta Vojska*, the priest Janez Evangelist Kalan, delivered a speech at the event, as did the leader of the anti-alcohol association *Trezvenost* (Sobriety) in Serbia, the Vienna-educated physician Miloš Đ. Popović. In addition to these choices that reflected the Yugoslav orientation of the organizers, there were also invited participants who represented the imperial framework in which the event was taking place. As a result, the educator Gyula Szalkay, a representative of the Hungarian *Alkoholelleses Egyesületek Országos Ligája* (Statewide League of Temperance Associations), delivered a lecture at the opening ceremony. The organizers also arranged German-language guided tours of the exhibition for members of the Austrian military stationed in the region, as well as for the

³⁹⁴ Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska, “Alkoholismus und soziale Verhältnisse in einigen galizischen Bezirken: Vortrag gehalten am VIII. internationalen Kongresse gegen den Alkoholismus in Wien,” *Internationale Monatsschrift zur Bekämpfung der Trinksitten* 11, no. 4–5 (April 1901): 110–26.

local German-speaking association of trade clerks. The German-language *Agramer Tagblatt* (Zagreb Daily) frequently covered the exhibition in its reports.³⁹⁵ This case demonstrates how local temperance initiatives could selectively transcend national and linguistic boundaries within a province and beyond.

The event brought together an unlikely mix of attendees, including Catholics and progressives, priests and medical doctors, as well as Hungarian- and German-speakers alongside South Slav nationalists. While the attendees recognized these divergent backgrounds, they simultaneously asserted their overarching indifference to such distinctions. One of the speakers, namely the priest Kalan, succinctly articulated this sentiment in his speech:

Although we may hold different principles in various areas, as teetotalers, we are permitted to have only one goal in sight. Even if we are associated with different organizations, we still act together. [...] Throughout Austria, for example, we have a large number of diverse temperance associations: Catholic, socialist, German, Slovenian, and so on. Nevertheless, during our anti-alcohol congress, we formed a collective alliance of all these organizations. A doctor may combat alcoholism from a medical standpoint, a priest might address it in his capacity as a minister, but both will have a common goal before them. [...] Our movement in Slovenia is Catholic, or if you prefer, clerical; while in your case, a liberal movement predominates. As a teetotaler, it's all the same to me.³⁹⁶

Listing the differences that he asserted the temperance movement treated with indifference, the speaker casually mentioned political, vocational, and even national identifications. The fact that he did so without much reflection or justification was revealing, underscoring a consensus that had solidified by 1914 regarding the concept of “alcoholism” as an object that transcended numerous boundaries.

The significance of the recurring Austrian congress of temperance activists, emphasized by Kalan, cannot be overstated. Its inception can be traced back to 1904 when leading

³⁹⁵ “Protualkoholna izložba u Zagrebu” [Anti-Alcohol Exhibition in Zagreb], *Novi život* 2, no. 5 (May 1914): 72–75.

³⁹⁶ “Protualkoholna izložba,” 72–75.

temperance associations in imperial Austria agreed to create a common coordinating office known as the *Zentralgeschäftsstelle österreichischer Alkoholgegner-Vereine* (Central Office of Austrian Anti-Alcohol Associations). Subsequently, in 1907, they began preparations for a temperance congress, which convened the following year. In this initiative, Kalan, a Slovene-speaker, played a pivotal role, alongside the liberal Viennese lawyer Adolf Daum, the socialist physician Holitscher from Bohemia, and the nationalist-leaning Viennese neurologist Rudolf Wlassak.³⁹⁷ It is important to note that women were actively involved in the organization, with Julie Kassowitz and Alice Masaryková serving on the preparatory committee, and Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska and Marianne Hainisch among the signatories of the invitation.³⁹⁸ Four such congresses were convened between 1908 and 1914, in Vienna, Graz, Salzburg, and Brünn/Brno, respectively.³⁹⁹ Although many of the initiators of the event were German speakers and the congresses took place mostly in Austrian provinces, their scope was imperial.

The imperial nature of the congresses revealed itself most clearly from the national identifications of the speakers and participants. A Polish participant at the first of these congresses, the physician Filip Eisenberg from Krakow, perceptively observed that the concerns about alcoholism

managed to unite individuals from diverse nationalities, various social classes, and disparate political factions. Besides the Czechs, one could observe Bohemian Germans, and Poles, as well as priests, clericals from Tyrol, German and Czech radical nationalists, along with Viennese socialists.⁴⁰⁰

³⁹⁷ Adolf Daum, *Bericht über den 1. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Wien, 12.-14. Oktober 1908* (Leipzig: Deuticke, 1909), I.

³⁹⁸ Daum, *Bericht über den 1. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag*, IX-XI.

³⁹⁹ See also Friedrich I. Neumann, *Bericht über den 2. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Graz am 8. und 9. Oktober 1911* (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1912); Friedrich I. Neumann, ed., *Bericht über den 3. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Salzburg am 22. und 23. September 1912*. Beiheft der Wochenschrift *Das österreichische Sanitätswesen* 41/1914 (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1914); “Vierter österreichischer Alkoholgegnertag,” 4.

⁴⁰⁰ Filip Eisenberg, “Wrażenia z I. austriackiego Zjazdu przeciwalkoholowego we Wiedniu d. 12-14 października 1908 r.” [Impressions from the 1st Austrian Anti-Alcohol Congress in Vienna on October 12-14, 1908], *Wyzwolenie* 3, no. 9–11 (November 1908): 1–4.

The subsequent three Austrian congresses of temperance activists enhanced, rather than diminished, this multinational character. In fact, as the introduction to this chapter already highlighted, the final of these congresses that took place in 1914 was not only multinational but also multilingual.⁴⁰¹ In a revealing detail, the participants requested the keynote lecture by the sociologist Foustka to be delivered successively in two languages.⁴⁰²

Although many, if not most, participants and organizers of the Austrian temperance conferences expressed support for eugenics, the official communications of the congresses were opaque, blurring the line between medical and moral arguments. This vagueness enabled the conferences to garner broad support from a medley of imperial Austria's politicians, scientists, civil society representatives, and religious figures, some of whom might not have fully grasped the racial undertones of the events. Apart from Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska and Marianne Hainisch, for example, the official invitation to the first congress included the signatures of figures as distinct as the Czech national liberal politician Karel Adámek, the legal scholar Eugen Ehrlich from the University of Czernowitz, the Romanian-speaking socialist politician from Bukovina Gheorghe Grigorovici, the German-nationalist politician Paul Hock, the Czech-speaking Moravian socialist politician Josef Hybeš, the bishop of Ljubljana Anton Jeglič, the Viennese pediatrician Max Kassowitz, the Catholic Slovene politician Janez Krek, the sociologist Tomáš Masaryk, the psychiatrist Alexander Pilcz, the entrepreneur and liberal politician Emanuel Proskowetz, the physician Gustav Rösler of the *völkisch* Neudeutscher Kulturbund, the Viennese bacteriologists Arthur Schattenfroh and Anton Weichselbaum, as well as the Galician agrarian politicians Jan Stapiński and Wojciech Wiącek.⁴⁰³ Representatives from various Austrian ministries attended the conferences in their official capacities, as did

⁴⁰¹ "IV. austrijski protualkoholni," 109–10.

⁴⁰² Břetislav Foustka, "O významu alkoholu pro život národa" [On the Significance of Alcohol for the Life of the Nation], *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 6, no. 13 (1914): 79–80.

⁴⁰³ Daum, *Bericht über den 1. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag*, IX–X.

numerous provincial and municipal administrators.⁴⁰⁴ The war brought these congresses to a halt. However, they resumed after 1918. The sixth and seventh congresses took place in Vienna in 1923 and 1931, respectively, although they were scaled down to the territory of interwar Austria and received less public coverage.⁴⁰⁵

While the divides among various emerging national temperance associations were deeper in royal Hungary, local temperance activists in the region showed keen interest in the conferences happening in imperial Austria. Especially noteworthy to the Hungarian-speaking temperance activists was the participation of their counterparts from Croatia and Slavonia in these imperial Austrian events. They observed with some concern that “the place for our Croatian brothers would be more suitable within our own camp.”⁴⁰⁶ Such concerns may be one reason why similar efforts to integrate temperance activists across various regions and political affiliations also took place in royal Hungary shortly before World War I. In effect, a country-wide temperance congress was planned for 1914, to be organized by an equally newly established umbrella association, the *Alkoholellesenes Egyesületek Országos Ligája* (Statewide League of Temperance Associations), led by a physician and prominent anti-alcohol activist Imre Dóczy.⁴⁰⁷

The upcoming congress was intended to address five major themes, with a strong emphasis on the potential collaboration of anti-alcohol activists with the local and state administration. In addition to discussing the public administration of municipalities and efforts

⁴⁰⁴ Additionally, on a more symbolic level, several high-ranking figures agreed to preside over the conferences. The first conference was presided over by the interior minister Richard von Bienerth, the second by the *Statthalter* of Styria, and the third by the *Landespräsident* of Salzburg.

⁴⁰⁵ “Der sechste österreichische Alkoholgegnertag,” *Die Südmarch: Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken* 4, no. 7 (July 1923): 329–30; Ernst Krasney, “7. österreichischer Alkoholgegnertag vom 21. bis 23. November 1931 in Wien,” *Aufwärts: Blätter für alkoholfreie Lebensgestaltung* 6, no. 1 (January 1932): 1–2.

⁴⁰⁶ “Az osztrák,” 77–78.

⁴⁰⁷ Imre Dóczy, “A magyar alkoholellesenes mozgalom” [The Hungarian Anti-Alcohol Movement], *Félegyházi Közlöny* 13, no. 19 (May 10, 1914): 4.

against alcoholism, as well as the state's role in addressing alcohol-related issues, the congress was also expected to explore subjects including the influence of families and schools in promoting abstinence, the involvement of organized industrial workers in the process, and providing support for individuals struggling with alcohol dependency.⁴⁰⁸ Crucially, neither the Statewide League nor the congress was intended exclusively for the Hungarian-speaking temperance activists, even though they were numerically most strongly represented in them.⁴⁰⁹

Both initiatives aimed to gather temperance activists from various associations in royal Hungary. Notably, representatives of the Transylvanian Saxon *Alkohol-Enthaltsamkeitsverein* in Mediasch/Medgyes/Mediaș played a significant role in the Statewide League and were included in the preparatory committee of the congress. Emil Neugeboren, a journalist from Hermannstadt/Nagyszeben/Sibiu, served as one of the vice presidents of the committee, and the nationalist physician Heinrich Siegmund and teacher Wilhelm Morres were among its members.⁴¹⁰ Additionally, the Croatian-language anti-alcohol journal *Novi Život*, edited by Andrija Štampar, covered the upcoming event in detail, though it did not confirm if it would send a delegate.⁴¹¹ However, with the outbreak of the war, Hungarian newspapers reported that the congress, initially scheduled for October with several thousand expected participants, had been “postponed.”⁴¹² Thus, the attempt to organize a countrywide anti-alcoholic congress in royal Hungary shortly before World War I was ultimately thwarted by the war itself.

Lastly, these temperance associations informed by eugenics endeavored to exert influence on Austrian legislation even before 1914. Remarkably, these efforts to lobby the

⁴⁰⁸ “Alkoholelles Egyesületek Országos Ligája” [Statewide League of Temperance Associations], *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 5 (May 1914): 53–55.

⁴⁰⁹ “Országos alkoholelles értekezlet” [Statewide Anti-Alcohol Congress], *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 1 (January 1914): 9.

⁴¹⁰ “Landeskongress der Alkoholgegner,” *Kirchliche Blätter aus der ev. Landeskirche A.B.* 6, no. 17 (April 25, 1914): 198.

⁴¹¹ “Iz Ugarske” [From Hungary], *Novi život* 2, no. 6 (June 1914): 94–95.

⁴¹² “Elhalasztott kongresszusok” [Postponed Congresses], *Magyarország* 21, no. 185 (August 1, 1914): 2.

Austrian central government against alcohol were also a result of collaboration and coordination across national boundaries. For example, a 1907 petition to the Austrian parliament calling for a partial ban on alcohol consumption was signed by several temperance associations from various parts of imperial Austria, including the *Družba treznosti* in Ljubljana, *Verein der Abstinenter* in Graz, *Zemský spolek proti alkoholismu v Čechách* in Prague, *Zemský spolek proti alkoholismu na Moravě* in Brno, *Verein der Abstinenter* in Brünn, *Eleuterya* in Krakow, as well as several Vienna-based associations representing various political currents and social groups. The latter included a women's temperance association and a group of abstinent Catholic priests.⁴¹³ Although these efforts to translate temperance concepts into legal measures were unsuccessful, they nonetheless showcased the pivotal role that the concept of alcoholism played in Austria-Hungary after 1900. It served as a boundary object that facilitated interactions and fostered unlikely collaboration among diverse national, political, and professional communities that were aligned with the principles of eugenics. However, the use of such a boundary object at the same time indicates that the networks of eugenics supporters described earlier were demarcated by established yet permeable boundaries.

Conclusion

Eugenic knowledge circulated within the Habsburg Empire, easily crossing its cultural divides. At the same time, eugenics served as a tool of cognitive management of imperial diversity. While substantiating these key arguments, this paper also demonstrates that there were several conflicting ways in which eugenicists related to their imperial situation. Some eugenicists located in the largest urban centers attempted to employ eugenic knowledge to

⁴¹³ “Petition der Vereine: Družba treznosti, Abstinenter in Laibach, Verein der Abstinenter in Graz, Zemský spolek proti alkoholismu v Čechách, Zemský spolek proti alkoholismu na Moravě, Verein der Abstinenter in Brünn, Eleuterya, katholisches Kreuzbündnis gegen Alkoholismus, der österreichische Verein gegen Trunksucht, Erste österreichische Gesellschaft gegen die Trinksitten, Eisenbahn-Alkoholgegnerverband, Verein abstinenten Frauen um gesetzliche Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung der Trunksucht,” in *Anhang zu den stenographischen Protokollen des Hauses der Abgeordneten des österreichischen Reichsrates* (Vienna: Staatsdruckerei, 1907), 3204–6.

envision and legitimize the empire as an environment that fosters unity in diversity. Others, primarily professionals involved in provincial administrative and educational bodies, sought to use eugenics as a means of assigning nationality to individuals and ultimately segregating them. Finally, some nationalist activists on the language frontiers of the empire envisaged extreme forms of eugenics as an instrument for suppressing national indifference and brutally disentangling the mixed rural populations. The differences between various national cultures thus mattered less for these eugenic blueprints than the function that this knowledge was envisaged to serve.

This chapter has emphasized four significant scientific networks that embraced eugenics in Austria-Hungary before World War I. These networks set themselves apart by formalizing their involvement with eugenics, even on an empire-wide scale. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that there were numerous other social contexts where eugenic ideas thrived, and various other networks engaged with these ideas during that period. Therefore, the chapter cannot claim to have presented a comprehensive overview of eugenics in the late Habsburg context.

If this chapter aimed for such comprehensiveness, it would need to delve into the diverse forms and levels of engagement with eugenics among various groups. It would need to retrace the footsteps of criminologists, psychiatrists (considering, for example, debates about the legal concept of diminished responsibility or the roles of psychiatrists as legal expert witnesses in Austria-Hungary's courts), racial anthropologists, and statisticians throughout society.⁴¹⁴ Furthermore, it would have to reconstruct the discussions of the various activists of the *Lebensreform* movement (beyond their focus on temperance) and even explore the fringe

⁴¹⁴ Sophie Ledebur, "Die österreichische Irrenrechts- und Strafrechtsreformbewegung und die Anfänge eines eugenischen Diskurses in der Psychiatrie um 1900," in *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900-1945*, ed. Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer, and Thomas Mayer (Vienna: Czernin, 2007), 208–35.

figures of occultist ultranationalism, such as Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels. Instead, this chapter has limited itself to presenting an overarching argument with the hope that it may inspire further research in a similar vein.

Despite the presence of numerous networks in Austria-Hungary that actively engaged with eugenics, each pursuing its own specific agenda, their influence on politics and policy was rather constrained. Significantly, even though proponents of eugenics considered the enactment of legislation to promote eugenic goals a top priority, no such legislation had been adopted before World War I. What is more, the prospect of eugenic legislation did not even receive serious consideration within the legislative bodies.

Similarly significant was the hesitant approach of the influential imperial administration. As Peter Becker highlights, Habsburg imperial bureaucrats nurtured a self-image of impartiality that enabled them to govern an ethnically and culturally diverse empire. However, they did not place a premium on scientific expertise. In contrast to their British imperial counterparts, putting their faith in the seeming objectivity and neutrality of science, the Habsburg administrators associated the concept of impartiality primarily with legal knowledge. Despite acknowledging the practical benefits of more technical manifestations of expertise, they were cautious about delegating administrative decisions to its producers.⁴¹⁵ If most supporters of eugenics in Austria-Hungary expected that the new quality of statehood would create opportunities for their interventions, these expectations did not materialize before World War I.

Of course, this does not imply that there were no imperial bureaucrats, including influential ones, who personally endorsed eugenics, either symbolically or in practice. It also does not suggest that no member of one of the several eugenic societies in Austria-Hungary

⁴¹⁵ Becker, "The Administrative Apparatus," 254.

was integrated into the administrative apparatus. However, as a collective, the pre-1914 administration displayed limited interest in eugenics and its recommendations. A complaint, publicly voiced in 1914 by German nationalist supporters of eugenics at the *Beratungsstelle für Volkswohlfahrt*, is telling in this regard. Highlighting the support which they observed their counterparts receiving in imperial Germany, they admitted with a certain amount of resignation that “given the peculiar character of Austria as a multi-national state, the state cannot, of course, be relied on even when it actively pursues social policy [...]”⁴¹⁶ Thus, eugenics failed to exert a substantial influence on public policies in late imperial Austria-Hungary.

Ultimately, the only notable context where eugenic ideas began to influence social practices in Austria-Hungary before 1914 was not tied to the imperial state. Instead, the impact of eugenic concepts was most perceptible within specific voluntary associations. These associations, influenced by proponents of eugenics who were closely associated with them, not only deliberated on eugenic ideas but also experimented with implementing them. Certain organizations with mass membership, including those engaged in nationalist frontier activism, mass gymnastics, popular educational initiatives, and temperance advocacy, emerged as the most significant settings where Habsburg subjects could encounter eugenics both in theory and in practice before 1914.

World War I brought about a significant shift in this context. As numerous crisis phenomena became increasingly evident during the ongoing war, both voluntary associations involved in various forms of wartime relief and the public administration started to incorporate eugenics and its advocates. The military authorities also explored various instrumental and performative applications of eugenic knowledge during the conflict. The chapter that follows

⁴¹⁶ “Gründung einer deutschösterreichischen Beratungsstelle,” 10.

delves into this expanding entanglement between eugenics, voluntary associations, and the imperial state in the course of the cataclysmic war.

BATTLEFRONT VS. HOME FRONT: EUGENICS AND AN EMPIRE AT WAR, 1914-1918

A heated debate took place within the Society of Medical Doctors in Vienna in March 1916. During the debate, several prominent physicians discussed the impact of the war on the population of the Habsburg Empire. The main speakers included not only medical doctors from the Austrian half of the empire but also a Hungarian pediatrician, Sándor Szana. The discussion was interdisciplinary, moreover, and physicians focusing on various fields took part in it, including anatomists, psychiatrists, and dermatologists, among others. Importantly, eugenics provided the underlying framework for the entire discussion.

Every main speaker invoked racial anxieties about the “quantity” and “quality” of the population. Their proposed responses to these imagined challenges were symptomatic of a radically expanding sense of what was possible within Austria-Hungary. While the main speakers enthusiastically subscribed to eugenics and anticipated that state institutions would now be willing to support and carry out their eugenic demands, their opinions about the means and goals of such eugenically inflected biopolitics diverged significantly.⁴¹⁷ Two different biopolitical projects, answering the question of how to maintain and reconstruct the empire, clashed on this occasion.

On the one hand, a nationalist psychiatrist Erwin Stransky promoted a biopolitical blueprint for an authoritarian, militarized, and male-dominated society. The psychiatrist was

⁴¹⁷ The discussion received extensive coverage in contemporary media and is analyzed in most accounts that deal with eugenics in Austria and beyond. While interpretations vary significantly, most scholars assume that the event must be interpreted within a national context. However, this chapter argues that the event should be placed within its Austro-Hungarian imperial location and sets out to critically reconstruct this context. Baader, “Eugenische Programme,” 113-117; Byer, *Rassenhygiene*, 68-101; Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 176-177; Karl Sablik, *Julius Tandler: Mediziner und Sozialreformer: eine Biographie* (Vienna: Schendl, 1983), 113-130; Peter Schwarz, *Julius Tandler: zwischen Humanismus und Eugenik* (Vienna: Steinbauer, 2017), passim.

notably taken aback by what he perceived as a moral decline within the empire. Framing this moral notion in a biological language of degeneracy, Stransky lamented the supposed shift in the ratio between the “mentally normal and mentally abnormal segments of the population,” and the resulting “dense crowd of the psychopathically inferior” that allegedly increasingly plagued the empire.⁴¹⁸ As a solution, the psychiatrist suggested to purify the empire by drafting these individuals into the military. Dispatched to the battlefield, they would be deployed to perform “the most dangerous activities” under the custody of the “summarily draconic procedures of military courts.”⁴¹⁹ Conjuring up an image of mentally disabled people deported to the front and potentially sentenced to death, Stransky exclaimed: “The battlefield may not turn out to be such a bad open-air clinic!”⁴²⁰

Seeking to persuade his audience of the ethical justification of this policy, Stransky went so far as to claim that the Entente mobilized “not only white people but also the Apaches of all skin colors and their unrestrained instincts,” echoing a racist trope from the Central Powers’ propaganda, which exploited the deployment of colonial soldiers by the Entente powers.⁴²¹ Stransky also showed much discomfort with what he called “feminist deviations [feministische Ausartungen].”⁴²² To counter such manifestations of “extreme individualism,” Stransky suggested introducing compulsory military training and control of young women, replacing the liberal aspirations of individualism and education.⁴²³ Ultimately, his suggestions were directed towards subjecting the entire society to a biopolitical regime enforced by the military.

⁴¹⁸ Erwin Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung: Erweiterte Diskussionsbemerkungen zum gleichnamigen Vortrage des Herrn Prof. Dr. J. Tandler,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 29, no. 18 (May 4, 1916): 556.

⁴¹⁹ Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 556.

⁴²⁰ Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 556.

⁴²¹ Christian Koller, “Nationalism and Racism in Franco-German Controversies about Colonial Soldiers,” in *Nations, Identities and the First World War. Shifting Loyalties to the Fatherland*, ed. Nico Wouters and Laurence van Ypersele (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 213–32; Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 556.

⁴²² Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 558.

⁴²³ Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 558.

The second main speaker, Julius Tandler, an anatomist and advocate of public health with eugenic undertones, embraced a different biopolitical blueprint, even though his suggestions, too, were more far-reaching than before the war. While he shared the eugenic anxieties about “the quantitative and qualitative damage of the body of the population,” Tandler questioned “all the noise about our population becoming physically degenerate.”⁴²⁴ The practical measures he proposed as wartime relief, such as reducing child and adult mortality rates, largely boiled down to various forms of welfare provision and public health measures. “If the attempts to compensate for quantitative damage often straddle the border between biological and social measures,” the anatomist claimed, “then the compensation for qualitative damage is even more clearly of a social nature.”⁴²⁵ Tandler’s proposed strategy, moreover, tended to target the natural and social environment, rather than intervene into individual bodies. Instead of the military, finally, it was the voluntary associations and the state, more precisely the civil administration, that Tandler assumed would embrace the main part of eugenic agendas. Stransky’s and Tandler’s arguments in the debate encapsulate two biopolitical projects in Austria-Hungary that collided during the war.

Departing from the narratives of nationalist conflict that precipitated the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, John Deak and Jonathan Gumz propose that it is more appropriate to perceive an internal struggle within the Habsburg state as the primary catalyst for its downfall. In their argument, the war initiated a struggle “between civilian authorities and the military over the management of the Habsburg state and the relationship of the state to its citizens.”⁴²⁶ In the

⁴²⁴ Julius Tandler, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 29, no. 15 (April 13, 1916): 446.

⁴²⁵ Tandler, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 446 and 451.

⁴²⁶ John Deak and Jonathan E. Gumz, “How to Break a State: The Habsburg Monarchy’s Internal War, 1914–1918,” *The American Historical Review* 122, no. 4 (October 2017): 1122.

course of this struggle, the military unleashed an “expanding state of emergency” and tried “usurping the imperial administration’s power” in the process.⁴²⁷

Rudolf Kučera, furthermore, demonstrates that the imperial state vastly expanded its functions during the war. In order to manage these expanded state functions in a moment of crisis, both military and civilian actors in wartime Austria-Hungary adopted scientific expertise and the language of objectivity it provided them. In effect, discourses of agrarian economics, nutrition science, and Taylorist scientific management, among others, began to significantly shape the everyday experience of ordinary people.⁴²⁸ In this chapter, I bring these arguments together and show that the embrace of expert knowledge was closely related to the struggle within and for the Habsburg state. Consequently, I highlight that eugenics was one of the biopolitical discourses that gained prominence within Austria-Hungary during the wartime period.

World War I reconfigured the relationship between the Habsburg imperial state and expert knowledge. Such embrace of scientific knowledge by the state was a major shift for experts in general, and for eugenicists in particular. Already before the war, eugenicists were searching for strategies that would make their suggestions relevant to various public actors. Yet, as I argued in the previous chapter, these attempts were mostly unsuccessful, and eugenicists failed to significantly influence either public policy or the daily practice of voluntary associations. After the outbreak of the war, however, the military, the voluntary associations, and the public administration all eventually embraced eugenics, albeit for different goals.

⁴²⁷ Deak and Gumz, “How to Break,” 1123.

⁴²⁸ Rudolf Kučera, *Rationed Life: Science, Everyday Life, and Working-Class Politics in the Bohemian Lands, 1914-1918* (Oxford: Berghahn, 2016).

The military set out to “remake the empire along the lines of an apolitical, unified, hierarchic, and disciplined past.”⁴²⁹ Its gradual and piecemeal embrace of eugenics, then, was a reaction to challenges posed by the army’s increased influence on the running of the Habsburg state. By assuming some of the agendas previously managed by civilian bureaucrats, particularly near the battlefield and in the other areas of Austria-Hungary that the military administered, the military was overwhelmed by the complexity of Habsburg society and lacked the experience and conceptual tools to make it legible, to use a term coined by James C. Scott.⁴³⁰ Reducing this complexity to simple biological categories, eugenic expertise appeared as a tool that allowed the military to make the Habsburg population legible and identify those individuals and groups whom they viewed as “disloyal elements” or “internal enemies.”

In turn, voluntary associations and, over time, even the public administration, expanded their influence over various forms of welfare provision, ranging from food distribution to child support. They attempted to “ameliorate its peoples’ intense and dramatic suffering” and thus to save their “popular legitimacy.”⁴³¹ Consequently, they sought various forms of biopolitical expertise enabling them to grapple with these new agendas. Eugenically oriented medical doctors and sociologists thus turned into producers of expertise that gained substantial and direct influence on relief practices and welfare policies.

If Pieter Judson argues that “many groups in society quickly recognized that war offered them opportunities to reshape empire according to their particular visions,” one can add that the promoters of eugenics counted among these groups.⁴³² Yet, as the clash between Stransky and Tandler highlights, eugenics in the wartime Habsburg Empire was not a monolithic body of

⁴²⁹ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 385.

⁴³⁰ James C. Scott, *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 2.

⁴³¹ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 387.

⁴³² Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 385.

knowledge. Instead, I argue in this chapter that two distinct types of eugenics coalesced during World War I that pursued radically different epistemic and political agendas and became embedded in different institutions and networks.

During the war, the military and the civil administration opted for different forms of eugenics. On the one hand, the military drew on a form of biopolitics that can be described as “exclusive and exclusionary toward all [...] human and environmental alterities.”⁴³³ The military used what one may call “battlefront biopolitics” to monitor, control, order, and discipline the bodies of soldiers, prisoners of war [POWs], and civilians, particularly women. Images of contamination were mobilized within the military medical networks not only to highlight real health risks, but also as metaphors for the various imagined internal elements that allegedly undermined the empire’s war effort from within. Even though the Austro-Hungarian military otherwise remained mistrustful of actors whom they suspected of fueling national tensions, many radical nationalist eugenicists joined the ranks of the producers of this biopolitical expertise.

On the other hand, the voluntary associations and the civil administration drew on a “home front biopolitics” that was less concerned with the tropes of internal enemies and contagion, and more with alleviating the suffering of the civilian population. They aimed at maintaining their lives “through systematic modifications of the environment,” rather than acting “directly on the body’s capabilities.”⁴³⁴ As we will see, the experts associated with the voluntary associations and the civil administration recruited chiefly from the circles of civic radical and socialist eugenicists. Consequently, their prewar concepts of “human economy” and “organic capital” became a central element of the home front biopolitics. This chapter

⁴³³ Esposito, “Community, Immunity, Biopolitics,” 86.

⁴³⁴ Ben Anderson, “Affect and Biopower: Towards a Politics of Life,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (2012): 39. Cited in Jamie Lorimer, “Probiotic Environmentalities: Rewilding with Wolves and Worms,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 34, no. 4 (July 2017): 35.

contextualizes the emergence and subsequent trajectories of both these manifestations of biopolitics within the wartime Habsburg Empire.

Battlefront Biopolitics: Bacteria and Internal Enemies

After the Habsburg Empire entered the World War I, a new form of biopolitics gradually emerged within the military medical networks spanning the battlefronts where Austrian-Hungarian armies fought, and beyond. The relationship between the military and the civilians in the late Habsburg Empire, as John Deak and Jonathan Gumz observe, was distinguished by an “increasingly hostile set of oppositions between the army, the state administration, and broad swaths of the political classes.”⁴³⁵ Viewing the complex negotiations between various civilian actors within the empire as “an existential threat to the empire from within,” after 1914 the military sought not only to emerge victorious from the war, but at the same time, to fundamentally transform Austria-Hungary’s state and society from above.⁴³⁶

The military encountered a significant problem, however. Unlike its rivals, the civilian administrators, the military lacked any significant experience with administering a complex, modernizing society which, moreover, was in upheaval both at the battlefront and in the other areas to which the military eventually extended its power.⁴³⁷ In other words, the society was a black box for the military, and the military sought to “arrange the population in ways that simplified the classic state functions,” or, in brief, make it legible.⁴³⁸

I argue that medicine increasingly equipped the military with the necessary epistemic toolkit and social practices, promising to facilitate the management of society. This process was incremental and bottom-up, as medical knowledge became salient through the handling of

⁴³⁵ Deak and Gumz, “How to Break,” 1111.

⁴³⁶ Deak and Gumz, “How to Break,” 1118.

⁴³⁷ John Deak, “The Great War and the Forgotten Realm: The Habsburg Monarchy and the First World War,” *The Journal of Modern History* 86, no. 2 (June 2014): 336–80.

⁴³⁸ Scott, *Seeing like a State*, 2.

specific tasks. Notably, the management of epidemics like typhus and sexually transmitted infections [STIs] served as an initial gateway through which medicine, including eugenics, began to permeate the military's practices during the war. Consequently, the military's quest to make the society legible gradually gained a radical biopolitical inflection. The Eastern Front, specifically, acted as a laboratory for these concepts and practices, although their application was not restricted solely to this context. A "battlefront biopolitics" thus emerged that fused the concepts and practices provided by medicine, and the disciplines of bacteriology and genetics in particular, with the Habsburg military's fear of internal enemies.

Facing setbacks at the battlefield, and facing difficulties and resistance while pursuing its authoritarian, technocratic quest to restructure Austria-Hungary along conservative lines, the military opted to conjure up specters of internal enemies, blame their alleged machinations for its failures, and set out to "punish [their] perceived disloyalty."⁴³⁹ Within a new biopolitical framework that came into being within Austro-Hungary's military medical networks, and at its battlefronts, bacteriology worked to identify the risks posed to the soldiers and civilians alike by various bacteria and parasitic organisms, and then to employ various hygienic practices to limit these risks.

Yet, it also racialized disease. Bacteriology promised, implicitly or even openly, to reveal to the military authorities the identity of the other, human, internal enemies who were allegedly lurking in the dark and undermining the imperial army's strength from within. These alleged internal enemies, bacteriology implied, could be made visible using the same methods that helped it observe and visualize microscopic organisms, that is, dangerous entities that would have remained obscure, or even entirely invisible, without its intervention.

⁴³⁹ Deak and Gumz, "How to Break," 1127.

At the battlefronts in Galicia and elsewhere, the discipline of bacteriology initially offered its services to the military to combat the typhus epidemic. Paul Weindling shows that by the turn of the century medical doctors and the broader public alike regarded typhus with panic, even though the illness was at the same time vanishing from the core parts of Europe.⁴⁴⁰ At about the same time, a significant shift took place within the medical discourse that undermined environmental theories of the emergence of typhus and, instead, identified a specific pathogenic microorganism as its cause, and a particular parasitic organism, the body louse, as its carrier.⁴⁴¹ After the outbreak of the war, medical doctors within the military were quick to introduce practices of louse control, including the gassing and burning of contaminated objects, as well as cleaning the bodies of contaminated people; eventually, an entire “cordon of preventive delousing stations” spanning through the battlefront came into being.⁴⁴²

Another significant problem, too, was resolved by the military medical doctors. Since the symptoms of typhus were at first difficult to distinguish from more benign illnesses, Austrian medical officers Edmund Weil and Arthur Felix successfully experimented with serological testing methods while they were deployed in Galicia.⁴⁴³ The resulting Weil-Felix agglutination reaction that used blood serum to reveal the hidden presence of typhus was quickly phased in by the military on a large scale.⁴⁴⁴ (Interestingly, the civilian authorities in Austria were more hesitant and did not issue a general recommendation for this procedure before November 1918.)⁴⁴⁵ Medical doctors within the military networks thus developed,

⁴⁴⁰ Paul J. Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 10.

⁴⁴¹ Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide*, 14.

⁴⁴² Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide*, 140.

⁴⁴³ Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide*, 12; Edmund Weil and Arthur Felix, “Serologische Fleckfieberdiagnose,” *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 5 (February 5, 1916): 1–2.

⁴⁴⁴ Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide*, 12. For Austria-Hungary’s military setting, see Austrian State Archives, Vienna, Archiv der Republik, Arbeit und Soziales, Bundesministerium für soziale Verwaltung, Volksgesundheit, Akten, Box 1588, Inv. No. 9081/1917, K.u.k. Kriegsministerium an alle Militärkommanden, December 6, 1917.

⁴⁴⁵ Austrian State Archives, Vienna, Archiv der Republik, Arbeit und Soziales, Bundesministerium für soziale Verwaltung, Volksgesundheit, Akten, Box 1588, Inv. No. 595/1918, Deutschösterreichisches Staatsamt für Volksgesundheit and alle Landesregierungen, November 27, 1918.

implemented, and perfected mechanisms that enabled them to reveal the spreaders of typhus, human and non-human, as hidden as they may have been.

As Paul Wendling argued in his classical book, the individuals that became the frequent targets of typhus prevention and control were not chosen based on purely medical grounds. Instead, what made these individuals stand out in the eyes of military physicians and authorities was “the medical stigma surrounding ethnic undesirables.”⁴⁴⁶ If the body louse had been identified as the carrier of the microscopic organism leading to typhus by 1914, Weindling notes tersely that the bacteriologists:

extended their expertise to the human hosts of insects, and classified supposedly surplus people, notably migrants, pedlars, Jews, and Gypsies, as human parasites menacing national hygiene.⁴⁴⁷

In the warring Central Powers, consequently, epidemics control at the battlefield had a racialized dynamic, and the Jews as well as the Roma, were targeted as the alleged carriers of epidemic disease, and subjected to mobility controls.

Even though the Habsburg military abhorred and repudiated nationalism, therefore, the language and practices of the military doctors started to elide the differences between the humans and the non-human vectors of the disease. Such parallels were not uncommon in the *völkisch* nationalist discourse already before the war, both in German Empire and in Austria-Hungary.⁴⁴⁸ The Habsburg military’s embrace of bacteriological expertise to render the society legible, therefore, had a grave unintended consequence, as the language and practices of some

⁴⁴⁶ Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide*, 9.

⁴⁴⁷ Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide*, 7.

⁴⁴⁸ Cited in Christoph Gradmann, “Invisible Enemies: Bacteriology and the Language of Politics in Imperial Germany,” *Science in Context* 13, no. 1 (2000): 24; Gradmann’s and Weindling’s arguments were recently restated by Jan Rybak, “Racialization of Disease: The Typhus-Epidemic, Antisemitism and Closed Borders in German-Occupied Poland, 1915–1918,” *European History Quarterly* 52, no. 3 (July 2022): 461–84.

of its hygienists increasingly resembled those of *völkisch* nationalists, even though they did not become identical.

If the hygienic discussions and practices at the battlefield revolving around typhus singled out individuals and groups perceived as “ethnic undesirables,” the parallel discussions on STIs did so primarily based on their gender. Nancy Wingfield argues that the STIs became an object of “increasing concerns” within the military already before the war.⁴⁴⁹ For the Habsburg military, the question of STIs was primarily a question of combat readiness of its soldiers. While effective treatments for the STIs, including syphilis, had recently become available, their application was time-consuming, somewhat risky, and costly. The STIs thus still posed a danger of removing soldiers from active duty for a relatively long period of time, and such risk was further aggravated by data indicating that the incidence of the STIs among the rank and file was significantly increasing.⁴⁵⁰ After the outbreak of the war in 1914, then, the concern of the military with the STIs transformed into a veritable alarm, a shift that Wingfield finds corroborated by a “frequent appearance” of this issue in military correspondence and medical publications.”⁴⁵¹ STIs thus emerged as another area where the military concerns with concealed entities that undermined its war effort coalesced with bacteriology.

When a military medical doctor wrote in 1910 that “prostitution is the main source of infection by venereal diseases,” he merely summarized a point of nearly universal agreement

⁴⁴⁹ Nancy M. Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution in Late Imperial Austria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 13.

⁴⁵⁰ The treatment of syphilis with an innovative antimicrobial agent Arsphenamine was universally introduced by the Austro-Hungarian army in early 1911, following almost immediately after this compound, also known as Salvarsan, became commercially available for the first time. Iuliu Moldovan, “Ergebnisse der Salvarsantherapieluetischer Erkrankungen im österreichisch-ungarischen Heere,” in *Militärmedizin und ärztliche Kriegswissenschaft: Vorträge, gehalten in der Abteilung XXX “Militärsanitätswesen” auf der 85. Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte in Wien in der Zeit vom 21. bis 28. September 1913*, ed. Zdzisław Hordyński-Juchnowicz and Erhard Glaser (Vienna: Šafář, 1914), 541–44. See also Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution*, 13 and passim.

⁴⁵¹ Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution*, 214; Nancy M. Wingfield, “The Enemy Within: Regulating Prostitution and Controlling Venereal Disease in Cisleithanian Austria during the Great War,” *Central European History* 46, no. 03 (September 2013): 573.

between physicians, military authorities, and civilian administrators.⁴⁵² Throughout the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, Austria-Hungary pursued a regulationist approach to sex work, a strategy that was widespread in Europe.⁴⁵³ The authorities, in particular, sought to interrupt the transmission of the STIs by targeting sex workers, subjecting them to registration, obligatory medical checks, and imposing various constraints on their behavior. Yet, within this regime, the sex workers who avoided the registration and who were commonly labelled as “clandestine prostitutes,” were not covered by these measures, even if they faced a penalty should they be discovered. Men, finally, were not targeted by these measures at all.⁴⁵⁴

As Nancy Wingfield points out, the war brought about a twofold shift. On the one hand, men and their behavior, too, became an object of regulation, even though women remained its most frequent target. On the other hand, and more significantly for the argument that I advance here, the authorities and physicians became increasingly focused on clandestine sex workers. Wingfield throws this newly developed concern with clandestine prostitution, and the imaginary that underpinned it, into sharp relief when she writes:

In addition to the tolerated prostitutes whom they considered a major source of sexually transmitted infections, local and regional authorities and the military focused almost obsessively on the “imminent danger” that other “enemies” behind the lines and on the home front represented. These threats were the women, many young, often poor, unemployed, or hailing from low-wage, low education positions long assumed to supply clandestine prostitutes [...] Suspects also included national or racial Others: masses of women, often Jewish, who fled the hostilities on the Eastern Front, as Bukovina and Galicia repeatedly changed hands.⁴⁵⁵

⁴⁵² Iuliu Moldovan, “Zur Prophylaxe der venerischen Erkrankungen,” *Streffleurs militärische Zeitschrift* 87, no. 11 (November 1910): 1765.

⁴⁵³ Peter Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 355–78.

⁴⁵⁴ Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution*; Milena Lenderová, *Chytila patrola, aneb, Prostituce za Rakouska i republiky* [Caught by the Patrol, or Prostitution under Austria and the Republic] (Prague: Karolinum, 2002), 195–210.

⁴⁵⁵ Wingfield, “The Enemy Within,” 570–71.

As Wingfield's selection of metaphors from the sources makes clear, the logic that drove the military's search for internal enemies, and that sought to uncover the invisible or covert risks, was thus an important part motivating this shift towards the clandestine sex workers. Race and gender ultimately intersected in these medical and administrative procedures.

Women, in short, became another imaginary enemy within. An instruction sheet issued by the Austrian Ministry of War in the early months of 1915, for example, stated that according to an old saying, "the woman and the hero do not go well together. You must, therefore, become as hard as steel in the face of female enemies if you want to retain your strength!"⁴⁵⁶ The leaflet, moreover, warned the soldiers that any woman "who gives herself to you, with or without resistance, [...] is suspected of carrying venereal disease."⁴⁵⁷ Finally, the leaflet that was originally drafted by the medical advisors of the ministry, went on to warn the soldiers that contracting a STI may result "in infertility and degeneration [Entartung] of the offspring" and thus "harm the solid foundations of our people's body, our healthy flourishing race [unsere gesunde blühende Rasse] which carries the power and splendor of our fatherland and which must be preserved unchanged for the future."⁴⁵⁸

Another official leaflet commonly distributed among soldiers who contracted syphilis not only warned them against procreating but also against entering marriage without a medical attestation: "If you are not yet married, under no circumstances should you marry until your doctor has given you express permission to do so after 3-4 years of treatment."⁴⁵⁹ Both leaflets

⁴⁵⁶ "Merkblatt über Geschlechtskrankheiten: Herausgegeben vom k.u.k. Kriegsministerium," *Das Österreichische Sanitätswesen* 27, no. 31–32 (August 1915): 1567–68.

⁴⁵⁷ "Merkblatt über Geschlechtskrankheiten," 1567–68.

⁴⁵⁸ "Merkblatt über Geschlechtskrankheiten," 1567–68. Significantly, the language used in the document drafted by Austrian doctors contained notable textual overlaps with a proclamation directed to German soldiers, distributed in his private capacity (but with the permission of the Bavarian Ministry of War), by Alfred Ploetz, the leading advocate of race hygiene in Imperial Germany. Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry, Munich, Alfred Ploetz Papers, Inv. no. PL 4/10, Aufruf an die Soldaten im Ersten Weltkrieg.

⁴⁵⁹ National Széchényi Library, Budapest, Manuscript Collection, István Apáthy Papers, Quart. Hung. 2453, Inv. No. 15, Merkblatt für syphilitische Kranke [1917].

show, in other words, that eugenic knowledge started to suffuse the attempts to prevent the spread of the STIs within the military. There is little to indicate that it was an intention of the military authorities to endorse eugenics, however. Yet, an affinity of means between the military's interest in maintaining the combat readiness of its soldiers by protecting them against the "concealed sources of disease," on the one hand, and between the anti-feminism of the nationalist eugenicists, on the other hand, made such an embrace of eugenic knowledge possible.

Syphilis was an illness that was marked with "a surreptitious, protracted development and often painless symptoms," and some of the sufferers were able to dissimulate or hide the infection, if they were aware of it at all.⁴⁶⁰ Yet, even in this case the recent advances in serology – the Wasserman test for syphilis was first introduced in 1905 – allowed physicians to use one's blood to identify even those asymptomatic carriers whose illness would have otherwise remained concealed.⁴⁶¹

In some places adjacent to the front, or recently occupied by the enemy armies, consequently, the Habsburg military hygienists promoted frequent serological testing. Often arbitrary and coerced in practice, the testing targeted primarily those civilian women who trespassed gender norms.⁴⁶² Ultimately, a network of field hospitals that specialized in isolating and eventually curing those with the STIs arose after October 1915, and facilities for testing were also significantly increased.⁴⁶³ Their introduction sought to provide a similarly large-scale response to the spread of the STIs as the introduction of a network of delousing stations did for

⁴⁶⁰ Baldwin, *Contagion and the State*, 355.

⁴⁶¹ Baldwin, *Contagion and the State*, 375.

⁴⁶² See also the case study below. László Berczeller, "Theorie und Praxis der Wassermannschen Reaktion," *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 27–28 (November 10, 1917): 11–18; Iuliu Moldovan, "Die Bekämpfung der Geschlechtskrankheiten bei der Armee im Felde," *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 24 (May 6, 1917): 1–4. Both authors were a part of the network of the bakteriologisches Laboratorium des k.k. Militär-sanitätskomitee.

⁴⁶³ Wingfield, "The Enemy Within," 577.

the typhus; indeed, both of these measures were promoted and finetuned by overlapping networks of military hygienists.⁴⁶⁴ The numerous medical doctors working within the military networks thus learned by doing that, similar to typhus, it was blood that in the case of the STIs ultimately betrayed an individual's invisible nature.

The emerging battlefield biopolitics, its goals and practices, was formulated and negotiated in expert networks within the military. These networks connected medical doctors at the battlefield with experts at the military-related research institutions in the hinterland, and with military officers and administrators. Crucially, the doctors who chose a career in the Habsburg military, as well as those who were drafted during the war, had diverse specializations, and they stemmed from various groups of the multiethnic empire.⁴⁶⁵ The disciplinary and ethnic composition of their networks reflected this.

The military expert networks were interdisciplinary, and even more importantly, they incorporated medical doctors originating from most ethnic groups of the Habsburg empire, including, but not limited to, the German-, Hungarian-, Czech-, Polish-, as well as Romanian-speaking individuals; some of the doctors were Jewish. Moreover, medical doctors from imperial Germany were actively involved in these networks and thus significantly deepened their ties with their Habsburg counterparts, often gathering and exchanging knowledge on a regular basis. I argue that these expert networks were crucial for making many military medical doctors into eugenicists, or for radicalizing their previous eugenic commitments.

The trajectory of a military hygienist Iuliu Moldovan (1882-1966) captures both the interdisciplinary and multiethnic nature of these networks, as well as the eugenic ideas thriving

⁴⁶⁴ The bakteriologisches Laboratorium des k.k. Militärsanitätskomitee, led by a hygienist Robert Doerr, was particularly active in that regard.

⁴⁶⁵ Jonathan E. Gumz, *The Resurrection and Collapse of Empire in Habsburg Serbia, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

within them. Even though Moldovan was born to a Romanian-speaking family in Marosbogát/Bogata de Mureș and graduated from a German-language high school in Medgyes/Mediasch/Mediaș, both of which were in Transylvania and thus a part of royal Hungary, Moldovan went on to spend his formative years in imperial Austria.⁴⁶⁶ Indeed, he was trained at the leading medical schools in Austria and Bohemia. After five semesters at the University of Vienna, Moldovan transferred to the German Charles-Ferdinand University in Prague in 1903 and graduated from this institution in 1906.⁴⁶⁷

As Moldovan's medical training was funded to a significant extent by a military stipend, he entered the Habsburg military after graduation, and ultimately joined one of the military's key medical research facilities. At the central bacteriological laboratory (bakteriologisches Laboratorium des k.k. Militärsanitätskomitee) in Vienna, from 1908 onwards, Moldovan engaged with bacteriology, serology, and immunology.⁴⁶⁸ During the entire World War I, then, Moldovan served as a hygienist in the Habsburg military, principally in Galicia, while maintaining contact to his previous networks. He returned to Transylvania, now a part of Romania, only after the Habsburg Empire had collapsed.⁴⁶⁹ Moldovan, therefore, had a distinctly imperial biography.

In Galicia, Moldovan served as a medical officer charged with maintaining the hygiene of the troops. At the battlefield or in its close proximity, Moldovan experimented with practices

⁴⁶⁶ Marius Turda, "Iuliu Moldovan," in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 292.

⁴⁶⁷ Moldovan graduated on May 9, 1906. As a Hungarian subject, he also received an additional certificate that allowed him to practice medicine in imperial Austria. Archives of the Charles University, Prague, Register of Doctors of the German Karl-Ferdinand University, Inv. No. 3, 1904–1924, 1906, folio 39, Moldovan Julius.

⁴⁶⁸ Turda, "Iuliu Moldovan," 292.

⁴⁶⁹ Immediately after the outbreak of the war, Moldovan was deployed in Serbia. However, by early September 1914, we find Moldovan stationed in Galicia where he stayed, with a brief interruption, until the winter or spring of 1918. Afterwards, Moldovan was stationed in Ukraine, which he left only in December 1918. Austrian State Archives, Vienna, Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Neue Feldakten, Höhere Heereskommandos, Armeekommando 2. Armee, Altes Armee Etappenkommando, 1914-1915, Sanitätschef, Box 343, Inv. No. 21., Report, Sanitätsinspektion der Lagerplätze in Sambor, September 10, 1914; Iuliu Moldovan, *Amintiri și reflexiuni* [Memories and Reflections], ed. Gheorghe Brătescu and Dan Enăchescu (Bucharest: Editura Universitară Carol Davila, 1996), 33–40.

of surveillance and population control, initially with a particular emphasis on the typhus. Already before the war Moldovan started building connections with the key researchers focusing on this disease. In particular, in 1912 he spent two months at the Institute for Tropical Medicine in Hamburg, an institution producing colonial medical knowledge. At the institute, Moldovan worked together with Stanislaus von Prowazek and Henrique da Rocha Lima, who were instrumental in identifying the etiology of typhus.⁴⁷⁰

During the war, Moldovan made a strategic choice to avoid theoretical research and, instead, translated this new knowledge into technologies and social practices for immediate military application. Already in 1914, Moldovan and his collaborators pioneered a method of disinfection of the soldiers' apparel and of their bodies using specially designed mobile disinfection units.⁴⁷¹ The practice was eventually adopted by large parts of the Austrian military.

Apart from setting up a sanitary "cordon of preventive delousing stations" spanning through a part of the Eastern front controlled by the Habsburg military, Moldovan engaged in an intensive network building.⁴⁷² To start with, he rushed to invite other military doctors and high-ranking officers of the Austrian, as well as German, military to inspect these disinfection units. Moreover, from very early on in the war, Moldovan started convening informal, but relatively largely conceived and ambitious, expert meetings. The promotion of the technical solutions and hygienic practices preferred by Moldovan assumed a central place at these meetings. At the second installment of these Scientific Sessions of Military Doctors, which took place on March 16, 1915, in Piotrków in the occupied Russian Poland, for instance, Moldovan

⁴⁷⁰ Library of the Institute of Hygiene, Bucharest, Inv. No. 49.574, manuscript, Râmneanțu, Petru: "Iuliu Moldovan (1882-1966): Viața, realizările și epoca sa." Bucharest, 1977, 5; Moldovan, *Amintiri și reflexiuni*, 27.

⁴⁷¹ Nicola Thadea Karasek, "Seuchen und Militär 1914-1918" (M.A. Thesis, University of Vienna, 2012), 41; Andor Adorján, "Magyar legény a kórházban: Gözfürdő, mosoda, téglamelegítő a fronton" [Hungarian Lad in the Hospital: Steam Bath, Laundry, Brick Heater at the Front], *Az Est* 6, no. 100 (April 11, 1915): 13.

⁴⁷² On the cordon of delousing stations, see Weindling, *Epidemics*, 140.

delivered a presentation on typhus and its prevention. The invitation card stated that German military doctors were particularly encouraged to attend.⁴⁷³

As a result of this intensive network building, Moldovan started cooperating with an influential German bacteriologist Ludolph Brauer, with whom he co-authored a book on typhus, *Die Erkennung und Verhütung des Flecktyphus und Rückfallfiebers*, published in 1915.⁴⁷⁴ The book received positive reviews in the medical journals both in Germany and in Austria-Hungary, went through several re-editions, and established Moldovan as a minor authority on the practicalities of the control and prevention of this particular disease.

The reason why it was worthwhile to discuss Moldovan's management of the typhus epidemic in detail is that the connections that he had built in the process, together with his prewar links to research institutions in Vienna and Hamburg, became the core of his network within the military. Already in 1915, Moldovan set out on the task to formalize this network, while at the same time extending it. In particular, he launched the *Feldärztliche Blätter* (Journal of Battlefield Medical Doctors), a periodical publication that brought together the military doctors on the Eastern Front and connected them with the experts at the research institutions in the hinterland.

Published from 1915 all the way to 1918, the periodical early on extended its attention beyond the study of typhus, and covered various medical fields, including, but not limited to most areas of bacteriology, venerology, surgery, and psychiatry.⁴⁷⁵ What brought the representatives of all these disciplines together were personal links to Moldovan, a shared

⁴⁷³ Austrian State Archives, Vienna, Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Neue Feldakten, Höhere Heereskommandos, Armeekommando 2. Armee, Altes Armeekommando, 1914-1915, Armeegruppe Kövess, Sanitätsreferent, Box 344, Inv. No. San 4243, Circular Letter, Einberufung der zweiten wissenschaftlichen Sitzung der MAe.

⁴⁷⁴ Iuliu Moldovan, "Vorschriften zur Bekämpfung der Läuseplage bei der Truppe: Entlausungs- und Desinfektionsanstalten für die Truppen," in *Die Erkennung und Verhütung des Flecktyphus und Rückfallfiebers*, ed. Ludolph Brauer (Würzburg: Kabitzsch, 1915), 14–17.

⁴⁷⁵ Iuliu Moldovan, "Hygiene in der Front," *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 1 (December 6, 1915): 2–4.

military culture, and an increasing enthusiasm for eugenics. On the pages of the *Feldärztliche Blätter*, eugenics became “a shared language and ambition,” to use Philippa Levine’s and Alison Bashford’s terms once again, that allowed the editor to involve and keep together actors with seemingly divergent disciplinary backgrounds, research objects, and agendas.⁴⁷⁶

Indeed, it was precisely at that time that eugenics also entered Moldovan’s language, and his contributions to the periodical. By mid-1916, Moldovan already wrote in unmistakably eugenic terms. He argued, for instance, that “the damage caused by venereal disease (...) affects the army by more ways than just causing a temporary deficiency of many soldiers.”⁴⁷⁷ As the disease spreads further, he claimed, “it affects the family and weakens the people through infirmity, declining birth rates and the degeneration of the offspring.”⁴⁷⁸ Invoking the anxieties regarding an increasing population decline, he concluded that “combating venereal diseases is an important postulate for the protection of the people [das Volk]. The great seriousness of the situation requires energetic, concerted, and ruthless intervention everywhere.”⁴⁷⁹ Moldovan’s embrace of eugenics, therefore, was part and parcel of his efforts to extend, and then to sustain, his networks; it also walked hand in hand with his turn to the theme of sexually transmitted infections.

From 1916 onwards, Moldovan sought to reposition himself as an expert on the prevention of sexually transmitted infections in the military context. The texts by Moldovan and his allies bear witness to increasingly rigorous practices of population management that were more broadly conceived, systematic, and coercive than the methods that were conventionally followed in the prewar period and in the civil hinterland. Moldovan, in

⁴⁷⁶ Levine and Bashford, “Introduction,” 4.

⁴⁷⁷ Iuliu Moldovan, “22. Juni 1915. Hygienische Betrachtungen,” *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.*, no. 13–14 (July 22, 1916): 2–4.

⁴⁷⁸ Moldovan, “22. Juni 1915,” 2–4.

⁴⁷⁹ Moldovan, “22. Juni 1915,” 2–4.

particular, was among those military medical doctors who called for, and to some extent also implemented, a regime of medical observation and control of female sex workers that revolved around examinations before and preventive measures after sexual intercourse, a medical treatment of “venereal disease” that was obligatory, yet free of charge, and a protracted internment of women suffering from an STI.⁴⁸⁰ This regime went beyond targeting the registered sex workers, as was common before the war. Instead, it sought to monitor also the “clandestine” sex workers, in some cases using this as a pretense to extend the control over entire female population that was deemed suspicious. In another significant shift, serological testing for STIs was to be applied on a large scale, to prevent any hidden carriers of the infections.⁴⁸¹

Yet again, aside from experimenting with these strict practices of population management, Moldovan embarked on network building.⁴⁸² Having tested his claims in correspondence, Moldovan proceeded to organizing a conference, the *Feldärztliche Tagung bei der k.u.k. 2. Armee*. Despite its name, suggesting a local scope of the meeting, the conference that took place in Lemberg in February 1917 was attended by some of the most influential medical doctors particularly from Vienna, but also from other parts of Austria-Hungary, as well as from Germany.

The participants included the Hamburg-based infectologist Henrique da Rocha Lima, the Austrian neurosurgeon Anton Eiselsberg and venerologist Ernst Finger, as well as the

⁴⁸⁰ Wingfield, “The Enemy Within,” 576.

⁴⁸¹ Moldovan, “Die Bekämpfung,” 1–4; Alois Glingar, “Die Bekämpfung der Geschlechtskrankheiten in Zloczow während eines Zeitraumes von sieben Monaten,” *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 22–23 (February 20, 1917): 25–28; Alois Glingar, “Richtlinien für die Untersuchung auf Geschlechtskrankheiten,” *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 24 (May 6, 1917): 9–11. See also the papers by Moldovan and Ernst Finger in Iuliu Moldovan and Otto Zuckerandl, eds., *Verhandlungen der Feldärztlichen Tagung bei der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Lemberg 20.-22. Februar 1917* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1917).

⁴⁸² National Archives of Romania, Cluj-Napoca Branch, Fund 231, Iuliu Moldovan Papers, File 10, Part F, Inv. No. 407-422, Letter, Generalarzt und Armeearzt der Armeearbeitung Woysch Muschold to Iuliu Moldovan, May 3, 1917.

Hungarian orthopedist Gyula Dollinger and surgeon Tibor Verebely. Their disciplinary backgrounds reflected the discussions on the pages of the *Feldärztliche Blätter*. The conference, among other topics, had separate sections dedicated to surgery, medical technology, and epidemiology with a particular focus on typhus and the STIs.⁴⁸³ Moldovan delivered a paper on the venereal diseases, and eugenic arguments resonated not only in his paper, but in the framing of the entire conference. The event received an extensive coverage in Austria-Hungary's medical journals of reference, including the *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, *Časopis lékařů českých*, and *Orvosi Hetilap*.⁴⁸⁴ Most of these outlets brought, in several installments, detailed summaries of the presentations delivered at the conference.

Moldovan's involvement with eugenics was more ambiguous than his participation in these military networks suggests, however. Even though Moldovan's eugenic texts from the World War I invoked "race," they did not yet relate "races" and "nations." An explanation may be found in his connection to another network of eugenicists, this time in Vienna, that prevented Moldovan from embracing nationalism. The anatomist Julius Tandler was one of the central figures of this network, and there is much that suggests that Moldovan was connected to him.

To start with, one of Tandler's close collaborators, a surgeon Otto Zuckerandl served as a military doctor at the Galician front, and closely cooperated with Moldovan, as a co-editor and frequent contributor to the *Feldärztliche Blätter*, and co-organizer of the large medical conference in Lemberg.⁴⁸⁵ Moreover, Moldovan obtained his Habilitation in pathological and

⁴⁸³ Moldovan and Zuckerandl, *Verhandlungen*, passim.

⁴⁸⁴ "Feldärztliche Tagung bei der k. u. k. 2. Armee: Abgehalten in Lemberg, 20.-22. Februar 1917," *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 67, no. 13 (March 24, 1917): 619–24; "Lékařský sjezd c. a k. 2. armády" [Medical Congress of the Imperial and Royal 2nd Army], *Časopis lékařů českých* 56, no. 25 (June 23, 1917): 778–80; "A második hadsereg orvosi szakértekezlete" [The Medical Congress of the Second Army], *Budapesti Orvosi Újság* 15, no. 4 (January 25, 1917): 31.

⁴⁸⁵ See above. On Otto Zuckerandl, see Tatjana Buklijaš, "The Politics of Fin-de-Siècle Anatomy," in *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918*, ed. Jan Surman and Mitchell G. Ash (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 209–44.

experimental anatomy from the University of Vienna in 1915. This is significant, since Moldovan submitted his application already in 1913, but the process proceeded only after Tandler became the wartime dean of the faculty. Moldovan's application received a unanimous support of the often-divided faculty, despite his nearly constant presence at the front.⁴⁸⁶ As the previous chapter elucidated, this group of medical doctors, biologists, and sociologists was active already in the prewar setting, and sought to develop eugenic concepts and narratives that accepted, or even affirmed, the diversity of the Habsburg Empire. Moldovan thus developed large intra- and inter-imperial scientific networks, and had embraced a far-reaching, yet not nationalist, package of eugenic concepts and practices.

From Battlefield to the Hinterland, from Bacteria to Genes

If bacteriology initially offered its main epistemic objects – bacteria and parasites – as convenient metaphors for the alleged internal enemies of the empire, the emerging science of genetics followed suit with a parallel conceptual framework revolving around the concept of the gene. Yet, they drew on very similar visual and linguistic tropes, similar cultural anxieties, and promoted comparable preventive practices as the bacteriologists.⁴⁸⁷ If medical science could make visible a microscopic entity such as a bacterium, it was also capable of identifying “alien” genes allegedly permeating individual and collective bodies, and to reveal their “true,” treacherous nature. Aided by the military's grasp over repressive techniques, and by its suspension of the rule of law, these medical doctors tended to view difference within the empire through a prism of contagion, and to act accordingly. The new, radical, battlefield biopolitics

⁴⁸⁶ The report on Moldovan's *Habilitation* was written by Tandler. Austrian State Archives, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Unterricht und Kultus, Unterrichtsministerium, Allgemeine Reihe, Inv. No. 628.13, Moldovan, Julius, Professorenakt, July 1915.

⁴⁸⁷ Amir Teicher, “Medical Bacteriology and Medical Genetics, 1880–1940: A Call for Synthesis,” *Medical History* 64, no. 3 (July 2020): 325–54.

thus encompassed Austria-Hungary's soldiers, but also civilians and POWs, in a drive to immunize the society against imagined threats.

Laurence Cole argues that when the World War I broke out, "the population in imperial Austria generally accepted at the start of the war that they should fulfil their patriotic duty," and the mobilization of troops took place "free of any major problems."⁴⁸⁸ Nevertheless, despite this prevailing patriotism in society, the authorities, and the military, in particular, "crudely distinguished between allegedly 'loyal' and 'disloyal' nationalities," questioning the trustworthiness of entire groups, such as Slovene-, or Italian- speakers.⁴⁸⁹ As we have seen, some military medical doctors participated in these military anxieties and used the concepts, practices, and metaphors drawn from bacteriology not only to detect the real biological threats, the bacteria, but also to make visible the imaginary human threats, primarily the marginalized ethnic others and women.

However, there was also a smaller but more radical group of scientists, mostly racial anthropologists, who worked deeper in the hinterland and drew on recent genetic knowledge to pursue an analogous agenda. Even more than the bacteriologists who diluted the divide between the contagious germs and their individual human carriers, these physical anthropologists sought to redirect the military's fears towards the image of the carriers of "alien" genes, thus feeding the military's suspicions about the alleged essential disloyalty of entire ethnic groups and seeking to reinforce them with scientific authority. From racialized disease, they shifted towards the specter of a diseased race.

⁴⁸⁸ Laurence Cole, *Military Culture and Popular Patriotism in Late Imperial Austria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 313; For a similar argument regarding the Bohemian Lands, see Ivan Šedivý, *Češi, české země a Velká válka: 1914-1918* [Czechs, Bohemian Lands, and the Great War: 1914-1918] (Prague: NLN, 2003).

⁴⁸⁹ Cole, *Military Culture*, 318.

The parallels between these uses of bacteriological and genetic knowledge were not accidental. The historian of medicine Amir Teicher recently pointed out the connections between the “germ theory of disease,” on the one hand, and the “gene theory of disease,” on the other, and argued that they “shared striking, all-too-often overlooked similarities.”⁴⁹⁰ In particular, both “built on shared epistemological assumptions that influenced their explanatory mechanisms and their overall conceptual frameworks; both mobilized similar visual and linguistic vocabulary; both appropriated – and enforced – prevailing cultural and gender norms; and both enshrined broadly parallel hygienic practices.”⁴⁹¹ Teicher points out that the most suggestive sign of these overlaps is the concept of invisible carriers, which manifests itself in bacteriology as the notion of “healthy (asymptomatic) carriers of germs” and in genetics in the notion of the “healthy (heterozygous) carriers of genes.”⁴⁹² In wartime Austria-Hungary, the parallels between bacteriology and genetics were reinforced within military medical networks, and both disciplines became wedded to the army’s anxieties.

The enrollment of genetics for the military’s concerns with the alleged disloyal groups became particularly salient in the anthropological research that was conducted on prisoners of war. The measurements took place in various Austrian POW camps and medical facilities, starting shortly after the outbreak of the war and continuing for most of its duration. These anthropological measurements and ethnological observations were part and parcel of the larger trend in Central Europe, where soldiers and POWs were used as objects for research on “racial types.”⁴⁹³ Yet, I will argue that the research also followed agendas that were highly specific to the imperial context in which they were taking place.

⁴⁹⁰ Teicher, “Medical Bacteriology,” 325.

⁴⁹¹ Teicher, “Medical Bacteriology,” 325.

⁴⁹² Teicher, “Medical Bacteriology,” 344.

⁴⁹³ Maciej Górny, “Bone & Soul: Physical Anthropology, the Great War and Nationalism in Eastern Europe,” *Cuadernos de Historia Contemporánea* 36 (2014): 239–58; Marius Turda, “In Search of Racial Types: Soldiers and the Anthropological Mapping of the Romanian Nation, 1914–44,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 47, no. 1 (February 2013): 1–21.

The biography of Rudolf Pöch (1870-1921), the leading scientist behind the Austrian research on POWs, encapsulates all the key influences from which the biopolitics emerging within the military medical networks was assembled. Pöch, who since 1913 occupied a newly established extraordinary chair of physical anthropology and ethnography at the University of Vienna was originally trained as a physician, and initially focused on colonial medicine. Using the results of his bacteriological research which he conducted as a part of a larger Austrian research expedition in colonial India, he became an authority on the plague.⁴⁹⁴ Moreover, in cooperation with the Institute for Tropical Medicine in Hamburg, Pöch studied malaria, this time in Western Africa. In the first decade of the twentieth century, Pöch refocused from bacteriology to physical anthropology. He then conducted racial research, again in colonial contexts, namely in New Guinea, Australia, and South Africa.⁴⁹⁵

Even though one of the texts presenting this research was his only prewar paper published in the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie*, Pöch likely became acquainted with the emerging German race hygiene already in the early 1890s.⁴⁹⁶ He subsequently promoted these ideas in Vienna, including within the local temperance movement, and was the first in Austria-Hungary to join the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene* after it was established in 1905.⁴⁹⁷ As an early promoter of race hygiene, Pöch embraced the emerging Mendelian genetics, asserting that “the results of experimental science of heredity call for completely new questions in physical anthropology. Above all, this perspective contributes

⁴⁹⁴ Rudolf Pöch, “Die Pest,” in *Handbuch der Tropenkrankheiten*, ed. Carl Mense (Leipzig: Barth, 1905), 391–433.

⁴⁹⁵ Margit Berner, “Forschungs-Material Kriegsgefangene: Die Massenuntersuchungen der Wiener Anthropologen an gefangenen Soldaten 1915-1918,” in *Vorreiter der Vernichtung: Eugenik, Rassenhygiene und Euthanasie in der österreichischen Diskussion vor 1938*, ed. Wolfgang Neugebauer and H. E. Gabriel (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005), 167–98.

⁴⁹⁶ Berner, “Forschungs-Material,” passim. See also Rudolf Pöch, “Rassenhygienische und ärztliche Beobachtungen aus Neu-Guinea,” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 5, no. 1 (1908): 46–66.

⁴⁹⁷ Pöch joined on November 5, 1906, as the 38th member. Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry, Munich, Alfred Ploetz Papers, Inv. no. PL 5/9, Mitglieder der Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene nach der Zeit des Eintrittes; “Die Abstinenzbewegung in Österreich,” *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 1902): 3.

greatly to clarifying the concept of race.”⁴⁹⁸ In its radical form embodied by Pöch, battlefield biopolitics fused the concepts, practices, and metaphors shared by bacteriology and genetics, on the one hand, with military know-how, on the other hand, while colonial knowledge, as well as ideas from German race hygiene, also merged into the resulting framework.

After World War I broke out, Pöch embarked on anthropological research on the prisoners of war. Less than a year after the outbreak of the war, Pöch and his allies submitted a project proposing that the scientists would enter the Austrian POW camps to conduct racial research on individuals belonging to small ethnic groups who had been drafted to the Russian imperial army. The project received generous funding from the *Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Imperial Academy of Sciences), and the military authorities enthusiastically approved the project in June 1915.⁴⁹⁹ Their presence at the POW camps, Pöch claimed, was a “research opportunity that will never repeat itself.”⁵⁰⁰ In doing so, he drew on a trope which he previously invoked to legitimize his colonial research, and which allowed him to cast the colonial peoples as “remains of the natives in the risk of extinction.”⁵⁰¹

If Pöch and his students indeed originally intended to follow this plan in the POW camps, however, they almost immediately abandoned it in practice, and their racial research covered an ever-increasing number of human groups.⁵⁰² Crucially, many of those groups did

⁴⁹⁸ Rudolf Pöch, “Neue anthropologische Fragestellungen,” *Mittheilungen der kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft* 62, no. 5 (1919): 193.

⁴⁹⁹ Interestingly, Andrew Evans notes that while the imperial German military initially hesitated to support racial research, the Austro-Hungarian military was quick in making its decision to support Pöch’s proposal. Andrew D. Evans, *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 134.

⁵⁰⁰ Rudolf Pöch, “I. Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k. u. k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien,” *Mittheilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 45 (1915): 220.

⁵⁰¹ Berner, “Forschungs-Material,” *passim*.

⁵⁰² As Margit Berner points out, the individuals were not assigned to groups based on their ancestry or on self-identification, but by the anthropologists themselves, based on the physical traits of these individuals. Due to this circular research design, the results confirmed the initial bias of the researchers. Margit Berner, “Die ‘rassenkundlichen’ Untersuchungen der Wiener Anthropologen in Kriegsgefangenenlagern 1915-1918,” *Zeitgeschichte* 30, no. 3 (2003): 126.

not dwell exclusively in the Russian Empire but resided also in Austria-Hungary. Already in a report covering the first three months of Pöch's research there was a long list of human groups which they measured. The list featured, but by no means was limited to, Poles, Romanians, Ukrainians [Kleinrussen], as well as the Jews and Roma.⁵⁰³ Various Finno-Ugric peoples were also measured.⁵⁰⁴ As the research expanded into further POW camps in the following months, it covered an ever-larger number of groups, now going clearly beyond the confines of the Russian Empire; successive research by Pöch or his allies thus additionally targeted Albanians, Montenegrins, Serbs, and even Italians.⁵⁰⁵ In total, over 7000 individuals were subjected to the dehumanizing and often painful anthropometric examination.⁵⁰⁶ While the research on POWs initially focused on a narrowly defined number of groups, it quickly spilled over to cover most ethnic groups of Eastern, Central, and Southeastern Europe.

The trope of whiteness was central to this research. Andrew Evans correctly observes that Pöch's research on POWs assigned "non-European racial identities" to the eastern adversaries of Austria-Hungary.⁵⁰⁷ Examining the eyes of the POWs, in particular, Pöch portrayed the various ethnic groups of the Russian empire as possessing "a unified racial identity associated with Asia rather than Europe," manifesting itself in a significant "degree of Mongolian influence."⁵⁰⁸ However, I argue that the goals of the project went even further, and ultimately sought to unmask the alleged internal enemies as "racial others." While the late

⁵⁰³ Pöch, "I. Bericht," 220–34.

⁵⁰⁴ Pöch, "I. Bericht," 220–34.

⁵⁰⁵ Rudolf Pöch, "IV. Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k. u. k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien," *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 48 (June 1, 1918): 149–50.

⁵⁰⁶ Margit Berner, "Die Bedeutung der biometrischen Erfassungsmethode in der österreichischen Anthropologie in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts," in *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900-1945*, ed. Gerhard Baader, Hans-Georg Hofer, and Thomas Mayer (Vienna: Czernin, 2007), 239–56. Interestingly, over one hundred of Pöch's photographic portraits of POWs made their way into Alfred Ploetz's personal collection. Each of the photographs assigns the POW a national identity. Written remarks on some of them, such as notations of physical features, suggest that Ploetz saw them as highly relevant for his racial hygienic arguments. Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry, Munich, Alfred Ploetz Papers, Inv. no. PL 9/2, Sammlung Rudolf Pöch.

⁵⁰⁷ Evans, *Anthropology at War*, 152.

⁵⁰⁸ Evans, *Anthropology at War*, 151.

Habsburg Empire's liberal anthropology emphasized the empire's hybridity, Pöch's research recast it as "racially" pure, white, and susceptible to contamination from external sources.

As Margit Berner points out, Pöch's POW research was informed by the recent theories of the German race hygienist Eugen Fischer who drew on the emerging Mendelian genetics in order to reframe the anthropological notion of "race."⁵⁰⁹ In particular, Pöch adopted Fischer's view that "race per se was not inherited; instead, individual traits were passed down, so that mixing created 'hybrids' rather than new races."⁵¹⁰ Consequently, when Pöch and his allies measured the ethnic groups that also lived in the Habsburg Empire, they also focused on the parts of their bodies that "particularly easily betray [verraten]" the supposed "admixture of Mongolian blood."⁵¹¹ It was strongly implied that the research revealed the alleged difference of these groups from the core groups of the empire, and their relatedness to its adversaries. As there was a certain degree of overlap between the Habsburg ethnic groups measured by Pöch, and the suspected disloyal groups, his research could be interpreted as an attempt to cast these groups as hidden carriers of "Mongolian genes," and thus to lend scientific authority to the military's anxieties.⁵¹²

Even though it was the POWs from the Russian Empire who became the primary object of Pöch's racial research during the war, it was increasingly clear that the real target was diversity within Austria-Hungary. While the research by a German Austrian racial anthropologist Rudolf Pöch and his students led the way, it provoked a quick reaction from some of the most influential Hungarian, Polish, and Czech racial anthropologists, who in spite

⁵⁰⁹ Margit Berner, "Large-Scale Anthropological Surveys in Austria-Hungary, 1871-1918," in *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, ed. Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010), 250.

⁵¹⁰ Berner, "Large-Scale Anthropological Surveys," 250.

⁵¹¹ Pöch, "I. Bericht," 224.

⁵¹² Margit Berner seems to concur with this assessment when she argues that "The transposition of the methods and findings of 'bastard' studies to the Habsburg monarchy encouraged a hierarchical classification of Europeans by physical criteria which was increasingly linked to cultural differences." Berner, "Large-Scale Anthropological Surveys," 248; Evans, *Anthropology at War*, 145.

of their antagonism towards Pöch to a significant extent mirrored his research design and his findings.

The emphasis on whiteness was even more pronounced in their research. If Pöch sought to make visible to the military the imagined, and hitherto invisible, groups of internal enemies, primarily by detecting an alleged presence of “Mongolian” genes in their bodies, the leading Hungarian, Polish, and Czech nationalist racial anthropologists, too, accepted these assumptions. They sought to “prove,” however, that there was no such “admixture” in the genes of their nations, and that, by consequence, their loyalty to the empire as well as their position within a putative racial and/or civilizational hierarchy was not to be questioned. If the earlier physical anthropology in the Habsburg Empire produced variations of a narrative about the power of intermarriage to blur differences, the leading physical anthropologists in Austria-Hungary were now creating narratives about a risk of contamination with “alien” genes.⁵¹³ In doing so, they broke with the liberal tone of prewar imperial physical anthropology and adopted, to a varying extent, a more exclusivist imaginary.

In Hungary, the professor of anatomy at the University of Budapest, Mihály Lenhossék, began conducting racial research on POWs shortly after the war broke out. In his texts published during the war, Lenhossék attempted to convince his readers that he arrived at the idea independently of Pöch while emphasizing that their methodology was largely similar.⁵¹⁴ Lenhossék’s main concern was the ethnogenesis of the Finno-Ugric peoples, and he measured

⁵¹³ For anthropology, and particularly physical anthropology, in the Habsburg Empire before 1914, see Irene Ranzmaier, “The Anthropological Society in Vienna and the Academic Establishment of Anthropology in Austria, 1870-1930,” *Histories of Anthropology Annual* 7, no. 1 (2011): 1–22; Irene Ranzmaier, *Die Anthropologische Gesellschaft in Wien und die akademische Etablierung anthropologischer Disziplinen an der Universität Wien 1870-1930* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2013).

⁵¹⁴ Mihály Lenhossék, “A finn-ugor nyelvcsaládhoz tartozó orosz hadifoglyokon végzett anthropologiai vizsgálatok” [Anthropological Studies on Russian Prisoners of War Belonging to the Finno-Ugric Language Family], *Akadémiai Értesítő* 27, no. 12 (December 15, 1916): 685; Mihály Lenhossék, “Anthropologische Untersuchungen an russischen Kriegsgefangenen finnisch-ugrischer Nationalität,” *Turán* 2, no. 3 (March 1917): 136-137. Note the different emphasis on the POW’s identity in the two versions of the paper.

various physical traits of prisoners of war who belonged to one of the Russian Empire's Finno-Ugric ethnic groups. In a veiled reaction to Pöch, Lenhossék was at pains to "prove" the Europeaness of contemporary Hungarians and their ancient ancestors. He asserted that these ancestors did not enter Europe from the East but rather expanded from the European West to the East of Europe and beyond, citing with sympathy a theory that located their origins in France or Prussia.⁵¹⁵

Although Lenhossék did not dispute Pöch's claims about the alleged "Mongolian traits" that seemed to "persist in the faces [of Finno-Ugric POW's] with extreme stubbornness," the Hungarian racial nationalist claimed that these putative traits were of little significance for the question of these peoples' origins.⁵¹⁶ Instead, he maintained that these alleged traits resulted from an intermarriage of Finno-Ugric peoples with the surrounding populations in Asia, even though "we have absolutely no information as to which Mongolian race it was that came into such close contact with the Finno-Ugric peoples and when the mixture took place."⁵¹⁷ To explain the alleged persistence over multiple generations of these traits that were "sometimes impossible to grasp and to localize and yet they were ostensibly present," Lenhossék drew on Mendelism, claiming that they represented dominant rather than recessive traits.⁵¹⁸ In order to claim Europeaness for the Hungarian nation, Lenhossék thus casted intermarriage as a potential source of "racial" contamination.

In Habsburg Galicia, research that mirrored Pöch's arguments was conducted at the University of Krakow by Polish racial anthropologists. The measurements were carried out on the soldiers and POWs who were recovering in military hospitals in Krakow and on the POWs who were detained in the Dąbie prisoner-of-war camp near the city. The research was led by

⁵¹⁵ Lenhossék, "Anthropologische Untersuchungen," 146.

⁵¹⁶ Lenhossék, "Anthropologische Untersuchungen," 145–46.

⁵¹⁷ Lenhossék, "Anthropologische Untersuchungen," 145–46.

⁵¹⁸ Lenhossék, "Anthropologische Untersuchungen," 145–46.

Adam Wrzosek, a temporary director of the university's department of physical anthropology, and by his assistants.⁵¹⁹ Like Pösch and Lenhossék, Wrzosek was a Mendelian, and had links to German race hygienic networks. Already before the war, he repudiated neo-Lamarckism in several experimental papers published by the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie*.⁵²⁰

The line of argument that these physical anthropologists sought to advance was put most succinctly by Wrzosek's student Olga Willerowa. Using the color of skin, hair, and eyes as the main proxies of "race," she concluded that while "the group of dark-haired people [brunetów i szatynów] with brown eyes is the most numerous" among all the groups that she had studied, including Armenians, Georgians, Macedonians, Moldovans, Serbs, and Tatars, "blonde people with either type of eye color were most predominant among the Cracovians."⁵²¹ While these scholars claimed whiteness for the core groups of the Polish nation, they also sought to undermine the claims of their nationalist competitors in Austria-Hungary. Tellingly, another scholar at the department, Franciszek Gawełek, conducted racial research not only on POWs, but also on Hungarian soldiers, collecting an "immense amount of material on the craniology of the skull of Asiatic peoples."⁵²²

⁵¹⁹ The Jagiellonian University Archives, Kraków, New Records Department, Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University 1849-1945, Fund WF II 176, Department of Anthropology, Inv. No. 131, Report, December 13., 1916. See also Rhode, "A Matter of Place, Space, and People," 105–40.

⁵²⁰ Adam Wrzosek and Adolf Maciesza, "Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die Vererbung der durch Ischiadicusverletzung hervorgerufenen Brown-Séquardschen Meerschweinchen-Epilepsie: Erster Teil der experimentellen Untersuchungen über die Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 8, no. 1 (1911): 1–24; Adam Wrzosek and Adolf Maciesza, "Über die Entstehung, den Verlauf und die Vererbung der durch Rückenmarksverletzung hervorgerufenen Meerschweinchen - Epilepsie: Dritter Teil der experimentellen Untersuchungen über die Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 11, no. 3 (1914): 290–98.

⁵²¹ Olga Willerowa, "Spostrzeżenia nad barwą oczów i skóry u Tatarów, Ormian, Gruzinów, Mołdawjan, Serbów i Macedończyków" [Observations on the Color of Eyes and Skin Among Tatars, Armenians, Georgians, Moldovans, Serbs, and Macedonians], *Przegląd Antropologiczny* 1, no. 1 (1926): 91.

⁵²² "Franciszek Gawełek do Józefa Kostrzewskiego, 1919 styczeń 7, Kraków" [Franciszek Gawełek to Józef Kostrzewski, January 7, 1919, Kraków], in *Źródła do dziejów Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu: Organizacja i rozwój uczelni od listopada 1918 roku do inauguracji w maju 1919 roku* [Sources for the History of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań: Organization and Development of the University from November 1918 to the Inauguration in May 1919], ed. Antoni Czubiński and Maria Kujawska, Vol. 1. *Dzieje UAM 10*. (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza, 1973), 51; *Kronika Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego: Za Rok Szkolny 1916/17 Za Rektoratu Rady Dworu Prof. Dra Władysława Szajnochy i Otwarcie Roku Szkolnego w dniu 27. października 1917* [Chronicle of the Jagiellonian University: for the Academic Year 1916/17 under the

Czech nationalist racial anthropologists joined the debate, too, even though they did not enjoy comparable level of trust from the military authorities and, as a consequence, did not have access to the POWs. Instead, they drew on improvised bodies of data to advance arguments that were ultimately very similar to those of their Hungarian and Polish counterparts. Initially, Jindřich Matiegka, the professor of physical anthropology at the University of Prague, pointed to the data gathered during the prewar military conscriptions, as well to various statements by earlier racial anthropologists, to claim that, due to their genetically determined heritage, the Czechs made for abundant, healthy, and physically strong, as well as loyal, soldiers: “It is clear that a nation that is so numerous and so able, both physically and mentally, represents a rich resource for the needs of the military.”⁵²³ While this argument highlighted the loyalty and utility of the group in whose name he claimed to speak, Matiegka at the same time remained unconvinced that it did enough to dispel Pösch’s upcoming results that may uncover them as contaminated with “alien” genes, and thus fundamentally untrustworthy.

Indicative of these doubts, Matiegka handed a set of data to his student Adalbert Schück/Vojtěch Suk, which they had gathered in the previous years at various schools in Prague. Suk then used this data to develop a similar argument as Lenhossék and Wrzosek, effectively claiming to have documented that the Czech’s whiteness was uncontaminated by “alien” genes. In particular, Suk compared the data on the “whites in Central Europe,” notably including the Czechs, with the data from various colonial contexts. Already in a preliminary study from 1916, Suk made comparisons with the Native Americans and with the native inhabitants of the Philippines, drawing on the data produced by other researchers.⁵²⁴

Rectorate of Court Counselor Prof. Dr. Władysław Szajnoch and the Opening of the Academic Year on October 27, 1917] (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1918), 61.

⁵²³ Jindřich Matiegka, “Die physische Beschaffenheit und die Kriegstüchtigkeit des böhmischen Volkes,” in *Das böhmische Volk: Wohngebiete: Körperliche Tüchtigkeit: Geistige und materielle Kultur*, ed. Zdeněk Václav Tobolka (Prague: Pražská akciová tiskárna, 1916), 11.

⁵²⁴ Vojtěch Suk, “Chrup školní mládeže pražské s hlediska antropologického” [The Dentition of School Youth in Prague from an Anthropological Perspective], *Lékařské rozhledy* 5, no. 3 (1916): 97–112.

Crucially, in his texts published somewhat later, Suk also included the newly processed results of a racial research on the Zulu people in the Natal province of South Africa that he had conducted himself between 1913 and 1914. The conclusions of Suk's comparison were racist: "there are no major differences between all the groups of the members of the white race [...] yet there are obvious and major differences when we compare the whites with other races, certainly indicating a lower degree of relatedness," as well as an alleged lower degree of development.⁵²⁵ Within a global racial hierarchy that he thus delineated, Suk went on to claim whiteness for the Czech population. The physical development of the Czechs of Prague, he asserted, "shows no marked peculiarities in comparison with other Whites."⁵²⁶

Some of the most prominent racial anthropologists in Austria-Hungary, including three university professors of anthropology, embarked on very similar research projects during the World War I. If they had previously argued about alleged racial types and hierarchies, they now shifted their focus to measuring and documenting also the imagined genetic contamination, marking the emergence of their discipline in a new key. Their physical anthropology deepened its break with ethnology and became more closely linked to genetics at a conceptual level. Mirroring the bacteriological image of the contamination of individual bodies through germs, racial anthropologists such as Pösch and Lenhossék worked with and popularized a trope of contamination of the collective body through "Mongolian" genes. Increasingly, these physical anthropologists prioritized eugenics as a logical consequence of their arguments. As one

⁵²⁵ Suk used the development of teeth as a proxy for race, assuming that a more precocious development of teeth was connected to an earlier onset of sexual maturity, and thus to an alleged lower level of biological development. Significantly, Suk knew Rudolf Pösch's research on colonial subjects with a similar topic. Suk, "Chrup školní mládeže pražské," 102.

⁵²⁶ The arguments of his 1916 study were republished in a 1919 issue of the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, showing that they could be easily reframed and repurposed in a new political context. Vojtěch Suk, "Eruption and Decay of Permanent Teeth in Whites and Negroes, with Comparative Remarks on Other Races," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 2, no. 4 (October 1919): 372.

anthropologist involved in the POW research put it shortly afterwards, “Eugenics should become applied anthropology.”⁵²⁷

While the military sought to restructure the Habsburg Empire’s institutions and societies, it pursued a conservative revolution carried out from above, through a combination of technocratic management and coercion. Unlike the Habsburg military, which did not seek popular mobilization, however, these racial anthropologists made some steps towards forming popular alliances. What appealed to some of them were the illiberal, antisemitic social movements that were reinvigorated by the war and significantly expanded as the war progressed, both in imperial Austria and in royal Hungary.⁵²⁸ Wartime research of some of these physical anthropologists contained veiled gestures towards these audiences. To start with, Rudolf Pöch not only measured Jewish POWs, but also grouped them together with the Roma people under the label of “foreign nations” [Fremdvölker].⁵²⁹ Moreover, in her analysis Willerowa compared her anthropological observations of European populations with data on Sephardic Jews, emphasizing their difference.⁵³⁰ Furthermore, Lenhossék warned against state-sponsored policies of assimilation that erased the language and “ethnic traits” of the Finno-Ugric peoples. Even though he made this point about the fate of the Finno-Ugric peoples in the empire of the Romanovs, the implications of Lenhossék’s argument for the Hungarian state that pursued similar policies could not escape his nationalist readers.⁵³¹ Finally, some Austrian

⁵²⁷ Viktor Lebzelter, Review of *Physical Anthropology, its scope and aims*, ed. Aleš Hrdlička, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 52 (1922): 280–81.

⁵²⁸ The mobilization of antisemitic movements during the war is well documented. See Péter Bihari, *Lövészárkok a hátszágban: középosztály, zsidókérdés, antiszemitizmus az első világháború Magyarországon* [Trenches in the Hinterland: Middle Class, Jewish Question, and Antisemitism in World War I Hungary] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2008); Michal Frankl and Miloslav Szabó, *Budovány státu bez antisemitismu? Násilí, diskurz loajality a vznik Československa* [Building a State Without Antisemitism? Violence, Discourse of Loyalty, and the Formation of Czechoslovakia] (Prague: NLN, 2015); Oliver Rathkolb, ed., *Der lange Schatten des Antisemitismus: Kritische Auseinandersetzungen mit der Geschichte der Universität Wien im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vienna University Press, 2013).

⁵²⁹ Pöch, “IV. Bericht,” 149.

⁵³⁰ Willerowa, “Spostrzeżenia nad barwą,” 90.

⁵³¹ Significantly, a German translation of Lenhossék’s paper appeared in the journal of the nationalist Hungarian Turán Society.

physical anthropologists also conducted research on Roma POWs, primarily from Southeastern Europe. The anthropologist Viktor Lebzelter who conducted such research then used his data to argue that, as Victoria Shmidt puts it, “sedentarized Roma were ‘whiter’ [than the nomadic ones] because of the ‘prominent racial influence of Balkan populations.’”⁵³²

Historians of gender, everyday life, and medicine have repeatedly questioned the rigid division and hierarchy between the battle front and the home front.⁵³³ Even though a new biopolitical framework emerged within the military medical networks that were immediately or indirectly connected to the battlefield, therefore, the experts who pioneered it sought to expand it further into the hinterland. Eugenicists managing the frontline biopolitics attempted to blur the boundary between the biopolitics at the battlefield and at the home front, emphasizing that the protection against external threats, such as parasites, bacteria, genes, and their carriers, to which this this biopolitics ultimately pointed, would be achieved only if it subsumed the society as a whole.

The racial research on the POWs was one example of this trend. Nevertheless, the most salient issue these eugenicists highlighted to lend a sense of urgency to their demands was sexually transmitted infections. For instance, already in 1915, the leading Viennese dermatologist Ernst Finger worked out a proposal suggesting a series of measures to be implemented by the military and civil authorities, respectively. Even though his proposal had been accepted by the Ministry of War, Finger complained about the separation and differences

⁵³² Victoria Shmidt and Bernadette Nadya Jaworsky, *Historicizing Roma in Central Europe: Between Critical Whiteness and Epistemic Injustice* (London: Routledge, 2021), 87.

⁵³³ See, for instance, Nancy M. Wingfield and Maria Bucur, eds., *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006); Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Roger Cooter, *Surgery and Society in Peace and War: Orthopaedics and the Organization of Modern Medicine, 1880-1948* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993).

between the military and civil authorities, arguing that these steps “would not be effective if the [civil] political authorities were unable to follow up on the necessary measures.”⁵³⁴

One of the military medical doctors who pursued a similar agenda, Iuliu Moldovan, made it clear in a 1916 text that a deeper coordination between the military and the civilian authorities boiled down to a transfer of actors, practices, and institutions from the battlefield to the civilian setting:

What is the point of curing venereal diseases, what is the point of keeping evidence of them, and of holding [the soldiers] in sanatoriums during demobilization until they are no longer contagious? In the contaminated hinterland, they will be infected again. If we do not act more ruthlessly and if we do not dispose with the shell of prudery and with the farce of personal freedom, as long as the legislation does not do away with the prevailing indolence of the population and pave the way for energetic, rational action, all our effort will fail or at least bring little success. We must proceed in a uniform, energetic, and ruthless manner on the entire battle front as well as on the home front.⁵³⁵

The psychiatrist Erwin Stransky ultimately argued along similar lines as Moldovan.

Stransky demanded that society be “militarized in an ethical sense, subordinating the individual to the community of the society and the state.” Stransky’s arguments were in line with the anti-feminism that became a part and parcel of the frontline biopolitics when he added that one of the priorities of such social transformation was to maintain “the man” as a “specific centerpiece of Central Europe’s organization and civilization,” primarily by hindering “the invasion of feminist principles from the East and from the West.”⁵³⁶ Stransky’s arguments thus left no doubt that the goal of these military medical networks was not only to transmit individual practices, techniques, or institutions from the battlefield to the home front. Rather, their goal

⁵³⁴ “Diskussion zum Vortrag J. Tandler: Krieg und Bevölkerung,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 29, no. 15 (April 13, 1916): 470–72; Ernst Finger, “Die Verbreitung der Geschlechtskrankheiten durch den Krieg und deren Bekämpfung: Referat, erstattet über Aufforderung des k. k. Ministeriums des Innern, Juli 1915,” *Das Österreichische Sanitätswesen* 27, no. 43–46 (October 1915): 1447–52.

⁵³⁵ Moldovan, “22. Juni 1915,” 2.

⁵³⁶ Stransky, “Krieg und Bevölkerung,” 558.

was to use a new biopolitical framework to fundamentally transform the empire's social fabric, creating a hierarchical, authoritarian, and male-dominated social order.

One of the most salient examples of authoritarian, technocratic projects of social transformation that were discussed within military networks and advised by eugenicists were the schemes of internal colonization. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, eugenicists linked to nationalist activism had already vividly discussed internal colonization through nationalist settlements before World War I. However, if the language around internal colonization during the war echoed the pre-war discussions among nationalist activists on the language frontiers of the empire, the practices that were put into place went beyond these models. During the war, these projects were adopted by the military authorities, and disabled soldiers as well as returning veterans were envisioned as the primary settlers.

Significantly, these projects were spearheaded nearly simultaneously in Austria as well as in Hungary by some leading military figures and by the bureaucracies of the shared Ministry of War and of the related institutions. In order to further develop these plans and put them into practice, the military authorities started to closely cooperate with some of the most influential nationalist eugenicists. Thus, it was no longer voluntary associations which these eugenicists envisioned would provide support to members of a racially defined national community. Rather, this support became a declared state policy.

If the physical anthropologists, such as Pösch or Wrzosek, claimed to unmask internal enemies by making their genetic alterity visible, the nationalist supporters of eugenics, such as Heinrich Rauchberg and Géza von Hoffmann, proposed to weaken or displace the inimical populations by reclaiming their soil. In doing so, they adapted their previous nationalist

blueprints for the military's use.⁵³⁷ The deep distrust of an important part of the military towards the complex political and administrative mechanisms which the empire used to contain nationalist movements, therefore, led these military actors to adopt radical biopolitics. In an act of historical irony, the discourse of objectivity to which the expert producers of this biopolitical knowledge resorted to justify their suggestions made the military figures oblivious to the fact that these eugenicists, whom they co-opted, were an avant-garde of the very nationalist movements against which the military revolted.

Both in royal Hungary and in imperial Austria, the prewar nationalist debate about internal colonization was reinvigorated and reframed in 1916. In Hungary, the *Országos Hadigondozó Hivatal* (National Military Welfare Office) was established in 1916.⁵³⁸ The embeddedness of the new institution within military networks, as Marius Turda astutely observes, was “crucial to the Military Welfare Office's activities.”⁵³⁹ Additionally, the emerging institution co-opted some of the leading nationalist supporters of eugenics. Pál Teleki, a long-term sympathizer of the eugenic movement, became its president, and the Office also ensured that the internationally connected eugenicist Géza von Hoffmann would join as an expert, returning from Germany, where he had served as a diplomat and cooperated closely with the *Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene*.⁵⁴⁰ Projects of internal colonization were high on the new Office's agenda.

On the one hand, these projects rested on the assumption that the countryside was “the source of the people's strength,” and therefore the main site of future national regeneration.⁵⁴¹

⁵³⁷ Ke-chin Hsia, *Victims' State: War and Welfare in Austria, 1868-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022), 67.

⁵³⁸ János Suba, “Az Országos Hadigondozó Hivatal” [The National Military Welfare Office], *Rendvédelem-történeti Füzetek* 18, no. 21 (2010): 123–39.

⁵³⁹ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 180.

⁵⁴⁰ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 185.

⁵⁴¹ Géza von Hoffmann, “Fajegészségügy és népesedéspolitika a közigazgatásban” [Racial Hygiene and Population Policy in Public Administration], *Magyar Közigazgatás* 36, no. 12 (March 24, 1918), 2.

On the other hand, state-driven internal colonization schemes intended to strengthen the Magyar population, understood in racial terms, and increase its control of the land at the expense of other groups inhabiting the multiethnic state. As Hoffman put it, the goal was to reinforce the “strength of our Hungarian race” while preventing it from being “immediately swallowed up by the sea of hostile peoples, which, with the exception of the Germans, surround us from the north, east and south.”⁵⁴²

Indeed, a 1918 guidebook penned by Teleki and Hoffmann and intended for local administrators involved in the internal colonization scheme highlighted that not all disabled soldiers were to receive equal treatment. “The fertility of each and every person or family is not welcome,” Hoffmann stressed, “because there are some for whom it is no harm if their stirp dies out sooner or later as a result of having few or no children.”⁵⁴³ While the guidebook stated that the decisions which individuals and families were to be identified as eligible for support had to be based on “moral, family, national, medical and populational” criteria, the guidebook also provided numerous model cases that were intended to highlight the program’s priorities and its best practices.⁵⁴⁴

The cases listed in the guidebook left no doubt that the key asset for a disabled soldier was his membership in the Hungarian national community, defined in racial terms. Particularly deserving of all possible forms of aid were thus “a purebred Hungarian peasant of outstanding intelligence in the fullness of his power [kiválóan értelmes, javakorabeli színmagyar parasztember],” “a family of purebred [színmagyar] Hungarians,” as well as a “family-oriented, very intelligent, Hungarian man,” or a man who “originated from a purebred [színmagyar]

⁵⁴² Géza Hoffmann, *Egészséges magyar családnak soha magva ne szakadjon!* [May the Seed of a Healthy Hungarian Family Never Break!] (Budapest: Magyar társadalmi muzeum, 1918), 2 and 6.

⁵⁴³ Pál Teleki, *Szociálpolitika és hadigondozás* [Social Policy and Military Welfare] (Budapest: Országos Hadigondozó Hivatal, 1918), 75.

⁵⁴⁴ Teleki, *Szociálpolitika és hadigondozás*, 74.

Hungarian family.”⁵⁴⁵ It was not by accident, then, that the internal colonization scheme spearheaded by the Office was covered with interest by a section of the press that promoted a racial definition of Hungarian nationhood, including the periodical *A Cél* (The Target).⁵⁴⁶

Discussions about internal colonization in imperial Austria were revived and reframed in 1916, as Ke-Chin Hsia shows, when internal colonization received an enthusiastic backing from a part of the military leadership, often under the label of “warrior homestead colonies.”⁵⁴⁷ According to these proposals, disabled soldiers and returning veterans were expected to settle conquered or vacated land or settle the land confiscated from apparent internal enemies. New rural communities would thus spring up that would be immune to the perceived degenerative influence of urban modernity, as well as act as a driver regenerating the postwar society at large.⁵⁴⁸

While the military adopted these projects as part and parcel of its expanding welfare services that it provided to disabled soldiers, for the eugenicists involved as advisors in those projects a racialized concept of national community ultimately overshadowed any other concern. Heinrich Rauchberg brought this into sharp relief when he tersely stated that the main task was “internal colonization, and then war victim welfare. The former is far more important because it has the more far-reaching mission.”⁵⁴⁹ As the natural environment was challenging in the Alpine areas where some attempts at internal colonization were planned to take place,

⁵⁴⁵ The discussions about internal colonization in the *Nemzetvédelem*, a short-lived eugenic periodical published in 1918, were even more explicit about the preference for ethnic Magyars. An unsigned article published in the first issue of the journal asserted that the first and foremost hallmark of a deserving settler is “belonging to Hungariandom” and that “when choosing the place of resettlement, the wish of the Hungarian man that he does not want to leave his former home deserves attention, so that a harmful miscegenation, which is so advanced in our days, will also be adequately stopped; on the other hand, connecting the pools of Hungarian population not with scattered but compact settlements is one of the biggest tasks of an agrarian policy, broadly conceived.” Teleki, *Szociálpolitika és hadigondozás*, 40–41, 53, 60 and 80; “A telepítés alapelvei fajegészségügyi szempontból” [Principles of Settlement from a Racial Hygiene Perspective], *Nemzetvédelem* 1, no. 1–2 (1918): 60 and 64.

⁵⁴⁶ Ibolya Godinek, “Fajvédő eszme A Cél című folyóiratban” [The Ideology of Race Protection in the Journal *A Cél*], *Valóság* 57, no. 2 (February 2014): 41.

⁵⁴⁷ Hsia, *Victims’ State*, 67–68.

⁵⁴⁸ Hsia, *Victims’ State*, 66.

⁵⁴⁹ Cited in Hsia, *Victims’ State*, 66.

and agricultural production there required specialized skills, moreover, another leading eugenicist proposed in 1916 that a successful project of internal colonization in these areas would require “competent” settlers from the peasant strata not only from Austria’s Vorarlberg, but also from Switzerland, and from the more mountainous parts of Bavaria.⁵⁵⁰ As the areas listed make clear, this suggestion thus prioritized Germans, defined in racial terms, even if they were civilians, rather than disabled soldiers, and even if they lacked imperial citizenship, to ultimately carry out the nationalist plan of internal colonization.

Both in Austria and in Hungary, an alliance of military networks and of nationalist eugenicists emerged by 1916 and spearheaded state-sponsored internal colonization as a key element of a fundamental social transformation. However, by that point, Austria-Hungary’s capacity to implement large-scale policies had started to decline, and the state-backed projects of internal colonization largely failed to materialize on the initially intended scale, both in Hungary and in Austria. What is more, the military’s grasp over the state and society in Austria-Hungary weakened from 1917 onward.⁵⁵¹ As a result of these changes the direct influence of eugenicists associated with the military also waned. Nevertheless, this did not alter the fact that, as an unintended outcome of the military’s efforts to control the state and reshape Austria-Hungary, these nationalist eugenicists developed a new sense of what was possible if their ideas were to gain state support.

Home Front Biopolitics: Food, Children, and the Renewal of the “Organic Capital”

While a radical biopolitical regime was developing within the military medical networks, an alternative biopolitical framework coalesced on the home front, particularly in the

⁵⁵⁰ *Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 12. und 13. März 1916: Vorträge und Wechselreden* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1916), 149.

⁵⁵¹ Deak and Gumz, “How to Break,” 1130.

largest urban centers of the empire. If the battlefield biopolitics was informed and managed by the networks of medical doctors associated with the military, in the large urban settings that were not directly affected by the war – including, but not limited to, Vienna, Budapest, and Prague – eugenically inflected biopolitics was for long primarily a domain of voluntary associations.

Maureen Healy and Friederike Kind-Kovács identified the food consumption and the family as the central arenas of politics in wartime Austria-Hungary where social consensus was negotiated, and ultimately collapsed.⁵⁵² From this perspective, it is no wonder that food assistance and child welfare became the two most salient areas into which these voluntary associations intervened. Of course, the two issues often overlapped. Women were indispensable for the practical operation of these voluntary associations, and throughout different urban contexts, these women devised various and creative ways of addressing food assistance and child welfare in tandem, ranging from targeted food distribution to summer camps. Even though the actors behind these voluntary associations, and to some extent their practices, too, exhibited a significant moment of continuity with the prewar charities, in a context of scarcity, displacement, and social upheaval they now found themselves making stark choices about whom “to make live” and whom “to let die.”⁵⁵³ Transformed into a modern biopolitical actor, these associations set out on a quest for expert discourses that would guide and legitimize their choices, and soon settled for medicine, and more specifically, eugenics. Consequently, racial and eugenic tropes increasingly permeated public discussions about food provisioning and child welfare in wartime Austria-Hungary.

⁵⁵² Healy, *Vienna and the Fall*; Friederike Kind-Kovács, “The ‘Other’ Child Transports: World War I and the Temporary Displacement of Needy Children from Central Europe,” *Revue d’histoire de l’enfance « irrégulière »*, no. 15 (2013): 75–109.

⁵⁵³ Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76* (New York: Picador, 2003), 247.

If the military developed a paradoxical affinity to the nationalist advocates of race hygiene, these middle-class women and men instead opted for a biopolitical toolkit developed in the course of prewar debates within socialist and civic radical intellectual networks. The concept of human economy and human capital that was coined by Rudolf Goldscheid and echoed by Julius Tandler's notion of "organic capital," in particular, became a preferred intellectual resource for these voluntary associations during the war, and a hallmark of a coalescing "home front biopolitics."

The concept of organic capital was flexible and, in spite of its intellectual genealogy, entered the vocabulary of all main actors of home front biopolitics, beyond political progressives. To the voluntary associations, a eugenic toolkit that foregrounded the capacity of the environment to maintain as well as to change the individual and the collective body turned out to be convenient, as it endowed their work with an aura of scientific authority, without fundamentally changing their day-to-day practices. The progressive medical doctors, in turn, drew on the concept of organic capital to link the wartime relief, and the expected post-war reconstruction, with a future-oriented narrative of social change and collective democratic renewal. Echoing this vast horizon of expectations and projecting it onto a more constrained reality of a brief sojourn in the countryside, one voluntary worker exclaimed: "Such unlimited possibilities for physical and mental recovery [Gesundung]!"⁵⁵⁴ Finally, the municipal authorities and the civil administration which supported these initiatives were also ready to adopt the vocabulary of human economy and organic capital. What appealed to them was its preference for gradual, indeed evolutionary, solutions and for a technocratic management of the society.

⁵⁵⁴ Eugenie Schwarzwald, "Mehr Luft!," *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 50, no. 202 (July 23, 1916): 13.

In a deliberate contrast to the concept of human material, often invoked by the military in reference to the men at the battlefield, therefore, home front biopolitics revolved around Goldscheid's notion of human capital, or Tandler's reformulation of the concept. Echoing this concept, the actors of home front biopolitics argued that humans embodied a source of cultural, social, and economic value, even though this value was ultimately framed in instrumental terms. Crucially, the biopolitics emerging in multiethnic urban centers drew on this toolkit to avoid emphasizing ethnic differences.

In Vienna, a voluntary association *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* (Viennese Children in the Countryside) was launched in mid-1916. Women played a vital role in making this initiative possible, and its extensive newspaper coverage often pointed out that “the idea behind it originated from women.”⁵⁵⁵ A feminist and educator Eugenie Schwarzwald, in particular, was the key figure behind this voluntary association. Schwarzwald who was a part of Vienna's liberal middle-class circles embarked on organizing various relief activities for Vienna's residents during the war, setting up soup kitchens, facilitating various support initiatives for children, and contributing aid to refugees.⁵⁵⁶ Her leading role in organizing and promoting the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* was a part and parcel of her involvement in the wartime relief initiatives, and in the civil society more broadly. As its name suggests, the activity of the association that peaked in 1916 and 1917 consisted of organizing summer stays in the countryside for Viennese children in need. Indeed, its statutes stipulated that the single purpose of the voluntary association was “to enable poor children in need of recreation who live permanently in Vienna to stay and eat in the countryside with appropriate supervision.”⁵⁵⁷

⁵⁵⁵ Schwarzwald, “Mehr Luft!,” 13.

⁵⁵⁶ Deborah Holmes, *Langeweile ist Gift: Das Leben der Eugenie Schwarzwald* (St. Pölten: Residenz-Verlag, 2012), 176–201.

⁵⁵⁷ *Satzungen des Vereines Wiener Kinder aufs Land* (Vienna: Karl Gorischek, 1917), 1.

Wiener Kinder aufs Land, however, was more than a charity; the association had a distinctive biopolitical agenda, too.

Eugenics was one of the key discourses that provided the framing for the association's agenda, as well as for its calls for public support. These calls often echoed the anxieties about the population decline that became particularly salient among Austrian eugenicists during the war. They also invoked the tropes about children as an embodiment of the future, and as a living guarantee of the collective renewal: "Especially now, with so many men's lives being extinguished, we must be conscious of the fact that the next generation – the growing child – is called on to fill the deep, painful holes the war has torn in our ranks, to rebuild the future of society, and the strength of the people [Volk] and the state."⁵⁵⁸ When the association encouraged its supporters to aid particularly those children "whose health appeared damaged or threatened by the wartime circumstances," these calls were based on particular eugenic assumptions about the plasticity of human bodies and about the power of the environment to shape them.⁵⁵⁹ In making this call, the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* assumed that an exposure to an unsanitary urban environment could combine with wartime scarcity and significantly damage individual health, as well as the health of the future generations. Relocating the children to a seemingly unspoiled countryside, then, became a strategy of individual as well as collective regeneration.

The Viennese association's link to eugenics, and the genealogy of the eugenic knowledge that influenced it becomes even clearer when we consider that Julius Tandler was a member of its board.⁵⁶⁰ An influential professor of anatomy, an early supporter of eugenics,

⁵⁵⁸ Cited in Healy, *Vienna and the Fall*, 222.

⁵⁵⁹ Cited in Annette Pommer, "(Wiener) Kinder aufs Land: Die Kinderverschickung im Ersten Weltkrieg," (M.A. Thesis, University of Salzburg, 2019), 84.

⁵⁶⁰ Elana Shapira, "Eugenie Schwarzwald," in *Shalvi/Hyman Encyclopedia of Jewish Women*, Jewish Women's Archive, last modified June 23, 2021, accessed January 25, 2022, <<https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/schwarzwald-eugenie>>.

and a social democrat, Tandler was one of the founders of the first Viennese self-described eugenic society that, as the preceding chapter argued, sought to remake eugenics into a tool that would affirm the diversity of the empire and to propel the development of a modern, urban, industrial society. Informed by this eugenic discourse that foregrounded the inheritance of acquired characteristics, *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* embraced the concept of organic or human capital that was coined and popularized in Vienna already before the Great War by Tandler's professional and political ally Rudolf Goldscheid, and that became a central category of Tandler's eugenic vocabulary from about 1916 onwards.⁵⁶¹

One of the newspaper articles promoting the association in the summer of 1916, for instance, clearly echoed the concept of organic capital when it stated that “every child who then returns to Vienna has a reserve fund of physical and mental health. It is a reserve fund that must one day bear rich interest and compound interest for the adults, for the coming, happier generations.”⁵⁶² Locating the child in its past and future Viennese context without ascribing it any national identity, this citation also shows how Tandler's and Goldscheid's eugenic arguments allowed the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* to contextualize the child in its social and natural environment, while going beyond a nation-centered biopolitics. When the association referred to the concept of organic capital, consequently, it did not foreground or exclude any of the groups that inhabited Vienna's ethnoculturally diverse working-class suburbs. Advised by one of Austria's most influential eugenicists of the time, the association thus made the notion of human capital into the core of its biopolitical blueprint.

From an institutional perspective, the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* was also more than a simple charity. It was closely entangled with the state administration, provincial as well as

⁵⁶¹ Sablik, *Julius Tandler*, 101.

⁵⁶² Moriz Scheyer, “Das Zweimonateparadies,” *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 50, no. 180 (July 1, 1916): 4.

municipal authorities, even with the church, and it received “powerful support” from them.⁵⁶³ Schwarzwald acknowledged this dependency when she pointed out that “the parents, the state, the municipality, and the public bodies all have the highest interest that the next generation, on which our salvation depends, prospers.”⁵⁶⁴ The close connection between the association and the provincial and municipal authorities was clearly recognized in the association’s by-laws; their representatives, among others, had a say in the making of the strategic decisions about the association’s work.⁵⁶⁵

Wiener Kinder aufs Land thus exemplifies a pattern that was replicated across several cities of the empire, despite its seemingly paradoxical nature: through their involvement in the voluntary association focused on wartime relief, progressive and socialist eugenicists established or significantly strengthened their connections with the state administration and with municipal bodies, despite their often conservative politics.

In the context of wartime Austria-Hungary, the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* voluntary association – with its biopolitical agenda, and its close links to the state and local administration – was not exceptional, but rather became indicative of a broader trend. A similar eugenically oriented relief initiative emerged also in the other metropolis of the Habsburg Empire. The parallels between the *Stefánia-Szövetség* (Stefánia Association), as it was called, and its Viennese counterpart are striking. First, the *Stefánia-Szövetség*, founded in 1915, was a voluntary charitable association. As social workers, middle-class women were crucial for its day-to-day operation. Yet, it also had a strong backing of the municipal administration of

⁵⁶³ Schwarzwald, “Mehr Luft!,” 13.

⁵⁶⁴ Eugenie Schwarzwald, “Wiener Kinder aufs Land!” *Die Zeit* 15, no. 4978 (August 3, 1916): 5.

⁵⁶⁵ *Satzungen des Vereines*, 12.

Budapest which played an important role in the association's emergence and provided a part of its funding.⁵⁶⁶

Speaking at the associations' founding session in June 1915 in the name of Hungary's minister of interior, moreover, a clerk of the ministry made it clear that the association also depended on the state administration's favor when he stated that "no matter how fervent the social action may be and no matter how good its prospects are, one can only do half the work without the support of the official Hungary, of the state life, and of the public administration. One needs the support of the entire government, of the entire public administration."⁵⁶⁷ Like the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land*, the association also received public patronage from various members of the aristocracy, including some members of the ruling dynasty.⁵⁶⁸ While the *Stefánia-Szövetség* emerged primarily as an expression of the civil society, the municipal and state authorities, as well as the conservative social elites, were thus entangled with it.

Numerous male middle class professionals became involved in the association, producing expert advice on medical matters. A crucial figure among them was József Madzsar, a medical doctor, an early advocate of eugenics who had numerous professional, political, and personal ties to Hungarian civic radicals. Madzsar played a vital role in the emergence of the association, in defining its agenda, and assumed the central role of its managing secretary.⁵⁶⁹ Consequently, like *Wiener Kinder aufs Land*, the *Stefánia-Szövetség* also became more than a traditional charity and embraced a biopolitical agenda informed by eugenics. Citing a crucial section of its by-laws, therefore, Madzsar maintained that "the *Stefánia-Szövetség* is not a

⁵⁶⁶ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről. 1915. jún. 13–1917. jún. 15.* [Report on the Operation of the Stefánia Association. June 13, 1915 – June 15, 1917] (Budapest: Pfeifer, 1917), passim.

⁵⁶⁷ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, 13.

⁵⁶⁸ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, passim.

⁵⁶⁹ Endre Kárpáti, *Madzsar József válogatott írásai* [Selected Writings of József Madzsar] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967), 39–46.

charitable association. Its aim is not to practice charity, but to ‘create the physical and moral conditions of a healthy society’ through maternal and infant protection.”⁵⁷⁰

Similar to Vienna, too, the association’s embrace of biopolitics was presented as a necessary response to “the great danger that threatens the future of the nation due to the rapid decrease in births and the high death rate” that demanded a “work of real national relief.”⁵⁷¹ The statutes of the association stipulated, consequently, that the purpose of the association was related both to health and the society, aiming “to conduct the birth as perfectly as possible and to ensure a healthy development of the newborn,” on the one hand, and “to participate in creating and ensuring the economic, moral, and social conditions of existence of the new generation,” on the other hand.⁵⁷² The draft statutes further specified that “the guiding idea of the association is to prevent disease, not to cure it.”⁵⁷³ The interconnected ideas of eugenics and of medical prevention thus became foundational for this association.

Budapest echoed Vienna on the conceptual level, too. Madzsar and some of his allies at the *Stefánia-Szövetség* embraced the concept of human capital. It helped them define and condense the association’s biopolitical agenda, and made it resonate beyond the circles of eugenically oriented professionals. The liberal mayor of Budapest István Bárczy clearly gestured towards this concept at the founding session of the association when he stressed that: “Every saved child, every saved healthy human life is actually capital for the state, economic capital, among other things.”⁵⁷⁴ The minutes of the session recorded that the audience – consisting of various stakeholders that included conservative aristocrats and state officials, liberal municipal politicians, middle class professionals embracing social reforms, and many

⁵⁷⁰ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, 6.

⁵⁷¹ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, 5.

⁵⁷² József Madzsar, *Az anya- és csecsemővédelem országos szervezése: Mellékelve a Stefánia-Szövetség alapszabályainak tervezete* [Countrywide Organization of Maternal and Infant Care: With an Attached Draft of the Stefánia Association’s By-Laws] (Budapest: Stefánia Szövetség, 1915), 17.

⁵⁷³ Madzsar, *Az anya- és csecsemővédelem*, 17.

⁵⁷⁴ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, 17.

women active in public life – reacted approvingly to this particular part of Bárczy’s speech, interrupting it with cries of “indeed!” and with “lively applause!”⁵⁷⁵

Similar to the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land*, the concept of human capital helped eugenicists such as Madzsar to address these audiences by appealing to the perceived instrumental value of children and their healthy development to the state and the community. The links between Viennese eugenicists and the Hungarian civic radicals preceded the war, and the circulation of knowledge between these two communities continued even during even after the August of 1914.⁵⁷⁶ The eugenicist József Madzsar, as the leading representative of the *Stefánia-Szövetség* visited Vienna twice in 1916,⁵⁷⁷ inspecting some of its child welfare institutions, while Julius Tandler searched in Budapest for potential allies, entering in contact with Madzsar, among others.⁵⁷⁸ The circulation and impact of this concept beyond the imperial capital was thus facilitated by these strengthening links.

Like its Austrian parallel, finally, the *Stefánia-Szövetség* provided relief to working class and, to some extent, middle class families, primarily in Budapest and some other urban areas. In these ethnoculturally diverse areas of royal Hungary, the association did not cater only for the imagined core groups of the nation and thus did not limit its support only to Hungarian speakers. Instead, the liberal and progressive actors behind the *Stefánia-Szövetség* tended to understand the scope of the association in more universal terms. The by-laws of the association explicitly stated that it “cares for those in need regardless of race, language or religion.”⁵⁷⁹ In

⁵⁷⁵ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, 17.

⁵⁷⁶ For contacts between Jászi and Goldscheid spanning several decades, see Litván, *A Twentieth-Century Prophet*, 103, 106, 119, 186, 288, 374.

⁵⁷⁷ Kárpáti, *Madzsar József*, 43.

⁵⁷⁸ Karl Sablik, “Julius Tandler und die Medizinische Fakultät in Budapest (I. Weltkrieg),” in *Acta Congressus Internationalis XXIV Historiae Artis Medicinae: 25-31 Augusti 1974 Budapestini*, ed. József Antall, Géza Buzinkay, Ferenc Némethy, Emil Schultheisz, Endre Réti, Dénes Karasszon, Győző Birtalan, and Károly Zalai (Budapest: Museum, Bibliotheca et Archivum Historiae Artis Medicinae Semmelweis Nominata, 1976), 631–35.

⁵⁷⁹ Indicative of the contradictions that marked Madzsar’s eugenic project was the same paragraph of the statutes stipulated that “the protection of the association primarily covers healthy women and children.” Madzsar, *Az anya-és csecsemővédelem*, 17.

its everyday practice, as well, the association often provided care beyond a single national community.

When the medical department of the association decided to publish educational booklets on childcare for young mothers and on baby nutrition, for instance, they distributed Romanian, Slovak, and German versions of the booklet, too, even though the larger part of the 520 000 copies of the booklet was in Hungarian.⁵⁸⁰ Equally significantly, the allies of the association reporting from a more rural setting highlighted that they provided material support also to the local Roma people.⁵⁸¹ Even in the association providing wartime relief for Budapest's women and children, therefore, the embrace of eugenics did not initially go hand in hand with an exclusive focus on a single national community, but rather recognized, and in some cases even affirmed, the ethnocultural diversity of the urban population.

From Voluntary Associations to the Civil Administration and Back Again

Home front biopolitics was pioneered by voluntary associations. Yet, responding to mounting challenges at the home front, the state deepened its involvement with these initiatives. From 1917 onwards, consequently, the imperial and provincial civil administrators, as well as the municipal authorities, increasingly intervened into these initiatives, taking over their agendas or at least coordinating them. In doing so, they also became increasingly associated with eugenic knowledge and practices, as well as with the experts who promoted them. By 1918, therefore, the imperial state no longer merely provided support for the voluntary associations striving to provide wartime relief. Ultimately the authorities in imperial Austria

⁵⁸⁰ *Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről*, 77.

⁵⁸¹ Nándorné Báthory, *A főthi példa: Fóth község népjóléti intézményei* [The Fót Model: Welfare Institutions of the Fót Municipality] (Budapest: Posner, 1916), 11; József Szterényi, *Egy szociális mintaintézmény: A főti Népjóléti központ* [A Social Model Institution: The Welfare Center of Fót] (Budapest: Pfeifer, 1918), 5–6.

launched their own initiative that facilitated summer stays for children affected in their health by the dreary wartime conditions.

The *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk*, as the initiative was called, started to emerge at the end of 1917 or at the beginning of 1918 within the *Gemeinsame Ernährungsausschuss* that brought together the representatives of Austrian and Hungarian governments, of the imperial ministry of finance, and of the Army Higher Command.⁵⁸² Despite being a state institution, the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* followed its voluntary forerunners such as the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land* by invoking eugenic metaphors while communicating its agendas to various audiences. Even in this case, these metaphors reflected the concept of organic capital. One of its promotional texts argued, for example, that “the idea that today’s children and youth are the state of tomorrow” was at the core of the initiative.⁵⁸³

In its initial design, *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* followed the broad scope of its civil society forerunners, as well. The promotional materials published by the organization in the early months of 1918 thus stressed that “no differences in nationality, denomination or legal status were made” while deciding which children were eligible for its support.⁵⁸⁴ The key conditions, instead, were medical and economic. Only those children were eligible “who have been prescribed a convalescent stay by a doctor due to their frail condition” and, at the same time, whose parents had a maximum income of 6,000 crowns and had more than one child to care for.⁵⁸⁵

⁵⁸² Annette Pommer, “Das Kaiser Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk: Die staatliche Kinderverschickungsaktion im Ersten Weltkrieg,” *historioPLUS* 7 (2020): 121–22.

⁵⁸³ “Land und Luft für die Kinder: Die Aktion unter dem Schutze des Kaisers,” *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 52, no. 86 (March 31, 1918): 11.

⁵⁸⁴ “Eine Aktion für unterernährte Kinder,” *Arbeiterzeitung* 30, no. 86 (March 31, 1918): 6. Cited in Pommer, “Das Kaiser Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk,” 127.

⁵⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

The goal of the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk*, therefore, was to perform the role of its institutional predecessors, yet on a much larger scale. Indeed, Friederike Kind-Kovács points out that the association received support from the emperor primarily as “he had hoped to strengthen the bonds between the increasingly disconnected crown lands as well as strengthening the severely afflicted monarchy.”⁵⁸⁶ With the pledged support of the imperial state, and emphasizing that it would include all crownlands of imperial Austria, as well as cover Hungary, the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* was thus tasked with extending the relief practices pioneered by voluntary associations from a local to an imperial level.

Even though Julius Tandler, who had been involved in the *Wiener Kinder aufs Land*, had the trust of the imperial Austrian administration, and, according to some sources, also of the new emperor, he did not become the driving force behind the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk*.⁵⁸⁷ It was the pediatrician and nutrition expert Clemens von Pirquet, instead, that had major influence on this initiative’s practices.⁵⁸⁸ During the war, Pirquet reacted to the increasing shortage of food in imperial Austria by developing a new system of nutrition. Inspired by Taylorism that sought to optimize the labor performance of the “human machine,” Pirquet’s system strove similarly to rationalize, and thus to reduce, food consumption.⁵⁸⁹ Consequently, the organization applied Pirquet’s system while feeding a part of the children it catered for.

The choice of Pirquet did not mean a drift away from eugenic concerns, however. A historian of science Hans-Georg Hofer argues that when Pirquet “sought to counter the

⁵⁸⁶ Kind-Kovács, “The ‘Other’ Child Transports,” 90.

⁵⁸⁷ Sablik, *Julius Tandler*, 111, 140–41, 150.

⁵⁸⁸ Edmund Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen über die große Erholungsaktion für Schulkinder im Sommer 1918: Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk I,” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 69, no. 1 (January 1, 1919): 33.

⁵⁸⁹ Michael Burri, “Clemens Pirquet: Early Twentieth-Century Scientific Networks, the Austrian Hunger Crisis, and the Making of the International Food Expert,” in *Remaking Central Europe*, by Natasha Wheatley and Peter Becker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 39–70; Hans-Georg Hofer, “Ernährungskrise, Krankheit, Hungertod: Wien (und Österreich-Ungarn) im Ersten Weltkrieg,” *Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte* 31 (2013): 33–66.

shortages in the hinterland with the ‘rational management of population capital’” he was “borrowing from the sociologist Rudolf Goldscheid, who coined the term ‘human economy’ in Vienna in 1911.”⁵⁹⁰ The Taylorist, technocratic aspects of Pirquet’s nutrition system thus dovetailed with analogous tendencies that were baked into Goldscheid’s eugenic notion of organic capital.

The introduction to the first volume of Pirquet’s *System der Ernährung*, published in 1917, not only casts the rationalization of nutrition as a fundamental precondition of eugenic population management, but also foregrounds children as the main object of such biopolitics, thus showcasing another important part of Pirquet’s agenda: “Nutrition will have to be our number one concern for years to come. If we begin to organize the diet rationally, the production of food will also have to follow us on the rational path. We will then be able not only to hold out with lower crop yields and without foreign supplies, but also to raise healthy, strong offspring.”⁵⁹¹ Pirquet’s leading expert position in the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* thus exhibited many continuities with the roles of the eugenicists Tandler and Madzsar in the earlier relief initiatives, but also went beyond it.

Due to a more centralized nature of the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk*, Pirquet and the pediatric clinic that he presided had significant control not only over the narrative about the organization, but also over its material practices. Consequently, Pirquet and his allies had a significant degree of influence over the selection and observation of the participating children.

⁵⁹⁰ Hofer, “Ernährungskrise, Krankheit, Hungertod,” 59.

⁵⁹¹ Clemens Freiherr von Pirquet, *System der Ernährung*. Vol. 1. (Berlin: Springer, 1917), 8. From this perspective, it was entirely logical for Pirquet to promote his innovative system of nutrition both at a 1917 conference that aimed to define German-Austrian nationalist activists’ biopolitical program for the last years of the war, and at a 1918 conference in Berlin that was intended to coordinate the eugenically oriented biopolitics between the Central powers, particularly during the anticipated postwar reconstruction. Clemens Freiherr von Pirquet, “Richtlinien der Volksernährung,” in *II. Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 15. u. 16. April 1917* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1917), 8–17; Clemens Freiherr von Pirquet, “Ergebnisse der Ernährung nach einem neuen System,” in *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, ed. Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner (Jena: Fischer, 1918), 128–38.

A report about the initiative published in a leading medical journal emphasized that these choices “were made exclusively on medical grounds.”⁵⁹² Particular attention was reportedly paid to ensure that only those children come “that are in real need of regeneration, who are weak or in a process of recovery, but not those who are manifestly diseased.”⁵⁹³

When these medical doctors defined the categories of children who were to be excluded from a summer stay in the countryside, eugenic assumptions shaped some of their choices. The report particularly highlighted that those children were excluded who were diagnosed with epilepsy.⁵⁹⁴ Believed to be a hereditary mental illness, epilepsy was frequently targeted by the eugenic movement, including in imperial Austria, where one of the early eugenics associations, tellingly bore the name *Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische*.⁵⁹⁵ Children who had been diagnosed with congenital syphilis were also among those who were denied participation.⁵⁹⁶ Whether the child had some other “hereditary burden [hereditäre Belastung],” moreover, was one of the crucial pieces of information that was to be established during the medical checkup and that then contributed to the decisions about the child’s eligibility to participate in a summer stay.⁵⁹⁷ The doctors also sought to filter out children which they labelled as “asocials” [dissoziale Elemente] and as “difficult to educate.”⁵⁹⁸ The entire process, finally, created a significant paper trail and produced a large set of standardized, comparable data on which Pirquet would later continue to draw.⁵⁹⁹ Due to its centralized, top-down nature, the

⁵⁹² Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 33.

⁵⁹³ Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 33.

⁵⁹⁴ Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 33.

⁵⁹⁵ As the previous chapter documents, moreover, the Austrian association had close institutional ties to the Children’s clinic of the Vienna University.

⁵⁹⁶ Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 33.

⁵⁹⁷ Interestingly, unlike the categories mentioned above, categories such as congenital heart disease actually increased the chances of a child being selected for the summer stay. Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 34.

⁵⁹⁸ Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 34.

⁵⁹⁹ See Clemens Freiherr von Pirquet, “Ernährungszustand der Kinder in Österreich während des Krieges und der Nachkriegszeit,” in *Volksgesundheit im Krieg*, ed. Clemens Freiherr von Pirquet (Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1926), 1:151–79.

Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk thus went the furthest among similar wartime initiatives in Austria-Hungary in translating eugenics into material practices on the ground.

The intention to use the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* to rebuild a sense of commonality within the empire was thwarted by imperial Austria's decreasing state capacity. As Tara Zahra argued about school-related child and youth welfare, since 1917 the state administration was increasingly forced to outsource its growing social welfare agenda to nationalist associations.⁶⁰⁰ In a context of acute food shortage, the decisive role that the state assumed in running the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* had similar unintended consequences.

When the organizers in the end of March 1918 made the public statement that “the numerous associations that have previously dealt with similar goals should be consulted for intensive cooperation” and that these associations will be “free to choose children according to their by-laws,” they all but recognized that the outcome would start to resemble, to an extent, the prewar practices of nationally exclusive welfare pursued by these associations.⁶⁰¹ Consequently, when a preliminary map was drawn in mid-March 1918 that indicated the rural areas where the urban children from imperial Austria could be placed, the preferred rural regions included the area surrounding Kronstadt/Braşov/Brassó and Hermannstadt/Sibiu/Nagyszeben in Transylvania, a large strip of land in the Banat, the areas surrounding Graz in Styria and Linz in Lower Austria, as well as Southern Moravia and the South-West and the East of Bohemia. In other words, the areas that the map singled out both in royal Hungary and in imperial Austria were almost exclusively those that were inhabited by

⁶⁰⁰ Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*, 80-81.

⁶⁰¹ “Die Kaiser-Karl-Aktion für unterernährte Kinder,” *Neue Freie Presse*, no. 19252 (March 31, 1918): 17.

German speakers.⁶⁰² The increased role of the imperial state thus, paradoxically, led to an increased dependence on nationalist activists.

The crownlands from which the children originated also suggested that the initiative prioritized areas inhabited by German speakers, despite the initial intentions. A report indicated that out of nearly sixty-six thousand children who took part at one of the largest summer stays, 54 percent originated from Vienna, more than 11 percent from other parts of Lower Austria, and 6 percent from Styria. Approximately 24 percent of participants, moreover, came from Bohemia, while the remaining crownlands added up the rest.⁶⁰³ However, the imperial initiative did not entirely collapse into nationalist welfare. There is nothing to suggest that the children from Vienna who did not speak German, or those who were bilingual, had been rejected by the initiative. Many children who received support from the initiative, moreover, were Jewish.⁶⁰⁴ Having adopted the concept of organic capital and extended the geographic scope of the older voluntary associations, the *Kaiser Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk* blended imperial and nationalist agendas, without fully aligning with either.

The intertwining of state-led social welfare, eugenics, and nationalism was even more pronounced in Northern Bohemia. By 1917, the physician and temperance activist Arnold Holitscher emerged as a key promoter of eugenically oriented social welfare for children in this context. Like many other eugenicists involved in the temperance movement, Holitscher emphasized the importance of the environment in shaping human bodies and warned against the toxic, intergenerational effects of alcohol.⁶⁰⁵ During the war, Holitscher increasingly applied this neo-Lamarckian framework to the pressing issue of food scarcity.

⁶⁰² Hungarian children, in turn, were accommodated in the Austrian Littoral. Pommer, “Das Kaiser Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk,” 126.

⁶⁰³ Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 37.

⁶⁰⁴ Pommer, “(Wiener) Kinder aufs Land!,” passim.

⁶⁰⁵ Holitscher’s arguments regarding alcoholism are analyzed in the preceding chapter.

In a lecture from April 1917, Holitscher claimed that undernourishment or what he perceived as unnatural nutrition would have damaging effects on the body, and that these effects would impact future generations. He painted this risk in unambiguously eugenic terms:

[N]utrition became one-sided. It now lacks certain substances that are indispensable for the development of the organism and of the offspring, yet it contains dangerous toxins which are increasingly being used. The lack of mineral salts, vitamins, and the excess of protein all reduce the body's resistance, cause diseases, and inhibit the development of the growing organism as well as of the germ plasm.⁶⁰⁶

In effect, Holitscher argued that food shortage would result in a “permanent harm to the individual, to the nation [das Volk], or to the species.”⁶⁰⁷

In effect, Holitscher called for the imperial state to intervene, and organize the food distribution for the benefit of “public nutrition and thus of public health, of the strength of our pedigree [Stammestüchtigkeit] and of the future of our Germandom.”⁶⁰⁸ In a context where socialist ideology exhibited a strong evolutionist influence, and where socialism and nationalism coexisted within the movement, Holitscher's deep commitment to socialism did not rule out either the nationalist definition of social welfare or the embrace of eugenics that was supposed to underpin it.

Holitscher not only intervened in public debates but also sought to directly influence the state administration. In the summer of 1917, he wrote a memorandum on the health effects of food shortage to the Austrian *Oberster Sanitätsrat* (Highest Medical Council), warning specifically about the situation in North Bohemia. The anxieties that he invoked revolved around both the purported “quality” and “quantity” of the population. On the one hand, Holitscher cautioned against the rapid progression of the “emaciation and weakening of the

⁶⁰⁶ Arnold Holitscher, “Schäden der Volksernährung,” in *II. Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 15. u. 16. April 1917: Vorträge* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1917), 40.

⁶⁰⁷ Holitscher, “Schäden der Volksernährung,” 19.

⁶⁰⁸ Holitscher, “Schäden der Volksernährung,” 40.

workforce, and particularly of women.” On the other hand, he also warned that “this frightening deterioration in health” was accompanied by “a significant increase in deaths despite a reduction in births to a third.”⁶⁰⁹ Both of these arguments fit neatly with his eugenic views and implied that the food shortage would ultimately lead to a decline in the fitness of the populace. Together with the multiplying reports by the local authorities about food shortages and the social protests in the area, Holitscher’s interventions were crucial in convincing the political and administrative actors to intervene in North Bohemia with a particular urgency.⁶¹⁰

In the early months of 1918, the imperial authorities launched the *Hilfsaktion für die nordböhmischen Kinder*, a relief initiative for the children of North Bohemia. The authorities were not only convinced by a eugenicist to allocate aid to this region but adopted the language of eugenics themselves. In an interview he gave to a Prague German-language newspaper, for instance, the former minister of education Max von Hussarek emphasized that “We are facing a risk that the child mortality will increase in a terrifying manner. What is more, the children will be physically and mentally stunted. As fathers and mothers then, they will not be able to endow the new generation with any vital power [Lebenskraft].”⁶¹¹

Institutionally, the initiative was a part of the *Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk*, and it received additional support from the provincial administration as well as from the nationalist child welfare charities. Reflecting the pronouncedly nationalist nature of these charities in

⁶⁰⁹ Austrian State Archives, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Inneres, Ministerium des Innern, Sanitätsakten, Akten (1900-1918), Box 3117 (Volkskrankheiten, in genere, 1918), Letter from Arnold Holitscher to k.k. Oberster Sanitätsrat, July 16, 1917. A smaller fragment of the letter is also cited in Hofer, “Ernährungskrise, Krankheit, Hungertod,” 44.

⁶¹⁰ See, for instance, Alexandra Špiritová, ed., *Sborník dokumentů k vnitřnímu vývoji v českých zemích za 1. světové války 1914-1918: Rok 1917* [Collection of Documents on the Internal Development in the Bohemian Lands during World War I 1914-1918: Year 1917], Vol. 4. (Prague: Státní ústřední archiv, 1996), 129-132; Jaroslav Vrbata and Eva Drašarová, eds., *Sborník dokumentů k vnitřnímu vývoji v českých zemích za 1. světové války 1914-1918: Rok 1918* [Collection of Documents on the Internal Development in the Czech Lands during World War I 1914-1918: Year 1918], Vol. 5. (Prague: Státní ústřední archiv, 1997), 53-55, 116-123, 143-144.

⁶¹¹ “Die Hilfsaktion für Nordböhmen: Unterredung mit dem Präsidenten des gemeinsamen Ernährungsausschuss GM Landwehr von Pragenau und mit dem Dr. Freiherrn von Hussarek,” *Prager Tagblatt* 43, no. 69 (March 23, 1918): 1.

Northern Bohemia, the nationalist dimension of the initiative was more explicit than in its Viennese counterpart. Only the German-speaking children were targeted in this case.⁶¹² At the same time, however, these charities were also spatially and organizationally fragmented, and while Holitscher had allies among the medical doctors in Northern Bohemia, they were not organized in a formal, hierarchical institution. Consequently, unlike their Viennese counterparts, medical doctors in Northern Bohemia had less influence on the everyday work of the associations, and on the selection of eligible children.

Another welfare initiative, catering primarily to the inhabitants of Prague, was launched by Czech nationalists in late 1917. As we have already seen, several Czech scholars had embraced eugenics by the time World War I broke out and founded the *Czech Eugenics Society* in Prague shortly thereafter. Already at its opening session that took place in early 1915, they called for the introduction of eugenically informed welfare. Similar to Vienna and Budapest, they drew on the notion of organic capital and its economic management. Introducing relief initiatives and eugenic initiatives, one of them claimed, was an urgent task precisely because “the idea of ‘economizing people’ that was coined already before the war by philosophers such as Goldscheid in his great book on ‘Menschenökonomie’” had now come back as “the most pressing issue and it is knocking also at the gates of our country with unavoidable urgency.”⁶¹³

During the war, when food shortages became a salient issue in Bohemian urban areas, these eugenicists saw an opportunity to increase their public visibility and establish links to the public administration. Drawing on the idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, some of the leading figures of the Czech Eugenic Society claimed that the natural environment created by food shortages was toxic, and that this toxicity would have a long-term effect on the

⁶¹² Pommer, “(Wiener) Kinder aufs Land!,” 128.

⁶¹³ František Čáda, “Úkoly a význam České společnosti eugenické” [Tasks and Significance of the Czech Eugenics Society], *Revue neuropsychopathologie* 12, no. 5–6 (June 25, 1915): 180.

society. Their efforts culminated in two books that explicitly dealt with the effects of undernourishment from the perspective of eugenics.

The books claimed that undernourishment disrupted the equilibrium of one's metabolism, created toxic by-products, and damaged the entire organism. Not even the “germ cells” were shielded from these toxic effects, they argued, and a repeated or protracted starving could thus make the future generation weaker and sicklier. For instance, in the book bearing the incendiary title *O smrti hladem a porušování organismu nedostatečnou výživou* (On Death by Starvation and the Harm to the Organism by Undernutrition), Jaroslav Kříženecký sought to establish that “the large part of the population does not receive sufficient nutrition and that it is systematically starving.”⁶¹⁴ He argued that:

The most serious thing is that this harm will not only concern the current generation and its offspring, but that the following generations are also threatened by it, since autointoxication during starvation also damages the germ plasm. The danger for the biological fitness of today's and future generations that results from the current malnutrition of the broadest strata is therefore worth considering. The deepest roots of generational power are undermined by the self-poisoning that results from starvation. It is not just about the present, but also about the future.⁶¹⁵

The other eugenicist, Růžička, made a similar argument.

However, Růžička went even further than Kříženecký and concluded with a direct call for eugenic policies:

A chronic malnutrition is an evil in itself. Yet, it is also a predisposing factor for many fatal diseases, even for those that affect the future generation. It is therefore one of the factors that eugenics works to mitigate and eliminate in the interest of the nation's future. The danger from chronic malnutrition is, of course, all the greater for a nation if it is also joined by the population decline,

⁶¹⁴ Jaroslav Kříženecký, *O smrti hladem a porušování organismu nedostatečnou výživou* [On Death by Starvation and the Harm to the Organism by Undernutrition] (Prague: Otto, 1918), 34.

⁶¹⁵ Kříženecký, *O smrti hladem*, 35.

caused by the Great War; the danger then grows into an outright threat, requiring appropriate intervention.⁶¹⁶

These eugenicists thus created alarmist narratives that framed food shortage as an intergenerational, biological risk for the national community.

There was demand for such a narrative, particularly among some nationalist politicians in Bohemia. More precisely, such a demand arose during the war, with the growing social conflict between the rural and the urban areas. Of course, the rural-urban political divide existed already before the war, yet it was greatly exacerbated by the asymmetrical experience of food shortage and continued to influence Czech politics well into the interwar period.⁶¹⁷ Some urban and rural political actors, however, made it a key part of their political strategy to bridge this divide. On the one hand, the middle-class political parties involved in Prague's municipal government hoped that deescalating the tensions between the countryside and the city would ultimately lead to a better food supply and solidify their contested legitimacy. On the other hand, the leaders of the agrarian party believed that the bridging of the rural-urban political divide would increase their coalition potential with urban political parties.⁶¹⁸ These political actors eagerly embraced the biological narratives produced by the eugenicists and transformed them into institutions and policies.

In September 1917 several middle-class politicians from Prague teamed up with some leading figures of the agrarian party, along with several medical doctors close to the *Czech Eugenic Society*, and established the *České Srdce* (Czech Heart), a versatile charity seeking to limit the impact of the food shortage. In particular, František Prokop Procházka, Prague's chief

⁶¹⁶ Vladislav Růžicka, *Hlad: jeho vliv na organismus a děje životní* [Starvation: Its influence on the Organism and Life Processes] (Prague: Vilímek, 1918), 24.

⁶¹⁷ Lucian George, "Greedy Farmers versus Workshy Workers: Urban-Rural Moral Competition and the Shadow of WWI in the Politics of Interwar Czechoslovakia," in *International Conference of the European Rural History Organisation* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2022), 60.

⁶¹⁸ Vojtěch Pojar, "Nedostatek potravin za první světové války a legitimita komunálních elit v Praze" [Food Shortages during World War I and the Legitimacy of Municipal Elites in Prague], *Hospodářské dějiny* 28, no. 2 (2013): 177–225.

municipal physician with an interest in eugenics, was one of the driving forces behind the association.⁶¹⁹ In its by-laws, the *České Srdce* established that its main agenda was to contribute by appropriate means “to alleviate the poverty of the population and to improve its conditions of existence, both on the physical and mental levels, primarily in the communities in the Prague metropolitan area, and in our small towns too, if need be.”⁶²⁰

The main activity of the charity consisted of obtaining food from the countryside through purchase or through donation and distributing it in major urban areas, using various channels ranging from direct distribution to cafeterias and soup kitchens. Moreover, eventually, the charity expanded its scope even further and included legal support for families, various forms of maternal welfare, and last but not least, long-term stays for the children from urban areas in the countryside.⁶²¹ The calls of the charity for material support were couched in a symbolic and highly emotionally charged nationalist language.

The influence of eugenics on this language was clear enough. A 1917 proclamation of the association’s purpose by one of its leading figures, for instance, stated that:

today, a united and spiritually reborn nation cries and trembles around us. Yet, it is a nation that is languishing and physically dying. [...] it is everyone’s duty to make sure that the nation survives into the future alive and unspoiled [nezbědačený].⁶²²

⁶¹⁹ *Pět let Českého srdce, 1917-1922* [Five Years of the Czech Heart, 1917-1922] (Prague: České srdce, 1922), 7.

⁶²⁰ The State Regional Archives in Benešov, Fund České srdce Benešov [Czech Heart, Benešov Branch], Inv. No. 1, *Stanovy Národního pomocného sdružení ČS*. Prague: Rolnická tiskárna, 1918: 1.

⁶²¹ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Rok činnosti Českého srdce” [One Year of Activity of the Czech Heart], *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fyzikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 15, no. 7–9 (October 28, 1918): 234–236; Jan Schneider and Josef Groh, eds., *Dvacet let Českého srdce 1917-1937: jubilejní památník jeho národní a humaní činnosti* [Twenty Years of the Czech Heart, 1917-1937: Jubilee Memorial of Its National and Humane Activities] (Prague: České srdce, 1937).

⁶²² Růžena Svobodová, “Nedejme zahynouti” [Let Us Not Perish], *Lípa* 1, no. 2 (1917): 29–30.

In turn, one of its branch offices warned that the shortage “threatens the physical dexterity of our nation, and thus our entire future.”⁶²³ The charity became one of the crucial agents supplying the urban areas in the last months of the war.

Even though the *České Srdce* was a civil society institution, it was designed as a substitute for the state. However, given the rapidly declining capacity of the imperial state, the authorities accepted or at least tolerated it, likely hoping that doing so would prevent or attenuate social unrest in Bohemia’s industrial cities. The association, for instance, could utilize the services of the state railways to transport the donated or purchased food from the countryside to the cities. It was widely understood that this food effectively bypassed the state distribution system.⁶²⁴ Moreover, the municipal governments transferred some of their responsibilities regarding food distribution to the association. Effectively, the state outsourced a part of its recently gained agenda even more clearly in this case, to a charity that worked parallel to the state-organized food distribution, rather than in tandem with it. The nationalist voluntary association thus developed a form of alternative state capacity with the state’s assent.

To sum up, in the final years of the war, supporters of eugenics advised both voluntary associations and civilian authorities on issues related to food supply and child welfare. As the influence of nationalist associations grew in the everyday operations of these initiatives, the physicians associated with them were recruited from both reform-oriented eugenicists and nationalist circles. In fact, they often rhetorically linked these two agendas.

Yet, how did the embrace of eugenic discourse and of eugenic experts shape the practices of these nationalist voluntary initiatives on the ground? A closer look at the day-to-

⁶²³ The State Regional Archives in Mělník, Fund Spolek České srdce Kralupy nad Vltavou [Czech Heart, Kralupy nad Vltavou Branch], uncatalogued, Provolání sběrací skupiny ČS Kralupy [Declaration of a Collecting Unit of the Czech Heart], December 18, 1917.

⁶²⁴ Schneider and Groh, *Dvacet let Českého srdce*, passim.

day practices of the association *České Srdce* may shed light on this question, given its pronounced nationalism, its assumption of some state functions, and the involvement of eugenically oriented physicians in its operations. The uniquely preserved papers of its branch office in the industrial city of Pilsen illuminate this issue.

These papers contain reports in which the association's social workers explained, sometimes in a detailed manner, why the charity refused to provide support to some individual cases. Crucially, most of the social workers making these choices were women, and the papers highlight their agency in shaping the policies of the charity on the ground. These women often had a longer experience with voluntary social work which they gained in the prewar charitable associations. In their daily practice, therefore, they drew on this experience, rather than on the expert knowledge produced by the eugenicists.

The records show that these social workers did not invoke eugenics. Far from following the latest advances in nutrition science, they appealed to a shared moral economy that defined what constituted equitable access to food, and by implication, what constituted poverty.⁶²⁵ Assessments about one's social status, defined by access to food, abounded in the records. "She is supported by her mother," a social worker noted in one particular case. In another, a social worker pointed out that "the father works at the Škoda factory for 60 crowns a week." The social workers reiterated a similar point over and over, suggesting that the family in question already had a sufficient supply of food. "[S]he is very wealthy," "she owns a grocer's shop," "he does not appear poor," "she is a member of a consumer cooperative," or more dryly, "she

⁶²⁵ Edward P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 50, no. 1 (1971): 76–136; Kučera, *Rationed Life*, 19 and 137–38.

has gainful employment,” the social workers observed about various individuals, arguing that this fact alone precluded their family from receiving assistance.⁶²⁶

The social workers also appealed to the prevalent norms of middle-class morality, yet without attempting to reinforce them with biological constructs. The complaints about one’s behavior were significantly gendered and focused almost exclusively on women. The reports contain a slew of such complaints, accusing the women in question of being “mostly at parties,” or remarking that they “did not enjoy a good reputation,” “lied, cheated, and allegedly stole from the house,” “gave the impression of a comedian,” “had been in prison several times,” “went home from the movies late at night,” “lived in vice,” “led a disorderly life,” and so on.⁶²⁷ Labeled as living a non-normative lifestyle and thus as “undeserving” poor, these women and their families were also flatly refused aid.

Nationalist arguments were frequently invoked in these reports, as well. Yet, even in this case, what mattered to the social workers was not the biological identity of the parents, but rather their perceived national indifference. As a testimony to the continuity of the practices of prewar nationalist activism, school attendance served as the main proxy for such national indifference. The social workers were quick to note, for example, that “the guardian has not yet decided whether to send the ward to a Czech or a German school,” or that a child “was taken by her mother from the third grade of a general Czech school and sent to a German school.”⁶²⁸ In these cases as well, the social workers punished the children for even a slight suspicion about a parent’s lack of national loyalty by making them ineligible to receive any aid.

⁶²⁶ Pilsen City Archives, Podpůrný spolek České srdce Plzeň [Czech Heart Relief Association in Pilsen], 1917-1919, Box 1252, File 70, Zamítnuté žádosti 1918-19.

⁶²⁷ Pilsen City Archives, Podpůrný spolek České srdce Plzeň [Czech Heart Relief Association in Pilsen], 1917-1919, Box 1252, File 70, Zamítnuté žádosti 1918-19.

⁶²⁸ Pilsen City Archives, Podpůrný spolek České srdce Plzeň [Czech Heart Relief Association in Pilsen], 1917-1919, Box 1252, File 70, Zamítnuté žádosti 1918-19.

While the language of eugenics permeated the public discussions about food distribution, and eugenicists played important roles within these charities, their actual practice only had a very loose connection to this ambiguous body of scientific knowledge. The criteria that decided one's access to food aid only partially corresponded with those that these eugenicists had in mind, even though they overlapped in cases where they both reinforced middle-class morals. Tellingly, eugenicists involved in this initiative started articulating their disappointment. For example, Jaroslav Kříženecký remarked bitterly that: "Charity and philanthropism often stand out as a driving force [of these practices] more than the awareness of the social necessity of caring for the nation's biological fitness."⁶²⁹ Even the *České Srdce*, arguably the most pronouncedly nationalist of the initiatives involved in home front biopolitics, ultimately fell far from fully implementing eugenic ideas in its day-to-day practice.

Conclusion

By delving into the interplay of eugenic discourses and the Habsburg imperial state during World War I, this chapter argues that eugenic expertise plugged into the body of the Leviathan during that cataclysmic moment.⁶³⁰ In other words, eugenic discourses and their expert producers became closely linked to various parts of the imperial state, in addition to reinforcing their previous intimate connections with segments of civil society. In light of the conclusions of the previous chapter, which suggest that the thriving, empire-wide networks of eugenics largely failed to exert an immediate impact on policy and legislation in Austria-Hungary before 1914, this analysis reveals that the war represented a significant shift in this regard.

⁶²⁹ Jaroslav Kříženecký, "Organisace vědy: česká eugenika" [Organization of Science: Czech Eugenics], *Nové Atheneum* 1, no. 3 (1920): 210.

⁶³⁰ I borrow this turn of phrase from Gil Eyal, "Plugging into the Body of the Leviathan: Proposal for a New Sociology of Public Interventions," *Middle East – Topics & Arguments* 2, no. 1 (2013): 13–24.

While the demand for biopolitical expertise generated by the supporters of eugenics arose in various parts of the imperial state, the chapter argues that the Habsburg military and the civilian administrators in major urban areas were at the forefront of this process. Furthermore, these groups adopted different forms of eugenics and applied them to distinct agendas. These profound differences and the resulting conflicts between the eugenicists associated with these two state agencies were not coincidental. They reflected a fierce struggle between the military and the civilian administration for the ultimate control of the imperial state, a struggle that erupted during the war and ultimately undermined the foundations of the empire.

The next chapter centers on the transitional period between the empire and the nation-states in the narrow sense, from about 1916 to the stabilization of post-Habsburg states around about 1923. Building on the findings about the interplay of eugenics and the state during the war, the chapter will demonstrate its effects on the networks and institutions of eugenicists during this period of post-imperial transition. It also reveals the fluctuating influence of the supporters of eugenics in the post-Habsburg countries in the early 1920s, which paradoxically tended to diminish once these states consolidated, and the wartime crises subsided.

Before transitioning to the next chapter, however, one further clarification is necessary. While there was a conflict between the biopolitics enabled by the state of exception spearheaded by the imperial military and the modernist biopolitical rule of the civil administrators, there was also a zone of indistinction between the two. Both state agencies and their eugenic advisors targeted people who were on the move. For many of the military-linked eugenicists, this mobility reinforced their overlapping concerns about the alleged bacteriological and genetic contagion and political disloyalty. Conversely, the neo-Lamarckism – in which differences in past environments translated into differences in biology and could be cast as hierarchies – commonly embraced by eugenic allies of municipal authorities, did not challenge the policy

choices that excluded mobile individuals from access to resources or the discourses that linked fears of epidemics with supposed civilizational hierarchies.

The people on the move who were thus affected in Austria-Hungary included the masses of refugees displaced by the war, as well as the itinerant people whom the authorities stamped with the label of “Gypsies.” For instance, as argued by Marius Weigl in his recent comprehensive study, the war brought about a significant shift in political and police discourses and practices concerning the administrative category of the “Gypsies,” even though this group had been a key subject of police surveillance and criminological conceptualization since at least the second half of the nineteenth century. (Weigl also explains that the link between scientific discourse and the actual practices of the gendarmes was quite loose, even though the discourse legitimized the practices.)⁶³¹ Not only did the authorities consider introducing a “Zigeunerverordnung,” a special legal measure targeting individuals labeled as “Gypsies,” during the war. Apart from this measure, which ultimately was not passed, the authorities also set up internment camps particularly affecting and segregating this group. The imperial military played a significant role in spearheading both of these measures, especially the internment camps.⁶³²

The conflict between the military and civilian administrators in Austria-Hungary did not extend to this issue. In fact, civilian authorities had already called for coercive police and administrative measures before the war. Equally important was the fact that from the mid-19th century onwards, when access to poor relief in any community of imperial Austria was made dependent on an individual’s right of domicile. This practice persisted, however, even as the state’s involvement in social policy became more robust. Excluding mobile individuals, along

⁶³¹ Marius Weigl, *Internierung und Militärdienst: Die “Lösung der Zigeunerfrage” in Österreich-Ungarn im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2022), 50.

⁶³² Weigl, *Internierung und Militärdienst*, 473.

with other social categories, from access to material aid, it was still in force during the war.⁶³³

In the urban contexts described above, individuals on the move without the right of domicile were excluded from access to welfare, including the eugenically informed forms described in this chapter.

⁶³³ Weigl, *Internierung und Militärdienst*, 62–65 and 257–281.

THE PARADOX OF STATE CONSOLIDATION: EUGENICS BETWEEN THE EMPIRE AND ITS MINIATURES, 1917-1923

In the wake of Austria-Hungary's dissolution, its successor states rapidly established public health ministries. By mid-1919, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia each had their own public health ministry in place. Republican Austria, meanwhile, inherited the imperial Austrian health ministry founded in 1917, rebranding it as *Staatsamt für Volksgesundheit* (State Office of People's Health). Interestingly, despite the surge of nationalism catalyzed by the war and the empire's disintegration, key administrators in these newly minted ministries maintained a keen interest in the work of their counterparts in other post-Habsburg states.

Andrija Štampar is the epitome of this tendency. An influential figure in Yugoslavia's new ministry of public health, Štampar was also an editor of its official bulletin, the *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja*. During the bulletin's initial years, it extensively covered the developments in the other countries that emerged from the ruins of Austria-Hungary. The bulletin systematically chronicled the establishment, administrative organization, and objectives of the health ministries in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, delving as well into their respective public health legislations and policies.⁶³⁴ Notably, Štampar was not alone in this pursuit.

⁶³⁴ See, for instance, "Djelokrug drž. ureda za nar. zdravlje u Njem. Austrii" [Scope of the State Office of People's Health in German Austria], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 1–2 (September 1919): 36–37; "Ministarstvo za javne radnje i opću pomoć u Ugarskoj" [Ministry for Public Works and Social Welfare in Hungary], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 10 (June 1920): 418–21; "Poljsko ministarstvo zdravlja" [Polish Ministry of Health], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 7 (March 1920): 291–92; Jan Semerád, "Organizacija zdravstvene službe u čehoslov. republici/Nacrt djelokruga čehoslov. ministarstva zdravlja" [Organization of Health Services in Czechoslovak Republic/Draft Scope of Czechoslovak Ministry of Health], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 1–2 (September 1919): 33–35.

Numerous public health officials across post-Habsburg states exhibited a similar curiosity. In a manner similar to the Yugoslav bulletin, the official journal of the Austrian central public health office devoted considerable attention to institutional frameworks and policies in post-Habsburg countries, albeit with certain blind spots. This journal allocated substantial coverage to public health and welfare policies in revolutionary Hungary.⁶³⁵ Furthermore, it frequently discussed public health initiatives and social reforms in Czechoslovakia, highlighting, among other topics, a reform of the marriage law.⁶³⁶ Yet, the journal mentioned the emerging Poland only in relation to its attempts to control post-war epidemics, and remained entirely silent about Yugoslavia.⁶³⁷

The official bulletin of the Czechoslovak ministry was also selective, but in a different manner. While it meticulously covered the developments in Poland and kept Austria in focus, its interest seemed limited to these countries, at least as far as post-Habsburg states were concerned.⁶³⁸ Only later did Czechoslovakia's doctors shift attention more prominently towards Yugoslavia, notably due to Štampar's initiatives.⁶³⁹ Taken together, these accounts highlight an

⁶³⁵ "Wohlfahrtsministerium in Ungarn," *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 2 (1920): 191; "Alkoholverbot in Ungarn," *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 27.

⁶³⁶ "Ministerium für Gesundheitswesen und körperliche Erziehung in Prag," *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 2 (1920): 840; "Das neue Ehegesetz in der Tschechoslowakei," *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 228 and 390.

⁶³⁷ "Expedition zur Bekämpfung des Fleckfiebers in Polen," *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 465.

⁶³⁸ "Činnost polského ministerstva zdravotnictví" [Activities of the Polish Ministry of Health], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 6 (August 20, 1919): 164–65; "Z polského ministerstva zdravotnictví" [From the Polish Ministry of Health], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 10 (December 20, 1919): 290; "Státní úřad pro zdraví lidu ve Vídni" [State Office for Public Health in Vienna], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 10 (December 20, 1919): 289; "Prof Finger: Sociální důležitost pohlavních chorob a jich potírání" [Prof. Finger: The Social Importance of Venereal Diseases and Their Suppression], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 8 (October 20, 1919): 232.

⁶³⁹ Marie Schneiderová, "Lékař a inženýr asanují vesnici v Jugoslávii" [Doctor and Engineer Sanitize a Village in Yugoslavia], *Věstník českých lékařů* 45, no. 21 (May 26, 1933): 609–11; Ivan Stodola, "Dojmy z cesty po Juhoslávii" [Impressions from a Trip to Yugoslavia], *Bojo zdravie: ľudový zdravotnícky časopis Masarykovej ligy proti tuberkulóze na Slovensku* 5, no. 9–10 (1930): 130–36; Croatian State Archives, Zagreb, Fund 831, Andrija Štampar Papers, Box 14, Inv. No. 10.733, Letter, Frank Swoboda to Andrija Štampar, November 24, 1932 (See also the attached newspaper clipping Frank Swoboda, "Hygiene hilft der Landwirtschaft in Jugoslawien," *Deutsche Landpost: Tagblatt der deutschen Landpartei* "Bund der Landwirte," 1932.)

underlying sentiment: in spite of the post-war nationalist fervor, many public health officials were keen to draw lessons from their peers in other post-Habsburg states and even held up specific policies as models.

Undoubtedly, the acute public health challenges faced by the region at the end of World War I, combined with the constrained resources at the disposal of the newly formed states, played a significant role in fostering this shared curiosity. The internationalist perspective that many of these public health officials adopted was another crucial contributing factor, as was the support which they received from the nascent transnational public health institutions.⁶⁴⁰ However, these factors alone do not provide a sufficient explanation. The mutual mirroring and interconnectedness among these stakeholders predated the empire's dramatic disintegration. The analysis, therefore, must factor in their recent imperial past. In what follows, it will become clear that the simultaneous emergence of nearly identical institutions, namely the public health ministries, across post-Habsburg Central Europe, stemmed from the extensive transnational knowledge exchange in the last years of the empire. Significantly, this exchange underwent a transformation during the war, while it was still deeply shaped by the empire's context.

This chapter explores the extraordinarily intensive networking, institution-building, and legislative lobbying that marked the activities of eugenics supporters in Austria-Hungary and post-Habsburg spaces between the crisis-ridden last years of World War I and the emergence and stabilization of post-Habsburg states. It thus teases out the complex relationship between eugenics and state-building during a period of post-imperial transition in the narrow sense, spanning from approximately 1917 to 1923.⁶⁴¹

⁶⁴⁰ This view was most cogently put forward by Sara Silverstein. Sara Silverstein, "Doctors and Diplomats: Health Services in the New Europe, 1918–1923," in *A New Europe, 1918-1923: Instability, Innovation, Recovery*, ed. Bartosz Dziewanowski-Stefańczyk and Jay M. Winter (London: Routledge, 2022), 142–60.

⁶⁴¹ For the periodization, see Egry, "The Leftover Empire?," 81–102.

The chapter opens by mapping how, around 1917, physicians from Austria-Hungary with a focus on public health formed inter-imperial professional networks with their counterparts from other Central Powers. Within these networks, they deliberated on the specific strategies for postwar reconstruction, as well as on potential futures for the region at large. Notably, their discussions transcended the mere reconstruction of the state, the devastated economy, or the damaged infrastructure, even though these aspects were part of the conversation. At its core, this reconstruction was of a biopolitical nature, and the vocabulary for these discussions was provided by eugenics. Within these inter-imperial forums, the central topic was the proposed biological revitalization of Central Europe's empires.

Two contrasting viewpoints emerged among the Austro-Hungarian participants within these networks. These viewpoints dovetailed with the forms of biopolitics that coalesced in the Habsburg Empire during the war, at the battlefronts and on the home front, respectively. One perspective, primarily advocated by physicians closely aligned with civil administration, emphasized the economic and societal significance of human lives, viewing them as pivotal for the revitalization of local economies. For them, rebuilding shattered economies involved not just bricks and mortar but human biology, as well, optimized through public health measures and specific eugenic practices. The eugenic notion of "biological capital" became their central point of reference, and human nature joined the list of objects to be reconstructed post-war.

The other viewpoint was most strongly associated with physicians who advocated for a demographic policy entirely dictated by present and anticipated military necessities. In these physicians' view, the strength and security of the state were paramount, with all other concerns being secondary. While the civilian-related physicians envisioned a post-war future that was liberal or socialist and expanded citizens' rights, the military-related physicians foresaw a future that was austere, authoritarian, and decisively anti-liberal. If the former sought to harness biopolitics to rebuild the local economies, the latter aimed to subordinate it to a militarized

society. This ideological clash manifested also in local contexts, reinvigorating local eugenic networks in both imperial Austria and royal Hungary during the final year of the empire's existence. As Austria-Hungary disintegrated, these discussions became nationalized, and the eugenicists' rhetoric readily adapted the envisioned rejuvenation of the empire to the regeneration of nation-states.

The inception of the imperial Austrian ministry of public health in 1917 was intimately linked to these inter-imperial debates, and the eugenic concept of “biological capital” was central to its foundational ideology. Moreover, it was not an isolated occurrence. When the successor states of the Habsburg Empire established similar ministries, they mirrored the imperial institution and were frequently promoted — and in some instances led — by physicians involved in these networks or by their allies. The fervent references to the purported regeneration of the “biological capital” of these emerging states during the initial phases of these ministries underscored these profound connections. The projected biopolitics of these nation-states was the imperial biopolitics writ small.

While the emergence of public health ministries around the collapse of the Habsburg Empire is intriguing in its own right, in this chapter it primarily serves as a backdrop to the main argument. The chapter contends that as the nation-states in post-Habsburg Central Europe consolidated during the early 1920s, a surprising trend emerged: eugenicists, despite their previous influence, saw their power wane within central state institutions.

On the one hand, state consolidation rendered superfluous the programs in which supporters of eugenics were involved during the war, such as recovery programs for children and food aid. As challenges like food shortages were alleviated with the consolidation of the post-Habsburg states, these programs were scaled down or discontinued. On the other hand, while post-Habsburg states introduced various social reforms and redistributive policies

reflecting an expanded notion of the rights of their citizens, these changes did not significantly empower the supporters of eugenics in the early 1920s. The attempts by eugenicists to decisively shape these laws or even introduce stand-alone eugenic legislation consistently met with failure at that time, as this chapter demonstrates. What is more, the ministries of public health, established in these fledgling states, waned or withered away throughout the 1920s as these states stabilized and solidified the role of the central government. Thus, rather than observing a seamless alliance between state-building and eugenics, we are presented with a more complex reality.

In order to grasp this counterintuitive dynamic between eugenics and the state in the early 1920s, this chapter proposes the label “paradox of state consolidation.” The diminishing influence of eugenics on the central authorities, as the states stabilized, was all the more paradoxical given that some key political figures in certain post-Habsburg countries were well-acquainted with and supportive of eugenics. Nevertheless, in spite of figures such as Austria’s president Michael Hainisch, his Czechoslovak counterpart Tomáš Masaryk, and Hungary’s prime minister Pál Teleki, there often was little political support for the policies which the eugenicists chose to promote as their priorities.⁶⁴² However, legislative politics appears to have played a smaller role in the eugenicists’ failure than the deep-seated tendencies among the post-Habsburg state administrators.

It is worthwhile to recall that the Habsburg bureaucracy was never entirely at ease with scientific epistemology. The successor states of the empire inherited and integrated some of these Habsburg bureaucrats into their administrative apparatus, albeit asymmetrically.⁶⁴³ The

⁶⁴² On Teleki, see Balázs Ablonczy, *A miniszterelnök élete és halála: Teleki Pál (1879-1941)* [The Life and Death of the Prime Minister: Pál Teleki, 1879-1941] (Budapest: Jaffa Kiadó, 2018). A biography that would convincingly tease out Hainisch’s and Masaryk’s relationship towards eugenics is still missing.

⁶⁴³ Peter Becker, Therese Garstenauer, Veronika Helfert, Karl Megner, Thomas Stockinger, and Guenther Steiner, eds., *Hofratsdämmerung? Verwaltung und ihr Personal in den Nachfolgestaaten der Habsburgermonarchie 1918 bis 1920* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2020); Gary B. Cohen, “The Austrian Bureaucracy at the Nexus of State and Society,” in *The Habsburg Civil Service and Beyond: Bureaucracy and Civil Servants from the Vormärz to the Inter-War*

trajectory of scientists advocating eugenics, who laid claims to scientific expertise and the neutrality and objectivity that walked hand in hand with it, is consistent with these recent findings on the Habsburg administration and its legacies. Before 1914, the administrators as a whole kept the advocates of eugenics at arm's length. This partially changed during the war. The escalating crises created a demand among the administrators for advice on biopolitical matters, and for the efficiency and legitimacy that it promised. Yet, this surge in demand was only temporary. As the wartime crises subsided and the successor states of the Habsburg Empire consolidated, old reservations within the bureaucracy resurfaced. In this changing landscape, the eugenicists gradually lost some of their leverage within the central administrative bodies of these states. In effect, many eugenicists, once courted for their claimed expertise, again found themselves relegated to the periphery as state-building proceeded.

In order to shed light on the changing position of eugenicists in a process of transition, which involved both the imperial collapse and the stabilization of the successor states, the chapter does not treat the year 1918 as a major break. Spanning from around 1917 to the early 1920s, the argument presented in this chapter unfolds in several steps. The first part of the chapter maps the networks of eugenics supporters in Austria-Hungary during the war, initially at the inter-imperial level and then at the local level. After analyzing the formation of these networks and the forceful clashes within them, the subsequent part of the chapter explores the interconnected creation of public health ministries in Austria-Hungary and its successor states.

After the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, its former territories were either stitched together to form new states or incorporated into existing ones. The third part of the chapter, therefore, makes a brief detour necessary to illuminate the differential impact within these states of the networks of post-Habsburg advocates of eugenics. Subsequently, the chapter turns to the

Years, ed. Franz Adlgasser and Fredrik Lindström (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2019), 49–66.

attempts to introduce eugenically-oriented legislation and policies in post-Habsburg countries. The eugenicists, often affiliated with the newly established ministries of public health, aimed to develop comprehensive public health legislation that incorporated eugenic principles. Additionally, they advocated for mandatory medical consultations for individuals entering marriage and joined broad coalitions that called for the introduction of prohibition, to name just a few of their goals. Yet, their attempts exhibit a consistent pattern of failure. A brief exploration of the decline of the health ministries in all these contexts then encapsulates and concludes this reflection on what the chapter calls the paradox of state consolidation.

Regenerating Mitteleuropa: Biopolitics in Wartime Inter-Imperial Networks

The outbreak of World War I did not halt transnational exchanges. Instead, as Jan Vermeiren argues, it reshaped them, instigating various “practices of solidarity, transnational interactions, coordination, and plans for future cooperation.”⁶⁴⁴ The projects of transnational collaboration that proliferated during the war, as Vermeiren demonstrates, notably encompassed “schemes for more permanent political and economic cooperation” arising from the “background of coalition warfare and alliance rhetoric.”⁶⁴⁵ Regarding the Central Powers, in particular, Vermeiren shows the multiplicity of wartime blueprints that aimed to increase the cooperation between Imperial Germany and the Habsburg Empire and boost their economic expansion towards the East and South of the European continent.⁶⁴⁶

The most consequential among these plans was the concept of Mitteleuropa. This blueprint for the economic and cultural integration of Central Europe, though not necessarily

⁶⁴⁴ Jan Vermeiren, “Notions of Solidarity and Integration in Times of War: The Idea of Europe, 1914–18.” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d’histoire* 24, no. 6 (2017): 874.

⁶⁴⁵ Vermeiren, “Notions of Solidarity,” 877.

⁶⁴⁶ Jan Vermeiren, *The First World War and German National Identity: The Dual Alliance at War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 164.

its political integration, was spearheaded by the German national-liberal politician and intellectual, Friedrich Naumann.⁶⁴⁷ In this subchapter, I argue that the Fraternal Military Association, one of the many semi-official associations promoting the concept of Mitteleuropa, emerged as the primary conduit for the transnational circulation of eugenic knowledge between Imperial Germany and Austria-Hungary during World War I. Moreover, this association became a battleground for ideological clashes between proponents of battlefield biopolitics and those advocating home front biopolitics. This tension provided the pivotal catalyst for the re-emergence of Austrian and Hungarian eugenics societies in the war's final two years.

Founded in March 1915, the *Reichsdeutsche Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung* [RWV] was followed with some delay by its sister organizations in royal Hungary and imperial Austria, established in June 1916 and January 1917, respectively. All embraced the concept of Mitteleuropa and aimed to foster economic, cultural, and scientific exchanges between the Central Powers.⁶⁴⁸ The RWV proclaimed that it strove to keep alive “the German people’s awareness of the high significance of the alliance” with the Habsburg Empire and to enhance understanding of its “political and ethnic as well as economic situation.”⁶⁴⁹ Conversely, its Austrian counterpart, the *Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung* [ÖWV], advocated for evolving the relationship with Imperial Germany from a “commonality in arms” to a “commonality of all spiritual and cultural goods.”⁶⁵⁰ As cultural agendas were salient among these organizations’ goals, their leadership featured not only a number of politicians and businessmen but also multiple leading cultural personalities and scientists. Indeed, facilitating

⁶⁴⁷ There is a vast, but uneven, literature that analyzes the uses of the concept of Mitteleuropa during the First World War. See, for instance, Károly Irinyi, *Mitteleuropa-tervek és az osztrák-magyar politikai közgondolkodás* [Central European Plans and Austro-Hungarian Political Public Opinion] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973); Jiří Kořalka, *Tschechen und Deutschland im langen 19. Jahrhundert: Studien zum gegenseitigen Verhältnis, 1800-1918* (Dresden: Thelam, 2018), 413-423; Richard Georg Plaschka, ed., *Mitteleuropa-Konzeptionen in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995).

⁶⁴⁸ Vermeiren, *The First World War*, 117.

⁶⁴⁹ Vermeiren, *The First World War*, 114.

⁶⁵⁰ *Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung: Gründende Versammlung: Wien, 26. Jan. 1917* (Vienna: Fromme, 1917), 1.

exchanges between scientific experts became an important part of these organizations' joint activities, and the organizations proceeded to establish several specialized committees.

Supporters of eugenics were active within both the RWV and the leadership of its Austrian and Hungarian sister organizations. In Austria, eugenicist Julius Tandler, a driving force behind home front biopolitics, served on the executive committee of the emerging organization. Additionally, he took on the role of chairman for the preparatory committee of its specialized medical section.⁶⁵¹ In the Hungarian organization, the *Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség* [MBS], Mihály Lenhossék was a member of its presidential senate. Lenhossék, a nationalist anatomist supportive of eugenics, was in the process of writing up the results of his racial research on the POWs at that time. Another nationalist patron of eugenics, geographer Pál Teleki, took on the role of secretary for the committee for science and letters. The medical section was chaired by senior liberal physician Leó Liebermann, who also engaged with eugenic ideas, though his perspective differed from that of Lenhossék and Teleki.⁶⁵² The medical sections of the association, in particular, became a platform for discussions among various eugenics advocates.

The overarching agenda of the medical sections of the RWV, ÖWV, and MBS was defined in relatively general terms. In Tandler's words, its purpose was to "make even more intimate the mutual relations between the medical communities of various states of Central Europe."⁶⁵³ Moreover, its specific program sought to cover a very broad range of agendas, from the unification of curricula in medical colleges and ongoing medical education, to the partial harmonization of sanitary legislation and coordinated epidemic control.⁶⁵⁴ Nevertheless, these

⁶⁵¹ *Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche*, 6 and 10.

⁶⁵² Albert Berzeviczy and Albert Apponyi, *Ungarische Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung = Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség* (Budapest: Pester Buchdruckerei, 1916), 38–39.

⁶⁵³ *Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche*, 31.

⁶⁵⁴ *Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche*, 31–32.

medical sections served as the primary institutional framework for wartime transnational cooperation between advocates of eugenics and population policy from Germany, Austria, and Hungary. Largely due to the active participation of leading eugenicists in the organization, these sections began organizing joint conferences in 1917. These events provided a platform for discussions about biopolitical strategies for the concluding phases of the war and, particularly, for the anticipated postwar reconstruction of Central Europe.

Overall, three conferences organized by the medical sections of the RWV, ÖWV, and MBS took place between 1917 and 1918. These conferences received patronage from some of the most prominent representatives of the Central Powers, including politicians, parts of their military leadership, and even members of their ruling houses. Indicative of the significance ascribed to interactions like these by Austrian imperial officials, the first of these conferences, which took place in October 1917 in the Austrian spa resort of Baden near Vienna, was opened by none other than the Austrian ruler himself.⁶⁵⁵ The successive conferences in Berlin and Budapest were respectively opened by notable members of Germany's and Hungary's ruling dynasties, even though the rulers themselves did not attend at that time.⁶⁵⁶ Such official patronage of the events organized by the Fraternal Military Associations' medical sections underscored the growing official recognition of medical expertise during the war and a broader acceptance of eugenics by the imperial state.

⁶⁵⁵ *Verhandlungen der Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Deutschlands, Ungarns und Österreichs. Baden bei Wien vom 11. bis 13. Oktober 1917* (Vienna: Perles, 1918), XI.

⁶⁵⁶ Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner, eds., *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918* (Jena: Fischer, 1918), 42–45; Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség [Hungarian Fraternal Military Association], *Jelentés a német, osztrák, török és magyar bajtársi szövetségek orvosi szakosztályainak és a bolgár kiküldötteknek Budapesten, 1918 szept. 21–23. án tartott együttes üléséről = Bericht über die in Budapest am 21–23. September 1918 stattgefundenen gemeinsamen Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Deutschlands, Österreichs, Türkei, Ungarn und Bulgarien* (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1918), 50–53.

Eugenics increasingly provided the framing and furnished the content for the conferences of the Fraternal Military Associations. At the inaugural conference in Baden, the organizers sought to discreetly bring the state administration closer to the eugenicists by choosing the treatment of ill and disabled soldiers at health resorts, spas, and clinics as its main theme.⁶⁵⁷ Concern with ability and economic efficiency was at the forefront of the conference. The organizers emphasized that “war heroes whose ability to work had been restricted” should be given an opportunity to become “useful members of the laboring strata again, with the assistance of medical science.”⁶⁵⁸ Their arguments were underpinned by the assumption that controlling and shaping the environment and its influence on the body was crucial not only for individual recovery but also for a larger social renewal. This was a strategic choice on the part of the organizers in a context where, as Ke-chin Hsia shows, the war stimulated the emergence of multiple welfare programs, including state-sponsored medical programs, that primarily targeted disabled veterans.⁶⁵⁹ Linking individual healing with imagined collective regeneration, the conference implied that the agendas of eugenics and the emerging welfare for the disabled veterans were not divergent but rather mutually reinforcing.

It is hardly coincidental that conference attendees in Baden frequently alluded to eugenic notions gaining traction in Austrian public discourse. Imperial Austria’s war minister, for instance, implored the participants to restore “a strong generation, healthy in mind and body.”⁶⁶⁰ Josef Thenen, a leading member of the medical section of the ÖWV, echoed this sentiment, calling for “the restoration and powerful development of the material and spiritual

⁶⁵⁷ “Gemeinschaftliche Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen von Deutschland, Ungarn und Österreich,” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 67, no. 39 (September 22, 1917): 1733–34.

⁶⁵⁸ *Verhandlungen der Tagung*, VII.

⁶⁵⁹ Ke-chin Hsia, “Who Provided Care for Wounded and Disabled Soldiers? Conceptualizing State–Civil Society Relationship in First World War Austria,” in *Other Fronts, Other Wars? First World War Studies on the Eve of the Centennial*, ed. Joachim Bürgschwentner, Matthias Egger, Gunda Barth-Scalmani (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 303–30.

⁶⁶⁰ *Verhandlungen der Tagung*, XXXIII.

strength of the people [Volkskraft].”⁶⁶¹ Echoing Tandler’s arguments, he further asserted that “the realization that matured during the hard war, namely that people are the state’s most precious asset, must not be forgotten, even in times of lasting peace.”⁶⁶² While eugenics was less prominent in Baden than at subsequent events, it nevertheless provided a shared set of assumptions for the discussions that took place there.

Each medical conference of the Fraternal Military Associations was attended by a large number of physicians from Germany, imperial Austria, and Hungary. These physicians hailed from both civilian and military backgrounds.⁶⁶³ For instance, the military hygienist and recent convert to eugenics, Iuliu Moldovan, temporarily left the battlefield to attend the second conference in Berlin in January 1918 as a member of the Austrian delegation.⁶⁶⁴ He also attended the third conference, which convened in Budapest in September of the same year.⁶⁶⁵ Notably, the differences of opinion between doctors from imperial Austria and royal Hungary who attended these events were less pronounced than the divisions within each of these two groups.

Two major camps emerged at the conferences, intriguingly aligning with the new functions which eugenics assumed within the imperial state during the war. On the one hand, a group of medical doctors with close ties to the civilian administration and voluntary associations championed concepts and practices derived from home front biopolitics.

⁶⁶¹ Josef Thenen, “Organisation der Kur- und Bäderfürsorge für Kriegsinvalide in Österreich,” in *Verhandlungen der Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Deutschlands, Ungarns und Österreichs. Baden bei Wien vom 11. bis 13. Oktober 1917* (Vienna: Perles, 1918), 50.

⁶⁶² Thenen, “Organisation der Kur- und Bäderfürsorge,” 50.

⁶⁶³ Apart from participants from Germany, Austria, and Hungary, much smaller delegations of representatives of Bulgaria and of the Ottoman Empire also attended all three conferences. These conferences thus reflected an imperialist blueprint of a “Greater Mitteleuropa” that included Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire, and thus aimed at a reordering of the Balkans and even of the Middle East. The RWV, in particular, actively supported this broader project of Mitteleuropa. Vermeiren, *The First World War*, 164.

⁶⁶⁴ The extant sources did not allow me to establish with certainty whether Moldovan attended the event as a protégé of Julius Tandler, or of the military hygienist Robert Doerr, or of both. Kirchner, Adam and Kirchner, *Der Wiederaufbau*, XIX.

⁶⁶⁵ On this occasion, Moldovan was a part of the Austrian-Hungarian military’s delegation. Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 223.

Frequently invoking the concept of “organic capital,” these doctors, including Tandler, Pirquet, and the delegates from the Hungarian *Stefánia Egyesület*, advocated for a eugenically-oriented population policy. This policy would extend welfare provisions universally among the empire’s subjects without highlighting ethnocultural differences. Essentially, they promoted a modern imperial biopolitics that did not aim for national homogenization.⁶⁶⁶

Conversely, Austrian and Hungarian medical doctors with close ties to military networks pushed for a rapid and decisive expansion of the biopolitical regime from the battlefronts, particularly from the East, to the home front. A rejection of modernity frequently coincided with their eugenic projects’ dismissal of ethnocultural diversity. Both groups competed for the endorsement of their distinct biopolitical visions, aiming to shape the post-war reconstruction of the Habsburg Empire and Central Europe at large.

Although eugenics served merely as a backdrop at the Baden conference, it profoundly shaped the discussions at the following events in Berlin and Budapest. The conference of the Fraternal Military Associations in Berlin, in particular, cemented their dedication to eugenics. This commitment was evident from the very title of the conference, *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege* (The Reconstruction of the Nation’s/People’s Strength after the War). The emphasis shifted from disability to pro-natalism, with debates centered around themes such as “the proliferation and preservation of the offspring” or “the protection and the strengthening of the youth.”⁶⁶⁷ Organizers and speakers from imperial Germany heavily emphasized the dual eugenic objectives of both qualitatively and quantitatively bolstering the population. Crucially, they often associated these objectives with the military utility of the populace. A leading German military physician succinctly encapsulated this link, stating, “the

⁶⁶⁶ Cf. Zygmunt Bauman’s classical argument that inextricably linked modernity with homogenization. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989).

⁶⁶⁷ Kirchner, Adam and Kirchner, *Der Wiederaufbau*, passim.

strength of the nation means military power [Volkskraft bedeutet zugleich Wehrkraft].”⁶⁶⁸ Operating from this premise, he advocated for a pro-natalist policy aimed at fostering the birth of “numerous, healthy, and strong children.”⁶⁶⁹ However, these arguments became a point of contention among participants from the Habsburg Empire.

The Berlin conference was the first major arena where the contrasting biopolitical visions of Austro-Hungarian eugenicists came to a head before an international audience. Some members of the Austrian and Hungarian delegations concurred with the organizers, believing that the demands of the battlefield – both past and present, and possibly future – should dictate the biopolitics of post-war recovery. For instance, Viennese military hygienist Robert Doerr’s lecture explored strategies for maintaining the military “sanitary apparatus that we put into service during the four years of the war” for as long as possible.⁶⁷⁰ He also discussed how to extend this apparatus into civilian areas and addressed the challenge of overcoming potential resistance from soldiers and veterans to such measures. Doerr anticipated that countermeasures would be essential, given that many soldiers expected a peace treaty to “signal a swift return to the bourgeois status quo” and were reluctant to “immediately and voluntarily shoulder a yoke of stringent social protection along with hygienic and demographic tutelage for an extended period.”⁶⁷¹ Among the participants from Austria-Hungary who chose to challenge this view, the position of the anatomist Julius Tandler was the most elaborate.

Tandler’s speech in Berlin was nothing short of a manifesto that directly confronted these views. Although he cloaked his arguments as a historical analysis tracing the evolution of the concept of population policy, the polemical thrust of his speech was evident. Tandler

⁶⁶⁸ Kirchner, Adam and Kirchner, *Der Wiederaufbau*, 55.

⁶⁶⁹ Kirchner, Adam and Kirchner, *Der Wiederaufbau*, 56.

⁶⁷⁰ Robert Doerr, “Demobilisierungsfragen,” in *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, ed. Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner (Jena: Fischer, 1918), 469 and 471.

⁶⁷¹ Doerr, “Demobilisierungsfragen,” 469 and 471.

attributed the views of his adversaries to what he described as the earliest and crudest manifestations of this concept. In particular, Tandler argued that a pursuit of “power, by military means” was the defining aspect of the earliest stage of population policy which he labelled as “imperialist population policy.”⁶⁷² He also identified a more recent, yet closely related stage, the “nationalist population policy.”⁶⁷³ Tandler was equally critical of both of these forms.

The aim of nationalist population policy, Tandler argued, was to “increase the number of fellow nationals as much as possible.”⁶⁷⁴ While Tandler’s position towards pro-natalism was ambiguous, if not supportive, it was the part about fellow nationals that rattled him. He claimed that in countries where the nation and the state were largely coterminous, nationalist population policy collapsed back into imperialism. Conversely, in multiethnic countries, such a policy proved to be self-defeating:

When the state border and the national border coincide, this policy is identical to the imperialist population policy of the state in question. When the state frontier and the national frontier diverge, and several nations form one state entity, things become complicated.⁶⁷⁵

While his critique of the “imperialist population policy” bore all the hallmarks of contemporary socialist perspectives on imperialism, Tandler’s skepticism of the nationalist variant was shaped by Austro-Marxist concerns about multiethnicity.

Returning to his wartime mantra, Tandler called for a modern type of population policy that affirms, rather than exploits, the alleged organic capital of the state.⁶⁷⁶ A Hungarian doctor associated with the *Stefánia Egyesület*, Vilmos Tauffer, subsequently claimed that “the idea

⁶⁷² Julius Tandler, “Bevölkerungspolitische Probleme und Ziele,” in *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, ed. Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner (Jena: Fischer, 1918), 96.

⁶⁷³ Tandler, “Bevölkerungspolitische Probleme,” 96.

⁶⁷⁴ Tandler, “Bevölkerungspolitische Probleme,” 96.

⁶⁷⁵ Tandler, “Bevölkerungspolitische Probleme,” 96.

⁶⁷⁶ Tandler, “Bevölkerungspolitische Probleme,” 96.

that the greatest treasure of the state lies in its children and that regeneration can only be found in the growing youth is gaining ground with elementary power.”⁶⁷⁷ He thus reinforced Tandler’s point about the “biological capital,” albeit with an even more pronounced pro-natalist bent. The advocates of the battlefield and home front biopolitical projects thus forcefully clashed at the Berlin conference.

Tensions between home front and battlefield biopolitics persisted at the third and final conference held in Budapest in September 1918. The focal point of this event was the continuing education of medical professionals – a choice reflective of the state’s escalating involvement in biopolitics during the war.⁶⁷⁸ The underlying assumption was that the emerging biopolitical practices necessitated a new cadre of trained medical experts. Several speakers made it clear that these new doctors would no longer limit themselves to healing individuals, but that their ultimate goal had to be collective regeneration. It was once again Tandler who emphasized in his paper that “the medical doctors of tomorrow are the true and authoritative managers of the organic capital of the state.”⁶⁷⁹ In contrast, Julius Hochenegg, a professor at the Second Surgical Clinic of Viennese University and surgeon-general, argued that “the nation and the military can no longer be regarded and treated as separate entities, but as a single indivisible unit,” which implied that the practices pioneered or tested at the battlefield had to be transmitted to the doctors in the hinterland, either through continuing education or by direct experience.⁶⁸⁰ Consequently, he argued, “the entire continuing medical education must be

⁶⁷⁷ Vilmos Tauffer, “Die Säuglingssterblichkeit und ihre Bekämpfung in Ungarn,” in *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, ed. Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner (Jena: Fischer, 1918), 115.

⁶⁷⁸ The fight against malaria was another issue discussed at the conference.

⁶⁷⁹ Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség, *Jelentés*, 103.

⁶⁸⁰ Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség, *Jelentés*, 166.

militarized.”⁶⁸¹ Even though they otherwise differed, both speakers concurred that the orientation and specific training of medical professionals should be geared towards eugenics.

Marius Turda has shown that the crucial part of the conference in Budapest was actually one of its follow-up special sessions.⁶⁸² This special session was explicitly and exclusively concerned with race hygiene and population policy, which had no precedent in the prior two events. The session served as a public manifestation of the growing cooperation between the German Society for Racial Hygiene, whose racial nationalism had become increasingly radical during the war, and a newly established association that brought together Hungarian nationalist eugenicists.⁶⁸³

As the war neared its end, two significant eugenic associations emerged in royal Hungary and imperial Austria: the Hungarian Society for Racial Hygiene and Population Policy, and the Austrian Society for Population Policy. Their establishment closely aligned with the timeline of the conferences held in Baden, Berlin, and Budapest. As we delve deeper, it becomes evident that the resurgence of eugenic societies in these regions was significantly propelled by the impetus offered through the transnational circulation of eugenic knowledge, embodied by these conferences. To truly comprehend this impact, however, it is crucial to explore first the local events and dynamics within imperial Austria and royal Hungary preceding the birth of these eugenic societies. The interplay of these transnational and local factors provides essential context for understanding the renewed emergence of eugenic societies in Austria-Hungary during the last years of the war.

Looking at the networking of Hungarian and Austrian eugenicists at the local or national level in 1916 and 1917, one observes a clear uptick in their activities, responding to the growing

⁶⁸¹ Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség, *Jelentés*, 166.

⁶⁸² Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 222–23.

⁶⁸³ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 222–23.

application of this ambiguous knowledge in both civil and military contexts. Austrian and Hungarian eugenicists organized large conferences during this period. These events also became sites of clashes between eugenicists committed to the distinct biopolitical approaches that emerged on the battlefield and those rooted in the home front, similar to the transnational interactions discussed earlier.

Between 1916 and 1917, two German nationalist conferences were held in imperial Austria that combined a focus on welfare and race hygiene. These conferences were organized by the *Deutsch-österreichische Beratungsstelle für Volkswohlfahrt* that emerged before the war out of cooperation between the nationalist activist associations such as the *Südmark* and had a close working relationship with them. The conferences did not conceal their nationalist agenda either in their name, the *Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt* (German-Austrian Conference on National Welfare), or in their overall framing.

The gatherings organized by the *Zentralstelle für Volkswohlfahrt* (Central Office for National Welfare) in imperial Germany served as the model for these German-Austrian conferences. These gatherings purported to address all biopolitical “work for the future, which encompasses all areas of national life [des völkischen Lebens].”⁶⁸⁴ Significantly, the eighth meeting of the *Zentralstelle* in 1915 was attended by several eugenicists or sympathizers of eugenics from Austria-Hungary who ostensibly intended to replicate similar events in the Austrian context. One of them, Michael Hainisch, made this goal explicit when he stated: “Thank God that we Austrians feed from the great source of spirit that bubbles up here in the Imperial Germany, and I hope that what is said today will be fruitful for Austria, too.”⁶⁸⁵ The topics of the 1915 conference, including “the numerical increase in offspring,” “the

⁶⁸⁴ *Die Erhaltung und Mehrung der deutschen Volkskraft: Verhandlungen der 8. Konferenz der Zentralstelle für Volkswohlfahrt in Berlin vom 26.-28. Oktober 1915* (Berlin: Heymann, 1916), III.

⁶⁸⁵ *Die Erhaltung und Mehrung*, 50.

maintenance and strengthening of the offspring,” “housing and settlement,” “public diseases,” “popular nutrition,” and “uplifting of the race” – prefigured many of the issues that would be discussed at the German-Austrian conferences.

The German-Austrian conferences aimed to project an image of national unity. They claimed to have invited the representatives of “all currents of the German-Austrian nation” to address the “burning questions of the nation’s welfare,” as Hainisch, who indeed became one of their chief organizers, put it.⁶⁸⁶ Even though the conferences professed to represent the three main political currents in modern German-Austrian politics – Christian Socials, social democrats, and the *völkisch* nationalists – the choice of speakers and the issues that were discussed made it nevertheless clear that the last current would dominate.

While many eugenicists involved in battlefield biopolitics had a background in nationalist activism, nationalist associations, such as the *Südmark*, did not solely connect themselves to the military. Instead, they balanced between the military and civilian authorities, waiting to see which of these bureaucracies would outsource more power over welfare provision to them. Consequently, the first *Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt* that took place in March 1916 did not have a single overarching theme; instead, it covered a range of biopolitical issues. The conference opened with a debate on “declining birth rates” which included two alarmist lectures calling for strict regulation of women’s reproductive behavior, delivered by Hainisch and Johannes Ude, a Catholic theologian who became an early supporter of eugenics in Austria.⁶⁸⁷ The participants then discussed child welfare, which was presented by Margarethe Roller, among others, a nationalist activist woman who was involved in welfare provision in

⁶⁸⁶ *Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung*, V. The Christian Social mayor of Vienna who delivered another opening speech at the conference made a similar point.

⁶⁸⁷ The third rejoinder to the debate was delivered by Theodor Altschul, a liberal eugenicist based in Prague. Altschul was less critical of neo-Malthusianism than his nationalist and Catholic interlocutors.

Moravia. The third main theme was tuberculosis and sexually transmitted infections, the latter being covered by Ernst Finger, a professor, and military advisor.

While the previous issues were regarded as vital also beyond the nationalist circles, the final topic of the conference, internal colonization schemes in rural areas, were a major concern almost exclusively in the nationalist milieu. The main lecture was delivered by Franz Jesser, a nationalist activist and MP for the *völkisch*-oriented *Deutsche Volkspartei*. The following debate concerned internal colonization schemes in the Alpine area, Lower Austria, and Moravia.⁶⁸⁸ Even though debates about internal colonization, permeated with eugenics, had been taking place already before the war, and Jesser had participated in them, it was likely the military's support for these projects that made them into a priority of the conference.

The choice of topics and invited experts at the first German-Austrian conference demonstrated the ongoing exchanges between the new biopolitical regime that emerged within the military medical networks and between the nationalist activists in the hinterland. Additionally, they indicated an expectation that the influence of these nationalist associations on welfare provision by civilian authorities on the home front would grow significantly.

The second *Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt* convened in April 1917. By this time, the outsourcing of specific aspects of the imperial state's welfare agendas to the nationalists was well underway.⁶⁸⁹ The conference discussions were primarily centered on food rationing and its implications for nationalist welfare provision.⁶⁹⁰ This overarching theme suggested that the nationalist associations had made their choice, placing most of their bets on further cooperation with the state administration. Counting on support from state authorities, the conference

⁶⁸⁸ Franz Jesser, "Ländliche Kriegerheimstätten," in *Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 12. und 13. März 1916: Vorträge und Wechselreden* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1916), 132–48.

⁶⁸⁹ Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*, 79–105.

⁶⁹⁰ *II. Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 15. u. 16. April 1917: Vorträge* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1917).

explored recent advances in nutritional science and other related bodies of biopolitical knowledge, including eugenics. In essence, the conference aimed to devise strategies that would enable the German-Austrian nationalist associations to incorporate food distribution into their welfare initiatives.

While German-Austrian nationalist associations initially spearheaded eugenic networking at the national level in Austria during the war, in Hungary, it was primarily a cluster of doctors and social workers who took the lead. Many of these individuals were progressives, frequently connected to voluntary associations such as the *Stefánia Egyesület*. As time progressed, other, more moderate doctors aligned with them, advocating for increased state involvement in welfare provision and medical prevention. Ultimately, they called for the creation of a Ministry of Public Health and Welfare.⁶⁹¹

The most powerful manifestation of this political demand was the *Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés* (Countrywide Public Health Assembly) that gathered in Budapest in October 1917. In a keynote speech, tellingly titled “The Tasks of the State on the Field of Public Health,” the physician Leó Liebermann linked the public health reform directly to eugenics:

Today, our views on the prerequisites of people’s health have broadened. The content of the concept has become richer because we oppose health not only to illness but also to physical and mental inferiority (*Minderwertigkeit*).⁶⁹² Consequently, we now think that increasing the value [of humans] is as important a task of healthcare management as the struggle against diseases. The fight against diseases nowadays cannot limit itself to nibbling around the edges [*aprólékoskodás*], or, to put it in medical language: to limit itself to alleviating the symptoms. If one wants to do a complete job, one is forced to seek for the

⁶⁹¹ Mária Kovács, *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 38–41; József Madzsar, and Béla Fenyvessy, eds., *A Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés munkálatai: Budapest 1917. évi október hó 25-28.* [Proceedings of the Countrywide Public Health Assembly: Budapest, October 25-28, 1917] (Budapest: Eggenberger, 1918), 1. See also a telling coverage of the event by Oszkár Jászi: “Népegészségi országos nagygyűlés” [Countrywide Public Health Assembly], *Világ* 8, no. 255 (October 14, 1917): 1–2.

⁶⁹² The German term was already included in the Hungarian-language speech.

ultimate roots of the existing problems, which can be found in the fields of economy and society.⁶⁹³

The reformist demand for a stronger state intervention into public health in royal Hungary was thus increasingly framed in the language of eugenics.

Medical doctors and other actors linked to the *Stefánia Association* were strongly represented among the speakers at the congress. They covered some of the most crucial sessions, including those on “population policy from an economic standpoint,” “population policy from a racial perspective,” “protection of mothers and infants,” and “protection of children.”⁶⁹⁴ The concept of “organic capital” was an important point of reference in these debates. Even the liberal József Sztérényi engaged with the notion when he wryly remarked that “the fact that humans are the greatest capital value [a legnagyobb tőkeérték az ember]” has so far been “truer everywhere else than here [in Hungary], where the importance of this principle has so far found little or no validation.”⁶⁹⁵ Nevertheless, the question “what does a person represent in his or her work and sacrifice for the nation, as converted to capital value” constituted the point of departure for his analysis.⁶⁹⁶

If these conferences in imperial Austria and royal Hungary were designed to project an image of national unity, they instead succeeded in exposing internal contradictions. At the German-Austrian conferences, conservative nationalism was challenged by liberal and social democratic physicians, as well as by many women who, by the end of the war, were vital for welfare provision. Henriette Herzfelder, for instance, objected to the fact that there was no woman among the presenters discussing the issue of the falling birthrate and made it clear that

⁶⁹³ Madzsar and Fenyvessy, *A Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés*, 41.

⁶⁹⁴ The presentations on these topics were delivered by József Sztérényi, József Madzsar, Vilmos Tauffer, and Sándor Szana.

⁶⁹⁵ Madzsar and Fenyvessy, *A Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés*, 60.

⁶⁹⁶ Madzsar and Fenyvessy, *A Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés*, 60.

“the population question is a part of the social question, and the former can be satisfactorily resolved only by solving the latter.”⁶⁹⁷

While at the German-Austrian nationalist conferences, speakers faced resistance from liberal, socialist, and feminist standpoints, speakers at the Hungarian conference faced resistance from the nationalist right. For example, Géza von Hoffmann objected, tellingly, that unlike the eugenic arguments presented by some other speakers, German race hygiene did not satisfy itself “only with producing human material in adequate quantity and quality but foregrounded its Germanic nature,” and raised the following rhetorical question: “I wonder to what extent this principle deserves to be put into practice from a Hungarian national point of view?”⁶⁹⁸ Equally telling was the response to Hoffmann in which the eugenicist József Madzsar dismissed the notion of eugenics as national science and emphatically denied that “biology” had anything to do with the “German version of racial hygiene.”⁶⁹⁹ While the national conferences were significant manifestations of a growing acceptance of eugenics, these internal conflicts suggest that it would be a mistake to cast them as direct precursors of the Austrian and Hungarian eugenic associations that emerged in 1917 and 1918, respectively.

The emergence of a powerful, semi-official network linking eugenicists in the Central Powers did more than just stimulate the debates about eugenics in imperial Austria and royal Hungary, exemplified by these conferences. The emerging inter-imperial network, as well as the potential for deepening links to the imperial state, incentivized Austrian and Hungarian eugenicists to reinvigorate their prewar associations. The eugenics associations in Vienna and Budapest that languished during the early years of the war were thus revived or, better, put on an entirely new footing. Yet these two associations did not share the politics that predominated

⁶⁹⁷ *Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung*, 38.

⁶⁹⁸ Madzsar and Fenyvessy, *A Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés*, 99.

⁶⁹⁹ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 191.

at the conferences taking place at the national level; rather, their primary goal was to contain them and subsequently establish a direct connection to the transnational networks.

In Vienna, where Goldscheid's, Tandler's, and Kammerer's eugenic section of the Sociological Society all but disappeared after the outbreak of the war, a new eugenic society sprang up in 1917. Out of the prewar leading figures of the eugenic association, it was Tandler, in particular, who assumed a leading role in the newly established *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* (Austrian Society for Population Policy), while Rudolf Goldscheid was also actively involved. To start with, Tandler was among the three eugenicists who signed the letter calling for the founding of the society in early June 1917. Moreover, he was one of the presidents of its founding assembly on June 26 of the same year.⁷⁰⁰ Finally, Tandler also delivered the first lecture at the society, predictably titled *Probleme der Bevölkerungspolitik in Österreich* (Problems of Population Policy in Austria) in November 1917.⁷⁰¹ One of the following sessions of the society, in February 1918, gathered to attend Goldscheid's lecture on *Menschenökonomie und Finanzpolitik* (Human Economy and Financial Policy). Apart from that, Tandler and Goldscheid sat on the three-member committee that decided about the association's future lecture program.⁷⁰² Finally, many of the association's early sessions took place at the Institute of Anatomy of the Viennese University, Tandler's home institution.⁷⁰³ The main actors and concepts that were at the forefront of the eugenic society, therefore, did not adopt the nationalism and conservatism of the *Tagungen für Volkswohlfahrt*, but rather represented a continuity with the imperial and progressive outlook of the prewar Viennese eugenic association.

⁷⁰⁰ "Bericht über die Tätigkeit der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik im Jahre 1917," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 2.

⁷⁰¹ Julius Tandler, "Probleme der Bevölkerungspolitik," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 15–18.

⁷⁰² "Bericht, 1917," 3.

⁷⁰³ "Bericht, 1917," 3.

The *Österreichische Gesellschaft* initially stressed its imperial scope. It sought to represent the empire's nationalities, not only German Austrians. Instead of defining itself as a nationalist association, it emphasized that representatives of all "associations [for population science and eugenics] of all of Austria's nations are to be included."⁷⁰⁴ Conversely, those associations were to be left out that pursued "political or nationalist goals," so as to preserve a "purely Austrian scientific agenda of the association."⁷⁰⁵ Consequently, a member of the *Czech Eugenics Society* and an influential Bohemian medical administrator, František Kulhavý, sat on the Austrian Society's board. The participants of the association's sessions were not limited to German Austrians either.⁷⁰⁶

Moreover, shortly after the association was established, Tandler and his allies began planning a conference on child welfare. The conference aimed to bring together Austrian and Hungarian eugenicists, particularly those Hungarians such as József Madzsar who were associated with the *Stefánia Egyesület*, one of the event's Hungarian backers. In December 1917, consequently, Madzsar travelled to Vienna and attended the meeting of the Austrian Society's board. To finalize the preparations, two coordinating committees were set up in Vienna and Budapest. Tandler and Madzsar, respectively, were among those who sat on these committees.⁷⁰⁷ The *Österreichische Gesellschaft* thus initially had an imperial scope and was a

⁷⁰⁴ "Bericht, 1917," 3.

⁷⁰⁵ "Bericht, 1917," 3.

⁷⁰⁶ For instance, the Polish Marxist economist Henryk Grossman contributed to a debate that took place on May 7, 1918. The members of the association who did not identify as Germans were not numerous, yet they included powerful figures such as Ivan Horbaczewski and Géza von Hoffmann. Wilhelm Hecke, "Bericht über die Tätigkeit der Gesellschaft in den Jahren 1918 bis 1920," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 2, no. 2 (April 1921): 2; "Bericht über die Tätigkeit in den ersten Monaten des Jahres 1918," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 7; "Mitgliederverzeichnis," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 9–13.

⁷⁰⁷ The announcement of the conference was also signed by Sándor Szana, in this case representing the Hungarian Society for Race Hygiene and Population policy. In the instability preceding and following the collapse of Austria-Hungary, the event was postponed and ultimately never took place in the form it had been originally planned. Instead, an Austrian conference on the same theme took place in April 1919. "Die Österreichisch-ungarische Tagung über die Fragen der Kinderaufzucht," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 38–39; Hecke, "Bericht, 1918 bis 1920," 1–3. Cf. Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 224.

step towards the negotiation and promotion of a style of biopolitics that emerged out of an interaction of eugenicists with the imperial civil administration and voluntary associations.⁷⁰⁸

The transnational exchanges of eugenicists at the conferences of the Fraternal Military Associations provided one of the key incentives for the emergence of the *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik*. While the society was founded in June 1917, it only began operating in October of the same year, which was also the time when the first conference of the Fraternal Military Association took place in Baden. One of the main, if unstated, goals of the society was to increase the prestige of Austrian eugenicists at these transnational events, and to mediate their access to them. In doing so, Tandler and his allies likely strove to contain, at least to some extent, the nationalist eugenicists.

To achieve this goal without provoking the rise of a competing association, Tandler and his allies included the nationalists in the new eugenic society, but in practice kept control of the internal decisions. While the *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* adopted an imperial scope, the 143 individuals and 13 voluntary associations that joined this society also included numerous nationalist eugenicists, as well as supporters of eugenics who stood close to the Austrian Christian Social party.⁷⁰⁹ The attempt to contain nationalist eugenicists through their inclusion was initially successful. They decisively increased their influence within the *Österreichische Gesellschaft* only after the collapse of the empire. In effect, Tandler's Austrian allies were at least as visible at the conferences in Baden, Berlin, and Budapest as his nationalist competitors, if not overshadowing them.

⁷⁰⁸ The Austrian association's name mirrored that of its German counterpart, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik*. However, it was not until December 1918 that the two organizations agreed to collaborate more closely. The author of the *Österreichische Gesellschaft's* first annual report published after the collapse of Austria-Hungary lamented that prior differences in handling multiethnicity had acted as a barrier, noting that "a different treatment was required in old Austria." Moreover, he noted that it was only after the Austrian association narrowed its focus to "the German-speaking territory" in the wake of the empire's collapse that such collaboration became feasible. Hecke, "Bericht, 1918 bis 1920," 2.

⁷⁰⁹ "Mitgliederverzeichnis," 9–13.

If the association in imperial Austria was founded to contain nationalist eugenicists, the emergence of the *Magyar Fajegészségtani és Népesedéspolitikai Társaság* (Hungarian Society for Race Hygiene and Population Policy) was driven by the goal of containing socialist and moderate eugenicists. As Marius Turda illustrates, the decision to re-establish the Hungarian eugenics society was made in early November 1917. This decision came soon after the conference in Baden and closely on the heels of the Hungarian congress on public health, where left-leaning eugenicists associated with voluntary organizations played a significant role.⁷¹⁰ Moreover, he documents that “crucial meetings” between the nationalist eugenicists linked to the military networks, such as Teleki and Hoffmann, took place directly at that congress.⁷¹¹ In addition to incorporating “race hygiene” into its name, the society also strategically included population science. Hoffmann, one of the key founders of the society, candidly conceded in his private correspondence that this strategy was “the only way to stop the establishment of a rival Society of Population Policy.”⁷¹²

This attempt of the Hungarian Society to contain the eugenicists involved in the home front voluntary associations was less successful than in Austria. Although the *Stefánia Association* initially agreed to join the publishers of the society’s periodical, *Nemzetvédelem* (National Defense/National Protection), it backed off even before the first issue was published, and its name did not appear on the periodical’s title page.⁷¹³ In effect, the new Hungarian eugenic association did not monopolize eugenic debates in Hungary to the same extent as its Austrian counterpart, nor did it fully succeed in projecting the image of a single institutional expression of eugenics in Hungary.

⁷¹⁰ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 194.

⁷¹¹ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 194.

⁷¹² Cited in Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 195.

⁷¹³ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 216.

By the time the first issue of the periodical *Nemzetvédelem* was published, Hungarian nationalist eugenicists, linked to military networks and grouped within the newly-formed Hungarian Society for Race Hygiene and Population Policy, had been diligently networking. As Marius Turda demonstrates, they sought “a common plan of action” with the Munich-based members of the German Society for Racial Hygiene.⁷¹⁴ To some extent, they also aimed to strengthen their connections with Austrian *völkisch* proponents of race hygiene. As Marius Turda records, these efforts culminated in a separate eugenics session that followed the official agenda of the Fraternal Military Associations’ Budapest conference.⁷¹⁵

The special session was co-sponsored by Hungary’s Military Welfare Office. It convened prominent nationalist promoters of eugenics from Hungary, Germany, and Austria, such as Géza von Hoffmann, Pál Teleki, and Max von Gruber.⁷¹⁶ All three of these speakers shared a strong commitment to nationalist schemes of internal colonization, even though they did not make it the central theme of their papers delivered at this meeting. This was also true of the fourth speaker, Wilhelm Hecke, a German-Austrian conservative statistician who had a close relationship with nationalist associations such as the *Südmark*.⁷¹⁷ He had just published a large study that attempted to measure the “differential fertility” – a common eugenic trope – of imperial Austria’s nationalities, devoting much space to rural areas. In line with the debates on and projects of internal colonization spearheaded by the *Südmark*, as well as by his Hungarian hosts, his study idealized these spaces as the source of national rejuvenation while simultaneously voicing anxieties about their potential demographic decline.⁷¹⁸ Nationalist

⁷¹⁴ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 223, and 297, footnote 64.

⁷¹⁵ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 223, and 297, footnote 64.

⁷¹⁶ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 221. The fifth presenter at the meeting was Wilhelm Weinberg, a German geneticist with Jewish ancestors. While he did not share the radical nationalism of the other presenters, they may have welcomed Weinberg’s expertise on Mendelian heredity, as it helped delegitimize the neo-Lamarckism embraced by many of their Viennese competitors.

⁷¹⁷ Gudrun Exner, Josef Kytir, and Alexander Pinwinkler, *Bevölkerungswissenschaft in Österreich in der Zwischenkriegszeit (1918-1938): Personen, Institutionen, Diskurse* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2004), 55–60.

⁷¹⁸ Wilhelm Hecke, *Die Verschiedenheit der deutschen und slawischen Volksvermehrung in Österreich* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1916).

schemes of internal colonization were thus one of the specific themes that brought these eugenicists together, along with their ties to military networks, as the meeting indicated. More broadly, the meeting highlighted, once again, the role of inter-imperial connections in shaping and stabilizing the local networks of eugenicists that emerged in the last year or so of the empire's existence.

Echoes of Imperial Institution-Building: The Transnational Making of Public Health Ministries

Pieter Judson underscores that World War I sparked “several new rounds of institution-building” within Austria-Hungary.⁷¹⁹ He posits that some of these initiatives were directed “formally from above,” such as the introduction of food rationing or enhanced police surveillance. Conversely, other institutional developments emerged “informally from below,” driven by improvisation, collaboration, and protest.⁷²⁰ This subchapter zeroes in on one of the final instances of top-down institution-building, related to public health, before the disintegration of the Habsburg Empire.

Just before its collapse, imperial Austria concluded its shift towards greater state involvement in public health and welfare by founding an independent Ministry of People's Health as its primary public health agency. Initially established as a *k.k. Amt für Volksgesundheit* (Imperial Office of People's Health) in October 1917, it was elevated to an independent ministry in August 1918. This move had few global precedents, as most countries only set up a dedicated ministry of public health after World War I, if not later.⁷²¹

⁷¹⁹ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 387.

⁷²⁰ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 387.

⁷²¹ Silverstein, “Doctors and Diplomats,” *passim*.

The creation of the imperial ministry of public health in Austria was a transformative step in public health administration, setting off a ripple effect in its successor states. Between 1918 and 1919, an array of nearly identical public health ministries sprang up in post-Habsburg countries, underscoring the profound impact of the original imperial template. As delineated in the beginning of this chapter, by mid-1919, the governments of several nascent nation-states – specifically Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia – had embraced this template and launched their individual ministries of public health. Austria, having transitioned into a republic after the disintegration of the empire, also chose to retain its central health institution.⁷²² The adoption of this institutional framework was not merely a symbolic gesture; it signified a commitment to modernizing public health administration in line with and beyond the principles established in the former imperial structure.

With the rise of these ministries, most public health initiatives in these countries were centralized under one administrative entity, directed by an elected or appointed figure, and staffed with medical experts. Despite the striking similarities in the architecture and objectives of these institutions, historians have primarily sought to understand their emergence within national political contexts and examined the involvement of their founders in national networks.⁷²³ However, this section argues that depicting this process solely as a national narrative would be misleading.

⁷²² Romania introduced a ministry of public health in the early 1920s, while in Italy, an independent ministry of public health was created only after the Second World War.

⁷²³ See, for instance, Željko Dugac, “‘Like Yeast in Fermentation’: Public Health in Interwar Yugoslavia,” in *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, ed. Marius Turda, Christian Promitzer, and Sevasti Trubeta (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011), 193–232; Heinz Flamm, *Die Geschichte der Staatsarzneikunde, Hygiene, Medizinischen Mikrobiologie, Sozialmedizin und Tierseuchenlehre in Österreich und ihrer Vertreter* (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2012); Károly Kapronczay, *Fejezetek 125 év magyar egészségügyének történetéből* [Chapters from the 125-Year History of Hungarian Healthcare] (Budapest: Semmelweis Orvostörténeti Múzeum, Könyvtár és Levéltár, 2001); Petr Svobodný and Ludmila Hlaváčková, *Dějiny lékařství v českých zemích* [History of Medicine in the Czech Lands] (Prague: Triton, 2004).

In what follows, I contend that the biopolitical institution-building culminating in the formation of these public health ministries was both (post)imperial and deeply interconnected. The creation of these biopolitical institutions was a transnational phenomenon propelled by networks of medical practitioners, initially within the empire and later in the post-imperial context. Furthermore, I demonstrate that, in each instance, supporters of eugenics not only contributed significantly to the inception of these central institutions but also held some of the highest positions within them.

A significant portion of these eugenicists had prior associations with the Habsburg civil administration. Moreover, eugenicists with strong ties to nationalist activism also frequently assumed influential positions within these ministries. As a result, all of these institutions were significantly influenced by imperial legacies, and particularly by the legacies of eugenic discourses that were prevalent in the late Habsburg imperial context. Even in the realm of biopolitics and its actors, discourses, and institutions, the year 1918 should not be considered a radical departure from the imperial past, but rather a moment of continuity.

Imperial medical networks played a critical role in shaping the public health ministries of imperial Austria and its successor states. Many of the key figures behind these ministries were deeply connected, both in terms of shared ideas and personal relationships. These experts often showed a strong commitment to eugenics and were actively involved in home front biopolitical projects. At the heart of their discussions was the notion of biological or organic capital, a concept ardently promoted by Julius Tandler. Furthermore, a significant number had direct ties to Tandler, who thus emerged as one of the key figures shaping biopolitics in late imperial and early post-imperial Central Europe.

Amidst the growing scarcity of essential resources and escalating social tensions in the late Habsburg Empire, physicians increasingly played pivotal roles in biopolitical initiatives.

As these initiatives often fell short of their goals, calls emerged from the medical community for increased state intervention, a stronger role for physicians in shaping state policies, and a centralized body to coordinate these efforts. This perspective was succinctly captured by a physician involved in child welfare, who advocated that the state should “leave the actual leadership and the design of the entire undertaking to the doctors.”⁷²⁴ Such sentiments were far from isolated; indeed, they reflected a broader consensus within the medical community actively engaged in home front biopolitics. This consensus was articulated and amplified by figures like Julius Tandler, who not only represented the demands of his peers but also couched them in the lexicon and principles of eugenics.

Benefiting from his prominent position within wartime eugenic networks, Julius Tandler emerged as a central figure in the founding of Imperial Austria’s Ministry of Public Health. He articulated his perspectives in a pivotal essay, *Volksgesundheit und Volkswohlfahrt* (People’s Health and People’s Welfare), published in June 1917 in the leading daily of the Austrian Social Democratic Party. The crux of Tandler’s argument was that:

the remaining organic capital of the state must be managed with utmost seriousness. Such management of human economy, however, requires a dedicated administrative apparatus. As public health and public welfare are about to become key agendas of the state, a standalone and independent administrative body must be created to handle them. Such administrative body is a ministry.⁷²⁵

In his essay, Tandler thus compellingly combined his call for institution-building with the eugenic notions of human economy and organic capital.

The shifting political landscape of Austria-Hungary around 1917 created an opening for the demands of physicians like Tandler. By this time, the military’s influence on the state had

⁷²⁴ Nobel, “Ärztliche Erfahrungen,” 161.

⁷²⁵ Julius Tandler, “Volksgesundheit und Volkswohlfahrt,” *Arbeiterzeitung* 29, no. 152 (June 5, 1917): 1.

weakened, and its attempt at radical social and political transformation had clearly failed.⁷²⁶ However, when the last Austrian emperor took office and the Austrian parliament reconvened, it became apparent to authorities that resurrecting pre-1914 political practices of compromise was no longer feasible.⁷²⁷ In response, officials sought and experimented with new narratives to reestablish political legitimacy. Biopolitical expertise offered one such alternative narrative. In the waning days of the empire, the authorities became open to negotiating with eugenic ideas, especially those proposed by Tandler.

Tandler not only championed the project in public debates but also worked behind the scenes. In a discreet manner, he lobbied for eugenically inflected public health policies and the creation of the ministry during his meetings with the last Austrian emperor. This lobbying was not without effect, as suggested by an entry in the diary of the liberal politician Josef Redlich. He notes that he “noticed the influence of Prof. Tandler’s ideas” on the emperor following one such meeting, with the emperor speaking “in a highly accentuated manner” about “our losses which affected a quarter of the working male population” and the concomitant “loss of labor energy.”⁷²⁸ Redlich’s observation underscores the impact Tandler’s ideas had on the Habsburg ruler.

In addition to private statements, the programmatic throne speech of the incoming Emperor in 1917 also reflected the influence of eugenicists, particularly in its sections dedicated to future welfare and public health measures. In the throne speech, the emperor asserted that “the war caused heavy damage to the people’s strength [Volkskraft],” which could only be rectified through a “determined population policy,” coordinated between the state and civil

⁷²⁶ Deak and Gumz, “How to Break,” 1130.

⁷²⁷ Deak and Gumz, “How to Break,” 1131.

⁷²⁸ The meeting in question took place in early July 1917. Josef Redlich, *Schicksalsjahre Österreichs, 1908-1919. Das politische Tagebuch Josef Redlichs*, ed. Fritz Fellner, Vol. 2. (Vienna: Böhlau, 1954), 217.

society.⁷²⁹ The speech specifically pledged to combat various “diseases of the people,” reduce infant mortality, overhaul youth welfare, and implement measures to curb youth delinquency. Another key focus was the introduction of housing policies and worker protections, particularly targeting the well-being of women and young workers. According to the speech, the “physical and mental efficiency” of this demographic was the cornerstone upon which “the future of our people’s strength [Volkskraft] and our economic life primarily depend.”⁷³⁰ While the emperor referenced “people’s strength” instead of using the term “organic capital,” his programmatic speech aligned with most of the biopolitical priorities championed by Tandler and his allies.

Reflecting both the sway of Tandler’s eugenic arguments among the authorities, this social democratic eugenicist eventually secured a position within the state administration. During the discussions regarding the composition of the last government of imperial Austria, Tandler was seriously considered as a candidate for the minister of public health. However, he was ultimately passed over at the last minute in favor of the incumbent, Ukrainian chemist Ivan Horbaczewski.⁷³¹ Additionally, from 1919 to 1920, Tandler held the position of chief officer for public health in the restructured Ministry of Public Welfare of the new Austrian Republic. (Horbaczewski’s immediate successor after October 1918 was the nationalist eugenicist Ignaz Kaup. He had temporarily returned to Austria from Germany, where he was a member of the German Society for Race Hygiene. Kaup and Tandler clashed forcefully during that period.)⁷³² Tandler’s strategy and trajectory were replicated by other eugenicists in various parts of Austria-Hungary and bore fruit once these areas were transformed into its successor states.

In partitioned Poland, the project of setting up a Ministry of Public Health was taken up almost simultaneously by several networks of medical scientists. One of the crucial individuals

⁷²⁹ “Die Thronrede Kaiser Karls,” *Reichspost* 24, no. 248 (May 31, 1917): 1–2.

⁷³⁰ “Die Thronrede,” 1–2.

⁷³¹ Sablik, *Julius Tandler*, 150.

⁷³² Sablik, *Julius Tandler*, passim.

in this context was Tomasz Janiszewski, the chief municipal physician of Kraków, an associate professor of social medicine at the Jagiellonian University, and a vocal supporter of eugenics. In 1916, Janiszewski became the president of the Galician Medical Society, and as such, emerged as one of the earliest advocates of the idea of creating an independent Ministry of Public Health.⁷³³ My argument centers on this individual whose trajectory underscores the significance of the Austro-Hungarian setting and eugenic networks in the development of central public health institutions in Poland.

In 1917, Janiszewski published a pamphlet titled *Polskie Ministerstwo Zdrowia Publicznego* (The Polish Ministry of Public Health) in Kraków. He made a case for establishing a ministry of public health in the Kingdom of Poland, which was occupied by the Central Powers, and proposed its potential structure. His overall argument was that a ministry of public health was necessary for “the preservation of health and strength of the nation” and the “moral and physical reconstruction of Poland.”⁷³⁴ For both of these goals, he asserted, eugenics was fundamental. While Janiszewski drew on the work of eugenicists from various contexts, such as Havelock Ellis, Karl Pearson, and Wilhelm Schallmayer, the fundamental concepts shaping his argument originated from sources closer to home.

Janiszewski portrayed the future ministry as a crucial step towards efficient management of organic capital and, consequently, the development of a human economy. He claimed that:

The state must, in the first instance, manage the most valuable material: humans. The management of material goods can only be a means to this end, not the end itself. The administration must be permeated with the spirit of human economy,

⁷³³ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 94.

⁷³⁴ Tomasz Wiktor Janiszewski, *Polskie Ministerstwo Zdrowia Publicznego: (zadania, zasady organizacyi i zakres działania zarządu spraw zdrowotnych w państwie polskiem)* [Polish Ministry of Public Health: Tasks, Principles of Organization, and Scope of the Health Administration in the Polish State] (Kraków: nakł. własny, 1917), 17 and 27.

that is, with the economy of human material. Its main goal is the profitability of human life.⁷³⁵

What is more, in a clear echo of Tandler's ideas, Janiszewski placed his argument within a historical trajectory of population policy. This trajectory spanned from its most basic form, the "imperialist population policy," through a "mercantilist population policy," all the way to its highest stage, the "human economy."⁷³⁶ Finally, Janiszewski emphasized the importance of a close cooperation between the civil administration pursuing social hygiene, eugenics, and population policy and voluntary associations.⁷³⁷ To substantiate his claim that a ministry of public health was crucial for Poland's alleged regeneration through preventive medicine and eugenics, Janiszewski thus drew on the line of argument pioneered and promoted by Viennese eugenicists and their allies.

Janiszewski's proposal proved crucial for the emergence of Poland's ministry of public health. As Magdalena Gawin points out, even though an alternative proposal for the ministry was drafted by the Warsaw Hygienic Society, "the whole regulation" of the Ministry of Public Health, Social Welfare, and Labor Protection, established by decree in April 1918, "clearly showed that it was the conception of Janiszewski and the Polish Society for Social Medicine that had been adopted."⁷³⁸ The broad competencies of the ministry encompassed not only public health but also social welfare and eugenically-inflected population policy.⁷³⁹

⁷³⁵ Janiszewski, *Polskie Ministerstwo*, 6–7.

⁷³⁶ It is true that when making these arguments, Janiszewski's only acknowledged point of reference was Heinz Potthoff, a German sociologist and economist. However, as a left-liberal member of the Monist League, was one of the loudest propagators of Goldscheid's ideas in imperial Germany. Moreover, many of the ideas that Janiszewski ascribes to Potthoff were actually made by Tandler, including the arguments about the historical sequence of population policy. In other words, Potthoff served primarily as a proxy for arguments made by Austrian eugenicists. Marie Louise Seelig, *Heinz Potthoff (1875-1945): Arbeitsrecht als volkswirtschaftliches und sozialpolitisches Gestaltungsinstrument* (Berlin: BWV Verlag, 2008), 101–109. The citation comes from Janiszewski, *Polskie Ministerstwo*, 9.

⁷³⁷ Janiszewski, *Polskie Ministerstwo*, 6.

⁷³⁸ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 98.

⁷³⁹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 98.

In January 1919, Janiszewski, who at the time was closely aligned with the agrarian Polish People's Party "Piast," became the second Minister of Public Health in independent Poland. He proved to be "among the most active physicians in the organization of the healthcare system and the reconstruction of the country."⁷⁴⁰ For some public health institutions in post-imperial Poland, including the Health Ministry, the legacies of Habsburg eugenics thus proved constitutive.

In Hungary, the institutional and conceptual connection to Vienna was even more fundamental for the emergence of the first health ministry. As in other places in the Habsburg Empire, medical doctors in Hungary increasingly demanded the establishment of a ministry of public health or social welfare. This demand arose from their active involvement or looser connection to voluntary associations. Even a liberal conservative doctor, Sándor Korányi, who was involved in an anti-tuberculosis association, stated in 1916 that "the country's ills cannot be healed with alms; the resolution of our task is imaginable only if the state and the voluntary associations exchange their roles, and the state assumes the leading role."⁷⁴¹ As the war continued and resources dwindled, these associations and their doctors called for a central institution that would support and coordinate their work and extend it into a broader program of social reform.

The concepts of human economy and organic capital also entered the political language of those who called for the establishment of the public health ministry in Hungary. For instance, Henrik Pach, a social hygienist long familiar with eugenics, drew on these tropes while celebrating the creation of the Ministry of Public Welfare in Hungary in 1917. (The Austrian and Hungarian Ministries of Public Welfare were distinct from the ministry of health but had a

⁷⁴⁰ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 94.

⁷⁴¹ Rudolfné Dósa, Ervinné Liptai, and Mihály Ruff, *A Magyar Tanácsköztársaság egészségügyi politikája* [Healthcare Policy of the Hungarian Soviet Republic] (Budapest: Medicina, 1959), 36.

partially overlapping agenda. While a Ministry of Public Welfare was established nearly simultaneously in imperial Austria and royal Hungary, a Hungarian ministry of health emerged only after a more significant delay.) He observed that as elsewhere, the public opinion in Hungary was concerned with “the strengthening of the national strength [Volkskraft] which had been severely weakened by the war.”⁷⁴² As a consequence, “finally and fortunately it is now a generally accepted opinion that humans are the most valuable capital of the state.”⁷⁴³

Similarly, Zsigmond Kunfi, a social democratic journalist and politician, argued that “the issue of population growth” was an important question for those “who consider human life not only valuable but as the actual basis of all other values.”⁷⁴⁴ Importantly, this language was not limited to the socialist left. Count Tivadar Batthyáni, a member of the Hungarian government both before and after the collapse of the empire, stressed the importance of the Ministry of Public Welfare by underlining that in order to achieve “a regeneration of the people,” it was imperative to recognize that “we mismanaged the most valuable part of national wealth, the humans.”⁷⁴⁵ Batthyáni’s diagnosis echoed Tandler’s arguments almost verbatim: “If until now the state power has primarily served the interests of the production of goods and wealth [...] we must take much more comprehensive care of protecting humans.”⁷⁴⁶ Batthyáni also emphasized that a central institution charged with public health, such as the ministry, did not preclude voluntary associations from their activity but rather amplified their impact. The *Stefánia Egyesület* served as an example for him.⁷⁴⁷ Many medical doctors, officials, and

⁷⁴² Henrik Pach, “Das Ministerium für Volkswohlfahrt,” *Pester Lloyd* 64, no. 251 (October 10, 1917): 2.

⁷⁴³ Pach, “Das Ministerium,” 2.

⁷⁴⁴ “Vita Madzsar József Ajövő nemzedék védelme és a háború c. előadása felett” [Discussion on József Madzsar’s Lecture on The Protection of Future Generations and War], *Huszadik Század* 33, no. 2 (February 1916): 165.

⁷⁴⁵ Tivadar Batthyány, *Népjóléti Minisztérium* [Ministry of Welfare] (Budapest: Franklin Nyomda, 1918), 17 and 20.

⁷⁴⁶ Batthyány, *Népjóléti Minisztérium*, 20.

⁷⁴⁷ Batthyány, *Népjóléti Minisztérium*, 39.

politicians in Hungary thus echoed the language that accompanied the institutional building in the field of public health in imperial Austria.

When the central authorities in the fields of public welfare and public health began to emerge in Hungary at the end of the war, political actors who embraced the concept of organic capital were at the forefront. In August 1917, when the Ministry of Public Welfare was effectively established, Tivadar Batthyáni became the first minister in charge of this office. After the collapse of the empire, Batthyáni's successor in the ministry was, in turn, replaced by the social democrat Zsigmond Kunfi in Count Károlyi's liberal democratic cabinet.⁷⁴⁸ While neither of them was a eugenicist in any meaningful sense of the word, both of these actors used the concept of organic capital and human economy to frame their arguments.

As we have seen, József Madzsar, a progressive figure, represented the most direct link to the home front biopolitics, voluntary associations, and Viennese eugenic networks. After the collapse of the empire, Madzsar became a leading officer in the Ministry of Public Welfare, and his influence grew with the advent of the Hungarian Republic of Councils.⁷⁴⁹ Although Madzsar was a civic radical and technocrat, not a communist, he ascended to a prominent bureaucratic role in the newly established Ministry of Public Health. He also took the helm as the President of the *Országos Egészségügyi Tanács* (National Council of Health), which, after its reorganization in April 1919, emerged as the pivotal institution for medical administration in the country.⁷⁵⁰ Furthermore, as Marius Turda observes, advocates of eugenics “dominated” the National Council of Health.⁷⁵¹ One may add that their names, including Leó Liebermann, Vilmos Tauffer, and Sándor Korányi, suggest that they tended to share Madzsar's institutional

⁷⁴⁸ Iván Bognár, “A Népjóléti Minisztérium és a Népjóléti Népbiztosság szervezete, 1917–1919” [Organization of the Ministry of Welfare and the People's Welfare Commissariat, 1917–1919], *Levéltári Közlemények* 37, no. 2 (1966): 300.

⁷⁴⁹ Kovács, *Liberal Professions*, 64.

⁷⁵⁰ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 65.

⁷⁵¹ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 233.

and conceptual background, if not always his political ideology. Despite the collapse of the empire and the divergent political regimes that assumed power in republican Austria and revolutionary Hungary, the biopolitical actors, discourses, and institutions initially followed a staggeringly similar pattern.

After October 1918, Czechoslovakia followed the same trajectory, even though the representatives of Czech nationalist parties in the Austrian Reichsrat had previously protested against the creation of the Ministry of Public Health. On the surface, the *Czech Eugenics Society* seemed to agree with their criticism, claiming that it was an unacceptable step towards centralization. In a memorandum submitted in September 1917 to the imperial Austrian Minister of Public Health, Ivan Horbaczewski, who had previously taught at the Czech section of Prague University, the society called for the decentralization of health administration. It stated: “The new central institution of social hygiene, if it wishes to remain objective, will either work to decentralize, or a need will emerge in culturally and hygienically contiguous communities to create decentralized branch offices that would act independently.”⁷⁵² However, the memorandum also requested the creation of state-sponsored eugenics research institutes, more control by the ministry over child and youth welfare and food distribution, and the establishment of national or provincial branches of the ministry.⁷⁵³ The concrete demands outlined in the memorandum of the *Czech Eugenics Society* suggest that, behind the facade of political declarations by Czech nationalists, medical professionals were prepared to seriously

⁷⁵² “Přípis o základních potřebách eugenických” [A Note on the Basic Needs of Eugenics], *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 14, no. 11–12 (December 25, 1917): 434.

⁷⁵³ “Přípis,” 434–437. See also Jaroslav Kříženecký, “K organizaci ministerstva lidového zdravotnictví” [On the Organization of the Ministry of Public Health], *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 15, no. 1–3 (March 25, 1918): 39–41; Vladislav Růžička, “Ministerstvo pro lidové zdravotnictví a sociální péči” [Ministry for Public Health and Social Care], *Národ (Praha)* 1, no. 13 (1917): 276–277.

engage with the idea of a central, imperial governmental institution managing public health. This was particularly true of those who were involved in eugenic networks.

In fact, negotiations regarding the creation of a central institution to manage public health were underway among Czech medical doctors at the time. In 1918, a series of strategic meetings took place in Vienna and Prague, focusing on institution-building in the field of public health. The choice of the imperial capital and the capital of Bohemia as venues for these meetings, together with the absence of representatives from Moravia and Silesia, seems to suggest that the initial plan was to establish a branch of the imperial ministry, or an independent institution, at the provincial level in Bohemia, similar to the demand raised by the *Czech Eugenics Society*. Prominent participants in these meetings included medical doctors Antonín Kolínský, František Kulhavý, Ladislav Prokop Procházka, and Karel Weigner. They held significant roles within the public administration, such as Bohemia's chief provincial medical officer and Prague's chief municipal physician, and were also closely linked to voluntary associations.⁷⁵⁴ Additionally, all four were intimately associated with the *Czech Eugenics Society*, while Kulhavý was also a member of the board of the *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik*.

Given their professional background and networks, these Czech medical doctors mirrored their Austrian, Polish, and Hungarian counterparts in drawing on the concepts of organic capital and human economy to frame their discussions on institution building. As early as 1916, Kulhavý echoed Goldscheid and Tandler by stating, “One of the things that we learned during the war is the value of humans. [...] The wealth of nations does not only consist of material goods. It is to be found not only in the mines and the minerals, for example, but also

⁷⁵⁴ “Vznik a vývoj československého ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy: K jubileu 1918-1928” [Formation and Development of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education: On the Jubilee 1918-1928], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 10, no. 11 (November 20, 1928): 584–95.

in the miners and engineers who work at these sites.”⁷⁵⁵ Eugenicians who were involved in or echoed biopolitical discussions at the imperial level thus played a vital role in the strategic discussions that led to the creation of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Public Health.

After the collapse of the empire, these individuals recast their plans into blueprints for a national institution. Kolínský, Kulhavý, and Procházka were instrumental in setting up Czechoslovakia’s Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, drafting its regulations, designing its administrative structure, and “organizing the initial work of the new ministry.”⁷⁵⁶ Moreover, while the former two became top bureaucrats in the ministry, Procházka eventually became the minister in 1920.⁷⁵⁷ Finally, Weigner, a professor of anatomy and a member of the leadership of the Sokol gymnastics association, created a blueprint for the ministry’s Department of Physical Education and became a key member of the ministry’s advisory board for the same topic.

The newly established State of Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs, soon renamed to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, also established a ministry of public health shortly after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, in December 1918.⁷⁵⁸ The circumstances that surrounded its creation have not yet been analyzed in detail, but there is evidence that suggests

⁷⁵⁵ František Kulhavý, “Stát a eugenika” [State and Eugenics], *Ochrana mládeže: Časopis pro veřejnou i soukromou péči o mládež v Království českém* 6, no. 4–5 (May 1916): 99. Unlike Goldscheid or Tandler, Kulhavý was a conservative. The ideological difference was most palpable regarding what they labelled as “quantitative population policy.” While Goldscheid negotiated with neo-Malthusian theories, and Tandler often changed his mind, Kulhavý was aggressively pro-natalist.

⁷⁵⁶ “Vzpomínky k sedmdesátinám odborového přednosty MUDr. Františka Kulhavého” [Memories for the Seventieth Birthday of the Head of the Department MUDr. František Kulhavý], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 15, no. 1 (January 15, 1933): 7; “Vznik a vývoj,” 586.

⁷⁵⁷ Conversely, the last minister of public health of imperial Austria relocated to Czechoslovakia in the interwar period to continue his career as a university professor, teaching and, for a shorter time, also heading the émigré Free Ukrainian University in Prague. Ukrainian and Czech physicians published a *Festschrift* to celebrate his 70th birthday as a special issue of the Prague-based *Ukrainskii medichnyi vistnyk*, with contributions of at least two eugenicians. See Borys Matiushenko, “Yevhenichna sterilizatsiya” [Eugenic Sterilization], *Ukrainskii medichnyi vistnyk*, no. 3–4 (December 1924): 96–107; Vladislav Růžička, “Histerheza protoplazmy ta ii znachennia dlia zahalnoi biolohii” [Hysteresis of Protoplasm and Its Significance for General Biology], *Ukrainskii medichnyi vistnyk*, no. 3–4 (December 1924): 11–34.

⁷⁵⁸ Dugac, “Like Yeast,” 196. On Batut’s trajectory, see Duraković, *Serbien und das Modernisierungsproblem*.

that it was a result of complex negotiations between medical doctors and other stakeholders from various parts of the new, diverse state. On the one hand, Jovan Milanović Batut, a medical doctor and supporter of race hygiene from the old Serbian Kingdom, counted among the most influential supporters of the new ministry in 1918.⁷⁵⁹ On the other hand, the arguments that surrounded the creation of the ministry of public health in imperial Austria, resonated among Slovene-, Croatian-, and Serbian-speaking medical doctors in Austria-Hungary.

Andrija Štampar, a former student of Tandler who maintained a relationship with his “dear mentor” until the latter’s death in 1936, is a paradigmatic case in this regard.⁷⁶⁰ In his articles which he started publishing already before the collapse of the empire in the influential cultural revue *Hrvatska Njiva*, and elsewhere, Štampar called for legislative and institutional reforms that would allow for a “protection of the people’s health,” primarily through the introduction of various preventive measures. “It is about time,” he declared in July 1918, “that independent bodies charged with public health are created that would separate the medical policy from other areas of public administration” and complained that it was “a true mystery that the [Croatian] Diet has not discussed such a proposal yet.”⁷⁶¹ In these texts, Goldscheid and his German follower Heinz Potthoff were some of the key references for Štampar.⁷⁶² As elsewhere, therefore, Štampar foregrounded the concepts of organic capital and human economy in these texts, assuming that “the volume of capital that is embodied in humans is incomparably larger than all other capital,” and an “economy of humans” was thus “much more important than any type of economy that is concerned with goods.”⁷⁶³

⁷⁵⁹ Dugac, “Like Yeast,” 196.

⁷⁶⁰ Cited in Kuhar, “From an Impure Source,” 94.

⁷⁶¹ The German social democratic eugenicist Grotjahn was another significant influence on Štampar in these texts. Kuhar, “From an Impure Source,” 96.

⁷⁶² Kuhar, “From an Impure Source,” 96.

⁷⁶³ Andrija Štampar, “Kako ćemo očuvati narodno zdravlje?” [How Will we Preserve Public Health?], *Hrvatska njiva* 2, no. 28 (July 15, 1918): 481.

After the emergence of Yugoslavia, Štampar did not reframe his arguments. Rather, he made them more radical and more explicit. He thus expressed his support for the new nation's ministry of public health and called for the introduction of a new, far-reaching health law, in texts in which the echo of Viennese eugenicists was still unmistakable. "The future belongs to that nation," he wrote in 1919, "which knows how to value its health, its organic capital, and that will devote more attention to the economy of humans, rather than to an economy of things."⁷⁶⁴

In 1919, Štampar was appointed director of the Department of Racial, Public and Social Hygiene in the Yugoslav ministry of public health.⁷⁶⁵ (The health minister, Uroš Krulj, a nationalist physician from Bosnia, was another supporter of eugenics.) Even though Štampar was an unlikely candidate, given his young age, socialist politics, and his previous career that had brought him to the rural parts of Croatia and Slavonia, his trajectory does not come as a surprise in the light of the preceding analysis. While Štampar's department was just one of several departments in the ministry, it was the only one in charge of hygiene and prevention, and during more than a decade in office, it allowed Štampar to engage in intensive institution building.⁷⁶⁶ Tellingly, a well informed and well-connected hygienist from Czechoslovakia observed during his visit of Yugoslavia in the mid-1920s that the entire "new organization of the preventive medicine" still rested "on a single person, namely the chief of the hygienic section of the Ministry of Public Health," that is, on Štampar.⁷⁶⁷

In Greater Romania, finally, the calls for the creation of a standalone ministry of public health came from several groups of doctors, only some of whom had a background in Austria-

⁷⁶⁴ Andrija Štampar, "Primjetbe k osnovi zakona o čuvanju narodnog zdravlja" [Remarks on the Draft Law on Public Health], *Liječnički vjesnik* 41, no. 8 (August 15, 1919): 424–29.

⁷⁶⁵ Dugac, "Like Yeast," 196.

⁷⁶⁶ Dugac, "Like Yeast," 196.

⁷⁶⁷ Hynek Pelc, "Jugoslávie nás předhání" [Yugoslavia is Outpacing Us], *Praktický lékař* 7, no. 23 (December 5, 1927): 859.

Hungary and were committed to eugenics. Nevertheless, apart from the country's capital, as Maria Bucur points out, the calls for the expansion of health institutions were “most prominently” coming from Cluj/Kolozsvár in post-Habsburg Transylvania.⁷⁶⁸ It is equally noteworthy that Iuliu Moldovan, a former Habsburg military doctor, emerged as the central figure in the public health institution-building in this region.⁷⁶⁹ Shortly after returning from the Austro-Hungarian military in December 1918, Moldovan undertook the task of restructuring and expanding the healthcare institutions in Transylvania. For two years, he championed this cause as the head of the Service for Public Health and Social Protection within the newly established regional Directing Council.⁷⁷⁰ Significantly, it was Moldovan, too, who vocally advocated the establishment of a public health ministry in Romania in the early 1920s.⁷⁷¹ He asserted that such a ministry would implement policies to counteract “the enormous deficit caused to the national economy by the losses of so much laboring and useful energy.”⁷⁷² However, when Romania's Ministry of Public Health was finally founded in 1923, it did not adhere to Moldovan's recommendations. As a result, his institution-building efforts remained confined to the regional level.

Eugenic concepts like human economy and organic capital underpinned Moldovan's arguments on institution-building during that time. For instance, in his 1921 essay on the “role of society in social medicine,” Moldovan stressed that it was “not the economy and finances that are the foundations upon which we can build a durable future.”⁷⁷³ Instead, he posited, it

⁷⁶⁸ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 190.

⁷⁶⁹ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 190.

⁷⁷⁰ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 190.

⁷⁷¹ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 191.

⁷⁷² Iuliu Moldovan, “Motive pentru înființarea Ministerului Sănătății Publice” [Reasons for Establishing the Ministry of Public Health], *Sănătatea publică* 1, no. 1 (January 1921): 10. See also “Proiect de organizare a Ministerului Sănătății Publice și a Serviciilor Sanitare” [Project for the Organization of the Ministry of Public Health and Sanitary Services], *Sănătatea publică* 1, no. 7–8 (July–August 1921): 17–32.

⁷⁷³ Iuliu Moldovan, “Rolul societății în igiena socială” [The Role of Society in Social Hygiene], *Revista Sănătății: Organ de profilaxie sanitară* 1, no. 1 (April 1921): 8.

was “the health of the people, their sustenance, and their physical and spiritual care.”⁷⁷⁴ His intellectual resources were even more explicit in another document from 1921. Here, Moldovan advocated for the establishment of a local specialized biopolitical research institution in Cluj/Kolozsvár. He asserted that the expanded Romanian state would flourish “if it provides the population with work in favorable physical conditions.”⁷⁷⁵ He believed this approach would supplant an antiquated “economic policy that exploits the energies of the masses of people in an egoistic way” with a new “biopolitics based on the vigor of human capital, constructing a secure, robust, and cultured economy on this foundation.”⁷⁷⁶

It is important to note that, unlike later in the interwar period, Moldovan’s biopolitical thinking at that time did not confine itself to a single national group. Maria Bucur underscores that Moldovan’s biopolitical blueprints were “more inclusive,” encompassing “the entire population of Transylvania.”⁷⁷⁷ (This strategy certainly initially convinced some: the 1919 Congress of Romanian Doctors in Transylvania was not only attended by representatives of Transylvanian Saxons, but they also made it clear that they “do not doubt that the Romanian doctors will aim for the health of all citizens without distinction.”)⁷⁷⁸ In other words, his viewpoints closely aligned with how a number of other eugenics supporters applied the concept of human economy in both the imperial and early postimperial contexts. While Moldovan was predominantly embedded within military medical networks prior to the Habsburg empire’s

⁷⁷⁴ Moldovan, “Rolul societății,” 8.

⁷⁷⁵ Adresă și proiect de lege privind înființarea unei Academii biopolitice. Inspectoratul general sanitar și de ocrotire Cluj. No. 31628/921, Cited in: Iuliu Moldovan, “Documente din trecut” [Documents from the Past], *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 9, no. 11–12 (October 1938 [1921]): 337.

⁷⁷⁶ Adresă și proiect de lege privind înființarea unei Academii biopolitice. Inspectoratul general sanitar și de ocrotire Cluj. No. 31628/921, Cited in: Moldovan, “Documente,” 337.

⁷⁷⁷ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 191.

⁷⁷⁸ National Archives of Romania, Cluj-Napoca Branch, Fund 231, Iuliu Moldovan Papers, File 10, Part B, Proces verbal luat în 28 ianuarie st. n. 1919 la Congresul medicilor români din Transilvania, Banat și părțile românești din țara ungurească, 2–3.

collapse and was only tenuously linked to Tandler and his allies, the latter's discourse also influenced Moldovan's pioneering institution-building efforts in Greater Romania.

The analysis of the emerging ministries of public health has uncovered a recurring pattern. A specific set of qualifications seemed to determine whether an individual would assume a central role in the creation of such ministries, either as its leader or as a high-ranking bureaucrat. These qualifications generally included a medical degree, previous experience in public administration and/or voluntary associations, active involvement in eugenics, a strong endorsement of the concepts of "organic capital" and "economy of humans," and often, a direct connection to Tandler. Consequently, the institutional development, evident in the near-simultaneous establishment of ministries of public health across multiple Central European states, was influenced by a shared set of biopolitical principles and fueled by a network of entangled medical professionals.

A consensus has emerged that the dissolution of Austria-Hungary in 1918 did not represent a radical departure from the past in the states that replaced it.⁷⁷⁹ As Pieter Judson explains, these nation-states were significantly more "influenced by the imperial context, practices, and traditions" than their nationalist leaders had acknowledged.⁷⁸⁰ Consequently, he suggests that the successor states of Austria-Hungary could be more accurately described as "miniature empires."⁷⁸¹ The extensive institution-building in the realm of biopolitics, as exemplified by the interlinked emergence of health ministries explored in this section, underscores Judson's conclusion. Instead of discarding the institutions of the defunct empire, the key participants in these debates essentially facilitated the reemergence of their scaled-down

⁷⁷⁹ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 387–88.

⁷⁸⁰ Judson, "'Where Our Commonality,'" 18.

⁷⁸¹ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 387–88.

versions. Thus, if Austria-Hungary's successor states constituted miniature empires, the same held true even for their initial approach to biopolitics.

Choosing Imperial Models, Choosing Biopolitics

Many states in interwar East Central Europe bore the legacies of multiple empires, be they German, Habsburg, Ottoman, and/or Tsarist. This subchapter argues that these states, in effect, had to choose from and negotiate among these various imperial legacies, including in the realm of biopolitics.⁷⁸² Thus, the strength of the biopolitical discourses inherited from Austria-Hungary during the interwar period in East Central Europe was asymmetrically distributed among different polities.

Among the successor states of the Habsburg Empire, Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia did not incorporate any other imperial legacy. However, it would be a mistake to cast these states as the rule and to dismiss states such as Yugoslavia, Poland, and Romania as exceptions. Instead, this subchapter explores the degree to which post-Habsburg actors influenced eugenics – and more broadly, biopolitics – in these countries during the interwar period. The significance of post-Habsburg eugenicists, their discourses, and practices in some of these countries was predicated by the sheer force of numbers. To gauge this force, I examine the overall proportion of post-Habsburg medical doctors within the entire medical community of those countries and use it as a rough proxy for their institutional influence. However, I also emphasize some contingent factors that affected the extent of influence post-Habsburg eugenicists had in these countries at the beginning of the interwar period.

Medical doctors born, educated, and previously employed in the Habsburg Empire, including those who advocated for eugenics, pursued their careers in Yugoslavia, Romania, and

⁷⁸² On public health as a particular imperial legacy, see Silverstein, “Doctors and Diplomats,” *passim*.

Poland. However, their influence differed across these countries in the first decade of the interwar period. In Yugoslavia, some of them became pivotal biopolitical figures, shaping public health strategies on a national scale. In Romania, their reach was generally limited to a regional setting, while their impact in interwar Poland was even more restricted.

Medical doctors from post-Habsburg regions played a significant role in the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, even though the state positioned itself in contrast to the old empires. In this complex state, which amalgamated the territories of two nation-states with sections of two landed empires (the Ottoman and the Habsburg), physicians with a Habsburg background were overwhelmingly more numerous than any other group of medical practitioners. Data from 1919, for instance, show that nearly 80 percent of Yugoslavia's doctors were based in the former territories of the Habsburg Empire, and that Croatia alone represented more than 27 percent.⁷⁸³ Conversely, the territories of the former Kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro, devastated by the war, had only around 300 physicians.⁷⁸⁴ Since there was no Faculty of Medicine in the regions that later became part of Yugoslavia until 1917, when one was founded in Zagreb, many physicians in the new state had earned their degrees from medical schools in either imperial Austria or royal Hungary.⁷⁸⁵ Consequently, medical doctors from the territories once under Austria-Hungary, including those who advocated for eugenics, not only maintained their sway in their original regions but also profoundly influenced the public health of the new state, particularly during its initial decade.

Not dissimilar to the situation in Yugoslavia, interwar Greater Romania stitched together territories from the former Habsburg and Romanov empires with the old Romanian

⁷⁸³ Mane Trbojević, "Statistika lekara u Jugoslaviji" [Statistics of Doctors in Yugoslavia], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 4 (December 1919): 142–45.

⁷⁸⁴ Trbojević, "Statistika lekara," 142–45.

⁷⁸⁵ Andrija Štampar, *Public Health in Yugoslavia* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1938), 3.

Kingdom, creating many similar challenges.⁷⁸⁶ However, in this case, the numerical balance between the doctors from the Old Kingdom of Romania and those from the post-Habsburg territories was more even than in Yugoslavia, even though both countries faced a significant shortage of medical doctors, especially in rural areas.⁷⁸⁷ By the end of the 1930s, about 45 percent of Romania's medical doctors lived in the former territories of Austria-Hungary, with Transylvania alone accounting for over 21 percent.⁷⁸⁸ In addition to the relative strength of these numbers, contingent factors also contributed to the establishment of Transylvania, in particular, as a significant center for eugenic knowledge production in Greater Romania.

After the collapse of the empire, the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Cluj underwent an “ample process of Romanization achieved on the old infrastructure.”⁷⁸⁹ As the central authorities aimed to establish “a strong Romanian academic center in Transylvania,” the university was generously funded and subsequently became “an outstanding part of the Romanian system of higher education.” During this process, most of the previous teaching staff were terminated, and ethnically Romanian academics came to dominate the university.⁷⁹⁰ Among the medical doctors in key positions were both Iuliu Moldovan, a former Habsburg military officer, and his close ally, Iuliu Hațieganu.⁷⁹¹ Consequently, the many cohorts of Romanian medical students who studied at the university during the interwar period and

⁷⁸⁶ Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).

⁷⁸⁷ Iosif Glicsman and J. R. Stoicescu, *Album statistic al igienei preventive, asistenței medicale și al asistenței sociale* [Statistical Album of Preventive Hygiene, Medical Care, and Social Assistance] (Bucharest: Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co, 1927), 16–17.

⁷⁸⁸ Constantin Gheorghiu, “Asistența medicală rurală în România” [Rural Healthcare in Romania], *Sociologie Românească* 2, no. 2 (February 1937): 84.

⁷⁸⁹ Victor Karady and Lucian Nastasă, *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and the Students of the Medical Faculty: (1872-1918)* (Budapest: Central European University, 2004), 68.

⁷⁹⁰ Karady and Nastasă, *The University of Kolozsvár*, 68.

⁷⁹¹ As a researcher at the University of Kolozsvár, Hațieganu engaged with the Austrian medical networks before 1918, and published regularly in the *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, albeit not on eugenics-related topics. See, for instance, Iuliu Hațieganu, “Über das Blutbild bei Struma und Morbus Basedowi,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 25, no. 39 (September 26, 1912): 1449–52; Iuliu Hațieganu and Béla Döri, “Über die klinische Vergleichung des Ewald-Boas und des Mintzchen Probefrühstückes,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 25, no. 52 (Dezember 1912): 2044–46; Iuliu Hațieganu, “Die klinische Bedeutung der Winkler-Schulze-Oxydase-Reaktion,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 26, no. 13 (April 3, 1913): 537–38.

furthered their understanding of preventive medicine at the Institute of Hygiene and Social Hygiene were mentored by some of the foremost post-Habsburg eugenicists. Their lectures appear to have left a strong impression on many, transforming these institutions into coordinating centers for a burgeoning network of eugenicists within the region.⁷⁹²

In effect, not only did the number of medical doctors in the region increase over the course of the interwar period, but so did the share of ethnic Romanian physicians among this professional body, as well as their awareness of and commitment to eugenics.⁷⁹³ These contingent events contributed to making Cluj/Kolozsvár, and Transylvania more broadly, into the second center of eugenic thinking in Romania. As Maria Bucur notes, this alternative center developed arguments and strategies that diverged significantly from those proposed by eugenicists in Romania's capital.⁷⁹⁴ In effect, a significant rivalry emerged in the interwar period between the biopolitical actors in a regional, post-imperial center of Cluj, and the administrative center of the nationalizing state in Bucharest. Maria Bucur posits that the distinctions between the political ideologies of the doctors in Cluj, who championed agrarian populism and regionalism, and those in Bucharest, who favored national liberalism and centralism, account for these tensions.⁷⁹⁵ However, there was also another crucial element: the Habsburg imperial legacies of the eugenicists in Transylvania. Similarly, what some historians

⁷⁹² Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 76; Library of the Institute of Hygiene, Bucharest, Inv. No. 49.574, manuscript, Râmneanțu, Petru: "Iuliu Moldovan (1882-1966): Viața, realizările și epoca sa." Bucharest, 1977, 52-57.

⁷⁹³ According to available statistics, there were approximately 1360 physicians in Transylvania in 1920 and around 1520 by the late 1930s. However, while the proportion of Romanian doctors was estimated to be 20 percent in 1920, this share grew to about 45 percent by 1937. Needless to say, as with all ethnic statistics, these figures should be approached cautiously and critically. Iuliu Moldovan, "Tabelă comperativă a medicilor din Transilvania (1917-1920)" [A Comparative Chart of Physicians in Transylvania, 1917-1920], *Buletinul Direcțiunei generale a serviciului sanitar* 32, no. 6 (June 1920): 190; Gheorghiu, "Asistența medicală," 84.

⁷⁹⁴ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 19-45.

⁷⁹⁵ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 191-92.

perceive as tensions between Croatian and Serbian eugenicists in Yugoslavia might be more productively viewed as a conflict arising from varied imperial and state legacies.⁷⁹⁶

In interwar Poland, which amalgamated territories from three defunct landed empires, medical doctors from the former Austrian partition had a less pronounced impact than their counterparts from the Russian partition. The numbers, once again, made a significant difference. Figures from the mid-1920s indicate that over 46 percent of all physicians in Poland were located in what had formerly been the Russian partition, whereas the Austrian partition accounted for less than 30 percent.⁷⁹⁷ Apart from their relative numerical weakness, more contingent factors also contributed to the sidelining of medical doctors, and by extension, eugenicists, from the former Austrian partition. Critically, while there were lively debates informed by eugenics in Habsburg Galicia, the true epicenter of Polish eugenic thinking before 1914 was in the Russian partition.⁷⁹⁸ The creation of a new Polish state reinforced this asymmetry, and even created a certain degree of mistrust between the powerful network of eugenicists centered in Warsaw, the new capital, and the individuals coming from the Habsburg context, who were ultimately sidelined.⁷⁹⁹ The legacy of eugenic discourses from Austria-Hungary was, therefore, more limited in interwar Poland than in Yugoslavia and Romania.

⁷⁹⁶ The tensions between Serbian and Croatian doctors in Yugoslavia are highlighted in both recent accounts of public health in early Yugoslavia, that both understandably revolve around the person of Andrija Štampar. Dugac, “Like Yeast,” *passim*.; Kuhar, “From an Impure Source,” 92–113. See also Sara Silverstein, “Reinventing International Health in East Central Europe: The League of Nations, State Sovereignty, and Universal Health,” in *Remaking Central Europe*, ed. Natasha Wheatley and Peter Becker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 71–98; Patrick Zylberman, “Fewer Parallels than Antitheses: Rene Sand and Andrija Štampar on Social Medicine, 1919–1955,” *Social History of Medicine* 17, no. 1 (April 2004): 77–92.

⁷⁹⁷ The numbers were even more pronouncedly tilted towards the Russian partition when it came to those doctors who spoke Polish. Antoni Cieszyński, *Stan lekarski w czasach obecnych pod względem liczbowym i ekonomicznym: Przyszłość stanu lekarskiego w Polsce* [Medical Profession in Present Times in Terms of Numbers and Economics: The Future of the Medical Profession in Poland] (Lwów: Nakład własny autora, 1928), 16–17, table 19; Elżbieta Więckowska, *Lekarze jako grupa zawodowa w II Rzeczypospolitej* [Doctors as a Professional Group in the Second Polish Republic] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2004), 28.

⁷⁹⁸ Stauter-Halsted, *The Devil’s Chain*, 284–310.

⁷⁹⁹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 99 and 110.

Even though the territories of Austria-Hungary that became part of Italy after 1918 included some large urban areas, these spaces were not the primary centers for the production of eugenic knowledge in the former empire. Moreover, the number of medical doctors who resided there was numerically insignificant compared to the rest of interwar Italy. The legacy of eugenic discourses from Austria-Hungary, therefore, did not leave a significant trace in the history of Italian eugenics, except perhaps for Franco Savorgnan. A nationalist demographer, Savorgnan hailed from Trieste and was a member of the provincial diet of the Littoral for a few years before 1914. However, Savorgnan left Austria shortly after Italy entered the First World War on the side of the Allies. Later, in Fascist Italy, he went on to become the head of the *Istituto Centrale di Statistica* (Central Institute of Statistics).⁸⁰⁰ While the following sections closely examine the post-Habsburg territories of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia, the cases of Poland and Italy will consequently be discussed less frequently.

Patterns of Failure: Eugenic Legislation in Post-Habsburg Countries in the 1920s

In the first decades of the twentieth century, eugenicists prioritized eugenic legislation. The attempts to introduce it in various national contexts around the world became a recurring theme in their writings.⁸⁰¹ In these texts, it was widely accepted that eugenicists should strive to convert their precepts into law. In making this argument, eugenicists mirrored the political strategy of other positivist movements for legal reform.⁸⁰² These tropes were also evident in the writings of eugenicists from Austria-Hungary. The works of Géza von Hoffmann, in particular,

⁸⁰⁰ Savorgnan was heavily influenced by Ludwig Gumplowicz and circulated his theories in the Italian context. Cassata, *Building the New Man*, 44–46 and 268–69.

⁸⁰¹ Current historiography on eugenics sometimes reflects this juridico-political inflection, without problematizing this preference. Levine, *Eugenics*, passim; Véronique Mottier, “Eugenics and the State: Policy-Making in Comparative Perspective,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, ed. Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 134–53.

⁸⁰² See, for instance, Michele Pifferi, *The Limits of Criminological Positivism: The Movement for Criminal Law Reform in the West, 1870–1940* (London: Routledge, 2021).

circulated widely throughout German-speaking Central Europe and beyond. Meticulously covering the eugenic legislation in the United States, they further reinforced the stipulated link between eugenics and legal reform.⁸⁰³ Consistent with these arguments, eugenicists in post-Habsburg states aggressively lobbied for eugenic legislation, especially in the initial years of those states' existence. In this subchapter, I argue that these attempts largely failed in the 1920s, with some doing so quite spectacularly, and I identify several causes of this failure.

One key reason for the failure of these attempts to introduce eugenic legislation in the decade following the collapse of the empire was the eugenicists' inability to form broad coalitions with various social constituencies. While eugenics bridged national and disciplinary divides among scientists in Habsburg and post-imperial Central Europe, eugenicists, in most instances, struggled to rally broad coalitions behind their proposals and encountered significant resistance. A salient example of such failure of eugenic proposals due to fierce resistance was the attempt to pass a "basic health law" that would reshape the entire public health framework. These sweeping laws were seriously considered in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and later, in Romania. In these countries, which amalgamated various imperial and nation-state legacies, these laws were designed to serve a dual purpose. On the one hand, they aimed to replace the legal pluralism in public health with a new law valid for the entire territory of these post-imperial states. On the other hand, these laws sought to surpass the liberal precepts of the Austrian and Hungarian health laws from the 1870s and introduce various eugenically-inflected preventive and social welfare measures.

To begin with, in Yugoslavia, the Serbian Medical Association drafted a basic health law in 1919 that emphasized curative medicine while marginalizing health prevention.

⁸⁰³ Géza von Hoffmann, *Die Rassenhygiene in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Munich: Lehmann, 1913); Géza von Hoffmann, "Die Rechtsgiltigkeit der Sterilisierungsgesetze und der einschränkenden Ehegesetze in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 34, no. 1 (1913): 900–905.

Significant in illustrating how post-imperial legacies structured the divisions within Yugoslavia's medical community, physicians from the post-Habsburg territories "strongly criticized" the draft, particularly those from Croatia.⁸⁰⁴ Equally revealing, Andrija Štampar emerged as one of the most vocal critics of the proposed law. He prepared an alternative draft that placed greater emphasis on eugenically-inflected strategies of public health and social medicine.⁸⁰⁵ However, neither of these comprehensive laws came anywhere near being enacted. As Martin Kuhar aptly observes, eugenics "ultimately failed to become an official policy" in Yugoslavia.⁸⁰⁶

Czechoslovakia followed a similar trajectory in its initial years of existence, with various reform attempts taking place. A draft of a basic health law was in the making, and the project was discussed at multiple public forums. The most notable demonstration of support for the new law was the First Medical Congress on Social Medicine, which convened in Prague in June 1919. The congress, attended by more than 500 participants, was presided by the head of the Czech Eugenics Society, Haškovec, and divided into several sections. The crucial section for public health was presided by an ally of the eugenics movement, Ladislav P. Procházka.⁸⁰⁷ In his keynote, Procházka called for a basic health law that was "unitary, as broad as possible, and covered all the branches of hygiene."⁸⁰⁸ In the subsequent section, moreover, Vladislav Růžička promoted eugenics while bolstering Procházka's argument. He claimed that a

⁸⁰⁴ Dugac, "Like Yeast," 198.

⁸⁰⁵ Dugac, "Like Yeast," 199.

⁸⁰⁶ Kuhar, "From an Impure Source," 93.

⁸⁰⁷ Ludmila Sinkulová, *Lékaři, stát a zdraví lidu: z historie zdravotní služby v zemích českých* [Doctors, the State, and the Health of the People: From the History of Healthcare in the Czech Lands] (Prague: Státní zdravotnické nakladatelství, 1959), 272–300.

⁸⁰⁸ Karel Helbich, ed., *Věstník I. lékařského sjezdu zdravotnicko-sociálního v Praze 1919* [Bulletin of the 1st Medical Congress of Health and Social Care in Prague 1919] (Prague: Ústřední jednota československých lékařů, 1919), 36.

“program of adaptive eugenics,” based on the inheritance of acquired characteristics, was “identical with the entire program of public health.”⁸⁰⁹

The proposed reform encountered significant resistance. Even among the medical profession, certain influential physicians expressed reservations about the proposal. Consequently, the draft of the law was never presented to the parliament, even though one of its main supporters served as Czechoslovakia’s minister of public health between 1920 and 1921.⁸¹⁰ Legal pluralism in public health ultimately characterized the entire interwar Czechoslovakia.⁸¹¹ The fate of these drafts of basic health laws in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia shows that such sweeping projects failed to garner sufficient support, even within the medical community.

While a unification of the legal framework for public health was not a relevant theme in Austria and Hungary, eugenicists nevertheless promoted legislation that went beyond the liberal principles of the imperial Austrian and Hungarian public health laws from the 1870s. The Hungarian Soviet Republic, on the one hand, went on to socialize all medical establishments by decree. At the same time, Madzsar and his allies produced “elaborate welfare concepts” as well as a slew of “decrees dressed in professionally impeccable minutiae,” as Mária Kovács fittingly describes them.⁸¹² Yet, many of them existed only on paper, and most, if not all, had been abolished after the collapse of the short-lived communist dictatorship.

⁸⁰⁹ Helbich, *Věstník I.*, 62–63.

⁸¹⁰ Hana Mášová, “Bojovník s byrokracií: Lékař a úředník Ladislav Prokop Procházka” [Fighter against Bureaucracy: Doctor and Official Ladislav Prokop Procházka], in *Historia - medicina - cultura: Sborník k dějinám medicíny* [History - Medicine - Culture: Collection on the History of Medicine] (Prague: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 2006), 197.

⁸¹¹ Svobodný and Hlaváčková, *Dějiny lékařství*, 161.

⁸¹² Kovács, *Liberal Professions*, 65.

In democratic Austria, Julius Tandler and his allies sought to introduce legislation that increased the role of the state in public health, as well as the rights of the citizens.⁸¹³ Tandler argued that these measures were vital for “rebuilding the people’s strength [Volkskraft] and protecting health.”⁸¹⁴ Using this eugenic trope, he asserted that these measures had to take place immediately, and that they represented a prelude to replacing of the old Austrian law on public health from 1870 that was “obsolete and in need of reform in so many ways.”⁸¹⁵

In both cases, these proposals met with fierce disapproval from within the medical community. Significantly, the groups of supporters and opponents of the changes, respectively, largely overlapped with the wartime divide between the network of eugenicists linked to the civil administration, on the one hand, and the military networks of the often radical, nationalist eugenicists, on the other hand. In Austria, the clash quickly escalated. One professional association of doctors opposing the proposed institutional changes threateningly declared: “Enough is enough! Colleagues! Not a day without a new assassination attempt. Arm yourself and be ready!”⁸¹⁶ These threats may have been an allusion to recent events.

In fact, a covert group of nationalist and antisemitic physicians orchestrated the first coup attempt against the authorities of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in Budapest a year earlier.⁸¹⁷ After the collapse of the revolutionary dictatorship in August 1919 and the removal of the progressive physicians who had previously overseen the country’s public health, including Tandler’s ally Madzsar, these nationalists were rewarded with a ministerial appointment. The new Minister of Public Health, András Csilléry, was a radical nationalist

⁸¹³ Some of these laws had been enacted and put into practice. Notably, they included the *Krankenanstaltengesetz* from July 1920, that obliged the state to cover a part of the hospital stay costs for its citizens. Sablik, *Julius Tandler*, 174–78.

⁸¹⁴ “Das Maß ist voll,” *Mitteilungen der Wirtschaftlichen Organisationen der Aerzte Wiens, Niederösterreichs, Salzburgs und Vorarlbergs, der Aerztekammern von Niederösterreich, Salzburg und Tirol*, no. 12 (September 1, 1920): 1563.

⁸¹⁵ “Das Maß,” 1563.

⁸¹⁶ “Das Maß,” 1566.

⁸¹⁷ Kovács, *Liberal Professions*, 66.

advocate of race hygiene and a former Austro-Hungarian military physician.⁸¹⁸ Thus, in Austria and Hungary, the conflicts within the medical profession resulting from attempts to reform public health were even more pronounced.

The situation in Romania was even more complex. The post-Habsburg eugenicists in Transylvania largely lacked decisive influence on the policies of the centralist, national liberal government throughout most of the 1920s. Moreover, many found it “impossible to work with the liberal regime from the very beginning.”⁸¹⁹ However, even here these eugenicists followed the same pattern and drafted a new, far-reaching piece of public health legislation with an explicit eugenic agenda. Even though eugenicists in Transylvania called for fundamental changes of public health in Greater Romania from the outset, a window of opportunity opened for them only in 1928 when their political ally, the National Peasant Party, for the first time became Romania’s governing force. In effect, Moldovan was appointed General Secretary at the health ministry, and his work on a draft basic health law received the party’s full political backing.⁸²⁰ The sweeping law was enacted in 1930.

While the law had been passed, it faced significant resistance from within the state administration. The ministry had been flooded with complaints, while the local authorities had been bogged in constant negotiations about the implementation of the law’s measures. Consequently, these local administrators resisted the law, and they opposed the doctors whom they saw as encroaching on their authority. The police and the courts of law followed a similar path as these administrators in their resistance against the new legislation.⁸²¹ Even the surveillance of the STIs, generally regarded as a part of the law which did not stay on paper,

⁸¹⁸ Kovács, *Liberal Professions*, 288.

⁸¹⁹ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 191.

⁸²⁰ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 191.

⁸²¹ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 197–200.

provoked an outcry and resistance in some communities.⁸²² In effect, a eugenicist who rivaled with Moldovan was not incorrect when he dryly remarked that it was “impossible to implement effectively the largest part of the provisions in this law.”⁸²³

In the early 1920s, there were not only drafts of eugenically oriented public health laws, but also other attempts to codify eugenic practices into law. Yet, even if these attempts were less all-encompassing and more focused on a particular policy, they nevertheless also resulted in failure. The attempts to pass laws introducing prenuptial health certificates illustrate this pattern. These attempts again showcase how eugenic initiatives were stimulated by the post-Habsburg states’ early efforts at legal unification. In this case, they were propelled by the efforts to unify the marriage law. Most countries in post-Habsburg Central Europe inherited multiple legal systems that treated marriage, including the right to divorce, in substantially different ways.⁸²⁴ Consequently, there were recurrent discussions about and attempts at unifying the legislation in the early postwar years, often hand in hand with proposed social reforms.⁸²⁵ In this case, however, these juridico-political concerns were compounded by a deeply emotional and exaggerated reaction to phenomena which were perceived as a menace to the moral order of the community.

The eugenic calls for prenuptial health certificates were reinforced by a moral panic targeting sex work. This moral panic also extended to sexually transmitted infections, which, according to medical and particularly eugenic narratives, were largely attributed to sex work.⁸²⁶ Nancy Wingfield has shown that such moral panic was prevalent during the late imperial era

⁸²² Zsuzsa Bokor, “Girls, Doctors and Institutions. Eugenics and Medical Institutionalisation in Interwar Cluj,” *Revista de Antropologie Urbană* 3, no. 5 (2015): 24.

⁸²³ Cited in Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 200.

⁸²⁴ Sándor Nagy, “One Empire, Two States, Many Laws: Matrimonial Law and Divorce in the Austro—Hungarian Monarchy,” *The Hungarian Historical Review* 3, no. 1 (2014): 190–221.

⁸²⁵ Martin Löhnig, ed., *Kulturkampf und die Ehe: Reform des europäischen Eherechts nach dem Großen Krieg* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021).

⁸²⁶ Closely tied to these concerns was a moral panic concerning trafficking, which had a distinctively racist and anti-Semitic dimension. Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution*, 11.

and escalated during the interwar period.⁸²⁷ On the one hand, this moral panic resulted in the introduction of new laws regulating prostitution in post-Habsburg countries. The debates surrounding these laws clearly exhibited nationalist, “racial,” and eugenic overtones. However, despite the general preference among eugenicists in the 1920s for some form of regulation, authorities in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and the Slovene provincial government all adopted abolitionist measures.⁸²⁸ It is noteworthy that Romania’s comprehensive public health law from 1930 also predominantly embraced abolitionism, even though the eugenicist who was its primary author leaned towards regulation.⁸²⁹ To assess the extent and manner of influence that supporters of eugenics had on the wording of these laws, further local and comparative research into their origins is necessary.

On the other hand, the moral panic about sex work and sexually transmitted infections fueled the eugenicists’ push for the introduction of prenuptial health certificates. According to their proposals, these certificates would be required for individuals wishing to marry and would be issued by a medical doctor following a comprehensive medical checkup, which would include tests for sexually transmitted infections and assumed hereditary diseases. Again, the effort was weakened by skepticism within the medical community itself. Portions of this community questioned the scientific basis of the prenuptial health certificates in light of the contemporary knowledge on human genetics. However, the push for the introduction of prenuptial health certificates failed primarily due to resistance from religious institutions against any further liberalization of marriage laws. As a result, despite the moral panic

⁸²⁷ Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution*, passim. The moral panic targeting sex work and sexually transmitted infections was evident in both the late Habsburg Empire and the late Romanov Empire. The latter has been thoroughly analyzed by Keely Stauter-Halsted, particularly with a focus on partitioned Poland. Stauter-Halsted, *The Devil’s Chain*.

⁸²⁸ Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution*, 248–53.

⁸²⁹ Zsuzsa Bokor, *Testtörténetek: a nemzet és a nemi betegségek medikalizálása a két világháború közötti Kolozsváron* [Body Histories: The Medicalization of the Nation and Venereal Diseases in Kolozsvár between the Two World Wars], (Kolozsvár: Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2013), passim.

surrounding their subject, these proposals never garnered the political support that eugenics advocates had hoped for.

In Czechoslovakia, the issue of prenuptial health certificates, propagated by eugenicists, appeared in a draft law, and entered parliamentary debate. A new marriage law that introduced civil marriage was passed in May 1919. Concurrently with the law, the parliament passed a resolution calling for additional legislation “ensuring the sexual health of the marital spouses and the healthy offspring.”⁸³⁰ Shortly afterwards, in July 1919, the government proposed an amendment to the marriage law, which, in its first article, introduced mandatory prenuptial health certificates. The initial draft of the amendment contained a very broad definition of the conditions that doctors were ordered to identify during the medical examination. In particular, the law prescribed the state doctors that they refuse to issue the prenuptial health certificate to any person suffering from “an illness that contravenes the purpose of marriage or has noxious effects on the health of the spouse or progeny.”⁸³¹ Thus, the wording of the draft clearly reflected the demands that Czech eugenicists, primarily the psychiatrist Ladislav Haškovec, had been making since the early 1900s.⁸³²

⁸³⁰ However, it is important to note that already the marriage law from May 1919 was influenced by eugenic thinking. Under the influence of a leading Czech psychiatrist, František Heveroch, the law included clauses that made it possible to sue for a separation of marriage if the spouse was mentally ill, suffered from epilepsy, or from “a heavy mental degeneracy, either inborn or acquired, that included heavy hysteria, alcoholism, or drug overuse.” “Zákon č. 320/1919 Sb., kterým se mění ustanovení občanského práva o obřadnostech smlouvy manželské, o rozluce a o překážkách manželství” [Act No. 320/1919 Coll., Which Amends the Provisions of Civil Law on the Ceremonies of the Marriage Contract, on Separation and on Obstacles to Marriage], Systém ASPI, On-line, Accessed January 16, 2023. <https://www.aspi.sk/products/lawText/1/1221/0/2/zakon-c-320-1919-sb-kterym-se-meni-ustanoveni-obcanskeho-prava-o-obradnostech-smlouvy-manzelske-o-rozluce-a-o-prekazkach-manzelstvi/zakon-c-320-1919-sb-kterym-se-meni-ustanoveni-obcanskeho-prava-o-obradnostech-smlouvy-manzelske-o-rozluce-a-o-prekazkach-manzelstvi?timeslice=06.06.1924&lastPara=undefined>.

⁸³¹ *Tisky k těsnopiseckým zprávám o schůzích Národního shromáždění československého* [Prints of Stenographic Reports on Sessions of the Czechoslovak National Assembly] (Prague: Národní shromáždění, 1918-1920), Issue Nr. 1398, Vládní návrh zákona, jímž se doplňuje zákon ze dne 22. května 1919, č. 320 Sb. z. a n. o obřadnostech manželské smlouvy a o rozluce manželství. See also Hugo Hecht, “Das Gesundheitszeugnis der Eheandidaten,” *Deutsche Zeitung Bohemia* 92, no. 112 (August 8, 1919): 3.

⁸³² The various interventions of the psychiatrist spanning from the turn of the century to the late 1920s were collected in a dedicated volume. Ladislav Haškovec, *Lékařské vysvědčení před sňatkem: Sbírka dokumentů doby* [Prenuptial Medical Certificate: Collection of Documents of the Period] (Prague: Borový, 1928). However, Haškovec also promoted these ideas beyond Bohemia, at various international forums. See, for instance, Ladislav Haškovec, “Contrat matrimonial et l’hygiène publique,” in *XV Congrès international de médecine, Lisbonne, 19-*

The proposal was short-lived. The government's medical advisory board refused to endorse the measure, even before an expected confrontation with the Catholic church would ensue. In a position paper, the medical advisory board questioned the ability of medical science to establish with confidence whether a condition, such as an illness, was heritable in general, and whether it could indeed be inherited in a particular individual. The eugenic wording of the draft law was silently dropped shortly afterwards.⁸³³ The attempt to introduce obligatory prenuptial health certificates thus failed in Czechoslovakia.

Shortly after the establishment of the Ministry of Public Health in Yugoslavia, its first minister tasked the eugenicist Laza Marković from Vojvodina to prepare a draft of a law introducing obligatory prenuptial medical certificates.⁸³⁴ Marković heeded the task, and the text of the draft law appeared in the *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* in December 1919. It was accompanied by a long article by the same eugenicist in which he made the case for the measure.⁸³⁵ The draft law provided a comprehensive list of traits, conditions, and social circumstances that its author intended to make barriers to legal marriage. Specifically, the draft law prohibited people who lacked legal capacity, those unable to work or reliant on alms, individuals under custody due to disabilities, those beyond reproductive age, or close relatives from marrying. The draft law also listed intellectual disabilities, mental illnesses, epilepsy, alcohol use, and contagious illnesses as reasons that, according to Marković, should prevent the marriage. The proposed State Marriage Health Commission was to make the final decision

26 avril 1906, Section 7: Neurologie, Psychiatrie et Anthropologie Criminelle (Lisbon: Mendonça, 1906), 600–624.

⁸³³ Jiří Klabouch, *Manželství a rodina v minulosti* [Marriage and Family in the Past] (Prague: Orbis, 1962), 169.

⁸³⁴ Kuhar, “Eugenika,” 46.

⁸³⁵ Laza Marković, “Rasna higijena: Nacrt zakona o braku” [Racial Hygiene: Draft Law on Marriage], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 4 (December 1919): 126–30.

regarding a marriage.⁸³⁶ The law stirred significant controversy, even within the medical community, and never reached the parliament.⁸³⁷

In early interwar Poland, the ministry of public health consulted eugenicists for expert advice and included them in drafting significant laws. However, the law into which the eugenicists incorporated their demand for the introduction of obligatory prenuptial health certificates was not a marriage law, but rather the law on the prevention of the STIs. Partly, this difference reflected the salience of the issue of the STIs within the Polish eugenic movement, particularly in the former Russian partition. Tellingly, the main Polish eugenics society had only recently changed its name from the *Polskie Towarzystwo Walki z Nierzędem i Chorobami Wenerycznymi* (Polish Society for Combating Prostitution and Venereal Diseases) to the much broader *Towarzystwo Walki ze Zwyródnieniem Rasy* (Society for Combating Racial Degeneration), when the Polish Ministry of Public Health started energetically backing its activities after 1918. The ministry went as far as to charge one of the leading members of the association with drafting a law on combatting the STIs.

The proposed legislation recommended mandating prenuptial health certificates, initially focusing on venereal diseases in men, in addition to enforcing regular check-ups and mandatory treatment for STIs.⁸³⁸ In doing so, the draft law reflected intense debates about the introduction of obligatory prenuptial health certificates that were intermittently taking place

⁸³⁶ As discussed in the subsequent chapter, the draft law also included clauses that effectively prohibited marriage across national lines. Marković, “Rasna higijena,” *passim*.

⁸³⁷ Interestingly, a law introducing a form of eugenic prenuptial counselling was introduced in Yugoslavia in the 1930s. The parliament passed the Law for the Fight against Venereal Disease and Prostitution in March 1934, shortly after approving a new Penal Law. The law introduced, among other measures, obligatory medical examinations against STIs for men wishing to enter marriage. However, it became apparent that the law was facing significant resistance, including within the medical community. Moreover, the law was further weakened by the relatively low capacity of the Yugoslav state to maintain a network of state physicians who would carry out the law’s requirements. In effect, the section of the law containing the prenuptial examinations was dropped in April 1935. Stefano Petrungaro, “The Medical Debate about Prostitution and Venereal Diseases in Yugoslavia (1918–1941),” *Social History of Medicine* 32, no. 1 (February 1, 2019): 128; Kuhar, “Eugenika,” 94–99.

⁸³⁸ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 105.

among Polish eugenicists since the early 1900s.⁸³⁹ Incorporating the demand for prenuptial health certificates was a strategy that the eugenicists saw as more likely to yield results than the calls for a new marriage law. While the eugenicists maintained much interest in the marriage law, it was never realized in interwar Poland, primarily because of opposition from the Catholic church. However, the draft law concerning STIs did not fare any better. Though it was presented to the council of ministers, it never passed.⁸⁴⁰ Persistent lobbying by the eugenicists for the introduction of prenuptial health certificates in subsequent years also failed to materialize in legislation.

While efforts to implement prenuptial health certificates gained some traction in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Poland during the 1920s before ultimately faltering, similar initiatives in Hungary and Austria were swiftly quashed in the early interwar years. Interwar Hungary, having faced significant territorial losses, did not possess multiple legal systems. This meant that eugenicists could not tie their proposals to broader state-building efforts or legal unification. Additionally, Hungary's existing marriage law was liberal, acknowledging civil marriages, and left little room for eugenicists to attach their ideas to calls for marriage reform. Consequently, although discussions about prenuptial health certificates were prominent among emerging eugenicists in the 1900s and 1910s, and an unofficial outline of such a law was even published by Dezső Buday in the eugenics journal *Nemzetvédelem* in the summer of 1918, interest in this measure saw a significant decline in the early years of interwar Hungary.⁸⁴¹

⁸³⁹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 67.

⁸⁴⁰ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 224.

⁸⁴¹ Dezső Buday, "Törvényjavaslat a házasságok kötelező orvosi vizsgálatáról" [Draft Law on the Mandatory Prenuptial Medical Examination], *Nemzetvédelem* 1, no. 1–2 (1918): 47–53; Géza von Hoffmann, "A svéd házassági törvény fajegészségügyi követelményei" [The Racial Hygienic Requirements of the Swedish Marriage Law], *Nemzetvédelem* 1, no. 1–2 (1918): 90–91. See also Gábor Szegedi, "Good Health Is the Best Dowry: Marriage Counseling, Premarital Examinations, Sex Education in Hungary 1920-1952," (PhD Thesis, Central European University, 2014), 43.

Although the issue resurfaced prominently by the mid-1920s, driven primarily by the moral panic and eugenic concerns over the alleged hereditary effects of STIs on the “race,” only a few eugenically oriented psychiatrists supported the introduction of obligatory prenuptial health certificates.⁸⁴² In contrast, recognizing that a new marriage law was improbable in the 1920s, many doctors – including both those who supported eugenics and those who were skeptical of it – expressed a strong preference for voluntary marriage consultations.⁸⁴³ Thus, despite a moral panic driven by fears of sexually transmitted infections, prenuptial health certificates were largely off the table.

While interwar Austria was similar to interwar Hungary in the sense that a drive for legal unification was not a key part of its nation-building process, its marriage law was less liberal than in Hungary. Yet, the numerous calls for reform of the marriage law by feminists and social reformers fell on deaf ears, as both the influential Christian Social Party and the Catholic Church resisted the issue.⁸⁴⁴ The proposals to introduce prenuptial health certificates, for example, by a group of nationalist MPs in 1921, or by physicians aligned with the social democratic party in the same year, met a similar fate.⁸⁴⁵ Therefore, eugenicists in 1920s Austria preferred to advocate for some form of voluntary marriage counseling as a surrogate for a law they deemed unlikely to materialize.

Finally, the issue of prenuptial health certificates found supporters in Romania, both in its post-Habsburg territories and in the Old Kingdom, where one gynecologist advocated for their introduction as early as 1912.⁸⁴⁶ Consequently, in the 1920s the issue was raised and intensively debated not only by the Bucharest-based press, where a liberal physician Iosif

⁸⁴² Szegedi, “Good Health,” 87.

⁸⁴³ Szegedi, “Good Health,” 87.

⁸⁴⁴ Britta McEwen, *Sexual Knowledge: Feeling, Fact, and Social Reform in Vienna, 1900-1934* (New York: Berghahn, 2012), 40.

⁸⁴⁵ Czech, “Regenerating the Nation,” 29–30.

⁸⁴⁶ Marius Turda, “‘To End the Degeneration of a Nation’: Debates on Eugenic Sterilization in Inter-War Romania,” *Medical History* 53, no. 01 (January 2009): 79.

Glicsman called for an introduction of such marriage law before Romania's parliament, but also by eugenicists in Transylvania. As Maria Bucur points out, the demand for a legislation including obligatory prenuptial health certificates was one of "a few specific recommendations" in Moldovan's early texts in Romania.⁸⁴⁷ Yet, these calls initially produced no material results, due to the lack of interest from central authorities who prioritized curative medicine.

When the post-Habsburg eugenicists recognized that their attempts to change the marriage law were unsuccessful in the early 1920s, they adopted an alternative strategy. Seeking localized and limited alternatives to eugenic legislation, they embraced the concept of marriage counseling. Consequently, several marriage counseling clinics were established in various post-Habsburg countries during the 1920s, with or without support from the authorities. These clinics exemplify a recurring theme that emerges as a clear thread in the subsequent chapter: recognizing their unsuccessful attempts at legal reform in the 1920s, eugenicists shifted their focus towards local institutions and voluntary practices not anchored in law.

Eugenics was at the core of the marriage counseling clinics' agenda, although their overall scope varied, and in some cases, the clinics included sexual advice or treatment of STIs. The clinics examined the bodies, and in some cases, the ancestry of men and women who planned to marry and produced advice based on such examinations. At the heart of this practice was a eugenic assumption that certain traits or conditions deemed "pathological," "degenerate," or "inferior" were hereditary and could be passed on to subsequent generations or damage the children's "germ plasm," thus reducing their supposed biological value. The main goal of the marriage counseling clinics was to identify these traits in individuals and dissuade them from entering marriage. These marriage counseling clinics pursued nearly identical goals as the draft laws on prenuptial health certificates, even though the form differed. Medical examinations at

⁸⁴⁷ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 82.

these clinics remained voluntary, the recommendations by the doctor were not legally binding, and in some cases, the clinics did not even generate written attestations of the medical examinations.

The first such institution, the Marriage Advice Center, was established in 1922 by the municipal authorities in Red Vienna.⁸⁴⁸ Eugenics and reproductive health were the chief hallmarks of the clinic's agenda. As its director, Karl Kautsky Jr., put it, the clinic highlighted an individual's responsibility not only for "one's own body" but also "to one's partner and progeny, and finally to society."⁸⁴⁹ Remarkably, the marriage counseling clinic in Vienna became the earliest, or second earliest, such institution in the world.⁸⁵⁰ Eugenicists in post-Habsburg Central Europe followed suit from the mid-1920s onwards, mirroring not only the Austrian case but also the nearly contemporary growth of marriage counseling clinics in Weimar Germany.

The first marriage counseling clinic in Hungary was established in Budapest in 1924 by the *Teleia*, an urban, liberal, voluntary association. Another clinic was launched in the same year, this time set up in an outer suburb of Budapest by the *Országos Szociálpolitikai Intézet* (State Institute of Social Policy), which was closer to interwar Hungary's official authorities.⁸⁵¹ In the second part of the 1920s, other organizations followed and set up a network of marriage counseling institutions beyond the capital, in provincial towns and in the countryside.⁸⁵² In Czechoslovakia, the first marriage counseling clinic was established in 1926 by the Czech Eugenic Society.⁸⁵³ In the subsequent years, several often short-lived clinics sprang up in

⁸⁴⁸ Helmut Gruber, "Sexuality in 'Red Vienna': Socialist Party Conceptions and Programs and Working-Class Life, 1920-34," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 31, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 37-68.

⁸⁴⁹ McEwen, *Sexual Knowledge*, 125-26.

⁸⁵⁰ "Eheprobleme des Volkes," *Volksaufartung, Erbkunde und Eheberatung* 4, no. 6 (June 15, 1929): 143-44.

⁸⁵¹ Szegedi, "Good Health," 129 and 133.

⁸⁵² Szegedi, "Good Health," 140, 142 and 147.

⁸⁵³ "Zdravotnická poradna sňatková" [Medical Marriage Counseling], *Věstník věnovaný zájmům porodních asistentek* 14, no. 4 (April 1926): 3.

Prague and in the larger towns of the country, some of which were created by the eugenic associations of German speakers.⁸⁵⁴ Finally, several individual physicians in the rural parts of Transylvania launched local programs of eugenic marriage counseling on their initiative at various points in time, particularly in the 1930s.⁸⁵⁵ The failure of post-Habsburg eugenicists' attempt at introducing obligatory prenuptial health certificates in the 1920s thus turned them into global pioneers of marriage counseling clinics.

Across all these contexts, however, the demand for voluntary health examinations and advice provided by these clinics remained limited. It made little difference whether the clinics operated in urban or rural settings, focused on middle-class or working-class subjects, or combined eugenic counseling with other services, such as sexual advice. To start with, during more than a decade of its existence in a city of nearly 2 million people, less than 5000 individuals chose to go to the pioneering clinic in Red Vienna.⁸⁵⁶ The first marriage counseling clinic in Hungary similarly struggled with low demand for its free services, attracting only 174 persons in its first year.⁸⁵⁷ The subsequent years brought no improvement; on the contrary, the number of visitors dwindled in the 1930s, and the clinic, situated in a middle-class area, “rolled onto a steady path of decline into almost complete insignificance,” as Gábor Szegedi aptly describes.⁸⁵⁸

⁸⁵⁴ By the late 1920s, Czech and German eugenics societies in Czechoslovakia started competing for the genealogies and health data collected by marriage counseling clinics. Interestingly, it was here that state authorities intervened. In 1932, the Public Health Ministry concluded the feud by ordering clinics with Czech leadership to submit their data to the Czech Eugenics Society, while clinics with German leadership had to submit their data to the Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Volksgesundheit, the central German eugenics association in Czechoslovakia at the time. “Sjednocení eugenických poraden: Výnos ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví ze dne 29. července 1932 č. 14488/32 jako dodatek k výnosu ze dne 9. ledna 1930 č. 33.319/29” [Unification of Eugenic Counseling: Decree of the Ministry of Public Health dated July 29, 1932, No. 14488/32 as an amendment to the decree of January 9, 1930, No. 33.319/29], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 14, no. 9 (September 20, 1932): 294. For some of the locations where marriage clinics emerged, see Barbora Jakobyová, “Budete se ženit? Budete se vdávat?: Snahy o eugenickou profylaxii v 1. ČSR” [Will you Marry? Attempts at Eugenic Prophylaxis in the First Czechoslovak Republic], *Historické rozhledy* 38 (2021): 197–209.

⁸⁵⁵ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 204.

⁸⁵⁶ Felix Tietze, “Eugenics in Austria,” *The Eugenics Review* 26, no. 4 (1935): 261.

⁸⁵⁷ Szegedi, “Good Health,” 129.

⁸⁵⁸ Szegedi, “Good Health,” 132.

Shifting the focus from middle-class areas to urban and rural workers yielded little change. The second Hungarian marriage clinic that was located in an industrial part of the Budapest agglomeration did not fare any better with its offer of voluntary consultations during most of its existence.⁸⁵⁹ The marriage counseling clinics set up in Hungary's larger towns by another association also achieved no better results. Meanwhile, the clinics in rural communities and small towns run by the official *Országos Közegészségügyi Intézet* (State Institute of Public Health) reported “very low attendance” and deprioritized the issue.⁸⁶⁰

Similarly, the first marriage consultation clinic in Prague saw about 150 visitors in its inaugural year, and even in subsequent years, the number of its visitors did not surpass 300 people.⁸⁶¹ Much to the chagrin of its eugenically-oriented staff, a significant portion of these visitors sought practical legal advice unrelated to the clinic's medical agenda. This occurred even though eugenics, particularly marriage control, had been intensively promoted in Prague since the early 1900s.⁸⁶² In summary, these findings suggest that marriage counseling clinics were unsuccessful in all post-Habsburg countries where they had been established during the 1920s.⁸⁶³

It is important to underscore that the demands of nationalist eugenicists from the multiethnic borderlands for a law on prenuptial medical certificates, as well as their marriage

⁸⁵⁹ Tellingly, the attendance of marriage counseling clinics increased only when the local authorities resorted to coercion and deception, introducing “obligatory” consultations without any legal basis. Maria Bucur notes at least one such case in rural Transylvania, while Gábor Szegedi uncovered two such cases in Hungary. Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 204; Szegedi, “Good Health,” 133.

⁸⁶⁰ Szegedi, “Good Health,” 141–42.

⁸⁶¹ Josef Wiener, “Prohlídky před sňatkem a sňatková poradna čsl. eugenické společnosti” [Prenuptial Medical Examinations and Marriage Counseling of the Czechoslovak Eugenic Society], *Časopis lékařů českých* 67, no. 39 (September 21, 1928): 1352–1354.

⁸⁶² Bohumil Sekla, “Funkce eugenického poradenství” [Functions of Eugenic Counseling], *Časopis lékařů českých* 76, no. 22 (June 22, 1937): 919–20. For one of the oldest popular texts about eugenic marriage control in Czech, see Ladislav Haškovec, *Snahy veřejného zdravotnictví v otázce smlouvy manželské* [Efforts of Public Health in the Matter of Marriage Contracts] (Prague: Otto, 1902).

⁸⁶³ The existing scholarship invokes contingent and local factors to account for these clinics' failure. Yet, the fact that these institutions faced indifference across the entire post-Habsburg Central Europe suggests that one may need to single out regional or even global factors that crucially contributed to this shared outcome.

counseling strategies, exhibited a pronounced exclusivist tendency. These demands presaged the future racist radicalization of the eugenic movement. The prerequisites for marriage set by the eugenicist Marković from Vojvodina specifically catered to individuals he deemed to belong to the “white race,” while concurrently excluding those categorized as members of the “black,” “red,” and “yellow races.”⁸⁶⁴ In this specific borderland context, the demand primarily hinted at, yet never overtly articulated, the exclusion of ethnic Hungarians, and potentially also the Jews and Roma, from intermarrying with members of the titular Yugoslav nation. Similarly, Romanian nationalist proponents of eugenics in Transylvania associated discussions about prenuptial counseling with efforts to regulate intermarriage across ethnic boundaries, especially within the urban populace.⁸⁶⁵ In these borderland settings, debates about eugenic surveillance of marriage were deeply intertwined with nationalist activists’ concerns regarding national homogeneity.

As demonstrated by the experiences with basic health laws and prenuptial health certificates, eugenicists in post-Habsburg countries faced significant challenges in garnering broad support for their proposals, especially during the 1920s. Nonetheless, they did integrate themselves into, advocate for, or even lead expansive and varied coalitions on certain fronts. Their efforts in these scenarios, however, also often faltered, albeit after a detour. While their eugenic ideas were indeed transformed into established legislation in these cases, they encountered unforeseen impediments. The state struggled to effectively implement this legislation, primarily due to resistance from its administrative apparatus, which refused to enforce these measures in practice.

The anti-alcohol movement, steeped in “racial” anxieties and eugenic arguments, serves as a prime example. Just as it had before the war, this movement in the early 1920s unified

⁸⁶⁴ Marković, “Rasna higijena,” 126–130.

⁸⁶⁵ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 201–202.

religious groups, diverse nationalist activists, liberal reformists, and socialists. It became a breeding ground for numerous reform proposals, some of which the legislative authorities seriously considered. Members of this movement believed that a particularly favorable window of opportunity had opened in the countries that emerged from the collapsed Habsburg Empire and actively lobbied for legal reform. (The apparent global momentum of the temperance movement, especially following the enactment of prohibition in the US, bolstered this enthusiasm.)⁸⁶⁶ Indeed, in response to this activism, most of these states passed legislation shortly after 1918, either prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages or introducing other forms of control over alcohol consumption.

While the eugenicists' demands did translate into actual laws in this instance, it quickly became clear to temperance advocates that the post-imperial states lacked the capacity to effectively enforce these measures, and their administrators were reluctant to do so. First, the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic tried to implement prohibition via a decree. In fact, the decree from March 21, 1919, which banned the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages, was among the first decrees issued by the government. A month later, an Anti-Alcohol Council was established by another decree.⁸⁶⁷ It was not surprising that these measures had been introduced, as the revolutionary state co-opted several former leaders of the temperance movement, including the eugenicist József Madzsar, and appointed them to steer its public health policy.⁸⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the state lacked the capacity to enforce such radical ban universally. Both industrial workers and farm laborers resisted the measure, and many local

⁸⁶⁶ Mark Lawrence Schrad, *Smashing the Liquor Machine: A Global History of Prohibition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021), passim.

⁸⁶⁷ Katalin Petrák and György Milei, eds., *A Magyar Tanácsköztársaság szociálpolitikája: Válogatott rendeletek, dokumentumok, cikkek* [Social Policy of the Hungarian Soviet Republic: Selected Decrees, Documents, Articles] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1959), 58 and 70.

⁸⁶⁸ Bognár, "A Népjóléti Minisztérium," 293–343; Endre Kárpáti, "Madzsar József egészségpolitikai tevékenysége a magyarországi polgári demokratikus forradalom és a Tanácsköztársaság idején" [The Health Policy Activities of József Madzsar during the Civil Democratic Revolution and the Hungarian Soviet Republic], *Az Országos Orvostörténeti Könyvtár közleményei* 28, no. 5 (1963): 55–75.

authorities hesitated to implement it. Eventually, the central authorities largely backtracked from the idea of prohibition.⁸⁶⁹

While in Hungary the attempt to restrict access to alcohol was undertaken by a revolutionary socialist dictatorship, in the Second Polish Republic, it was a democratically elected parliament that sought to introduce similar policies. Various agrarian, Catholic, reformist, and socialist groups coalesced in the parliament in their support for prohibition, a demand that was shared by leading Polish eugenicists both before and after 1918. Indeed, the *Polskie Towarzystwo Walki z Alkoholizmem "Trzeźwość"* (Sobriety, The Polish Association for the Fight against Alcoholism), a voluntary association founded in 1919 that brought together temperance activists from all three former partitions, became one of the strongest voices supporting prohibition, echoing eugenic arguments. Reflecting this broad agreement, a law restricting access to alcohol was passed in 1920. The law introduced a state monopoly for alcoholic beverages and allowed local authorities to introduce prohibition in individual communities.⁸⁷⁰ Nonetheless, the law was never fully implemented in practice, and its most restrictive parts were ultimately dropped in 1931.⁸⁷¹ Both attempts to introduce significant legal steps towards prohibition thus failed, due to the limited capacity of the state to enforce them.

Even though temperance activists in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia also embraced eugenics and called for sweeping restrictions on access to alcohol, the measures actually introduced in these countries were of a more limited nature. To start with, the only significant piece of legislation against alcoholism passed in interwar Austria was a 1922 law prohibiting the sale of alcohol to children and young people under the age of 16. While Catholic,

⁸⁶⁹ Petrák and Milei, *A Magyar Tanácsköztársaság*, 139.

⁸⁷⁰ Following local referendums, prohibition was introduced in 227 communities, mainly in the former Russian partition.

⁸⁷¹ Paweł Grata, "Krucjata antyalkoholowa w Sejmie Ustawodawczym i jej efekty (1919–1922)" [Anti-alcohol Crusade in the Legislative Sejm and Its Effects (1919–1922)], *UR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 8, no. 3 (2018): 5–25.

nationalist, and socialist members of the Austrian parliament repeatedly sought to regulate or restrict alcohol production or sale by law, their calls had very little effect.⁸⁷²

Czechoslovakia ultimately followed a pattern nearly identical to Austria, even though the Czechoslovak authorities initially introduced a radical ban on the sale of distilled alcoholic beverages in December 1918. However, the ban was only temporary, restricted to Upper Hungary, and sparsely enforced due to the contested and violent nature of post-imperial transition in this area.⁸⁷³ In 1922, the Czechoslovak parliament passed an anti-alcoholic legislation, authored by Arnold Holitscher, a German-speaking social democratic politician and fervent eugenicist. This law, which prohibited children and youth from purchasing alcohol, stood as the most significant anti-alcohol measure of the interwar period in Czechoslovakia.⁸⁷⁴ While the Austrian and Czechoslovak laws had a limited scope, they were nevertheless regularly breached. The sporadic enforcement by the authorities essentially amounted to passive resistance against these measures.⁸⁷⁵

The demands of temperance activists in Yugoslavia, shared by various actors across ideological divides, translated into measures that were introduced shortly after the collapse of the empire. Initially, these demands resulted in measures confined to a single region. Slovene and Croatian medical doctors, along with temperance activists, were instrumental in advocating

⁸⁷² Anita Ziegerhofer, “Xanthippen, Schmutzlieschen, Zitron-Eulalien: Österreichs Frauen im Kampf gegen den Alkoholismus im 19./20. Jahrhundert,” *GeschlechterGeschichten* 47 (2017): 190–91.

⁸⁷³ On the post-imperial transition in this area, see Rudolf Kučera, “Exploiting Victory, Sinking into Defeat: Uniformed Violence in the Creation of the New Order in Czechoslovakia and Austria, 1918–1922,” *The Journal of Modern History* 88, no. 4 (December 2016): 827–55 and Attila Simon, *Az átmenet bizonytalansága: Az 1918/1919-es impériumváltás Pozsonytól Kassáig* [The Uncertainty of the Transition: The 1918/1919 Imperial Change from Bratislava to Košice] (Budapest: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet-Bölcészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2021).

⁸⁷⁴ Eva Morovicsová, “Právne normy a činnosť Československého abstinentného zväzu v boji proti alkoholizmu v prvej Československej republike” [Legal Norms and Activities of the Czechoslovak Abstinence Union in the Fight against Alcoholism in the First Czechoslovak Republic], *Alkoholizmus a drogové závislosti* 49, no. 2 (2014): 65–80.

⁸⁷⁵ Drahomír Jančík, “Pít či nepít – to jest, oč tu běží: Střety příznivců a odpůrců abstinence v meziválečném Československu” [To Drink or Not to Drink – That is the Question: Clashes between Supporters and Opponents of Abstinence in Interwar Czechoslovakia], *Historická sociologie* 2014, no. 1 (June 2014): 63.

for these reforms. Their arguments, centered on public morality, order, and the “health of the national body,” initially resonated with the authorities. Consequently, in 1919, the provincial authorities in Slovenia and Croatia unveiled two nearly identical orders. These orders prohibited the sale of alcohol during nighttime and on Sundays and barred those under the age of 16 from purchasing it. By December 1919, due to sustained advocacy, these regional measures were elevated to a nationwide law.⁸⁷⁶ However, its enforcement was inconsistent at best. Disheartened temperance activists remarked that the law remained “an empty promise, because we see that these orders are not followed even where they have already been announced.”⁸⁷⁷

Following the empire’s collapse, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia all introduced strikingly similar legal measures to regulate alcohol consumption. While this marked one of the rare occasions during the initial decade of their existence where eugenicists’ demands materialized into law, the enforcement of such legislation posed a significant challenge. These states either lacked the resolve or the means to duly penalize those breaching the provisions. Regardless of the wide-ranging support backing this facet of the eugenicist agenda, the endeavor largely proved unsuccessful. Taken together, the cases of basic health laws, prenuptial health certificates, and temperance initiatives illuminate the vigorous and widespread nature of resistance against eugenic measures in the 1920s. While eugenics faced resistance from below and from certain political actors, it was also actively thwarted by the state administration. As the state became more consolidated, the reluctance of these administrators intensified. It also significantly contributed to the weakening of the ministries of public health.

⁸⁷⁶ Tomislav Kostović, “Škola narodnog zdravlja u borbi protiv alkoholizma u međuratnoj Hrvatskoj” [School of Public Health in the Fight against Alcoholism in Interwar Croatia] (M.A. Thesis, University of Zagreb, 2018), 29–35.

⁸⁷⁷ “Država u borbi protiv alkohola” [The State in the Fight Against Alcohol], *Novi život* 5, no. 1 (January 1920): 14–15; Cited in Kostović, “Škola narodnog zdravlja,” 34.

A Fading Legacy: Public Health Ministries

Between 1917 and 1919, public health ministries took shape across both Habsburg and post-Habsburg Central Europe, with eugenic ideas playing a pivotal role in their establishment. Unlike other ministries, the public health ministries were staffed with medically educated professionals, and some of these clerks supported eugenics. Consequently, these ministries served as one of the primary conduits between eugenics proponents and the government. However, as the successor states of the empire consolidated in the early 1920s, some of their political elites as well as a part of their state administration withdrew their support from the health ministries. As a result, public health ministries across post-Habsburg Central Europe weakened, and in most instances, they ultimately faded away during the interwar period.

This trend presents a compelling paradox, which serves as the core focus of this subchapter. As the turmoil of the war and its immediate aftermath subsided and as the post-Habsburg states stabilized, the sway of eugenicists over central authorities and their associated institutions began to wane, albeit temporarily. This pattern held true across different political landscapes, from nascent democracies to the authoritarian regimes that emerged in the region during the 1920s.

In Poland, Hungary, and Austria, the ministries of public health were either quickly abolished or merged with other ministries, and their agendas were dissipated. To start with, in their attempts to exercise influence on legislation through the Ministry of Public Health the eugenicists in Poland suffered a defeat that was as quick as it was spectacular.⁸⁷⁸ Even though they initially had a certain degree of power within the government through their involvement in the ministry, by 1920 that influence significantly diminished.⁸⁷⁹ What is more, the Ministry

⁸⁷⁸ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 120–21.

⁸⁷⁹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 106–107.

itself was dissolved in January 1924, for budgetary reasons. Following the dismantling of the ministry, the calls of leading Polish eugenicists for its restoration were repeatedly brushed aside by the government, and the ministry was never reestablished in the interwar Poland.⁸⁸⁰ Significantly, these calls failed even after the authoritarian regime led by Józef Piłsudski came to power in 1926, in spite of its technocratic tendencies and in spite of its ideological embrace of the notion of collective moral rebirth.⁸⁸¹

Even though in Austria the imperial Ministry of People's Health formally ceased to exist after the collapse of the empire, a nearly identical institution, the *Staatsamt für Volksgesundheit* (State Office of People's Health), stepped into the breach on October 30, 1918. Yet, the State Office was shortly thereafter merged with two other ministries, giving rise to a *Staatsamt für soziale Verwaltung* (State Office of Social Administration) in March 1919, and ultimately to a ministry of the same name in 1920.⁸⁸² As a consequence of this merger, the influence of medical doctors, and eugenicists in particular, within the ministry weakened. In Hungary, finally, the perceived utility of an independent Ministry of Public Health that started its work in 1919 quickly diminished, and it was integrated into another ministry by the end of 1919. In the first governments of Horthy's Kingdom of Hungary, consequently, public health agenda was managed by the Ministry of Public Welfare and Labor. Yet, the latter ministry, too, was ultimately abolished in 1932.⁸⁸³

The ministry of public health in Yugoslavia had initially remained independent. However, the post-Habsburg eugenicist Andrija Štampar who spearheaded some eugenically inflected public health policies lost much of his leverage within the ministry after the mid-

⁸⁸⁰ After its dissolution, the public health agenda was divided between seven other ministries. Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 110–11.

⁸⁸¹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, passim.

⁸⁸² Sablik, *Julius Tandler*, 151.

⁸⁸³ Kapronczay, *Fejezetek*, 8–9.

1920s. He was ultimately forced to leave the central administration in 1931.⁸⁸⁴ Shortly after the establishment of the royal dictatorship in Yugoslavia in 1929, moreover, the Ministry of Health was merged with the Ministry of Social Welfare. The entire public health agenda, consequently, was concentrated in a single department of the new ministry. While the public health sector was relatively underfunded already in the 1920s, receiving around three percent of the country's overall budget, moreover, public health spending plummeted in the 1930s. By 1933, the budget for public health diminished by one third.⁸⁸⁵ The political regime that represented an attempt at an authoritarian and centralizing nation-building, therefore, paradoxically presided over a further weakening of the Ministry of Public Health and its agendas.

Romania, unlike other countries, did not establish a ministry of public health immediately after 1918. This was in spite of appeals from medical doctors, notably those from the post-Habsburg territories of Romania, such as Transylvania. Instead, as a part of the unifying agenda of the central government, the regional Governing Council of Transylvania, including its section charged with public health, had been abolished in 1920.⁸⁸⁶ Moreover, when the institution-building these doctors had advocated for finally took shape in the early 1920s, it ironically served to further diminish, rather than amplify, their influence. When the national liberal government in Bucharest established a Ministry of Public Health in 1923, it empowered the central authorities to solidify their dominance over the country's public health policies.⁸⁸⁷

The new ministry did not embrace the calls of regional doctors for foregrounding eugenically oriented preventive medicine within the scope of the ministry. Instead, the largest part of the ministry's relatively generous budget went into the construction of hospitals and

⁸⁸⁴ Kuhar, "Eugenika," 30–53.

⁸⁸⁵ Štampar, *Public Health*, 22 and 42.

⁸⁸⁶ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 190.

⁸⁸⁷ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 191.

covering the costs of their operation.⁸⁸⁸ Moreover, the regional medical infrastructure in Transylvania was integrated into the centralized network of public health institutions. The leading post-Habsburg eugenicist in the region, Moldovan, was in effect first demoted to a position that largely consisted of implementing the policies drafted by the central government, and then temporarily left the state administration to cooperate with the leading Romanian nationalist voluntary association in the region.⁸⁸⁹

To sum up, the push towards consolidation of the state and the centralization of political power in Yugoslavia and Romania did not strengthen the post-Habsburg eugenicists. In the former scenario, as the state consolidated, the influence of post-Habsburg eugenicists within the Ministry of Public Health waned, and the ministry was ultimately dissolved. Conversely, in the latter scenario, the centralizing drive of the Ministry of Public Health undermined the regional institutions that originally employed the post-Habsburg eugenicists. In both cases, their power diminished in the process.

Finally, the Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education in Czechoslovakia underwent several reorganizations, and there were recurring debates about its potential closure or merger with another ministry. “Whenever there is talk about slashing the number of ministries, the name of the Ministry of Public Health is always invoked as one that should be abolished,” complained Ladislav P. Procházka, one of its ministers and an advocate of eugenics, in an essay for a leading liberal magazine.⁸⁹⁰ Despite these discussions, the institution remained standing and independent throughout the entire interwar period.⁸⁹¹ However, within the government, it was counted among the least powerful ministries. Czech nationalist political

⁸⁸⁸ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 192

⁸⁸⁹ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 193; Turda, “Iuliu Moldovan,” 296–97.

⁸⁹⁰ Ladislav Prokop Procházka, “Zrušíme-li ministerstvo zdravotnictví, nezapomínejme na jeho úkoly!” [If We Abolish the Ministry of Health, Let Us not Forget its Tasks!], *Přítomnost* 2, no. 50 (December 24, 1925): 786–87.

⁸⁹¹ Svobodný and Hlaváčková, *Dějiny lékařství*, 161–62.

parties implicitly recognized the ministry's limited sway. Consequently, from the mid-1920s onward, the institution was nearly continuously helmed by politicians representing Czechoslovakia's ethnic minorities and Slovak speakers. Even though the ministry so cherished by Czech eugenicists was neither abolished nor merged, its influence did not increase hand in glove with the consolidation of the Czechoslovak state; rather, it remained consistently constrained.

The preceding paragraphs systematically reviewed some of the most significant projects of eugenic legislation in post-Habsburg countries, as well as the trajectory of these countries' public health ministries, in the first decade of their existence. Despite much initial talk about introducing eugenic laws and shaping eugenic institutions, there were few palpable outcomes. Attempts to introduce eugenic legislation ran aground shortly after 1918, and efforts to revive them were rare and unsuccessful in the 1920s. The ministries of public health, in whose creation and functioning post-Habsburg eugenicists played a significant role, had been abolished, merged, or remained relatively powerless.

Conclusion

If, like many historians of eugenics in the region, we were to tacitly accept the eugenicists' framing that emphasizes eugenic legislation and central eugenic institutions, then the story of eugenics in post-Habsburg countries during the 1920s would seem like a spectacular failure. While the intertwined crises of the wartime era and the empire's collapse presented eugenicists with a brief window of opportunity, it swiftly shut on them. As we have observed, the consolidation of post-Habsburg countries and the overarching advancements in state-building not only weakened but, in some instances, actively thwarted efforts to introduce eugenic legislation and establish centralized institutions. Contrary to a linear narrative that paints eugenics and state-building as progressing in tandem throughout the 1920s, state

consolidation, in fact, diminished the appetite for eugenic ideas and “solutions” among state administrators. Amid skepticism from state administrators, resistance from below, and a dearth of political backing, most proposals for eugenic legislation were quashed during the initial interwar debate. This observation cautions us against adopting teleological narratives that posit a close interrelation between the trajectories of eugenics and state-building in post-Habsburg Central Europe.

Placing too much emphasis on eugenic legislation and on the institutions of the central government, however, would be misleading. Such a narrow perspective overlooks the more complex reality of eugenic practices and thinking in the region. The lack of eugenic legislation or of powerful, centralized institutions dedicated to eugenic principles did not necessarily imply an absence of eugenic thinking and practices. Instead, the subsequent chapter reveals that eugenic principles gradually pervaded an increasing number of spaces during the 1920s, particularly at the local level. The continuities with the late Habsburg context are equally striking. The frictions between eugenicists associated with the former empire’s civil administration and military persisted in new contexts after 1918, fatefully influencing the biopolitics of post-Habsburg countries at the local level throughout the 1920s.

IMPERIAL LEGACIES, POST-IMPERIAL SPACES: EUGENIC PRACTICES IN POST-HABSBURG COUNTRIES, 1918-C. 1929

In January 1926, the inaugural issue of a specialized medical journal focusing on pediatrics, titled *A Gyermek-Diet'a-Das Kind*, was published in Bratislava/Pozsony/Pressburg. This town, situated in what was once the northern region of royal Hungary and home to a significant number of Hungarian and German speakers, had since become a part of Czechoslovakia and transformed into a university city. On the surface, the launch of this pediatric journal was not particularly remarkable, given that pediatrics in Czechoslovakia solidified itself during the interwar period, and forged stronger connections with public health initiatives.⁸⁹² The establishment of specialized institutions and publication outlets was an integral part of this process.

As its title suggested, the journal, however, stood out due to its multilingual nature, presenting articles in Czech, German, Hungarian, and Slovak languages. While these contributions primarily originated from individuals based in Bratislava and often dealt with local matters that held implications for municipal health policies, the journal also extended its coverage to the new publications and developments further afield. Apart from Prague, the journal reported on Vienna and Budapest as well, which gave its coverage a notably post-imperial outlook. Crucially, the multilingual discussions within the journal were often framed in eugenic terms and the journal featured papers that delved into topics such as inheritance, “healthy offspring,” and “the question of reproduction and the one-child system,” among others.⁸⁹³

⁸⁹² Jiří Brdlík, *Dětské lékařství v minulosti a jak jsem je prožíval* [Pediatrics in the Past and How I Experienced It] (Prague: Státní zdravotnické nakladatelství, 1957), passim.

⁸⁹³ Jiří Brdlík, “Úvodem - Einleitung - Bevezető,” *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 1 (January 15, 1926): 1–6; Mihály Csáder, “A szociális gyermekgondozás reformja” [The Reform of Social Child Care], *A Gyermek -*

Co-edited by a German-speaking physician from Bratislava and his Hungarian-speaking colleague, alongside a recently appointed Czech university lecturer, the journal emerged as a result of an accommodation between local actors and the representatives of the new multiethnic yet nationalizing state. In this regard, the journal continued an already established pattern: the medical school at the newly founded local university was initially attended by countless Hungarian and German speakers, and the exams were conducted in those languages as well, with Hungarian being facilitated by an interpreter.⁸⁹⁴ While short-lived, this journal exemplifies the importance of local contexts and local negotiations for the history of eugenics across post-Habsburg Central Europe.

Eugenics in post-Habsburg Europe revolved around the process of state-building. Historians studying eugenics in this region have traditionally assumed that the state being constructed was a nation-state characterized by a substantial degree of centralization, unification, and national homogeneity. They believed, moreover, that eugenics was easily harnessed for such a political project, and the central authorities were eager to introduce eugenic policies from above, primarily through legislation. One issue with this narrative is the scarcity of instances where eugenic policies were actually implemented in this manner after 1918. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the endeavors to introduce eugenic legislation in these states displayed a consistent pattern of failure during the immediate postwar years and, indeed, for much of the 1920s. While acknowledging that the history of eugenics in post-Habsburg

Diet'a - Das Kind 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1926): 122–24; Ernő Reiner, “Egészséges utódokat” [Healthy Offspring], *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 3 (March 15, 1926): 74–75; Eugen Rottenstein, “Die Frage der Vermehrung und das Ein-Kind-System,” *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 1 (January 15, 1926): 18–19; Desider Silberstein, “Zdravotné pomery detí v Petržalke” [Health Conditions of Children in Petržalka], *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1926): 105–108; Ervín Tramer, “Die Vererbung,” *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1926): 108–11.

⁸⁹⁴ Jiří Brdlik, *Padesát let dětským lékařem* [Fifty Years as a Pediatrician] (Prague: Státní zdravotnické nakladatelství, 1961), 52.

Central Europe was inherently tied to state-building, this chapter poses the question of whether a nation-state was always its central focus.

The assumption that the states of post-Habsburg Central Europe were simply nation-states relies on the self-perceptions of these states themselves. However, this assumption has recently been fundamentally challenged, and historians increasingly view these states as little empires instead.⁸⁹⁵ There is a growing body of research that explores the characteristics typical of empires within these states, focusing on what Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper refer to as the “politics of difference.” This term describes the strategies employed by empires as they sought to “incorporate diverse populations while reproducing distinctions and hierarchy among them.”⁸⁹⁶ At the local and practical level, these strategies took the form of coopting regional elites and implementing “differentiated rule.”⁸⁹⁷ By approaching these states as little empires, this chapter demonstrates that biopolitics in post-Habsburg Central Europe, and specifically eugenics in the 1920s, also exhibited these characteristics. It shows that within these states, different spaces were governed in distinct ways, and they were subject to varying eugenic policies. Additionally, local civil societies and administrators played significant roles in driving these policies, sometimes even surpassing the influence of central authorities.

Eugenicists paradoxically lost some of their influence in the central state institutions in the early 1920s, as the preceding chapter elucidated. In response, they adjusted their strategies. This chapter argues that these supporters of eugenics scaled down their plans, aiming to

⁸⁹⁵ Judson, “Where Our Commonality,” 1–21.

⁸⁹⁶ Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, “Empires and the Politics of Difference: Pathways of Incorporation and Exclusion,” in *The Oxford World History of Empire: Volume One: The Imperial Experience*, ed. Peter Fibiger Bang, Christopher A. Bayly, and Walter Scheidel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 375.

⁸⁹⁷ Gábor Egry, “Unruly Borderlands: Border-Making, Peripheralization and Layered Regionalism in Post-First World War Maramureş and the Banat,” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire* 27, no. 6 (2020): 771; Ulrike von Hirschhausen and Jörn Leonhard, “Beyond Rise, Decline and Fall. Comparing Multi-Ethnic Empires in the Long Nineteenth Century,” in *Comparing Empires: Encounters and Transfers in the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Ulrike von Hirschhausen and Jörn Leonhard (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 9–36.

implement them in various local contexts. These spaces encompassed metropolitan urban centers, multiethnic borderlands, rural areas, and various voluntary associations. Importantly, there were significant variations in the genealogy and structure of eugenic discourses and practices among these spaces, even within a single country. While eugenics and biopolitics manifested substantial differences within individual states, a transnational analysis reveals that in analogous spaces, such as large metropolitan areas or multiethnic borderlands, they shared striking similarities across post-Habsburg Central Europe. Even concerning policies influenced by eugenics, therefore, these states exhibited differentiated rule in the 1920s. The chapter, in other words, demonstrates that these states can thus be regarded as little empires even in terms of their approach to biopolitics.

Imperial legacies were also evident in the genealogies of eugenics across various spaces in post-Habsburg Central Europe. On the one hand, there was a notable continuity between the eugenic debates associated with the networks of reformist sociologists before 1914, eugenic projects on the home front during the war, and the actors who promoted eugenics, their discourses, and practices in metropolitan areas after 1918. On the other hand, the actors, discourses, and practices that emerged as significant in the borderland areas showed a strong continuity with the eugenics previously debated and practiced by military medical networks. In these borderlands, the impact of battlefield biopolitics persisted, continuing to affect the lives of their diverse inhabitants. While the first framework was modernist and engaged with the ethnocultural diversity of post-Habsburg societies, the second was anti-modernist and inclined toward ethnic purification. This point underscores the impact of imperial legacies in shaping biopolitics in the area in the early interwar period.

These two distinct styles of biopolitics, inherited from the late imperial context, competed with each other in numerous settings. While this chapter does not delve into all of these settings, it highlights two that held particular significance for the state-building process

in the region, as well as for shaping the perspectives of eugenicists who either worked within them or received their training there. On the one hand, the rural areas beyond the borderlands emerged as a focal point of contention between modernist and anti-modernist eugenicists and their strategies for shaping the post-imperial peasants and their environment. On the other hand, specific voluntary associations emerged as another sphere where these eugenicists vied for influence over the masses of their members and sought closer collaboration with the state.

Multiple Red Viennas: Modernist Biopolitics in Post-Habsburg Metropolitan Areas

After 1918, several major cities of the Habsburg Empire became the capitals of its successor states. Vienna and Budapest, once asymmetrical metropolises of Austria-Hungary, underwent such a transformation. Prague also experienced a significant metamorphosis, shifting from the center of a crownland to the capital city of Czechoslovakia.⁸⁹⁸ To start with, these cities expanded their administrative influence over their outskirts through either formal incorporation or more informal means of exerting control. In terms of municipal governance, moreover, these three capital cities achieved a certain, albeit varying and constrained, degree of autonomy and a distinct position that set them apart within these countries. Reflecting their socially diverse populations, the politics in these expanded municipalities were shaped by a socialist majority, as in Vienna, or influenced by liberal and socialist actors, as was the case in Prague and Budapest. This stood in contrast to the dominance of conservative forces outside the capital, especially in the increasingly polarized Austria and Hungary.⁸⁹⁹ Taking advantage

⁸⁹⁸ Not every successor state had its capital located within Austria-Hungary's former territory, nor did their municipal experts recruit from the former Habsburg imperial setting. Consequently, Habsburg imperial legacies would not be an appropriate framework for analyzing the public health and welfare policies in the capitals of Italy, Poland, Romania, or Yugoslavia. Moreover, additional research is needed to clarify the extent to which the argument put forth in this subchapter applies to those provincial centers of the old empire that transformed into second cities of post-Habsburg countries.

⁸⁹⁹ Therese Garstenauer and Veronika Helfert, "Von der Residenzstadt zum Roten Wien: Die Veränderungen in der Gemeindeverwaltung, 1918-1920," in *Das Rote Wien 1919-1934: Ideen, Debatten, Praxis*, ed. Werner Michael Schwarz, Georg Spitaler, and Elke Wikidal (Vienna: Birkhäuser, 2019), 38-41; Károly Ignácz, "The

of the opportunity that had thus presented itself, these capital cities experimented with modern municipal governance. In all three cases, governing a municipality in a modern way entailed incorporating certain biopolitical strategies.

These capital cities became the focal points for a modernist, reform-oriented biopolitics in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary during the 1920s. Primarily driven by social hygiene, subsequent policies encompassed a range of public health and welfare interventions aimed at molding the urban residents' environment, individual behavior, and their very bodies. Among the wide range of areas of human biological existence that now became political issues, there was a particular emphasis on support for women, children, and youth, as well as screenings for communicable illnesses and campaigns against alcoholism.⁹⁰⁰ Marriage counseling clinics, discussed in the previous chapter, were also a part of these biopolitical initiatives. As the last example illustrates, the social hygiene that loomed large in these cities was influenced or even permeated by eugenics.

Entangled with social hygiene, eugenics became one of the key discourses that drove public health policies in these cities, and the proponents of the latter emerged as important experts who informed them. One notable example is Julius Tandler, who, after his wartime engagement in various welfare initiatives and a short but influential postwar stay at Austria's central public health authority, became a Directing City Councilor for Welfare and Social Administration (amtsführender Stadtrat für Wohlfahrtswesen und soziale Verwaltung) of the

Emergence of the 'Outskirts of Budapest' as a New Administrative District through Food Supply, 1917–1919," *Südostforschungen* 79, no. 1 (2020): 71–95; Michal Švec, *Komunální politika ve Velké Praze: obecní volby, politické strany a zvolené orgány v letech 1923–1938* [Municipal Politics in Greater Prague: Municipal Elections, Political Parties, and Elected Bodies in the Years 1923–1938] (Prague: Karolinum, 2012).

⁹⁰⁰ Ladislav Prokop Procházka, *Zdravotnictví velké Prahy: Popis, úkoly a návrh organisace* [Healthcare in Greater Prague: Description, Tasks, and Proposal for Organization] (Prague: Rockefellerova nadace, 1922); Dezső Schuler, *Hatósági és társadalmi embervédelem Budapesten* [Official and Social Human Protection in Budapest], Vol. 1–2. (Budapest: Budapest Székesfőváros Statisztikai Hivatala, 1937); *Das Wohlfahrtsamt der Stadt Wien und seine Einrichtungen, 1921–1931* (Vienna: Magistrat der Stadt Wien, 1931).

City of Vienna in 1920.⁹⁰¹ However, the same held true for Ladislav Prokop Procházka, the chief municipal physician who played a crucial role in coordinating public health and welfare initiatives in interwar Prague. His authority expanded significantly as a result of his participation in wartime food aid schemes and during his brief tenure at Czechoslovakia's health ministry. While some doctors who participated in the wartime *Stefánia Egyesület* and other relief initiatives in Budapest were marginalized or compelled to emigrate after Hungary's failed revolution, there was still a certain level of continuity, too, particularly within those voluntary associations that sustained their efforts during the interwar period.

The trajectories of these leading municipal experts in public health highlight the remarkable continuity of actors, discourses, and practices from the prewar reformist debates to the eugenically-inflected relief initiatives during wartime on the home front, and further to the interwar biopolitics in urban contexts. The wartime period saw an increase in prominent public interventions that significantly impacted the daily lives of Austria-Hungary's subjects. This experience lent legitimacy to postwar biopolitics in urban areas, expanding the boundaries of what was deemed possible. Simultaneously, it strengthened the credentials of these supporters of eugenics. Notably, their participation in wartime food aid and child welfare initiatives played a pivotal role in advancing their post-war municipal careers.

These physicians informed by eugenics had risen to prominent positions in the health ministries around 1918. Yet, they had to quit these central state authorities shortly afterwards and reframe their reformist plans for municipal politics. In effect, their eugenic agenda had been repeatedly scaled down from the imperial to the national and then to the municipal level. However, simultaneously, they progressively extended the scope of their interventions,

⁹⁰¹ Britta McEwen, "Welfare and Eugenics: Julius Tandler's Rassenhygienische Vision for Interwar Vienna," *Austrian History Yearbook* 41 (2010): 171.

encompassing an increasingly broader range of aspects of human life within the municipal context.

This section makes such continuity its central theme. The biopolitics in these post-imperial capital cities stands out in comparison to other territories in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Its analysis is the first step in substantiating the central argument of this chapter, as it indicates that space mattered in the biopolitics of these states, giving rise to a form of differential rule.

Biopolitics in Vienna, Prague, and Budapest was driven by experts who shared a similar intellectual and institutional background. However, the other actors varied. In Vienna, it was the municipality that played the key role in implementing its eugenic strategies, particularly after acquiring the status of a federal state in the early 1920s. Voluntary associations, as well as Austria's central authorities, were thus relegated to a secondary position. In fact, Tandler explicitly aimed to replace the charitable, voluntary associations with services provided by municipal organizations. Conversely, in Budapest, voluntary associations such as the *Stefánia Egyesület* continued to have a significant impact on the provision of eugenically influenced welfare, albeit with a partial backing from the local municipality. Additionally, in the early postwar period, international relief organizations also provided significant support, similar to their involvement in early postwar Vienna. Prague, finally, represented a middle ground where municipal actors and voluntary associations cooperated in providing health services, some of which were influenced by eugenics.

These differences were not coincidental. The specific relationship between municipal, associational, and state actors in biopolitics in these cities closely mirrored the local dynamics that emerged during the final years of the war. Tandler's push to replace voluntary associations with public bodies not only reflected his socialist conviction of making access to these services

a social right but also aligned with the initiatives developed during the final years of the war which aimed to centralize, expand, and ultimately to replace the work of voluntary associations. Likewise, the significance of voluntary associations supported by the municipality in Budapest reflected a configuration that emerged during the war. The entanglement between municipal and voluntary initiatives in Prague also followed a similar pattern.

The new socialist municipal government in interwar Vienna pursued social reform. In its broad outlines, the social reform reflected the fundamental principles of Austro-Marxism. A central aspect of this political ideology was the belief that achieving a “peaceful evolution towards a classless society” required the education, strengthening, and refinement of the workers’ consciousness.⁹⁰² Yet, it was the expertise of eugenically-oriented physicians that solidified these ideas into a consistent program of municipal reform.

Austrian socialists, upon entering the municipal government, did not have preconceived solutions to rely on. It was only Julius Tandler’s involvement in the municipal administration that brought coherence to their policies regarding municipal housing, welfare, and public health.⁹⁰³ Tandler’s notable scientific credentials that made him stand out within the party leadership were not the sole reason for his impact. Simultaneously, he gradually built and directed a large administrative body comprising bureaucrats, many of whom had a medical background, along with specialists working at the local level.⁹⁰⁴ Over time, women became increasingly represented among these specialists, as the city exclusively recruited social workers from among women, providing them with opportunities. Their education, both on a personal and institutional level, intersected with the women’s movement, and they continued to

⁹⁰² Mark E. Blum, and William Smaldone, eds., *Austro-Marxism: The Ideology of Unity* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), xv–xvi.

⁹⁰³ Helmut Gruber, *Red Vienna: Experiment in Working-Class Culture, 1919-1934* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 49 and 65.

⁹⁰⁴ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 149–50.

remember this formative experience even after emigrating following the defeat of the socialist movement in Vienna.⁹⁰⁵ Eugenics thus provided the grid that structured the city's public health and welfare policies, and shaped the practices of the administrators responsible for these agendas.

Municipal housing projects were the main priority and a source of prestige for the socialist administration. Roughly between Austria's political consolidation and the demise of Red Vienna in the early 1930s, the municipality constructed dwellings for approximately 200,000 people in a metropolis of less than two million.⁹⁰⁶ As Helmut Gruber aptly puts it, the socialists in Vienna did not limit themselves to a simple social reform; rather, they were committed to creating "an all-encompassing proletarian culture in which the physical context of a certain type of habitation would play a central organizing role. Environmentalism was an important aspect of Austro-Marxist subjectivism and was the unwritten basis of municipal reform. Theoretically, it had an affinity to neo-Lamarckism [...]."⁹⁰⁷ He encapsulates the ultimate biopolitical purpose of public housing as "environment for *Neue Menschen*," that is, a setting that would shape the socialist New Men and Women.⁹⁰⁸

By the 1920s, Tandler started emphasizing a significant and unsettling distinction that built on these neo-Lamarckian assumptions. He claimed that not every human had the same capacity for development, elevating young individuals into the most malleable form of "human capital" and making them a priority for biopolitical intervention.⁹⁰⁹ He thus proclaimed a new hierarchy among Vienna's citizens, although this hierarchy was based on age and ability rather than ethnicity. This distinction had important repercussions for the municipal housing projects,

⁹⁰⁵ The contents of a journal published by such émigrés in Czechoslovakia in the 1930s serve as a case in point. "Die Fürsorgerinnenschule Ilse Arlts," *Zeitschrift für Krankenpflege und Fürsorge* 1, no. 4–5 (1937): 37.

⁹⁰⁶ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 46 and 52.

⁹⁰⁷ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 46.

⁹⁰⁸ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 46.

⁹⁰⁹ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 163.

among Tandler's other arguments. When a significant portion of the apartments were rented out to young workers with children, it reflected these assumptions.⁹¹⁰ Perceived as the most adaptable, these young families were to be molded both biologically and culturally.

Hand in glove with the housing construction, various public health and social welfare initiatives aimed at achieving precisely that: shaping an environment which would mold not only future new humans, but also an "orderly" worker family that exuded the middle-class notions of "decency" and "respectability."⁹¹¹ Enlisted for a comprehensive population policy pursuing eugenic goals, health and welfare interventions in Vienna often took the form of examinations and advice at a municipal clinic, or involved a family visit by the municipal welfare workers. The municipality built a vast network of such clinics that covered various issues, ranging from maternal health and child development to the prevention of various illnesses.⁹¹² As these services were also integrated into the new municipal housing projects, Tandler's eugenically inflected biopolitics became deeply embedded in the material culture and shaped the everyday lives of Vienna's citizens.

The *Karl-Marx-Hof*, a community-constructed housing complex that opened in 1930 and was widely promoted, both locally and internationally, as a model achievement of the municipal government, exemplifies the comprehensive nature of the deliberate design of the physical and social environment in a way that aligned with eugenic principles. In addition to offering essential services such as two laundries, a post office, a library, over two dozen shops, and several restaurants, the *Karl-Marx-Hof* featured a comprehensive set of facilities that reflected Vienna's biopolitical priorities. These facilities included a mother counseling center, a youth home, a tuberculosis care facility, a dental clinic, several examination rooms, a

⁹¹⁰ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 61.

⁹¹¹ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 46.

⁹¹² Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 66.

pharmacy, and a local insurance office. Moreover, the housing complex included kindergartens and two public bathhouses.⁹¹³ Even the restaurants were aligned with these priorities, as one contemporary American visitor noted: “no intoxicating liquors are either sold or allowed on the premises; even the name of the concern is *Alkoholfreie Gaststätte des Arbeiter-Abstinenterbundes* (Alcohol-free restaurant of the Workers’ Abstinence Association), which proclaims it as a boozeless affair.”⁹¹⁴ The façade of the housing complex was adorned with four statues symbolizing “Freedom,” “Welfare (Fürsorge),” “Enlightenment” and “Physical Culture.”⁹¹⁵ By aiming to shape the bodies and minds of its inhabitants through their living environment, the community-constructed housing complex deeply integrated neo-Lamarckian eugenics into its design.

The impact of eugenics within these communal housing projects was not limited to the built environment alone. There was a strict regime within the houses, with medical concerns playing a prominent role. Furthermore, the various institutions within the housing estates employed a range of specialists, many of whom had medical education. Following the Austro-Marxist preference for top-down solutions, surveillance and discipline were central to the daily routines of these specialists.⁹¹⁶ Importantly, this emphasis on eugenically-oriented health and welfare agendas contrasted with the initial ideas on the construction of municipal housing put forth by Otto Bauer, a prominent Austro-Marxist theorist. In 1919, Bauer listed multiple facilities he deemed essential for these projects. However, among these facilities, specialized

⁹¹³ Doris Gantner, “Sozialpolitik des Roten Wien 1919 – 1934. Kommunale Leuchtturmprojekte in den Bereichen Architektur und Gesundheit unter dem Aspekt des Social Engineering,” (M.A. Thesis, University of Vienna, 2017), 53.

⁹¹⁴ William E. Johnson, “That House with One Thousand Rooms” (undated manuscript), 14; Cited in Schrad, *Smashing the Liquor Machine*, 123.

⁹¹⁵ *Der Karl-Marx-Hof: Die Wohnhausanlage der Gemeinde Wien auf der Hagenwiese in Heiligenstadt* (Vienna: Die Gemeinde Wien, 1930), 2.

⁹¹⁶ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 63.

medical institutions were few.⁹¹⁷ The municipal housing projects that emerged later on thus highlight the significant influence of experts like Tandler on municipal policy.

Education policy was also an integral part of the strategy to shape the physical and mental development of Vienna's residents.⁹¹⁸ Going beyond the school system, the municipality emphasized popular education for people of all ages. Sexual education was an intrinsic component of these popular education initiatives. As noted by Britta McEwen in her comprehensive history of sexual education in interwar Vienna, the groundbreaking efforts to widely disseminate sexual knowledge were viewed as a means of "healing the social body," with Tandler once again playing a central, albeit somewhat ambiguous, role in these efforts.⁹¹⁹ Finally, the municipality reorganized its child welfare policy, and in 1923 created a *Kinderübernahmestelle* (Foster Care Service) to serve as its central node.⁹²⁰ The *Kinderübernahmestelle* catered to abandoned children and children who were labeled as "delinquent" or "threatened" and removed from their parents by the authorities. It made decisions regarding their future placement. The *Kinderübernahmestelle* incorporated eugenics into its practices and established connections with some of the Viennese doctors and educators who had already focused on the so-called "abnormal" children before World War I, within a clear eugenic framework.⁹²¹

While Vienna was unique among post-Habsburg capitals in its comprehensive embrace of socialist politics in the 1920s, the public health and welfare policies in the other capitals,

⁹¹⁷ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 50.

⁹¹⁸ Gruber, *Red Vienna*, 73.

⁹¹⁹ McEwen, *Sexual Knowledge*, 3.

⁹²⁰ Reinhard Sieder, "Wiener Arbeiterkinder: Praktiken des Alltagslebens und die Anfänge der eugenischen Fürsorgepolitik," in *Kindheit und Schule im Ersten Weltkrieg*, ed. Hannes Stekl and Christa Hämmerle (Vienna: New Academic Press, 2015), 260–85; Sieder, "Das Dispositiv," 156–93.

⁹²¹ See Chapter 1.

namely Prague and Budapest, had a genealogical connection to the Austrian metropolis and bore family resemblances with it. When it came to biopolitics, there were multiple Red Viennas.

This connection was already evident at the conceptual level. For instance, in his texts from the interwar period, Prague's chief municipal physician Procházka alluded to the idea that human life was "the most valuable asset" and subject to "an economy with human lives on a large scale within states and nations."⁹²² What is more, the principles underlying his biopolitical strategy, which involved actively shaping the environment to promote not only individual health but also the imagined collective biological development, reminisced of Vienna's doctors. "At its core, the entire development of social welfare ultimately aims at the healing of the people," Procházka asserted, and specified that "the development of social welfare and the change in social conditions actually represent the most powerful step towards the healing of nations that has occurred in human history so far."⁹²³ Even if Procházka's ultimate political goal was not to create a socialist New Man, and he went further than Tandler in making the imaginary national community an object of biopolitical intervention, he nevertheless operated within a similar epistemic framework.

Even though Procházka engaged with Czech nationalism, the municipal public health and welfare policies were envisioned to have a much broader focus than a single imagined community. As late as 1931, the Prague physician asserted that such policies had to be based on the principle that "every human without exception" had a right to them.⁹²⁴ Furthermore, he emphasized that such policies should be based on the assumption that "there are no inferiors," as evaluating a person "solely based on their fitness for work and earning capacity was

⁹²² Ladislav Prokop Procházka, "Zdravotnictví a sociální politika" [Healthcare and Social Policy], in *Zdravotnictví a sociální politika* [Healthcare and Social Policy] (Prague: Sociální ústav ČSR, 1934), 5.

⁹²³ Ladislav Prokop Procházka, *Cestou za zdravím* [On the Way to Health] (Prague: Lékařské knihkupectví a nakladatelství Mladé generace lékařů, 1931), 87.

⁹²⁴ Procházka, *Cestou za zdravím*, 90.

inadequate.”⁹²⁵ Procházka thus rejected what he described as the “coldly statistical” or technocratic aspects of Goldscheid’s economy of humans. Instead, he turned to a term introduced by Masaryk and commonly employed by liberal intellectuals in interwar Czechoslovakia, asserting that these policies had to prioritize “humanity,” that is, a secularized version of Christian morality.⁹²⁶

Public health experts in Prague, such as Procházka, were familiar with eugenics, and emphasized that the experience of World War I made them realize “the connection between social conditions and healthcare, i.e., the identity of goals between so-called social welfare and public health.”⁹²⁷ However, instead of creating a comprehensive system to replace the former voluntary associations with municipal institutions as in Vienna, interwar Prague’s public health relied on an interpenetration of municipal and voluntary actors that became its central defining feature.⁹²⁸ Even though the municipal experts sought to coordinate and standardize the work of these associations and staff them with medical professionals, the results varied. In effect, the policies shaped by eugenics in interwar Prague were fewer and less far-reaching than those implemented in Vienna.

Nevertheless, eugenics did leave its imprint on some measures. Admittedly, this was less the case with municipal housing, which was not prioritized by Prague’s administration and only accounted for a small portion of the city’s housing stock.⁹²⁹ Instead, various counseling centers became influenced by eugenic agendas. These centers were typically founded and maintained by voluntary associations, with support from the municipality. These centers aimed

⁹²⁵ Procházka, *Cestou za zdravím*, 90.

⁹²⁶ Procházka, “Zdravotnictví a sociální,” 5.

⁹²⁷ Ladislav Prokop Procházka, ed., *Zpráva o zdravotních poměrech hlavního města Prahy v letech 1910-1925* [Report on the Health Conditions of the Capital City of Prague in the Years 1910-1925] (Prague: Nákladem Obce hlavního města Prahy, 1928), IX.

⁹²⁸ Ladislav Prokop Procházka, “Právo na život” [Right to Life], *Přítomnost* 3, no. 24 (June 24, 1926): 377–79.

⁹²⁹ Ladislav Prokop Procházka, “Otcové a děti a pražské problémy” [Fathers and Children and Prague’s Issues], *Přítomnost* 3, no. 4 (February 4, 1926): 59–60.

to shape “orderly” families that conformed to contemporary middle-class norms, with a primary focus on women and children. Social workers employed at these centers also monitored their clients’ behavior within families. Specialized counseling centers were established for pregnant women, children of various ages, individuals suffering from tuberculosis, and those infected with STIs. Particularly from the late 1920s onwards, career counseling centers were also being set up.⁹³⁰ Furthermore, this network of counseling centers was accompanied by municipally-run or municipally-funded creches, summer camps, and selective food aid for school children.⁹³¹ In the absence of a systematic project of municipal housing development, eugenically-informed members of Prague’s administration thus focused on preventive medical counseling and some aspects of welfare provision.

The impact of eugenics was also evident in municipal policies towards children who were orphaned or forcibly removed from their families. In particular, the *Ústřední dětská ochrannovna* (Central Children’s Shelter), which was compared to the Viennese *Kinderübernahmestelle* by Prague’s experts, closely cooperated with the eugenically-oriented *Institute of Pedology*.⁹³² With its merger of public and voluntary actors in its biopolitics, Prague represented a middle ground between Vienna, where municipal actors dominated the field, and Budapest, where voluntary associations continued to play a more significant role.

In Hungary’s capital city, the municipal authorities’ involvement in public health and welfare provision had been initially accompanied, if not overshadowed, by voluntary associations and international humanitarian relief organizations. This was especially evident during the early post-war years, which were marked by a significant decline in living conditions

⁹³⁰ Petr Zenkl, “Městská sociální péče” [Municipal Social Welfare], in *Praha v obnoveném státě československém* [Prague in the Restored Czechoslovak State], ed. Václav Vojtíšek (Prague: Rada města, 1936), 437–38.

⁹³¹ Petr Zenkl, “Über die soziale Fürsorge der Stadt Prag: Ein Vortrag,” *Blätter für das Wohlfahrtswesen der Stadt Wien* 29, no. 279 (June 1930): 105–18.

⁹³² Zenkl, “Městská sociální péče,” 433.

and food shortages and made significant sections of the population dependent on humanitarian aid, as Friederike Kind-Kovács has shown.⁹³³ One example is the *Stefánia Egyesület*, which was established during the war and eventually extended its activities from Budapest to other major cities and towns in Hungary. With international humanitarian support, it continued to focus on pronatalist child and maternal welfare initiatives. These initiatives included providing medical advice and material aid to support the well-being of children and mothers. Within the local voluntary associations, therefore, the eugenics-informed practices that emerged during the wartime period persisted or even expanded after the war.

Apart from the practices implemented during the war, the concepts that influenced the debates at that time also continued to have an impact within these voluntary associations. An example is a pamphlet *A szellemi és a fizikai munka válsága Magyarországon* (The Crisis of Intellectual and Physical Labor in Hungary) published in 1921 in the book series of the *Stefánia Egyesület*. The author of the pamphlet, János Szekeres, was a statistician, former secretary of the *Társadalomtudományi Társaság* (Society for Social Sciences), and an influential member of Hungarian civic radical circles. During Hungary's brief communist dictatorship, Szekeres had an administrative job at the People's Commissariat for Welfare.⁹³⁴ In Szekeres' argument, the concept of "human capital" played a crucial role, even though it was not explicitly mentioned in the text.

Combining economics and biology, Szekeres examined the link between the decreasing living standards of industrial workers and public employees, and the declining birth rates. He argued that these socioeconomic groups were "the most valuable element of the population" and documented that their current income did not allow them to afford the necessary food items

⁹³³ Friederike Kind-Kovács, *Budapest's Children: Humanitarian Relief in the Aftermath of the Great War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2022), passim.

⁹³⁴ Ágnes Kenyeres, "Szekeres Sándor" [Sándor Szekeres], in *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon* [Hungarian Biographical Lexicon], Vol. 3 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981), 744.

to meet “the caloric needs of an average normal family.”⁹³⁵ Szekeres claimed that as a result, “population growth had been inhibited” through declining birth rates, increased child mortality, and emigration, and warned that this situation “decreased the country’s vitality,” and posed a direct threat to “the regeneration of the entire country.”⁹³⁶ There were also voices within the association whose nationalism was more extreme and more racialized than that of Szekeres.⁹³⁷ However, it was ultimately the notion of human capital that prevailed and featured in the pronouncements of the association’s leadership, including its director, Lajos Keller.⁹³⁸ By linking its pro-natalist biopolitics to nationalist rhetoric, the *Stefánia Egyesület* had thus sought to adapt itself to the realities of Hungary’s new national conservative regime.

The resulting biopolitics that characterized these cities in the 1920s and beyond was marked by ambiguity. On the one hand, it represented a modern and reform-oriented approach that emphasized environmental and socio-economic factors rather than a purportedly timeless biological essence. Furthermore, since these capital cities maintained much of their prewar multiethnic character, the biopolitical practices within them accommodated this diversity, rather than seeking to exclude individuals who did not belong to the perceived core groups of the nation. On the other hand, these biopolitical interventions displayed a certain degree of paternalism and were accompanied by increased surveillance.⁹³⁹ Municipal authorities were ready to invoke the moral authority of nature to legitimize middle-class values, and to discipline individuals who transgressed these norms.

⁹³⁵ János Szekeres, *A szellemi és a fizikai munka válsága Magyarországon* [The Crisis of Intellectual and Physical Labor in Hungary] (Budapest: Pesti Nyomda, 1921), 8 and 13.

⁹³⁶ Szekeres, *A szellemi és a fizikai*, 13 and 10.

⁹³⁷ Alajos Kovács, *Magyarország néperezének újjászületése* [Rebirth of the Strength of the Hungarian Nation] (Szeged: Szegedi Városi Nyomda, 1922).

⁹³⁸ Kind-Kovács, *Budapest’s Children*, 143.

⁹³⁹ Jakub Rákosník and Radka Šustrová, *Rodina v zájmu státu: Populační růst a instituce manželství v českých zemích 1918-1989* [Family in the Interest of the State: Population Growth and the Institution of Marriage in the Czech Lands 1918-1989] (Prague: NLN, 2016), passim; Reinhard Sieder, “Housing Policy, Social Welfare, and Family Life in ‘Red Vienna’, 1919-34,” *Oral History* 13, no. 2 (Autumn 1985): 35–48.

The ambiguity of this eugenic package is encapsulated in a statement by Tandler concerning the welfare in Vienna during the 1920s. Drawing on a familiar concept, the physician-turned-municipal politician asserted that the fundamental goal “of every population policy is the administration [Verwaltung] of organic capital, that is of the humans who live within a community.”⁹⁴⁰ Despite this technocratic metaphor, however, Tandler also went on to assert that such biopolitics “extends indiscriminately to all humans [wahllos auf alle Menschen],” and “does not ask about worthy or unworthy life [fragt nicht nach lebenswertem oder unlebenswertem Leben].”⁹⁴¹

Dominate, “Civilize,” and Purify: Anti-Modernist Biopolitics in the Post-Habsburg Borderlands

Stitched together from various territories of three defunct continental empires, the nation-states of interwar East Central Europe had significant borderland areas. From Poland’s eastern borderlands to Yugoslavia’s Macedonia, from Romania’s Bessarabia to Austria’s Burgenland, these borderlands were rural, multiethnic, and marked by various imperial legacies.

Although the emerging scholarship has not yet produced a collective portrait of these borderlands, individual studies indicate that there are some family resemblances between them. Mirroring past empires, the new or expanded nation-states of East Central Europe often embraced the rhetoric of the civilizing mission to frame their state-building agenda in these borderlands. Public health was a part and parcel of such state-building and involved various networks of medical experts. Some of them were influenced by eugenics, even though historians differ on the overall importance of this ambiguous body of knowledge for state-

⁹⁴⁰ Julius Tandler, “Gefahren der Minderwertigkeit,” *Das Wiener Jugendhilfswerk* 5 (1928): 3.

⁹⁴¹ Tandler, “Gefahren der Minderwertigkeit,” 19, cited in Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 165.

building within these borderland spaces in the interwar period.⁹⁴² The effects of these initiatives, particularly at the global and national level, are also murky. On the one hand, Sara Silverstein reveals that Macedonia was a laboratory for “a new and important model for international health,” while Patrick Zylberman sees the “sanitary zone” in Poland’s eastern borderlands proposed in 1922 as a pioneering international attempt “to deal with issues by ‘debordering’ them.”⁹⁴³ On the other hand, Victoria Shmidt sees Czechoslovakia’s borderlands as a locus that both reconfigured and radicalized Czech nationalism as well as eugenics.⁹⁴⁴ Thus far, no attempt has been made to write a transnational history of the actors, discourses, and practices of eugenically-oriented public health across borderlands that share the same imperial legacy.

This section builds upon and adds complexity to the current understanding of biopolitics in the borderlands of East Central Europe. It does so by placing particular emphasis on the post-Habsburg borderlands. More specifically, it examines the shared patterns of biopolitics among those borderlands that were originally parts of royal Hungary and later transformed into borderlands of other post-Habsburg states. It interrogates the extent to which imperial legacies shaped the biopolitics in these areas, more broadly, and the specific role that eugenics played in this process. The argument put forth is that these regions became crucial contexts where eugenics flourished during the first interwar decade. It reinforces the central claim of this

⁹⁴² Kathryn Ciancia, *On Civilization’s Edge: A Polish Borderland in the Interwar World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021); Victoria Shmidt, “Public Health as an Agent of Internal Colonialism in Interwar Czechoslovakia: Shaping the Discourse about the Nation’s Children,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 52, no. 4 (2018): 355–87; Sara Silverstein, “The Periphery Is the Centre: Some Macedonian Origins of Social Medicine and Internationalism,” *Contemporary European History* 28, no. 2 (May 2019): 220–33; Patrick Zylberman, “Civilizing the State: Borders, Weak States and International Health in Modern Europe,” in *Medicine at the Border: Disease, Globalization and Security, 1850 to the Present*, ed. Alison Bashford (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 21–40.

⁹⁴³ Silverstein, “The Periphery,” 220; Patrick Zylberman, “‘Debordering’ Public Health: The Changing Patterns of Health Border in Modern Europe,” *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos* 27, no. suppl 1 (September 2020): 37.

⁹⁴⁴ Shmidt, *The Politics of Disability*, passim.

chapter, which is that the biopolitics of the post-Habsburg states were characterized by differential rule, a characteristic typically associated with empires.

Focusing on areas such as Burgenland, Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Transylvania, or Vojvodina, this section demonstrates that they became hotbeds for radical, nationalist eugenic projects. The resulting biopolitical practices in these borderlands included high-profile campaigns against epidemic diseases, settlement projects supported by central authorities, pro-natalist welfare initiatives for the perceived co-nationals, and the practices resulting in racialization of marginalized groups. In this regard, these borderlands bore many similarities to the prewar nationalist activist associations and wartime military networks, and this section documents that there was indeed significant continuity between the actors, discourses, and practices involved in these three settings.

Crucially, it was here that nationalist, military veteran advocates of eugenics forged an increasingly robust and mutually supportive relationship with local civil administration. More than ever before, the local authorities in the borderlands were now willing to embrace their suggestions and turn them into state policy on the local level. These post-Habsburg borderlands within successor states thus became one of the key laboratories where the biopolitics of prewar nationalist associations and of the battlefield started to amalgamate with civil administration.

Even though these post-Habsburg borderlands were now incorporated into self-described nation-states, the administrators responsible for governing them largely consisted of bureaucrats with prior experience in the Habsburg imperial public and civil service, as highlighted by Gábor Egry.⁹⁴⁵ This was true wherever the new states lacked necessary human resources to replace the old local administrators, and these clerks could thus continue or even

⁹⁴⁵ Egry, “The Leftover Empire?,” 87.

advance their careers within the new nation-states, as was the case in Transylvania.⁹⁴⁶ Ironically, this was also the case in contexts such as Subcarpathian Ruthenia, where the previous imperial administrators were largely replaced by incoming Czech-speaking clerks. However, these new clerks often had an imperial experience as well, particularly in the administration of Austria-Hungary's internal colony in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Consequently, the communist as well as the Rusyn nationalist press sarcastically labeled them as "Bosnians."⁹⁴⁷ Given their professional background and formative experiences, these administrators kept or imparted "a specific understanding of what it meant to be a bureaucrat."⁹⁴⁸

If the borderlands were a stage for "a colonizing mission managed by former imperial bureaucrats," what was at the center of the self-perception of its managers?⁹⁴⁹ The first aspect that recent scholarship on Habsburg administration highlights was a commitment to infrastructural expansion and modernization, understood as an imperial civilizing mission.⁹⁵⁰ Moreover, they saw it as their task to serve as mediators between the state and the local society, ensuring a degree of interpenetration. Crucially for my argument, these bureaucrats also continued to embrace a notion of objectivity and neutrality based on their professional expertise and local experience, even though in reality their conduct could be messier and more informal.⁹⁵¹ It was particularly this last aspect of their self-perception that had been challenged by local actors, as well as scrutinized by central authorities.

⁹⁴⁶ Gábor Egry, "Unholy Alliances? Language Exams, Loyalty, and Identification in Interwar Romania," *Slavic Review* 76, no. 4 (2017): 959–82.

⁹⁴⁷ Geoffrey Brown, "'The Spirit of Dictators': Rusyn Accusations of Corruption and Imperialism against František Svojše and Officials in Czechoslovak Ruthenia," *Bohemia* 57, no. 2 (2017): 346–66.

⁹⁴⁸ Egry, "The Leftover Empire," 87.

⁹⁴⁹ Egry, "The Leftover Empire," 87.

⁹⁵⁰ Gábor Egry, *The Empire's New Clothes: How Austria-Hungary's Legacy Kept the Successor States Running* (Leiden: Foundation for Austrian Studies, 2020), 13.

⁹⁵¹ John Deak, *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015), 29 and 215–60.

Important groups of local actors resisted these administrators and fundamentally questioned their credentials. As Gábor Egry puts it, the borderlands such as Transylvania or Prekmurje were home to “a new, aspiring middle class with pre-1918 imperial experience that could more easily imagine itself as a new elite – equal to the new rulers or even more civilized – than as the subjects of a civilizing mission directed from the center.”⁹⁵² A striking “anti-colonialist discourse” that likened the policies of the new states to colonial rule emerged as a result of the clash between the claims of the incoming administrators and of the rising local middle class.⁹⁵³

Moreover, even the socialist or communist challengers who opposed both the local middle class as well as the state administration sometimes embraced this anti-colonialist discourse, as in Slovakia. A group of young Hungarian-speaking communist sociologists that congregated in the *Sarló* (Scythe) group in the early 1930s, for instance, observed the long-term impact of post-imperial transitions during their tours through the borderland areas of Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia. They noted that the collapse of the empire and the integration of these areas into a new country rolled back their economic development and the income of the working people now “not only lagged behind the wages in Bohemia and Moravia, but also lagged behind the wages paid in prewar Hungary.”⁹⁵⁴ Using parts of the Marxist intellectual toolkit to describe a dependent position of these borderlands within the new nation-states, these sociologists ultimately concluded that the experience of “colonial and class exploitation entirely overlaps” in these areas.⁹⁵⁵ Framing the new administration as an agent of colonial dominance,

⁹⁵² Egry, *The Empire's New Clothes*, 19.

⁹⁵³ Egry, *The Empire's New Clothes*, 19.

⁹⁵⁴ *A Sarló jegyében: az újarcú magyaroktól a magyar szocialistákig: a Sarló 1931-iki pozsonyi kongresszusának vitaanyaga* [In the Sign of the Sickle: From New Hungarians to Hungarian Socialists: Proceedings of the 1931 Congress of The *Sarló* in Bratislava] (Pozsony: A Sarló országos vezetősége, 1932), 29.

⁹⁵⁵ *A Sarló jegyében*, 34.

this “anti-colonialist discourse” radically questioned the administration’s neutrality and its professionalism.

These challenges were further compounded by the central state authorities – in some cases located outside of the former empire’s territory – who were also sometimes mistrustful of their local representatives in the multiethnic borderlands.⁹⁵⁶ Their claims for objectivity and impartiality challenged from both directions, the bureaucrats in the borderlands such as Subcarpathian Ruthenia found an alternative source of authority in the expertise produced by scientific professionals, including the medical doctors. For instance, a semi-official Czech-language newspaper that advocated the administration’s policies in Subcarpathian Ruthenia reported with considerable satisfaction in 1927 on an article in the *Russkij vistnyk* (Rusyn Herald). While the article dismissed “the politics of the Czech Bosnians” in its broad outlines, it also advocated for a more nuanced perspective. Importantly, the Rusyn periodical emphasized that recognizing this complexity meant acknowledging that there were “Czech individuals who deserve everyone’s respect such as the [medical] doctors Pinta, Pejše, Albert, among others.”⁹⁵⁷ As such statements multiplied, they revealed a subtle yet significant shift.

Traditionally, imperial bureaucrats in Austria-Hungary prioritized their own legal expertise, often relegating more technical and scientific forms of knowledge to a secondary role. According to Peter Becker, this was also evident in their assertions of objectivity and non-partisanship, which relied on legal expertise rather than on a narrative of the presumed value neutrality of modern science and technology.⁹⁵⁸ Symptomatically, complaints about the alleged disregard for the arguments of physicians among the juridically-influenced administrators were a recurring theme in the medical journals of the early 20th century in the region. However, with

⁹⁵⁶ Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics*, 161–66.

⁹⁵⁷ “Strizlivé slovo” [Sober Word], *Podkarpatské hlasy: neodvislý týždenník, hájící zájmy českého živlu na Podk. Rusi a Vých. Slovensku* 3, no. 83 (April 9, 1927): 2.

⁹⁵⁸ Becker, “The Administrative Apparatus,” 254.

their professed neutrality grounded in legal expertise vehemently challenged by anti-colonial discourses in the borderlands during the interwar period, these administrators sought an additional source of legitimacy. They found it in an alliance with scientific and medical experts who interpreted nature while invoking the objectivity and universality of their enquiries. In doing so, they began attributing greater importance to these forms of knowledge than ever before and took steps towards a more profound “scientification” of certain aspects of governance in these borderlands.⁹⁵⁹

Medical doctors counted among the experts whose recognition by the administration grew in these borderlands. While the bureaucrats managing the post-Habsburg borderlands tended to have an experience from the Habsburg civil or public administration, the incoming experts who would produce biopolitical knowledge tailored for these borderlands recruited from military networks, and from the former Austro-Hungarian military networks, in particular. Moreover, they often combined their recent experience with battlefield biopolitics with an active involvement in nationalist associations that often stretched back before 1914. As such, they advocated eugenics, and in some cases counted among its staunchest supporters in the area.

To begin with, a former medical officer in the Habsburg military, Iuliu Moldovan, became a leading medical administrator in Transylvania after 1918, as well as a towering figure of the eugenics movement in interwar Romania more broadly. Moldovan’s prewar and wartime trajectory, in particular his increasingly influential position within Austro-Hungarian military medical networks, and his growing engagement with eugenics, is documented in the second chapter of this dissertation. Following his return to Transylvania in December 1918, Moldovan joined the Ruling Council, the de-facto regional government of the area, and went on to establish an Institute of Hygiene and Social Hygiene in 1919 in Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg,

⁹⁵⁹ For “scientification of colonialism,” see Anne Kwaschik, “Die Verwissenschaftlichung des Kolonialen als kultureller Code und internationale Praxis um 1900,” *Historische Anthropologie* 28, no. 3 (2020): 399–423.

the first of its kind in Romania.⁹⁶⁰ In 1925, Moldovan launched Romania's first eugenic society.⁹⁶¹ Increasingly involved in nationalist activism, and strengthening the nationalist content of his eugenic project, Moldovan was elected president of the *Asociația Transilvană pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român* (Transylvanian Association for Romanian Literature and the Culture of the Romanian People; abbreviated as ASTRA), a leading Romanian nationalist association in the region, in 1932.⁹⁶² A former Habsburg officer thus became a leading representative of Romanian eugenics, and a principal architect of biopolitical strategies for the Romanian nation-building project in Transylvania. This paradoxical trajectory represents a pattern that was replicated in most post-Habsburg borderlands, including Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Vojvodina, and in Burgenland.

On the other side of the Carpathians, in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, the medical doctors who arrived in this territory shortly after it became a part of Czechoslovakia were “mostly those who had returned from the world war just a few days earlier,” as one of them recalled several decades later.⁹⁶³ Bohuslav Albert (1890-1952), an informal leader of a cohort of young Czech medical doctors who settled in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, is a prime example of this emerging link between the Austro-Hungarian battlefield biopolitics and the biopolitics of the new Czechoslovak authorities in the borderlands. Before his appointment as the new director of the central hospital in Mukachevo/Munkács/Mukačevo in 1919 and as the director of the Czechoslovak Red Cross in the province, Albert was a medical officer in the Austro-Hungarian army who served at the Eastern front.⁹⁶⁴ Earlier, in 1912, Albert also participated in the Balkan

⁹⁶⁰ Marius Turda, “Iuliu Moldovan,” in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 296–99.

⁹⁶¹ Turda, “Iuliu Moldovan,” *passim*.

⁹⁶² Turda, “Iuliu Moldovan,” *passim*.

⁹⁶³ Bohuslav Kupec, “Dr B. Albert - zdravotnícký a sociální administrátor. Vzpomínky na naši spolupráci na Podkarpatské Rusi a ve Zlíně” [Dr. B. Albert – Public Health and Social Administrator. Memories of Our Cooperation in Subcarpathian Rus and Zlín], *Československá nemocnice* 18, no. 2 (February 1950): 53–54.

⁹⁶⁴ It must be emphasized that Albert's trajectory was not exceptional in this regard. Other leading medical doctors involved in the administration of Subcarpathian Ruthenia such as Václav Pejše and Josef Frantál were also decorated military doctors within the Habsburg army. “Militärärztliche Auszeichnungen und Ernennungen,”

Wars where he volunteered in the Serbian army; this engagement illustrates Albert's commitment to pan-Slavic nationalism.⁹⁶⁵

Albert embraced eugenics and tried to incorporate it into the design of a House of National Health in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, a planned central medical institution within the province for whose establishment he intensively lobbied. According to his project of the House drafted in 1925, the research institution was designed to “produce a theoretical foundation for all practical initiatives aiming at the racial improvement of the broad strata of Subcarpathian Ruthenia's population,” and its departments of demography and special pathology, respectively, were tasked with the study of those “manifestations of racial and national physiology which border on one or another form of racial or social pathology,” as well as those “social-medical phenomena that cause the degeneration of the nation in terms of race.”⁹⁶⁶ Even though many important civil administrators in Subcarpathian Ruthenia previously served in the imperial administration of Bosnia, leading public health officers thus rather recruited from the ranks of Austro-Hungarian veteran doctors, and they brought a radical biopolitical toolkit with them.

In Vojvodina that now became a part of interwar Yugoslavia, the medical doctors Laza Marković and Vladan Jojkić emerged as the key producers of eugenic knowledge linked to the

Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift 67, no. 17 (April 21, 1917): 798; “Militärärztliche Auszeichnungen und Ernennungen,” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 68, no. 9 (March 2, 1918): 399.

⁹⁶⁵ Interestingly, Albert came from a family which had intimate ties to the Habsburg Empire, as his uncle served as the personal physician of the emperor Franz Joseph I. Albert's early biography is well documented, even if not always critically interpreted, in Igor Lichtej, “Český lékař Bohuslav Albert a jeho priekopnícka činnosť na Podkarpatskej Rusi v rokoch 1919–1927” [Czech Doctor Bohuslav Albert and His Pioneering Activity in Subcarpathian Rus in the Years 1919–1927], *Česko-slovenská historická ročenka* 23, no. 2 (2021): 83–96; Hana Mášová, “Účelnost pro vyšší humanitu: Lékař a organizátor Bohuslav Albert” [Purpose for Higher Humanity: Doctor and Organizer Bohuslav Albert], *Dějiny věd a techniky* 31, no. 1 (1998): 1–23.

⁹⁶⁶ The institute started operating only in 1933, several years after Albert's departure from Subcarpathian Ruthenia, and did not fully reflect Albert's project from 1925. However, the institute did follow Albert's suggestion to include the eugenically oriented departments. National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 143, Report, Bohuslav Albert, Úvaha o směrnicích k vybudování Ústavu národního zdraví v Podkarpatské Rusi, Mukačevo 1925, 4, 13. See also Jaroslav Dlouhý, “Dům lidového zdraví v Užhorodě” [House of National Health in Uzhhorod], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 15, no. 1 (January 15, 1933): 5–7.

administration of this area. The former, Marković, became a Commissioner for Public Health at the People's Administration of Banat, Bačka, and Baranya – the de-facto regional government – immediately after the collapse of the empire in 1918. (Symptomatic of his nationalism, one of the first reports Marković produced in this capacity called for the nationalization of the regional medical corps. He accused the former imperial authorities of “knowingly and deliberately keeping the Serbian nation in hygienic destitution” and called for a swift, thorough, and systematic replacement of the health officials in the region with Serbian nationalists.)⁹⁶⁷ His influence on the public health policy in the region reached its peak in the 1920s, however, when he established and led a series of institutions, including the provincial branch of the Red Cross, the State School of Health Enlightenment, the House of People's Health, and the provincial medical chamber. Ultimately, after the introduction of the royal dictatorship in 1929, he became the chief of the medical department of the regional (banovina) administration.⁹⁶⁸

Marković had a long history of cooperation with the Serb nationalist associations in the region, for whom he produced race hygienic advice already before 1914, as we have seen in one of the previous chapters.⁹⁶⁹ What is more, he served as a volunteer in the Serbian Army during the Balkan Wars. In contrast, his activities during World War I remain murky, except for the fact that he spent some time administering the local Red Cross hospital in Novi Sad.⁹⁷⁰

⁹⁶⁷ Marković's report contained palpable anti-Semitic undertones, which became entirely explicit when he castigated the former imperial administration for filling the regional medical corps with “foreigners, mostly Jews, doctors who mostly did not know Serbian, did not have the slightest feeling for the condition of the Serbian people, and did not make the slightest effort to guide and raise them to a healthy, hygienic life.” Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 76, National Administration for Banat, Bačka, and Baranja, Box 3, Inv. No. 136/1919, Report “Građa protiv Mađara na polju brige za narodno zdravlje” [Material against Hungarians in the Field of Public Health], February 5, 1919.

⁹⁶⁸ Ján Čajak, “Dr. Laza Marković,” *Náš život: Časopis Matice slovenskej v Južoslávii* 3, no. 2 (August 1935): 90.

⁹⁶⁹ For details, see the first chapter of this dissertation.

⁹⁷⁰ Telling, perhaps, is the fact that the laudatory obituaries written about Marković largely avoid discussing this issue. Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 143, The Danube Banovina Committee of the Red Cross Society, Box 34, “Izveštaj o radu Dunavskog banovinskog odbora Društva Crvenog krsta Kraljevine Jugoslavije za 1935. Godinu” [Report on the Work of the Danube Banovina Committee of the Red Cross Society of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia for the Year 1935], 1–3.

In the interwar period, he presided over a regional branch of the *Narodna Odbrana* (National Defence).⁹⁷¹ The nationalist association recruited its members largely from the ranks of Serbian war veterans, assumed a staunchly anti-liberal stance, and aimed at creating a synthetic Yugoslav culture by “organiz[ing] action to protect [the] nation from external and internal anti-state, destructive, and defeatist elements.”⁹⁷²

The latter medical doctor, Jojkić (1886-1954), whose career culminated in 1938 when he became the head of the department of the provincial administration responsible for public health and social policy, was a decorated Habsburg military doctor who served in the imperial army throughout World War I.⁹⁷³ At the same time, however, he was a staunch nationalist who volunteered for Serbia during the Balkan Wars shortly after receiving his medical degree in 1911 from the University of Vienna.⁹⁷⁴ After his return from the front in December 1918, Jojkić joined the de facto regional government as part of its public health division, gradually advancing through the ranks of the regional administration over the subsequent two decades.⁹⁷⁵ He also developed a close relationship with the local medical institutions, including Marković’s State School of Health Enlightenment, as well as with the Serbian integral nationalist associations in the region.⁹⁷⁶ Strikingly, a former Habsburg military physician thus replaced a

⁹⁷¹ Darinka Lacković, “Smrt Dr. Laze Markovića” [Death of Dr. Laza Marković], *Seljanka: list za prosvjećivanje žena na selu* 3, no. 9 (January 9, 1935): 1–2.

⁹⁷² Kalendar Narodne Odbrane, 1925, Cited in John Paul Newman, *Yugoslavia in the Shadow of War: Veterans and the Limits of State Building, 1903–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 58 and 75.

⁹⁷³ Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 126, Royal Administration of the Danube Banovina, Part I, Box 613, Personal File Jojkić Vladan, Inv. No. 3, Order 4430/1938 from February 5, 1938; “Militärärztliche Auszeichnungen und Ernennungen,” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 68, no. 44 (November 2, 1918): 1956.

⁹⁷⁴ Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 126, Royal Administration of the Danube Banovina, Part I, Box 613, Personal File Jojkić Vladan, Inv. No. 8, University Diploma, and Inv. No. 13, Copy of a Certificate from June 2, 1931.

⁹⁷⁵ Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 126, Royal Administration of the Danube Banovina, Part I, Box 613, Personal File Jojkić Vladan, Inv. No. 15, Official Personnel Record.

⁹⁷⁶ Laza Marković, “Zdravstveni Odsek za Banat, Bačku i Baranju, Inspektorat Ministarstva Narodnog Zdravlja za Beogradsku, Bačku i Sremsku Oblast i Dom Narodnog Zdravlja u Novom Sadu” [Health Section for Banat, Bačka, and Baranya, Inspectorate of the Ministry of Public Health for the Belgrade, Bačka, and Srem Region, and the House of People’s Health in Novi Sad], in *Mati: Komad u jednom činu* [Mother: A Play in One Act] (Novi Sad: Dom narodnog zdravlja, 1928), 107–11; “Postavljenja, premeštaji i penzionisanja u resoru Ministarstva socijalne politike i narodnog zdravlja u mesecima junu-novembru 1935 godine” [Appointments, Transfers, and Retirements in the Ministry of Social Policy and Public Health in the Months of June-November 1935], *Socijalni arhiv* 1, no. 9–10 (September 1935): 165.

another military veteran, and his eugenic blueprint was even more radical than that of his predecessor. The link, therefore, between the Habsburg battlefield biopolitics refracted through nationalist activism, on the one hand, and the radical biopolitics in the borderlands, on the other hand, remained strong even in those states of interwar East Central Europe that had to negotiate the Habsburg legacies with the legacies of other imperial or post-imperial states.

The Burgenland in Austria followed a similar pattern, particularly after a generously funded health demonstration area had been set up in this borderland area in 1929.⁹⁷⁷ A young medical doctor Georg Pösch (1895-1970) who was appointed its director as well as the medical commissioner of the Eisenstadt district, had served as a military doctor in the Habsburg military during the war and had a history of active involvement in radical nationalist associations.⁹⁷⁸ Georg Pösch, moreover, had intimate links to the wartime Austrian racial research on the POWs, even though he did not directly participate in it. His uncle Rudolf Pösch led this research, and he did so with the assistance of his wife Helene Schürer von Waldheim, who after the death of Rudolf in 1921 went on to marry his nephew, Georg. (Both members of the *völkisch* nationalist scientific couple then joined the Austrian NSDAP sometime during the interwar period.)⁹⁷⁹ In the borderlands, the nationalist activists and Habsburg veteran physicians loomed large, and their biopolitics has found a new, radical use.

Reinforcing the authority of the new administrators with the imagined authority of nature itself, these eugenicists constructed narratives that framed the costs of post-imperial transitions as manifestations of an alleged, deeply embedded pathology. The previous imperial rule, the argument went, created conditions that distorted the development of the populations

⁹⁷⁷ *10 Jahre Burgenland: Seine politische, kulturelle und wirtschaftliche Entwicklung in den Jahren 1921–1931* (Vienna: Wirtschafts-Zeitungs-Verlag, 1931), 34.

⁹⁷⁸ “Eingelangt am 16. Juli 1915,” *Kriegszeitung des A.T.V. Graz*, no. 37 (July 24, 1915): 372; “Beförderungen und Auszeichnungen,” *Kriegszeitung des A.T.V. Graz*, no. 173 (December 22, 1917): 1100.

⁹⁷⁹ Johannes Hofinger, “Georg Pösch: Ein Schreibtischtäter der NS-Euthanasie,” in *Nationalsozialismus in Salzburg* (Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, 2016), 286–88.

in the borderlands not merely in culture, but also in biology. Far from exploitative dominance, then, in these narratives the “civilizing mission” of the new states was framed as a biopolitical project of collective regeneration, to be carried out by the medical experts in tandem with the local administrators.

To begin with, Czech eugenicists in Subcarpathian Ruthenia deliberated how “former state units and their political tendencies influenced phenomena of social pathology,” and called for a detailed assessment of these conditions, as far as the areas “from which the Czechoslovak Republic was formed, and particularly those in Eastern Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia” were concerned.⁹⁸⁰ On the same note, the nationalist medical doctor Marković claimed that before World War I, “our people” in Vojvodina and in the Banat “lived in a state of great hygienic darkness, because the old Hungarian authorities did not show any love for them and they sought neither to enlighten them, nor to equip them for a difficult struggle for survival.” This allegedly manifested itself in their biology, particularly in their poor health and high mortality rate.⁹⁸¹ In Burgenland, Georg Pösch went on to invoke “the destitution of this region, which in earlier times was little affected by measures of a medical-preventive nature, a fact that appears determined by history and by a relatively late abolition of serfdom.”⁹⁸² Another doctor added flatly that since the territory became a part of Austria, it became healthier and “significantly converged with the Austrian cultural level [*Kulturhöhe*].”⁹⁸³ In Transylvania, finally, Iuliu Moldovan warned in January 1919 that any medical “measures to be taken during

⁹⁸⁰ “Sociálně-lékařský sjezd, pořádaný Podkarpatskou župou Ú.J.Č.L. v Mukačevě (Podkarpatská Rus)” [Social-Medical Congress organized by the Subcarpathian County of the Central Union of Czechoslovak Doctors in Mukachevo, Subcarpathian Ruthenia], *Česká mysl* 18, no. 3 (1922): 188–89.

⁹⁸¹ Interestingly, Marković struggled to support his arguments with statistical figures, which suggested that the public health situation in his region, including among ethnic Serbs, was more favorable than in most other parts of Yugoslavia. Laza Marković, *Postanaki zadaci Državne škole za zdravstveno prosvjećivanje* [Establishment and Tasks of the State School for Health Education], Biblioteka Državne škole za zdravstveno prosvjećivanje 1 (Novi Sad: Državna škola za zdravstveno prosvjećivanje, 1920), 3.

⁹⁸² Georg Pösch, “Mustergesundheitsfürsorge in der Freistadt und im Bezirk Eisenstadt,” *Volksgesundheit: Zeitschrift für soziale Hygiene* 5, no. 11–12 (1931): 172.

⁹⁸³ Geiza Artur Nindl, “Volksgesundheit und öffentliche Gesundheitsfürsorge im Burgenland,” *Volksgesundheit: Zeitschrift für soziale Hygiene* 5, no. 11–12 (1931): 168.

the transition period” needed to factor in that the “sanitary and hygienic organization was insufficient from the beginning” and, at any rate, “this organization had now been largely destroyed by the events of the war.”⁹⁸⁴ A contributor to *Revista Sănătății*, a journal favored by Moldovan’s allies, opted for a more pronouncedly orientalist framing: “No sooner do you leave the civilized city of Cluj than you find yourself mired in full savagery [în plină sălbăcie]. Such filth, as rarely seen.” However, the civilization of the city lacked legitimacy in his eyes due to its alleged otherness; the author claimed it did not reflect “a people” but rather “a mere group of parasites.”⁹⁸⁵ In short, these eugenicists crafted narratives that framed the costs of post-imperial transition as symptoms of a deeply embedded pathology and backwardness and legitimized the proclaimed civilizing missions of the new nation-states as a politics of regeneration.

The former territories of royal Hungary, such as Burgenland and Slovakia, were transformed into borderlands of the successor states in a process marked by physical violence carried out by military and paramilitary actors.⁹⁸⁶ The veteran doctors, who often arrived in the post-Habsburg borderlands during this initial period of violence, carried with them many of the ideas and practices that had circulated in their previous military medical networks. They consolidated, promoted, and instrumentally applied them in their new setting in the borderlands.

⁹⁸⁴ “Proces verbal luat în 28 Ianuarie st. n. 1919 la Congresul medicilor români din Transilvania, Banat și părțile românești din țara ungurească” [Minutes Taken on January 28, 1919, at the Congress of Romanian Doctors from Transylvania, Banat, and the Romanian Section of the Partium], in “Documente din trecut” [Documents from the Past], *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 9, no. 11–12 (October 1938 [1921]): 324–25.

⁹⁸⁵ Iacob Iacobovici, “Fațada și realitate” [Facade and Reality], *Revista Sănătății* 1, no. 2 (May 1921): 36–39.

⁹⁸⁶ Robert Gerwarth, “The Central European Counter-Revolution: Paramilitary Violence in Germany, Austria and Hungary after the Great War,” *Past & Present* 200, no. 1 (2008): 175–209; Kučera, “Exploiting Victory,” 827–55; Ibolya Murber, “A burgenlandi impériumváltás 1918–1924: Kikényszerített identitásképzés és politikai erőszak” [The Imperial Transition in Burgenland, 1918–1924: Coerced Identity Formation and Political Violence], *Múltunk*, no. 2 (2019): 181–214; John Paul Newman, “Post-Imperial and Post-War Violence in the South Slav Lands, 1917–1923,” *Contemporary European History* 19, no. 3 (August 2010): 249–65; Tamás Révész, “Post-war Turmoil and Violence (Hungary),” in *1914-1918-online, International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, ed. Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer, and Bill Nasson, issued by Freie Universität Berlin. Last modified March 9, 2023. On-line. Accessed April 20, 2023. https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/post-war_turmoil_and_violence_hungary.

Shortly after gaining control of these territories, the new authorities launched anti-epidemic campaigns targeting infectious illnesses such as typhus, trachoma, and the STIs.⁹⁸⁷ Enlisting for these campaigns was usually the first step through which veteran doctors started shaping public health policies in these borderlands. The practices and technologies of epidemic control used at the front were applied to these borderlands by veteran physicians, and similar solutions thus appeared nearly simultaneously in different contexts as a result. The technology of “mobile dispensaries” is a case in point. These motorized convoys that facilitated epidemic surveillance, disinfection, and delousing were widely used by the Habsburg military at the Eastern Front, particularly for typhus prevention, and the technology was readily adopted in the borderlands as one of the main tools of epidemic management.⁹⁸⁸ In Transylvania, Iuliu Moldovan, as an expert of the Ruling Council, was instrumental in this process. In December 1919, Moldovan published official guidelines for combating epidemics, including typhus.⁹⁸⁹ The guidelines closely reflected his frontline expertise, as did another measure that the veteran doctor introduced in the same year. The nineteen mobile dispensaries that were introduced carried out health surveillance and anti-epidemic measures such as delousing, along with immunization, testing for syphilis and its treatment, as well as prenatal advice.⁹⁹⁰

Similarly, in 1920, Czechoslovak authorities introduced a unit of motorized dispensaries in Slovakia and in Subcarpathian Ruthenia that focused primarily on epidemic illnesses such as typhus and was equipped for disinfection and delousing.⁹⁹¹ The technology became the centerpiece of the policy of epidemic control in the area.⁹⁹² The project originated with another

⁹⁸⁷ Victoria Schmidt, “The Politics of Surveillance in the Interwar Czechoslovak Periphery: The Role of Campaigns Against Infectious Diseases,” *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 68, no. 1 (2019): 29–56.

⁹⁸⁸ For the centrality of this technology, see Schmidt, “The Politics of Surveillance,” 42.

⁹⁸⁹ Iuliu Moldovan, “Instrucțiuni regulamentare pentru combaterea boalelor contagioase” [Regulatory Instructions for the Control of Contagious Diseases], *Gazeta Oficială*, no. 81 (January 20, 1920): 1–6.

⁹⁹⁰ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 193–94.

⁹⁹¹ Václav Vraný, “Státní epidemická autokolona” [State Epidemic Motorized Dispensary], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 2, no. 11 (November 20, 1920): 265–67.

⁹⁹² Schmidt, “The Politics of Surveillance,” 42. The author, however, uncritically follows the claims of the actors who implemented the measure when she notes that they outright “developed” it.

veteran physician, Václav Vraný, who between 1915 and 1918 served in the Eastern Front at the Austrian General Government of Lublin as an officer in charge of local epidemic control.⁹⁹³ Other parts of the strategy of epidemic control in these borderland areas, then, were from the outset formulated by other veteran doctors, including Bohuslav Albert.⁹⁹⁴ These doctors were then praised by their Czech nationalist colleagues as the “guardians of the state” and as “a medical guard valiantly standing against the contagions that threaten the entire state.”⁹⁹⁵ There is nothing that indicates that the similarity between these two parallel cases was a result of exchanges between these contexts. Indeed, they materialized long before the establishment of the Health Section of the League of Nations in 1921 and before the vivid internationalist exchanges that it facilitated. Tellingly, Marković in Vojvodina also implored the central authorities in Belgrade to provide him with automobiles and the funds necessary to set up a unit of mobile dispensaries in the region.⁹⁹⁶ In Poland, mobile dispensaries were also proposed as a strategy of fighting typhus.⁹⁹⁷ In short, these cases highlight the parallel transfer of biopolitical practices and technologies from the imperial, military context to the borderlands.

In the course of the 1920s, the advocates of eugenics in these borderlands extended their scope from epidemic management and relief initiatives to a broader and more complex range

⁹⁹³ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 134, Inv. No. 5050/1922, Lékařský ředitel hygienické sekce LN, Curriculum vitae Václav Vraný.

⁹⁹⁴ Bohuslav Albert, “Čs. Červený kříž v Podkarpatské Rusi” [Czechoslovak Red Cross in Subcarpathian Ruthenia], *Zprávy Československého Červeného kříže* 1, no. 2 (December 1, 1920): 17–19.

⁹⁹⁵ *Sociálně-lékařský sjezd pořádaný Podkarpatskou (XXXIII) župou Ú.J.Čs.L. ve dnech 4. až 7. června 1922 v Mukačevě* [Social-Medical Congress organized by the Subcarpathian (XXXIII) County of the Czechoslovak Red Cross on June 4–7, 1922, in Mukachevo] (Mukachevo: vlastním nákladem, 1923), 14.

⁹⁹⁶ The request was granted in 1922. Furthermore, it appears that Yugoslavia’s authorities began using similar mobile dispensaries not only in their borderlands but also in wider areas of their territories. Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 85, Health Department of the Ministry of Public Health for Banat, Bačka, and Baranja, Box 1, Decree no. 43397/1922 from December 14, 1922; Stevo Ivanić, *Epidemiologija* [Epidemiology] (Zagreb: Higijenski zavod sa školom narodnog zdravlja, 1926), 60–65.

⁹⁹⁷ However, it should be noted that in this case, other technologies, such as disinfection trains, eventually emerged as equally important. Tomasz Wiktor Janiszewski, *The Plan of Campaign against the Epidemie [sic!] of Typhus in Poland* (Warsaw: Drukarnia Państwowa, 1919), 8; Łukasz Mieszkowski, “Disinfection Trains: Fighting Lice on Polish Railways, 1918–1920,” in *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Fearing for the Nation*, ed. Immo Rebitschek, Barbara Klich-Kluczevska, and Joachim Puttkamer (London: Routledge, 2022), 160–74.

of hygienic and welfare policies. However, these initiatives differed from the eugenically-informed initiatives in large urban areas discussed in the previous section. While the latter were universalist, at least in principle, the former were based on differential treatment of various groups and distinguished between the perceived co-nationals and the ethnic others.

Across all borderland contexts under scrutiny, eugenicists singled out the alleged members of the core groups of the imagined national community. Marković in Vojvodina made precisely this move when he claimed that the Serb peasantry in Vojvodina and the Banat represented “our national core [naša narodna jezgra],” tasked with defending the territory against internal and external enemies.⁹⁹⁸ The eugenicist added, tellingly, that it was imperative that “every one of us knows all his enemies and those who harm his health – whether it is bad passions and habits, whether it is various narcotic poisons, or whether it is various germs of infectious or communicable disease – so that every one of us prepares, as soldiers are preparing in advance, in peaceful times, for a fight which one cannot avoid, for this difficult struggle against the nations which they must or should fight for their life and survival.”⁹⁹⁹ Similarly, Georg Pösch argued that the Burgenland was home to the “German man of the best sort [vom besten Schlag]” who embodied “the only guarantor for the German bulwark on the eastern border.”¹⁰⁰⁰

The eugenicists in Subcarpathian Ruthenia drew on pan-Slavic arguments to cast Czech settler doctors as “stronger brothers” liberating and healing the previously “subjugated” Slavic Rusyns, a task that “will bear rich fruit for the Rusyns, as well as for the Czechoslovak nation.”¹⁰⁰¹ While Czech eugenicists claimed this population for the state-building project,

⁹⁹⁸ Marković, *Postanak i zadaci*, 5.

⁹⁹⁹ Marković, *Postanak i zadaci*, 12.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Georg Pösch, “Gesundheitsdienst im Lande,” *Mitteilungen der Unterabteilung Gesundheitswesen im Ministerium für innere und kulturelle Angelegenheiten* 1, no. 4 (April 1939): 29.

¹⁰⁰¹ Albert, “Čs. Červený kříž,” 17; *Sociálně-lékařský sjezd, pořádaný Podkarpatskou župou Ú.J.Č.L. v Mukačevě [Podkarpatská Rus] ve dnech 4.-7. června 1922 pod protektorátem guvernéra Podkarpatské Rusi dle usnes. valné hromady lékař. župy Ú. J.Č.L. pro Podkarpatskou Rus, dne 2. února 1922* [Social-Medical Congress, organized

however, they elaborated various theories claiming its biological “degeneracy,” and ultimately assigned it a subordinate position within the “racial” order.¹⁰⁰² On the other hand, Romanian eugenicists in Transylvania claimed some of its inhabitants not merely as members of the imagined national community, but went as far as to frame a part of them rather as its “least racially contaminated” core that the isolation of the local mountainous areas preserved in its most archaic form.¹⁰⁰³ Even though the eugenicists in the borderlands differed regarding the particular place they assigned to the local populations in the alleged “racial” hierarchy, they claimed that biology enabled them to single out certain groups as their co-nationals.

What followed were eugenic strategies aimed at affirming the health, physical force, and numerical strength of these core groups. In doing so, the veteran doctors drew on a strategy that they had already promoted in prewar nationalist associations or during the World War I, albeit not always in the same territories. Settlement projects in the borderlands, as a source of the purported security of the state, emerged as one salient strategy of choice. To start with, it was along these lines that Marković in Vojvodina chose to argue. He claimed in 1920 that the “question of our internal colonization” needs to be intertwined with the “demands of race hygiene.”¹⁰⁰⁴ In particular, Yugoslavia should prefer “war veterans and volunteers who represent a defensive element and good selection,” who would guarantee high population growth, producing numerous “healthy and valuable children,” and thus the “main pillars supporting the state.”¹⁰⁰⁵ Jojkić, who was in many ways his successor, wrote an elaborate

by the Subcarpathian County of the Central Union of Czechoslovak Physicians District in Mukachevo, Subcarpathian Ruthenia, from June 4 to June 7, 1922, under the Protectorate of the Governor of Subcarpathian Ruthenia According to the Resolution of the General Assembly of the Medical County on February 2, 1922], [Mukachevo]: Ú.J.Č.L. Župa podkarpatská, 1922, 15.

¹⁰⁰² Victoria Shmidt, “Race Science in Czechoslovakia: Serving Segregation in the Name of the Nation,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 83, no. 101241 (October 2020): 1–13.

¹⁰⁰³ Marius Turda, “The Nation as Object: Race, Blood, and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania,” *Slavic Review* 66, no. 03 (2007): 429.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Laza Marković, “Agrarna reforma i rasna higijena” [Agrarian Reform and Racial Hygiene], *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 7 (March 1920): 298.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Marković, “Agrarna reforma,” 298.

treatise in 1931 deliberating on the strategies of ethnic engineering in the region that took its cues from the radical discourses of German population science and Geopolitik.¹⁰⁰⁶

In Subcarpathian Ruthenia, too, the settlers and their health received much of the eugenicists' attention. While there were several Czech colonization projects in rural areas, however, the doctors focused on the settlers in urban areas, including clerks, military officials, and other middle-class professions.¹⁰⁰⁷ "This infestation [of Subcarpathian Ruthenia] by infectious diseases," wrote one doctor in 1925, "was dangerous for our involved clerks and military men who do not have an inherited partial immunity that the native population [domorodé obyvatelstvo] possesses. Many of our families are mourning the losses they suffered in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. That is why the state administration, since the regime change, did everything to rid the country of the danger of endemic diseases (...)"¹⁰⁰⁸ The rhetoric and priorities of eugenicists in Subcarpathian Ruthenia were thus comparable to the other borderlands; they privileged the claimed co-nationals at the expense of the marginalized populations.¹⁰⁰⁹

Shortly after his arrival to Transylvania, moreover, Iuliu Moldovan embraced a broad definition of the community he claimed would benefit from eugenic policies."¹⁰¹⁰ However, if the community thus defined stretched beyond the boundaries of the Romanian nation, Moldovan after a few years reframed his arguments in more unequivocally nationalist terms.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Vladan Jojkić, *Nacionalizacija Bačke i Banata: Etno-politička studija* [Nationalization of Bačka and Banat: Ethno-Political Study] (Novi Sad: Jovanović i Bogdanov, 1931).

¹⁰⁰⁷ For an example of such settlement, see Josef Kápar, ed., *Svoboda: její vznik a budování: k desátému výročí osídlení legionářů na Podkarpatské Rusi* [Freedom: Its Origins and Development: On the Tenth Anniversary of the Settlement of Legionaries in Subcarpathian Ruthenia] (Prague: Obecně prospěšné stavební a bytové družstvo pro výstavbu kolonií, 1933).

¹⁰⁰⁸ "Bolševický reflex na zdravotnictví v Podkarpatské Rusi" [Bolshevik Impact on Healthcare in Subcarpathian Ruthenia], *Věstník českých lékařů* 37, no. 32 (August 8, 1925): 424.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Interestingly, settling unemployed Czech workers in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, as well as other manifestations of internal colonization, were also a constitutive part of the Czech fascist movement's program, and particularly of their proposed strategy of fighting the Great Depression. Radola Gajda, *Stavovská demokracie národního státu: úvahy o mravní a hmotné stavbě státu* [Corporatist Democracy in a National State: Reflections on the Moral and Material Structure of the State] (Prague: Národní obec fašistická, 1933), passim.

¹⁰¹⁰ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, passim.

By 1925, when Moldovan published his first major eugenic book in Romanian, the reframing had concluded, and the book's title identified "eugenics" with the "hygiene of the nation." While he proposed few concrete strategies to achieve this goal in the book, "the problem of internal colonization [problema colonizării interne]" was one of the eight strategies that Moldovan listed, closely connected to issues of emigration and immigration, whose control was crucial in order to "prevent undesirable mixing of races."¹⁰¹¹

Tellingly, a struggle with child mortality was another issue listed as salient for the "hygiene of the nation" in Moldovan's eponymous 1925 book.¹⁰¹² This strategy was repeated across the borderlands studied here. In Vojvodina, Vladan Jojkić lamented in a dark turn of phrase that "the saddest thing is that a greatly increased mortality rate [...] is affecting primarily our national population [naše nacionalno stanovništvo]."¹⁰¹³ Deploring a much worse overall health situation and a much-elevated child mortality rate among the South Slav population in the region, he complained that among the "minority groups [kod ostalih, manjinskih grupa]" these rates were much lower.¹⁰¹⁴ (Within Jojkić's office, similar arguments had already become commonplace, even before he began voicing them publicly.)¹⁰¹⁵ Similarly, Georg Pösch complained in the early 1930s that "the war destroyed much of the highly valuable hereditary

¹⁰¹¹ Iuliu Moldovan, *Igiena Națiunei: (Eugenia)* [Hygiene of the Nation: Eugenics] (Cluj: Institutul de Igienă și Igienă Socială, 1925), 43.

¹⁰¹² Moldovan, *Igiena Națiunei*, 43.

¹⁰¹³ Vladan Jojkić, "Higijenske prilike i zdravstveni budžet Dunavske Banovine" [Hygienic Conditions and Health Budget of the Danube Banovina], *Dan: nezavisni informativni dnevnik* 5, no. 1 (January 1, 1939): 2–3.

¹⁰¹⁴ Jojkić, "Higijenske prilike," 2–3.

¹⁰¹⁵ A report from 1936, for example, stated in unmistakable terms that "When processing data on infant mortality in the Danube Banovina for the past sixteen years, one particularly concerning fact has been identified, which in itself represents a significant problem for the Banovina. This fact is the high infant mortality rate in certain areas of the former Vojvodina with Yugoslav population [...]. It should be emphasized at the outset that a large number of births currently maintains the population balance, and thus the natural population growth remains constant. However, there is a possibility that under the influence of economic, cultural, and other factors, the birth rate will decline, as the number of marriages contracted is also steadily decreasing. This could make infant mortality a much more serious problem that could threaten our vital strength. To prevent this, intervention by the health authorities is necessary." Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 212, Provincial Institute for Health Protection, Box 29, Higijenski zavod Novi Sad, AJ 1-25, 1928-1941, Inv. No. 1684/1936, "Program rada na suzbijanju smrtnosti odojčadi" [Program of the Work on the Fight against Infant Mortality], January 29, 1936.

material” in Burgenland.¹⁰¹⁶ Therefore, the doctors in the area had to ensure the “survival of our national population [Volkstum]” by “carrying out a highly individualized assessment,” primarily of children.¹⁰¹⁷ In a similarly ominous phrasing as Jojkić, then, Pösch specified elsewhere that “health prevention should never turn into the breeding of inferiors,” and doctors such as himself must “proceed in a truly social manner and select the promising cases from the hopeless ones.”¹⁰¹⁸ In a formulation that was more benign yet also racially inflected, Czech eugenicists in 1920 called for “a wider expansion of the protection of mothers and children” that opened up manifold “tasks in the field of eugenics, so much needed in Subcarpathian Ruthenia.”¹⁰¹⁹

Marginalized groups became a foil against which these eugenicists defined their alleged co-nationals, as well as the policies they designed to benefit them. However, analyzing the intricate processes by which various marginalized groups were racialized in these areas would exceed the scope of this section; for some of these borderlands such analysis is already available elsewhere.¹⁰²⁰ I argue, merely, that there was a strong continuity between the actors and practices involved in these processes and those associated with the biopolitics promoted by the military medical networks during World War I. On the one hand, epidemic management in the borderlands racialized various groups, including Jews and Roma, as pathological carriers. In Transylvania, an emerging network of eugenically oriented physicians around Iuliu Moldovan started promoting various measures targeting the STIs as well as their suspected careers and

¹⁰¹⁶ Georg Pösch, “Volksgesundheit I,” *Burgenländische Lehrerzeitung* 12, no. 9 (September 1933): 39.

¹⁰¹⁷ Pösch, “Volksgesundheit I,” 39.

¹⁰¹⁸ Maria Mundprecht, “Mustergesundheitsfürsorge im Burgenlande,” *Der Freie Burgenländer: Unabhängige deutsche Zeitung für das Burgenland* 10, no. 468 (June 22, 1930): 3.

¹⁰¹⁹ Albert, “Čs. Červený kříž,” 17–19.

¹⁰²⁰ Pavel Baloun, “Československá civilizační mise: asimilační praktiky vůči ‘cikánským’ dětem v letech 1918–1942” [Czechoslovak Civilizing Mission: Assimilation Practices Toward ‘Gypsy’ Children in the Years 1918–1942], *Dějiny – teorie – kritika*, no. 2 (2018): 175–202; Filip Herza, “Colonial Czechoslovakia? Overseas and Internal Colonization in The Interwar Czechoslovak Republic,” *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* (2022); Schmidt, *The Politics of Disability*; Florian Freund, “Der polizeilich-administrative Zigeunerbegriff: Ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Begriffes „Zigeuner“,” *Zeitgeschichte* 30, no. 2 (2003): 76–90.

even produced a draft law regulating sex work shortly after Moldovan became a member of the de-facto regional government.¹⁰²¹ They continued to assign much importance to introducing various policies against the STIs throughout the 1920s and the 1930s.¹⁰²² Crucially, as Maria Bucur puts it, “Hungarian prostitutes in Transylvania were viewed [by these doctors], by definition, as a eugenic threat to Romanian men, while Romanian prostitutes were considered only potentially dysgenic, if they actually transmitted venereal diseases to their clients.”¹⁰²³ This racialization of disease, as well as the practices to which these women had been subjected, clearly reveal the extent to what Moldovan’s wartime military experience continued to matter.

Shortly after their arrival in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, eugenically oriented Czech physicians organized a conference on social medicine that promoted their vision of regeneration to local administrators, as well as to their colleagues from the historical lands who attended in a large number. The program of the conference which gathered at the hotel *Csillag* in Mukachevo/Mukačevo/Munkács in June 1922 covered a broad spectrum of issues linked to the perceived civilizing mission of the new authorities, and some of the presentations highlighted the extent to which disease had been racialized by the local medical and administrative actors. For instance, one speaker merged the stereotypes about the Roma people that were widespread among the local administrators with the more recent notion that racialized them as disease carriers. The speaker claimed that “Gypsies have no income, they travel to the west[ern parts of Czechoslovakia], they are a veritable plague [metla] of the countryside and cities: they steal, murder, spread infectious diseases, they accept various suspicious non-Gypsy individuals, they torment the authorities who do not know how to deal with them, they fill prisons and threaten

¹⁰²¹ Maria Bucur, “Fallen Women and Necessary Evils: Eugenic Representations of Prostitution in Interwar Romania,” in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 337.

¹⁰²² These policies elicited significant local resistance that ironically also drew on Habsburg imperial legacies. Bokor, *Testtörténetek*, passim.

¹⁰²³ Bucur, “Fallen Women,” 349.

public safety.”¹⁰²⁴ Meanwhile in Burgenland, an ophthalmologist tasked with the fight against the trachoma claimed that “it was absolutely striking that only the villages inhabited by the Slovaks are infested with disease” and linked this observation with the concerns raised by the neighboring parts of Austria about the alleged spread of the infection through the movement of Burgenland’s infected inhabitants.¹⁰²⁵ The same infection also caused concern among physicians in the public health administration in Vojvodina, as they became convinced that it was “mostly found among the Slavs,” while it “very rarely” affected ethnic Germans.¹⁰²⁶ While the arguments and practices which racialized disease were by no means limited to these borderlands of post-Habsburg countries, they did serve as a hothouse and testing ground for them.

These borderlands also became focal points for racial research. In the early 1930s, race scientist Hella Pösch conducted anthropological research on the members of the local Jewish community in Burgenland. Her work, which she framed as “race science [Rassenkunde] of Jews,” displayed a clear imprint of Nazi racial ideology.¹⁰²⁷ The Austrian physical anthropologist Viktor Lebzelter also measured the bodies of various subjects in Burgenland, but with the intention of using his results to challenge Nazi racial theories.¹⁰²⁸ Romanian

¹⁰²⁴ Karel Adam, “Zpráva k návrhu organisace výchovy cikánské mládeže” [Report on the Proposal for the Organization of Education for Romani Youth], in *Sociálně-lékařský sjezd pořádaný Podkarpatskou (XXXIII) župou Ú. J. Čs. L. ve dnech 4. až 7. června 1922 v Mukačevě* [Social-Medical Congress organized by the Subcarpathian (XXXIII) County of the Czechoslovak Red Cross on June 4-7, 1922, in Mukachevo] (Mukachevo: Ú.J.Č.L. Župa podkarpatská, 1923), 48–49. Cited in Baloun, “Československá civilizační,” 183.

¹⁰²⁵ United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section, Registry files (1919-1927), Health, Trachoma, Inv. No. R917/12B/47653/31706, Trachoma enquiry: File concerning Austria, 498.

¹⁰²⁶ Interestingly, the head of the trachoma department of the regional administration not only authored a report on the issue for the 1938 volume of the *Klinische Monatsblätter für Augenheilkunde*, published in Nazi Germany, but also conducted a related research trip to a colonial setting, namely French Tunisia. Archives of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, Fund 212, Provincial Institute for Health Protection, Box 29, Higijenski zavod Novi Sad, AJ 1-25, 1928-1941, “Godišnji izveštaj Higijenskog zavoda u Novom Sadu i podređenih mu ustanova za 1938 godinu” [Annual Report of the Institute of Hygiene in Novi Sad and Its Subordinate Institutions for the Year 1938].

¹⁰²⁷ Sabrina Rogahn, *Rassismus popularisieren: Hans F. K. Günthers »Rassenkunden« in der Rezensionsliteratur 1922–1942* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2022), 783.

¹⁰²⁸ Lebzelter, who was loyal to Austria’s ruling Fatherland Front, had the backing of the local administration in Burgenland for his research. See “Anthropologische Aufnahme der Bevölkerung des Burgenlandes,” *Landesamtsblatt für das Burgenland* 15, no. 27 (April 7, 1935): 307.

doctors in Transylvania employed anthropometric and serological techniques to conduct racial research on various groups living in the borderland, as documented by Marius Turda.¹⁰²⁹ In Subcarpathian Ruthenia, anthropologist Vojtěch Suk conducted anthropometric and serological measurements on the local Hutsul people, Rusyns, and German speakers during the 1920s and 1930s.¹⁰³⁰ Suk's other research also extended to both the Roma and Jewish communities in the area.¹⁰³¹ Although Jindřich Matiegka, Suk's teacher and later adversary, did not conduct research in the area himself, he also explored various methods to obtain anthropometric data about the local Hutsuls, Rusyns, and other groups.¹⁰³² There was thus a partial overlap between the individuals involved in this research and those who conducted anthropological research on prisoners of war during wartime, as well as some degree of continuity in their methods and objectives.

To sum up, biopolitics in all these borderlands shared a common genealogy, pursued similar objectives, employed comparable strategies, and utilized similar technologies. Despite the fact that the eugenicists driving this biopolitical agenda ostensibly adhered to different political ideologies – ranging from social democracy in Czechoslovakia and agrarianism in Romania to national socialism in Austria – there were noticeable parallels between the discourses and practices implemented on the ground.

¹⁰²⁹ Turda, "The Nation as Object," 32–46.

¹⁰³⁰ Vojtěch Suk, "Příspěvky k anthropologii podkarpatských Huculů" [Contributions to the Anthropology of Subcarpathian Hutsuls], *Národopisný věstník československý* 15, no. 1 (1922): 32–43; Vojtěch Suk, *Anthropologie Podkarpatské Rusi s některými poznámkami o lidských plemenech vůbec a metodách anthropologických* [Anthropology of Subcarpathian Ruthenia with Some Notes on Human Races in General and Anthropological Methods] (Brno: Přírodovědecká fakulta, 1932); Vojtěch Suk, "Příspěvky ke studiu skupin krevních v Československu" [Contributions to the Study of Blood Groups in Czechoslovakia], *Biologické listy* 17, no. 1 (1932): 13–20.

¹⁰³¹ F. J. Havelka, "Egy prágai egyetemi tanár a ruszinszkói zsidókérdésről" [A Prague University Professor on the Jewish Question in Ruthenia], *Uj Közlöny* 48, no. 58 (March 12, 1926), 1; Shmidt, "The Politics of Surveillance," *passim*.

¹⁰³² For instance, Matiegka closely cooperated with local teachers who conducted amateur racial research on schoolchildren in some parts of Subcarpathian Ruthenia. For an initial outline of their research, see Mykola Chrapko and Adolf Bartoš, *Obsleduvannya shkôl'nych detej v Sevljushskom okruzi na Pôdkarpats'kôj Rusi* [Examination of School Children in the Syvlyush District in Subcarpathian Rus] (Syvlyush: [sine], 1934).

As the cooperation between the eugenically oriented doctors and the local civil servants strengthened during the 1920s, racial and eugenic tropes entered the language of the administrators responsible for public health and social issues in these borderlands. By the end of that decade, for instance, documents produced by the authorities in Subcarpathian Ruthenia featured tropes about “degeneration” and “ethnic pathology.”¹⁰³³ They attributed a “large degree of malnourishment” and alleged “racial regression,” to the “low level of cultural development” of the local population.¹⁰³⁴ The administration, then, praised its own work for the supposed “better good of a poor and largely degenerate people.”¹⁰³⁵ If it is true, as Debora Coen shows, that the Habsburg imperial administration made “the territory and its population legible” by “bringing imperial diversity into sharper focus,” the new administrators of these borderlands after 1918 broke with this tradition.¹⁰³⁶ Even though many of them had experience working in the old imperial administration, they no longer documented the internal diversity of these areas but instead sought to make them legible, with the assistance of eugenically influenced medical doctors and other experts. These borderlands were thus a crucial context where post-Habsburg eugenicists and administrators learned to see like a nation state.

Forging the Post-Imperial Peasant: Eugenics in the Rural Spaces Between Modernism and Anti-Modernism

Rural areas covered an overwhelming part of the territories of the post-Habsburg states. In the interwar period, these vast spaces became an arena in which various eugenic projects

¹⁰³³ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 416, Inv. No. 2973/1927, Civilní správa Podkarpatské Rusi, zdravotní referát, Report, Poradny pro sociální choroby: státní podpora na r. 1927, January 28, 1927.

¹⁰³⁴ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 416, Inv. No. 101.644/III/1928, Zemský úřad v Užhorodě, Report, Poradna pro sociální nemoci v Nižních Verečkách – zřízení, November 7, 1928.

¹⁰³⁵ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 416, Inv. No. 101.644/III/1928, Zemský úřad v Užhorodě, Report, Poradna pro sociální nemoci v Nižních Verečkách – zřízení, November 7, 1928.

¹⁰³⁶ Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 9.

competed. In all cases, however, these eugenic projects aimed at making a new rural subject.¹⁰³⁷ These discourses in East Central Europe were a part of a transnational trend that in the interwar period made the eugenicists view the rural population as the primary repository of national strength, and as a resource for projects of collective regeneration. Marius Turda fittingly calls this transnational trope “eugenic pastoralism.”¹⁰³⁸ What made post-Habsburg Central Europe specific, however, was the post-imperial context. Indeed, I argue that in this part of the world these discourses about the rural spaces tended to posit a fundamental break between the empire and the nation-states and to identify the imperial legacies as a burden that needed to be shed away. The discourses about rural regeneration in this part of interwar East Central Europe were thus about a regeneration from an imperial past, and the new subject was a specifically post-imperial subject. Ironically, however, the eugenic knowledge that informed these projects was also an imperial legacy.

As Kiran Klaus Patel points out, “the interwar years were a period of rapid change in the rural world, with new forms, sites and intensities of governance” that notably included new “social and technological forms of engineering the rural.”¹⁰³⁹ That was true also in post-Habsburg Central Europe where various actors – including, but not limited to, experts, state administrators, educators, and peasants themselves – negotiated projects that aimed to regenerate “the rural world as a hybrid social and natural environment.”¹⁰⁴⁰ In states such as Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Romania various initiatives

¹⁰³⁷ On the “making of subjects,” see Laura Cremonesi, Orazio Irrera, Daniele Lorenzini, and Martina Tazzioli, eds., *Foucault and the Making of Subjects* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016).

¹⁰³⁸ Marius Turda, “Minorities and Eugenic Subcultures in East-Central Europe,” *Acta Historiae Medicinae, Stomatologiae, Pharmaciae, Medicinae Veterinariae* 34, no. 1 (November 2015): 11.

¹⁰³⁹ Kiran Klaus Patel, “The Green Heart of Governance: Rural Europe during the Interwar Years in a Global Perspective,” in *Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe*, ed. Liesbeth van de Grift and Amalia Ribi Forclaz (London: Routledge, 2018), 2.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Liesbeth van de Grift and Amalia Ribi Forclaz, “Preface,” in *Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe*, ed. Liesbeth van de Grift and Amalia Ribi Forclaz (London: Routledge, 2018), xi.

emerged that aimed to mold a new rural world and the new peasant.¹⁰⁴¹ Significantly, Philippa Levine and Alison Bashford emphasize that the emerging eugenic discourses approached the population in at least three forms – as a citizenry, as a labor force, and as the generator of future fitness.¹⁰⁴² It is crucial to keep in mind, therefore, that in the debates that took place in the interwar period, the peasants and their environment were addressed from all these perspectives, but within the same biosocial framework. These seemingly disparate issues thus must be historicized together. This section proposes and explores a concept of “strategies of rural regeneration” that may help to analyze and to compare these discussions. With populational concerns in mind, these strategies aimed at rejuvenating the rural world, both as a social and natural reality.

I suggest distinguishing four ideal-typical strategies of rural regeneration (see table 1). These strategies were based on fundamentally different epistemic and political assumptions about the plasticity of human nature and about modernity.¹⁰⁴³ Employing eugenic metaphors, moreover, these strategies identified four distinct causes of “degeneration,” ranging from urban modernity to a lack of opportunities. Importantly, while these causes were distinct, they all pointed towards the imperial past that allegedly made them possible. Finally, these strategies envisaged four different intended outcomes of rural regeneration.

First, what can be described as the neo-traditionalist strategy identified the root cause of the decline in the influence of urban modernity and, consequently, sought to regenerate the peasants by immunizing and shielding them from its purportedly corruptive influences. Second, what I call a strategy of rural development aimed at radically remaking the backward rural environment, thus creating a modern peasant as well as an organic form of rural modernity.

¹⁰⁴¹ See Raluca Mușat, “‘To Cure, Uplift and Ennoble the Village’: Militant Sociology in the Romanian Countryside, 1934–1938,” *East European Politics and Societies* 27, no. 3 (August 2013): 353–75.

¹⁰⁴² Levine and Bashford, “Introduction,” 4.

¹⁰⁴³ My typology is inspired by Meloni, *Political Biology*, 93–135.

Third, a strategy of purification blamed the influence of external entities – be they “racial poisons,” such as alcohol, parasites, or “alien” genes –, and pointed to various forms of cleansing as a way of uncovering the hidden, timeless authenticity of the peasants and of the rural world. Fourth, a strategy of urbanization identified the lack of opportunities typical for the rural areas as the key source of problems of the rural world and sought to expand the urban infrastructure and ways of life into the rural spaces.

Table 1: Four Strategies of Rural Regeneration

	Strategy	Human nature	Modernity	Cause of “Degeneration”	Intended outcome
1	<i>Neo-traditionalism</i>	<i>Plastic</i>	<i>Anti-modernism</i>	<i>Urban modernity</i>	<i>Invented tradition</i>
2	<i>Rural development</i>	<i>Plastic</i>	<i>Modernism</i>	<i>“Backward” environment</i>	<i>Rural modernity</i>
3	<i>Purification</i>	<i>Fixed</i>	<i>Anti-modernism</i>	<i>External entities</i>	<i>“Archaic” countryside</i>
4	<i>Urbanization</i>	<i>Fixed</i>	<i>Modernism</i>	<i>Lack of opportunities</i>	<i>Urbs in rure</i>

Numerous projects took place in post-Habsburg Central Europe that pursued a strategy of rural regeneration, with vastly varying degrees of state involvement, scope, and coercion. Their integrative history remains to be written. In what follows, the four ideal-typical strategies of rural regeneration, their diverging theoretical underpinnings and intended outcomes, are illuminated through a comparative study of only one such project, namely the rural health demonstration areas. The health demonstration areas were a model institution that circulated globally during the interwar period. While they were first experimented within the United States of America “to determine the cost of an adequate program and the feasibility of community support,” they soon expanded to South America, Southeast Asia, and Europe.¹⁰⁴⁴ Their

¹⁰⁴⁴ Lion Murard, “Designs within Disorder: International Conferences on Rural Health Care and the Art of the Local, 1931–39,” in *Shifting Boundaries of Public Health: Europe in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Susan Gross Solomon, Lion Murard, and Patrick Zylberman (Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), 142.

proliferation was facilitated by powerful transnational actors, including the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) and the League of Nations Health Organization.

In the European context, the rural health demonstration areas mushroomed in the post-imperial East Central Europe but arose also beyond it, for instance in Spain and in the Irish Free State.¹⁰⁴⁵ I will focus here primarily on four health demonstration areas that were among the earliest to emerge in post-Habsburg states: 1) in Gödöllő, a summer resort town and its adjacent rural surroundings in Hungary, 2) in the village of Mraclin near Zagreb in Yugoslavia, 3) in the rural district of Gilău near Cluj in Romania, and 4) in Vršovice, a rapidly developing suburban district of Prague, Czechoslovakia. These projects were set up as a result of cooperation of international actors, primarily the RF, with local medical experts, various state bodies, the provincial or community self-government, and in some cases involved also local voluntary associations.

There were many shared incentives that led the local actors – both medical experts and administrators – to earmark these places for health demonstration areas. Importantly, the funding from the RF came hand in hand with a consistent set of requirements, out of which two stand out.¹⁰⁴⁶ First, the RF encouraged medical experts to select a site that was easily accessible, as the health demonstration areas were also used for training of medical professionals. Second, the RF incentivized the medical experts to choose locations they regarded as representative of their country's social and ethnic structure. Consequently, all four locations that will be discussed here were thus adjacent to a large urban area, three (Gödöllő, Mraclin, Vršovice) were connected to a railroad, and two (Gödöllő, Vršovice) could even be reached by the metropolitan

¹⁰⁴⁵ Murard, "Designs within Disorder, 142.

¹⁰⁴⁶ These requirements are highlighted in Ivo Pirc, *Asanacija Lukovice: Spomenica ob otvoritvi zdravstvenskega doma v Lukovici* [Sanitation of Lukovica: Commemoration of the Opening of the Health Center in Lukovica] (Ljubljana: Državni higijski zavod, 1926).

public transport network.¹⁰⁴⁷ Not only did the medical experts respond to identical requirements and similar incentives, moreover, but they were also acutely aware of each other's work. They visited each other's health demonstration areas, exchanged information, and used these experiences to promote parallel solutions in their local contexts.¹⁰⁴⁸ Since the four health demonstration areas cited above drew on the same transnational model, responded to the same requirements, and were implemented by experts who closely followed each other's projects, the differences between them are all the more significant. These differences reflect these experts' divergent epistemic and political assumptions that ultimately led them to pursue fundamentally different strategies of rural regeneration.

As an example of a neo-traditionalist strategy of rural regeneration, consider the town of Gödöllő where the first rural health demonstration area in Hungary was inaugurated in 1927. The medical doctors involved in the project assumed that human nature was plastic, and that it was shaped by its environment. Their leader Béla Johan, for instance, emphasized that “human health depends to a large extent on one's environment. By the environment I mean other humans, but also the house, the room in which one lives, one's workshop, office, school, [...], air [...], water, [and] food [...]”¹⁰⁴⁹ To Johan and his colleagues, however, this fact provided

¹⁰⁴⁷ Aside from the requirements of the RF, national political actors also influenced the choice of the location of the health demonstration areas. It was perhaps not an accident that the Vršovice district housed the landed estate of the leader of the Czechoslovak Agrarian Party, Antonín Švehla, and that Gödöllő served as a summer residence to Miklós Horthy. Mraclin and Gilău, in turn, were locally known for their staunch support of, respectively, the Croatian and Romanian agrarian parties.

¹⁰⁴⁸ See, for instance, Béla Johan, “Az orvos és a modern közegészségügy: Jugoszlávia egészségügyi szervezete” [The Doctor and Modern Public Health: The Healthcare Organization of Yugoslavia], *Orvosi Hetilap* 69, no. 11 (March 15, 1925): 224–28; Sabin Manuilă, “Specializarea în Sănătatea publică și Fondatiunea Rockefeller” [Specialization in Public Health and the Rockefeller Foundation], *Adevărul* 45, no. 14773 (February 29, 1932): 1–2; Hynek Pelc, “Otevření zdravotních ústavů a školní hygieny v Budapešti a Záhřebě” [Opening of Health Institutions and School Hygiene in Budapest and Zagreb], *Praktický lékař* 7, no. 21 (May 11, 1927): 792–95; Andrija Štampar, “Rockefellerova fondacija” [Rockefeller Foundation], *Politika* 25, no. 7365 (October 31, 1928): 8.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Béla Johan, “A modern közegészségügy célja, eszközei, eredményei” [The Purpose, Means, and Results of Modern Public Health], *Népegészségügy* 9, no. 10 (May 15, 1928): 610. On Johan, see László Kiss, “Egészség és politika – az egészségügyi prevenció Magyarországon a 20. század első felében” [Health and Politics – Healthcare Prevention in Hungary in the First Half of the 20th Century], *Korall* 4, no. 17 (2004): 107–37.

few reasons for optimism. Indeed, these doctors embraced eugenics and claimed that an unhealthy environment may harm not only individual bodies, but also the future generations.

Even though they identified multiple environmental causes of such “degeneration”, they were nevertheless inclined to locate its main source in modern culture, as epitomized by the city. Employing anti-modernist tropes contrasting the corrupt city to a healthier countryside, the doctors László Kontra and Tibor Bielek thus stressed that “the spread of civilization (...) poses many a danger to human health. Urbanization, the development of industry, compulsory school attendance, and the rush of modern life makes the protection of health into a primary goal of every cultural state.”¹⁰⁵⁰ In line with the official national conservative ideology of interwar Hungary, they regarded the spread of the allegedly corruptive urban culture as an unwelcome legacy of prewar liberal, imperial Hungary.

Even though they admitted that the rural areas were not pristine, these doctors hesitated to significantly change their natural and social environment. While claiming that such a change would not happen “for long decades or even centuries to come,” Johan rather called for interventions that “protect health, isolate the human organism from impending threats, and make it strong and resistant,” mainly through newly introduced healthy habits.¹⁰⁵¹ In this neo-traditionalist framework, therefore, the rural world and its inhabitants were to be insulated against the perceived sources of toxicity and strengthened through various invented traditions.

Let us turn to a second case, the village of Mraclin in Yugoslavia where a health demonstration area was launched at exactly the same time as in Gödöllő. Yet, the strategy of rural regeneration pursued there differed significantly. While the medical doctors in Mraclin shared the assumption that human nature was plastic and that it could be molded by the

¹⁰⁵⁰ Kontra was one of the medical administrators involved in the Gödöllő project. László Kontra and Tibor Bielek, *A falu egészségvédelme* [Health Protection in the Village] (Pécs: Dunántúl, 1934), 4.

¹⁰⁵¹ Johan, *A modern*, 608; Kontra and Bielek, *A falu*, 4.

environment, they linked it with more pronouncedly modernist beliefs. Health risks did not emanate from urban modernity, they argued, but rather from the heavy burden of tradition. As Andrija Štampar, the leading figure of this group of medical experts, put it in his speech to Mraclin's inhabitants in the spring of 1927: "[...] a country in the heart of Europe cannot be allowed to die of backwardness."¹⁰⁵²

It was often strongly implied that the legacy of imperial Hungary was to blame. In this case, however, its claimed legacy was the perceived lack of modern development. Unlike the doctors at Gödöllő, moreover, Štampar and his colleagues believed that a fundamental change of the environment was not merely possible, but also that such a change had the power to regenerate the peasants and transform them into modern rural subjects. It is little wonder, therefore, that they immediately embarked on a project that massively remodeled the environment of Mraclin, and ultimately added nearly 250 new constructions to that particular rural community. Importantly, the remodeling of the environment was accompanied by a series of other social and even veterinary interventions.¹⁰⁵³ Ultimately, the medical doctors, veterinarians, agricultural experts and engineers who accompanied Štampar believed that such a strategy of rural development would inaugurate an organic form of rural modernity.

Not all medical experts subscribing to eugenics were ready to embrace an ontology of human body that stressed its malleability, particularly at a historical juncture when Mendelism was gaining prominence, stipulating that the hereditary facts about organisms' nature were fully insulated from the environment. A case in point is the strategy of rural regeneration pursued by the medical experts in Gilău, Romania, where a health demonstration area was launched in

¹⁰⁵² Štampar's speech is reported by a village chronicler cited in Željko Cvetnić and Željko Dugac, *Selo Mraclin i Andrija Štampar – susret lokalnog i globalnog* [The Village of Mraclin and Andrija Štampar – the Meeting of Local and Global] (Mraclin: HAZU, 2018), 15. For a programmatic text by Štampar for an urban liberal audience, see "Naša ideologija" [Our Ideology], *Nova Evropa* 18, no. 8 (October 1928): 229–31.

¹⁰⁵³ Popular health education featured prominently among these attempts. See Željko Dugac, *Protiv bolesti i neznanja: Rockefellerova fondacija u međuratnoj Jugoslaviji* [Against Disease and Ignorance: The Rockefeller Foundation in Interwar Yugoslavia] (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2005).

1931. These medical doctors – in most cases trained by Iuliu Moldovan – repudiated both the notion of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, as well as modernism. The peasantry, in their anti-modernist framework, was a repository of national authenticity, vital power, and health. Since human nature was not plastic, moreover, these medical doctors believed that this repository was virtually timeless.¹⁰⁵⁴ Engineering the environment, in other words, could not alter much about this timeless nature, and was, consequently, de-prioritized. Reviewing the results of the first five years of their work at Gilău, the doctors Mihai Zolog and Ioan Prodan admitted that “our results (...) turned out to be rather far from a radical change of the district’s sanitary environment. Yet we never aimed to achieve the whole thing, nor could we.”¹⁰⁵⁵

There was a risk to the allegedly timeless biological qualities of the countryside, however, that these doctors identified in external entities – mainly some bacteria, alcohol, and “alien” genes – that had the ability to enter human organism and alter it. The activity of the demonstration area thus foregrounded, among others, the testing and treating of syphilis.¹⁰⁵⁶ As in the previous case, the Hungarian imperial legacy that increased the exchanges of the rural areas with the near urban centers, as well as the impact of the First World War, was made responsible for these ills.¹⁰⁵⁷ In the eugenic arguments of these medical doctors, these external entities emerged as vital threats corrupting the pristine nature of the peasant. What was needed, then, was a strategy of purification that brutally removed all external entities and uncovered underneath a timeless, archaic nature of the peasant and his world.¹⁰⁵⁸

¹⁰⁵⁴ The best overview of racial debates related to the rural areas in Romania remains Turda, “The Nation,” 413–41.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Mihai Zolog and Ioan Prodan, “Plasa sanitară model Gilău. Raport de activitate pe anii 1931-1936” [Gilău Model Sanitary District. Activity Report for the Years 1931-1936], *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 8, no. 1–3 (January 1937): 32.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Mihai Zolog, Ioan Cosma, and Ioan Prodan, “Activitatea Plasei sanitare model Gilău pe anii 1931-1933” [Activity of the Gilău Model Sanitary District for the Years 1931-1933], *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 5, no. 1–6 (January 1934): 22.

¹⁰⁵⁷ The debates about syphilis are analyzed in detail in Bokor, *Testtörténetek*, passim.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Significantly, the local health demonstration area included not only villages in the proximity of the urban area of Cluj, but also a portion of the villages located in the northwestern part of the Munții Apuseni mountain range. Zolog, Cosma, and Prodan, “Activitatea Plasei,” 11.

The fourth strategy of rural regeneration shared the assumption that human nature is fixed but linked it with a distinctly modernist worldview. Ultimately, as the case of the district of Vršovice in Czechoslovakia makes clear, it led to an embrace of urbanization as a way of modernizing rural areas. Even though Vršovice, the center of a health demonstration area established in 1927, was a rapidly developing suburb of Prague, the broader district included communities with a more pronouncedly rural character.¹⁰⁵⁹

The key experts behind the project, Prague's chief municipal physician Ladislav Procházka and the advocate of social medicine Hynek Pelc, observed that the provision of healthcare in these communities was fragmented between various charities that often failed to coordinate their work. This fragmentation was interpreted by these doctors as a result of the long lack of access of Czech nationalists to state institutions in the imperial Austria and seen as a major obstacle to an efficient and modern public health administration, together with the persisting legacies of the old division of the city's area into particular administrative units, for which they again blamed the imperial past.¹⁰⁶⁰ Overall, these experts viewed the unwieldiness of the health administration as a significant contributor to healthcare challenges in these communities, comparable in strength to other factors such as the unhygienic environment in these areas. Taken together, they were seen as obstacles to a full-fledged, healthy, and "natural" development of their inhabitants.

In effect, these medical experts primarily aimed to coordinate the various health-related associations that had already worked within the district. They also expanded or newly created

¹⁰⁵⁹ Hana Mášová, "Social Hygiene and Social Medicine in Interwar Czechoslovakia with the 13th District of the City of Prague as Its Laboratory," *Hygiea Internationalis* 6, no. 2 (2007): 53–68.

¹⁰⁶⁰ The city of Prague was unified with its suburbs only after 1918. However, Jiří Pešek documents that the unification had previously been thwarted by the failure of the local elites to negotiate a compromise about common policies. Jiří Pešek, *Od aglomerace k velkoměstu: Praha a středoevropské metropole, 1850-1920* [From Agglomeration to Metropolis: Prague and Central European Metropolises, 1850-1920] (Prague: Scriptorium, 1999).

various bodies providing health advice or popularizing medicine.¹⁰⁶¹ Eugenics was a part and parcel of these bodies' agenda, featuring most pronouncedly in the establishment of vocational guidance clinics, an anti-alcoholic clinic, and even a specialized eugenic clinic that offered voluntary premarital examinations and marriage counseling.¹⁰⁶² Conversely, these physicians chose not to embrace a program that would alter the natural and social environment of the area in a deliberate manner. Assuming that these changes would inevitably take place during the ongoing real estate development of the area, they neither made any ambitious attempts to direct them, nor did they seem concerned about their potential impact on the remaining rural features of the area.

Even though the more senior physician, Procházka, occasionally invoked human plasticity, the doctor who was more directly involved in the project, Pelc, was quite skeptical of the claims about the ability of the environment to change human nature, particularly across generations.¹⁰⁶³ Their strategy – aiming to influence individual choices, rather than the environment in which they were taking place – revealed a tacit concession that human nature was largely fixed. The goal for these modernist doctors, then, was to remove the constraints that hindered the actualization of the inborn potential that was hiding in human nature. In their final analysis, they perceived the rural environment as one of these constraints, and urbanization

¹⁰⁶¹ Hynek Pelc, *Zdravotní a sociální přehled XIII. okresu velké Prahy: za účelem organisování vzorové práce zdravotní a sociální v tomto okrese* [Health and Social Overview of the 13th District of Greater Prague: For the Purpose of Organizing Exemplary Health and Social Work in this District] (Prague: Nákladem vlastním, 1927).

¹⁰⁶² United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section, Registry files (1928-1932), Health – General, Bacteriology - Public Health Activities, Health Centres, etc., Inv. No. R5888/8A/14827/5241, Public Health Activities Health Center, etc. – Czechoslovakia, A report on the work of the Health Centres in Czechoslovakia, 7.

¹⁰⁶³ Hynek Pelc, “O možnostech zdokonaliti lidský rod úpravou životního prostředí cestou sociálního lékařství” [On the Possibilities of Improving the Human Race through Environmental Modification via Social Medicine], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 89–101. Despite the title, Pelc argued that there were no such possibilities. When Pelc newly expressed support for neo-Lamarckism in his 1937 textbook of social medicine, therefore, it marked a departure from his previous views. This belated shift was driven more by his positioning within the local scientific field than by his actual practice. Hynek Pelc, *Sociální lékařství* [Social Medicine] (Prague: Melantrich, 1937).

of the area as the solution. Extending the city and its way of life into the countryside thus became the key tenet of their strategy of rural regeneration.

While these strategies for rural regeneration aimed to revitalize the countryside by addressing the perceived legacies of its imperial past, the actors, discourses, and practices that informed them were themselves a legacy of empire. On one hand, the modernist projects of rural regeneration were spearheaded by the reformist eugenicists who had previously established close relationships with the voluntary associations and the civil administration in the late Habsburg Empire, particularly during the war. On the other hand, the anti-modernist projects were linked to eugenicists who had previously been a part of the Habsburg military medical networks. For example, the Hungarian eugenically-oriented social hygienists, whose names I mentioned above, were all veterans of military medical networks. While Béla Johan worked at a military bacteriological laboratory, László Kontra and Tibor Bielek were deployed in the field.¹⁰⁶⁴ The local driving force behind the main rural health demonstration area in Romania was none other than Iuliu Moldovan, whose Habsburg military medical past we had the opportunity to follow in detail. This link was present in both cases discussed here, therefore, but it was not limited to them. In interwar Austria, there were two major health demonstration areas: one in Hartberg in Styria, and the other in the Eisenstadt district in Burgenland.¹⁰⁶⁵ The agenda of the latter was formulated by the veteran medical doctor Georg Pösch, for whom it became a crucial institution that enabled him to pursue an anti-modernist and nationalist eugenic project in this borderland region.¹⁰⁶⁶ The connection between the Habsburg military

¹⁰⁶⁴ Zoltán Alföldy, “Johan Béla (1889-1983)” [Béla Johan, 1889-1983], *Orvosi Hetilap* 124, no. 28 (July 10, 1983): 1699; “Egészségügyi tisztek kinevezése” [Appointment of Health Officers], *Pécsi Napló* 26, no. 136 (June 20, 1917): 5; Sándor Paulovits, ed., *Harmincas honvédek élete a halálmezőkön* [The Lives of the Soldiers of the Thirties on the Fields of Death] (Kecskemét: sine, 1939), 309.

¹⁰⁶⁵ René Sand, “Health Centres in Europe,” *League of Red Cross Societies Monthly Bulletin* 16, no. 12 (December 1935): 219–21.

¹⁰⁶⁶ See above.

medical doctors and the interwar anti-modernist strategies of rural regeneration can thus be discerned across many post-Habsburg spaces.

As the cases of the health demonstration areas in Transylvania and Burgenland suggest, these institutions pursuing strategies of rural regeneration were in some cases located in borderland areas. In these cases, the colonial tropes of the civilizing mission entered the vocabulary of the eugenicists who were involved in these projects. For example, a young Yugoslav hygienist Drago Chloupek who was in charge of a health center in Miloševo near Pristina in post-Ottoman Kosovo echoed similar tropes in a 1928 report to his hygienist colleagues. In his report, Chloupek contrasted the culture of the settlers in the area who recently came from Serbia and other parts of Yugoslavia with the villages of the local Albanian speakers. While the former were allegedly “relatively progressive in every aspect, with a better style of life,” the other exhibited “the influence of the past foreign yoke and the impact of a violent rule of a conservative and primitive Asiatic people.”¹⁰⁶⁷ According to Chloupek, the pursuit of rural regeneration then constituted “a materialization of a revolution of an irrational and unhygienic village life, a powerful impulse in the decrepit organism of our village, and an activator of latent national energies of our village population.”¹⁰⁶⁸ In these borderlands, strategies of rural regeneration became a part of the discourse of civilizing mission.

Similar arguments were advanced in Czechoslovakia by Stanislav Vomela, the leading physician behind the health demonstration area that was set up in 1927 in the town of Holešov in Moravian Wallachia.¹⁰⁶⁹ Even though the region was located in the historic lands, Vomela framed his research and proposed health intervention as a part and parcel of the Czechoslovak

¹⁰⁶⁷ United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section, Registry files (1928-1932), Health - International Liaison, International Liaison, 1928 - Rural Hygiene Interchange, Inv. No. R5938/8B/6477/261, Rural Hygiene Interchange, 1928 - Conferences given to participants, Assanation des Dorfes am Kossovo. Vortrag vom 6. Juni in Miloševo bei Priština (Jugoslawien).

¹⁰⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Cf. my interpretation with Shmidt, “Public Health,” 355–87. Confusingly, Shmidt mistakenly identifies the area as Moravian Slovakia, and labels the population as ethnic Slovaks, if not Slovak nationals.

civilizing mission. His argument was based on an assumption that the natural environment as well as the population of this rural, mountainous region – including the pastoralist Wallachs – was characteristic rather for the entire range of the Carpathians stretching all the way to Romania’s Transylvania. In line with his neo-Lamarckism, Vomela also assumed that the local populations suffered from comparable health conditions. In Vomela’s dehumanizing phrasing which was clearly influenced by eugenics, the doctor asserted that “many a village in Moravian Wallachia” was “truly infested with the most varied manifestations of endemic constitutional degeneration” that imprinted people with “traits typical for anthropoid apes” and presented “a eugenic problem of the first order.”¹⁰⁷⁰ As a response, Vomela suggested a set of concrete hygienic policies that focused mainly on altering the environment. Additionally, he pressed for a more comprehensive and authoritative paternalistic management of these areas, or as he articulated it, an “absolute dictatorship of enlightened experts permeated with love for humanity and supported by the state power.”¹⁰⁷¹ However, the state authorities in the area were hesitant to provide backing for Vomela’s demands that went beyond the more narrow and technical scope of the local health demonstration center.¹⁰⁷²

Last but not least, the rural health demonstration areas played an important role in the education of young medical professionals. There was an important gender dimension to this. Throughout the region, the RF placed much emphasis on introducing public health nurses, a profession that required higher education in social work, offered an independent, middle-class

¹⁰⁷⁰ A copy of Vomela’s manuscript book was presented to Czechoslovakia’s president, Masaryk, and is still a part of his personal library. Library of the Masaryk Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, T. G. Masaryk Library, Inv. No. FO2068, Manuscript, Vomela, Stanislav. *Pamětní spis o sanaci Valašska*. Holešov: nákladem vlastním, 1928.

¹⁰⁷¹ Ibidem.

¹⁰⁷²¹⁰⁷² Notably, Vomela displayed significant interest in regions whose administration showed some colonial influences. In addition to Subcarpathian Ruthenia, he also delved into comparable areas within other post-Habsburg countries. For example, he undertook multiple study trips to Macedonia. Stanislav Vomela, “Karpatský masiv po stránce zdravotnické” [Carpathian Massif from the Medical Perspective], *Věstník československých lékařů* 46, no. 31–32 (August 10, 1934): 868–70; Stanislav Vomela, *V srdci Makedonie* [In the Heart of Macedonia] (Holešov: nákladem vlastním, 1931).

standing, and, crucially, was practiced by women. This was a significant shift from the old imperial setting where caring in the medical context was often carried out by religious personnel or by volunteers.

The new secular public health nurses adopted a discourse of professionalism to differentiate themselves from their predecessors. As a platform for these professional debates that defined their identity, the nurses initiated the publication of specialized periodicals. The first issue of the Zagreb-based journal *Sestrinska riječ* (The Nursing Word) stated this intention in no ambiguous terms: “Along with our work, we need to speak our word. We need to clarify the concepts once and for all, that we are not tenders or charity workers. Along with our work, let our printed word be heard: let it say what we do, how we think and what we want.”¹⁰⁷³ The experiences made within the health demonstration areas, in particular, were an important topic in the early issues of journals such as *Sestrinska riječ*, *Sociální pracovnice* (Social Worker), or in the more national-conservative *A Zöld Kereszt: Tudósító Egészségügyi Védőnők Részére* (The Green Cross: Bulletin for the Public Health Nurses). Next to the schools of nursing or their equivalents, the rural health demonstration areas became crucial sites for their education and training. They also provided training for young medical doctors, among whom women were increasingly represented in the interwar period. For these individuals, the experience of the rural areas and their participation in the projects of rural regeneration were a part of their formative professional experience.

¹⁰⁷³ “Mjesto uvoda” [Introduction], *Sestrinska riječ* 1, no. 1–2 (February 1, 1933): 1.

Alternative States: Voluntary Associations, Eugenics, and the Central Authorities

Everyday life in the Late Habsburg Empire was structured by numerous voluntary associations.¹⁰⁷⁴ These associations ranged from amateur theatre troupes and singing choirs to voluntary firemen and consumer cooperatives and continued to thrive in the post-imperial setting.¹⁰⁷⁵ It is important to note that, of course, the vast majority of these associations was not influenced by eugenics in any way or associated with its proponents. However, there were two significant exceptions.

The first exception were the eugenics societies themselves. These societies were usually duly registered as voluntary associations, and thus bound by the same legal requirements. In effect, the eugenics societies founded before 1918 such as the *Deutschösterreichische Beratungsstelle für Volkswohlfahrt*, *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik*, or the *Czech Eugenics Society* had their by-laws, published yearly reports, elected their representatives at regular assemblies, and engaged in other day-to-day activities required by the authorities from all voluntary associations, and the same was frequently true of the plethora of eugenic societies that emerged after 1918.

Even though the liberal principle of association was thus baked into some of their practical activities, many eugenics societies were notably illiberal. During the interwar period, in particular, the number of eugenics societies that embraced radical nationalism and subscribed to racist theories multiplied. The most striking example is Austria, where several such associations emerged in the early 1920s. It began in 1923 with the *Oberösterreichische*

¹⁰⁷⁴ See, for instance, Gary B. Cohen, “Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1867-1914,” *Central European History* 40, no. 2 (2007): 241–78.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Fabio Gioni and Stefano Petrunaro, “Voluntary Associations, State and Gender in Interwar Yugoslavia. An Introduction,” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire* 26, no. 1 (2019): 1–18.

Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene (Upper Austrian Society of Race Hygiene) in Linz, followed by the *Grazer Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene*, the *Wiener Gesellschaft für Rassenpflege* (*Rassenhygiene*), and the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenpflege* in Vienna, all founded in 1924. The second half of the 1920s saw the addition of the *Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene* in Freistadt in Upper Austria, established in 1926.¹⁰⁷⁶ These voluntary associations stated the promotion of eugenics as their primary objective in their by-laws, embraced a *völkisch* form of nationalism, subscribed to hard heredity, and shared an interest in eugenic family research. Antisemitism was increasingly palpable in these associations, too.¹⁰⁷⁷

The second half of the 1920s in Austria also witnessed the founding of the more moderate *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Volksgesundheit* (Austrian Society for Public Health), created by a circle of eugenically oriented advisors of the Austrian president Hainisch in 1926, and the somewhat overlapping *Österreichischer Bund für Volksaufartung und Erbkunde* (Austrian League for Regeneration and Heredity), which emerged in Vienna in 1928.¹⁰⁷⁸ Thus, eugenic societies in post-Habsburg Austria, and beyond, assumed the form of voluntary associations, and they were marked by the high degree of fragmentation that was quite typical of Habsburg and post-Habsburg associational life more generally.

There was also another group of voluntary associations that had a much broader scope than these eugenic societies, yet it also increasingly embraced eugenics, albeit in various forms and to varying degrees. These associations tended to be closely entangled with political projects, often of a nationalist nature, and had large, sometimes even mass membership. Nationalist cultural associations such as the German-Austrian *Südmark* or the Romanian

¹⁰⁷⁶ Thomas Mayer, “Wie kommt die Eugenik in die Eugenik? Sampling und Auswahlverfahren von prozessproduzierten Daten am Beispiel eugenischer Netzwerke in Österreich,” *Historical Social Research* 34, no. 1 (2009): 159–71.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Thomas Mayer, “Eugenische Initiativen und Netzwerke in Österreich von 1918 bis 1945,” *VIRUS – Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte der Medizin* 5, no. 1 (2005): 55.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Thomas Mayer, “Akademische Netzwerke um die „Wiener Gesellschaft für Rassenpflege (Rassenhygiene)“ von 1924 bis 1948,” (M.A. Thesis, University of Vienna, 2004), 80–81.

ASTRA were salient among these voluntary associations.¹⁰⁷⁹ Mass gymnastics associations such as the German-nationalist *Turnverein* or its pan-Slavic analogue, the *Sokol* (Falcon), also featured prominently among them. However, the spectrum of these voluntary associations that negotiated with various forms of eugenics was much broader and included school associations,¹⁰⁸⁰ youth associations,¹⁰⁸¹ and associations promoting temperance or other parts of the *Lebensreform*, a transnational movement of modernist moral reform.¹⁰⁸² Even some ethnic cooperatives, such as those of German-speakers in Vojvodina,¹⁰⁸³ and some churches were seen as fertile ground by eugenicists.¹⁰⁸⁴ Although these voluntary associations constituted only a small fraction of the thriving associational life in Austria-Hungary, they held significance due to their large membership, dense network of local branches, and their stated ambition to influence the everyday lives of their members.

I argue that these voluntary associations, or “alternative states,” as I suggested to describe them in the introduction to this dissertation, played a significant role in accommodating and promoting eugenic discourses and practices. Additionally, these mass voluntary associations served as a crucial avenue for some eugenicists to establish connections with the state administration, particularly during the interwar period. Finally, the members of these voluntary associations were unevenly distributed across interwar post-imperial Central Europe, with their roots being the deepest in the post-Habsburg areas of these countries or virtually

¹⁰⁷⁹ Bucur, Maria. “Awakening or Constructing Biological Consciousness?: ‘Astra’ and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania,” *Colloquia: Journal of Central European History* 2, no. 1–2 (1995): 172–85.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Tara Zahra's classical study provides certain hints regarding the presence of eugenic tropes in these associations; however, there is a noticeable absence of focus on “race” and biopolitics. Tara Zahra, “‘Each Nation Only Cares for Its Own’: Empire, Nation, and Child Welfare Activism in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1918,” *The American Historical Review* 111, no. 5 (December 2006): 1378–1402.

¹⁰⁸¹ Hermann Soyka, “Zwischen Jugendbewegung und Abstinenzbewegung: Wurzeln – Gemeinsamkeiten – Abgrenzungen – Wandel am Beispiel der Vereinsgeschichte der ‘Deutschen Gemeinschaft für alkoholfreie Kultur’,” (M.A. Thesis, University of Graz), 2013.

¹⁰⁸² Judith Grosse, Francesco Spöring, and Jana Tschurennev, eds., *Biopolitik und Sittlichkeitsreform: Kampagnen gegen Alkohol, Drogen und Prostitution 1880–1950* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2014).

¹⁰⁸³ Bernd Robionek, “Contested Cooperation: The Ethnic-German Welfare Cooperatives in the Vojvodina (1930s),” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d’histoire* 26, no. 1 (January 2, 2019): 104–20.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Georgescu, *The Eugenic Fortress*, passim.

limited to them. Therefore, their distribution serves as another example of the practices of differential rule that characterized the successor states of Austria-Hungary.

An analysis of eugenics in post-Habsburg Central Europe must have the alternative states as one of its central foci. Eugenics and its proponents began to intertwine with these alternative states during the late imperial period, even though the process was still in its initial stages when World War I started. As demonstrated in the first chapter of this dissertation, eugenic discussions flourished within nationalist cultural associations and among temperance activists. The list of associations that were among the earliest to engage with eugenics, however, is longer and includes also mass gymnastics movements and certain nationalist welfare associations. However, despite the growing debates on eugenics within these alternative states, its promoters were far from exerting dominance over these associations or significantly influencing their practices prior to 1914.

The importance of eugenics in these alternative states grew significantly in the interwar period. Already during World War I, some of these associations were involved in various forms of welfare provision. As a result, they became increasingly influenced by eugenics and entangled with the state, as documented in the second chapter of this dissertation. However, in this section, I argue that the decisive moment came only after the collapse of the empire when the emergence of new self-styled nation-states posed an unprecedented challenge to these alternative states. The response to these challenges varied depending on whether the alternative states belonged to the titular nations of the successor states or to their minorities. In both cases, though, an increased embrace of eugenics was involved.

Wherever these alternative states belonged to the titular nations of the post-Habsburg states, the main function of these associations was challenged. Independent, voluntary associations that catered to the cultural needs of their perceived co-nationals and ran parallel to

the state could become superfluous in the post-Habsburg countries that embraced nationalizing agendas themselves. Consequently, these alternative states sought to reframe their agenda. The reframing typically took the form of enthusiastic self-cooptation into the state-building and nation-building projects, prioritizing biopolitics in the process. In doing so, they established various forms of reciprocity with the new state authorities. The process was not always straightforward, as some of these alternative states also embraced regionalist agendas alongside their enduring nationalism. However, the majority of these alternative states belonging to the titular nations ultimately became deeply intertwined with the nation-state at some point during the interwar period. Consequently, the eugenicists involved in these associations became increasingly integrated into the state administration. Similar to the processes that linked eugenicists with the civil administration in the borderlands, and partially overlapping with them in some cases, this was another instance when eugenics began to influence the state from below.

In the case of alternative states that were driven by nationalist activists who did not belong to the titular nations of post-Habsburg states, the challenge brought about by the collapse of the imperial framework was linked to the new status of their imagined communities. As Larry Wolff points out, the idea of self-determined national majorities proclaimed in Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points in January 1918 and materialized in the outcome of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, "raised a series of challenges to the territorial mapping and ethnographic definition of the new state[s]" of East Central Europe.¹⁰⁸⁵ In effect, delineating the nation-states in this part of the world also meant "creat[ing] minorities that would inevitably be politically vulnerable to the predominant national majority."¹⁰⁸⁶ Consequently, these alternative states had

¹⁰⁸⁵ Larry Wolff, *Woodrow Wilson and the Reimagining of Eastern Europe* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2020), 168.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Wolff, *Woodrow Wilson*, 170.

to either redefine or establish themselves anew as vehicles for the construction of minority identities.

Instead of relying solely on cultural agitation, these alternative states pursued this objective through various biopolitical strategies. The formation of minority identity for them entailed molding the physical “body of the nation,” as well as purifying it. As Marius Turda puts it, minority eugenics in East Central Europe claimed to “protect the ethnic minority from a number of challenges posed by the post-Versailles world and its new political environment” as well as to “create the physical and cultural differences that underpinned the categories of majority and minority.”¹⁰⁸⁷ In post-Habsburg spaces, the advocates of eugenics within the alternative states significantly contributed to creating such eugenic blueprint, as we will see.

The remaining part of this subsection analyzes the entanglements between eugenics and the alternative states, using nationalist mass gymnastics associations as an example. The focus on this case is justified not only because it supports the argument outlined above, but also because these voluntary associations served as key platforms for eugenics and its promoters in the post-Habsburg states of the interwar period.

The ultimate model for most of these nationalist mass gymnastics associations in Austria-Hungary was provided by the *Turnvereine*, or gymnastic clubs, which were first established in Germany in 1811. Initially connecting their nationalism with liberal ideas, the *Turnvereine* originally combined the notions of German unity with a “praise for active citizenship (practiced within the clubs), and a quasi-religious faith in progress through education, whereby exercise completed the individual’s harmonious *Bildung*, developing body

¹⁰⁸⁷ Turda, “Introduction,” xix.

and character in tandem with the intellect.”¹⁰⁸⁸ Yet, even though they were at first closely connected with German liberalism in both their ideology and social embeddedness, the *Turnvereine* and their nationalism eventually shifted from this old left towards a new right. By the turn of the century, their imagined national community was increasingly defined along racial lines, and concerns with “degeneration,” hygiene, and eugenics were increasingly coming to the foreground.¹⁰⁸⁹ Ultimately, alongside contemporary competitive sports, mass gymnastics emerged as a core biopolitical technology in Germany during the twentieth century.¹⁰⁹⁰

In the Habsburg Empire, gymnastic associations, either directly continuing or indirectly mirroring this model, began to emerge during Austria’s liberalization in the 1860s. They quickly became important venues for physical exercise, middle-class sociability, and popular education, eventually attaining a mass character.¹⁰⁹¹ They were also closely connected with military culture. On the one hand, there were the Turner clubs of German Austrians. Even though they were first introduced to Austria already in the 1840s, they had been suppressed after the defeat of the 1848 revolution, and only started truly proliferating from the 1860s onward. Initially led by the liberal middle class, these clubs gradually incorporated members from the lower middle class and working class as they expanded. On the other hand, there was the Czech nationalist *Sokol* [Falcon] association. Founded in Prague in 1862 by two ethnic Germans converted to Czech nationalism, the *Sokol* closely mirrored the *Turnverein*. Slavic pan-nationalism was deeply ingrained in the ideology and organization of the *Sokol*. As a result, the *Sokol* model spread beyond Bohemia and reached beyond Czech nationalist circles. In the following decades, similar associations were established among Croatian, Serbian, Slovene,

¹⁰⁸⁸ Daniel A. McMillan, “Nothing Wrong with My Bodily Fluids: Gymnastics, Biology, and Nationalism in the Germanies before 1871,” in *Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe*, ed. Pieter M. Judson and Marsha L. Rozenblit (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 52.

¹⁰⁸⁹ McMillan, “Nothing Wrong,” 51 and 56.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Michael Hau, *Performance Anxiety: Sport and Work in Germany from the Empire to Nazism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 17.

¹⁰⁹¹ Claire Elaine Nolte, “Voluntary Associations and Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Prague,” in *Different Paths to the Nation*, ed. Laurence Cole (London: Palgrave, 2007), 89.

Polish, and Ukrainian nationalists within the Habsburg Empire. The Sokol movement also extended beyond the borders of the empire, with analogous associations emerging in Bulgaria and the Tsarist Empire. Additionally, the diasporas of these peoples in other regions also formed Sokol associations. Initially led by the liberal middle classes, the Sokol also saw a rapid expansion of its membership. In effect, in both the Turner and Sokol associations, the liberal middle-class leadership faced challenges from the rise of mass politics in the 1880s and early 1900s, respectively.

In the German Austrian Turnverein, on the one hand, the challenge to the association's liberalism took the form of *völkisch* nationalism. Associated primarily with the followers of Georg Ritter von Schönerer, this political ideology was characterized by virulent antisemitism and other forms of racism.¹⁰⁹² When the *Deutsche Turnerschaft* in Lower Austria introduced into its by-laws a paragraph excluding Jewish members in 1887, it was a part of a broader trend that was spreading across the imperial Austria.¹⁰⁹³ On the other hand, the challenge of mass politics to the liberal leadership of *Sokol* emerged only around the turn of the century, driven by the political demands of its socialist, clerical, and feminist members, and reached its peak around 1910. (While there was also a degree of antisemitism within *Sokol* associations, it was not formalized in its by-laws.)¹⁰⁹⁴ Hand in hand with these challenges of mass politics to the liberal leadership of these associations, the influence of physicians and gymnastics trainers advocating eugenics grew within both the *Turnverein* and *Sokol*. However, the way in which these eugenicists related to the liberal leadership differed significantly.

¹⁰⁹² Carl E. Schorske, "Politics in a New Key: An Austrian Trio," in *Fin-de-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), 116–80.

¹⁰⁹³ Nolte, "Voluntary Associations," 95.

¹⁰⁹⁴ *Valný sjezd České obce sokolské pořádaný ve dnech 27. - 28. listopadu 1910* [General Assembly of the Czech Sokol Association held on November 27-28, 1910] (Prague: Česká obec sokolská, 1910).

In the German Austrian *Turnverein*, race hygiene started to proliferate by the end of the nineteenth century. It enlisted itself for the *völkisch* challenge to the liberal leadership of the associations, enabled by mass politics. One of the earliest and most influential authors in this regard was Ferdinand Hueppe (1852-1938), a medical doctor. Born and educated in Germany, Hueppe was a renowned bacteriologist who worked for some time at Robert Koch's lab. However, in 1889, he became a professor of hygiene in Prague, and it was there where he developed his eugenic ideas, and intimately linked them with his interest in mass gymnastics and sports.¹⁰⁹⁵

Indeed, mass gymnastics, including the *Turnverein* of which he was a member, and emerging sports such as soccer was the main vehicle for his eugenic proposals.¹⁰⁹⁶ Hueppe maintained that the mission of mass gymnastics at the *Turnverein* and beyond was primarily to biologically regenerate the national community, and that such renewal was a precondition for mass mobilization. "With a membership of almost one million men," he argued, "the largest and most important association in the world for physical exercises, the German Turnverein includes numerous craftsmen who labor in a one-sided way in their jobs, but as members of this association they develop in a well-rounded manner to the extent that they annually provide around 30,000 of the best recruits for the army."¹⁰⁹⁷

Hueppe's race hygiene was anti-modernist. He claimed that one of the main dangers posed by modernity could be found in the world of industrial labor, and that new methods of production strove to increase efficiency through rational control of human body and its actions.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Baader, "Eugenische Programme," passim.

¹⁰⁹⁶ Tellingly, Hueppe became one of the early promoters of bodybuilding. See Ferdinand Hueppe, "Einleitung" in *System Proschek: Übungssystem koordinierter Muskelgruppen*, ed. Josef Proschek, 4th ed (Vienna: Perles, [1907]); Josef Proschek, *Proškův systém: cvičný systém koordinovaných skupin svalových, S úvodem c. k. vrchního zdravotního rady Prof. Dr. Ferdinanda Hueppa* [Prošek's System: An Exercise System of Coordinated Muscle Groups. With an introduction by the k. und k. Supreme Health Counsellor Prof. Dr. Ferdinand Hueppe] (Prague: Kočí, 1907).

¹⁰⁹⁷ Ferdinand Hueppe, *Hygiene der Körperübungen* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1910), 12–13.

The discourses of scientific management of labor, and Taylorism in particular, in the early twentieth century led the manual workers (and to an extent, also office workers) to repeat monotonously a short set of movements.¹⁰⁹⁸ This was a source of concern for Hueppe, as this disciplined labor impacted human bodies. Performing repeated movements, these bodies developed their inborn potentials only one-sidedly, and this imbalance was a great loss for the nation and the “race,” Hueppe argued.¹⁰⁹⁹

These arguments were embedded in a theoretical framework that linked race hygiene to constitutional medicine, of which Hueppe was a pioneer. Framing the capacity of an individual to resist illnesses as a function of their inborn constitution, Hueppe framed this constitution as hereditary, and essentially identified it with “race,” claiming that “since the Younger Stone Age our body does not exhibit any substantial alterations within the distinct boundaries set by different races.”¹¹⁰⁰ At the same time, Hueppe was wholeheartedly dedicated to the neo-Lamarckian concept of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, which underpinned his nationalist, conservative vision of the collective body allegedly embattled by various sources of biological and moral corruption.¹¹⁰¹ Against this specter that followed from industrial labor, and from other manifestations of modernity, Hueppe posited mass physical exercise and sport as the main alternative.

Hueppe’s race hygiene discarded the values of the old, German liberalism, and offered a biopolitical blueprint for its increasingly powerful *völkisch* challengers. His race hygiene was Nordicist, and it aimed at shielding and purifying the bodies of the “Nordic-Aryan race.” Hueppe also identified a racialized body with a racialized mind and claimed that mass

¹⁰⁹⁸ Anson Rabinbach, *The Human Motor: Energy, Fatigue, and the Origins of Modernity* (New York: Basic Books, 1990).

¹⁰⁹⁹ Hueppe, *Hygiene der Körperübungen*, 10-13; Ferdinand Hueppe, *Die hygienische Bedeutung der erziehenden Knabenhandarbeit* (Leipzig: Frankenstein & Wagner, 1899).

¹¹⁰⁰ Hueppe, *Hygiene der Körperübungen*, 7.

¹¹⁰¹ Baader, “Eugenische Programme,” *passim*.

gymnastics developed a “racial” psychology that was as biologically determined as physical characteristics. Furthermore, Hueppe’s arguments had an antisemitic inflection, and antisemitic tropes were explicit already in his texts from the late 1890s.¹¹⁰² Finally, as important as mass gymnastics was, it was not the only prerequisite of biological regeneration for Hueppe who maintained that preserving “racial” purity by opposing mixed marriages, as well as by a selective appropriation of the *Lebensreform* movement, was equally vital.¹¹⁰³

In the Sokol associations in Austria-Hungary, the medical doctors, physical anthropologists, and instructors of gymnastics who promoted eugenics did not directly challenge the liberal leadership of Sokol but were rather co-opted by it. They initially tended to provide a medical justification for the positions maintained by the Sokol leadership on a range of issues that were seen as contentious within the associations, such as temperance, the increasing participation of women, and the calls to tilt the Sokol activities more towards sports. In effect, debates about gymnastics were becoming increasingly medicalized after 1900, and eugenics was often a part of these arguments.¹¹⁰⁴ This medicalization was exemplified by two bibliographies of medical texts on gymnastics that were published by the Sokol. The earlier bibliography appeared in 1905 in a Croatian Sokol journal and primarily covered Serbian medical texts.¹¹⁰⁵ The latter, published in 1911 by the Czech flagship Sokol journal, had a transnational scope. It included primarily Croatian, Czech, Polish, Russian, and Slovene

¹¹⁰² Bernhard Wilhelm Matz, “Die Konstitutionstypologie von Ernst Kretschmer: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte von Psychiatrie und Psychologie des Zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts,” (PhD Thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, 2002), 212–213.

¹¹⁰³ Interestingly, Hueppe opposed the temperance movement and rallied against vegetarianism, diverging in this regard from many other early *völkisch* advocates of race hygiene in imperial Austria. Hueppe, *Hygiene der Körperübungen*, passim.

¹¹⁰⁴ Social Darwinist discourses were a common currency in both Sokol and Turnverein. In the former case, they were already a part and parcel of the programmatic arguments of the association’s founder, Tyrš. In the other context, they became widespread at about the same time.

¹¹⁰⁵ Đorđe Gavrilović, “Srpska gimnastičko-higijenska bibliografija” [Serb Gymnastic-Hygienic Bibliography], *Sokol: Časopis za promicanje tjelovježbe* 4, no. 2–12 (1905): passim.

authors.¹¹⁰⁶ It showcased not only that the medicalization of Sokol practices was a transnational process, although the degree varied in individual contexts, but also illustrated how the Sokol facilitated the circulation of specialized medical knowledge across national boundaries.

While eugenics was increasingly a part of medical arguments within Sokol, no coherent body of knowledge one could describe as Sokol eugenics came into being before 1914. Instead, there was a significant variety of eugenic arguments, resulting from attempts to retool eugenics for specific agendas.¹¹⁰⁷ First, Sokol was a locus for flourishing temperance initiatives driven by physicians. A Polish Sokół journal, for example, observed that “Sokół is precisely the institution in Poland that was the first, apart from specifically abstinent associations, to effectively initiate a decisive fight against alcohol on a broad scale.”¹¹⁰⁸ Mobilizing moral as well as medical arguments, the physicians and other activists involved in these initiatives increasingly invoked eugenic tropes about the alleged detrimental effects of alcohol on the hereditary health of the national body. Moreover, they integrated these claims into a comprehensive pessimistic eugenic vision in which many perceived manifestations of modern life threatened human health across generations. Writing in Križevci in Croatia-Slavonia, a Catholic physician closely linked with the Sokol association, Fran Gundrum, symptomatically argued that “alcohol is a poison for the human body” and that it was “high time for the world to open its eyes, to seriously see and study the dreadful danger that threatens the human race from the pleasure of alcohol.”¹¹⁰⁹ The physicians writing for the Czech Sokol periodical

¹¹⁰⁶ *Literatura Sokolská: Seznam spisů odborné tělocvičné literatury české, chorvatské, polské, ruské, slovinské i jinojazyčné* [Sokol Literature: A List of Works of Specialized Literature on Gymnastics in Czech, Croatian, Polish, Russian, Slovenian, and Other Languages], 2nd ed (Prague: Springer, 1911).

¹¹⁰⁷ For a detailed analysis of these debates, see Lucija Balikić and Vojtěch Pojar, “‘Politics of Plastic Nationhood’: Sokol Mass Gymnastics and Eugenics Between Empire and Nation-States,” *East Central Europe* 50, no. 2–3 (2023): 155–79. I am indebted to Lucija Balikić for generously sharing multiple sources on the Sokol associations in the Yugoslav region with me.

¹¹⁰⁸ “Czy alkohol wzmacnia siły i sprawność?” [Does Alcohol Enhance Strength and Fitness?], *Przewodnik Gimnastyczny Sokół: organ Związku Polskich Gimnastycznych Tow. Sokolich w Austrii* 33, no. 6 and 7 (1913): 43–46, 52–55.

¹¹⁰⁹ Fran Srećko Gundrum, “Alkohol i sokolstvo” [Alcohol and Sokol Movement], *Sokol: Časopis Saveza hrvatskih sokolskih društava* 5, no. 8 (August 1906): 119.

Zdravotní hlídka (Medical Rubric), such as the surgeon Duchoslav Panýrek, argued along similar lines.¹¹¹⁰ Initially perceived as a priority among Sokol's biopolitical initiatives across several national contexts in Austria-Hungary, temperance or abstinence initiatives provided an early entry point for eugenic discourses.

Eugenics was also increasingly present in arguments about women's participation in Sokol exercise and governance. These arguments emerged after the turn of the century when women involved in Sokol called for a more equitable representation within the association's management and for greater agency in defining their exercise programs. Advocates of eugenics rarely opposed women's participation in Sokol gymnastics in response to these calls. Yet, they argued for limiting women's involvement to activities that did not interfere with childbearing, thus linking women's citizenship with motherhood, and reinforcing the gendered division of labor. "Only a healthy and strong woman," asserted a Czech-born Croatian Sokol leader Josip Hanuš, "can give her nation a solid and healthy younger generation and can raise children in the spirit of the nation, developing strong characters. The task of our sisters in Sokol is to educate such healthy, strong, and resilient women."¹¹¹¹ Arguments along these lines had been put forward in Sokol by male advocates of eugenics in various national contexts, and interestingly, these arguments exhibited striking similarities among both modernist and anti-modernist eugenicists.¹¹¹²

¹¹¹⁰ Duchoslav Panýrek, "Některé novější vědecké poznatky o vlivu lihovin na člověka" [Some Recent Scientific Findings on the Impact of Spirits on Humans], *Zdravotní hlídka Věstniku sokolského* 6, no. 18 (1914): 101–3.

¹¹¹¹ Josip Hanuš, "O potrebi ženskog tjelesnog odgoja" [On the Need for Female Physical Education], *Hrvatski Sokol: Časopis hrvatskog sokolskog saveza* 9, no. 9 (September 1910), 117.

¹¹¹² See, for instance, "O zadaniach skautingu dla dziewcząt" [On the Tasks of Girl Scouting], *Przewodnik Gimnastyczny Sokół: organ Związku Polskich Gimnastycznych Tow. Sokolich w Austrii* 34, no. 6 (June 1914): 42–43; Fran Srećko Gundrum, *Tjelovježba i športovi za ženskinje sa zdravstvenog stajališta* [Physical Exercise and Sports for Women from a Health Perspective] (Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1909); František Tichý, "Tělesná cvičení žen" [Physical Exercises for Women], *Zdravotní hlídka Věstniku sokolského* 3, no. 2 (1911): 9–10; Pavel Pestotnik, "Telesna vzgoja žen - društvena organizacija za ženstvo" [Women's Physical Education - Social Organization for Women], *Sokolski vestnik: Glasilo žup Ljubljana I, Idrijske in Novomeške* 3, no. 3 (October 1912): 81–89, 133–137.

Finally, there were medical justifications for Sokol gymnastics written from a eugenic standpoint. The traditional forms of gymnastic exercises were challenged within Sokol, as various sports such as football were becoming increasingly popular in Austria-Hungary around the turn of the century, and they were increasingly demanded by rank-and-file Sokol members.¹¹¹³ Eugenicists in Sokol developed arguments that extolled the alleged positive impact of traditional Sokol exercises on the health, strength, and “race” of the gymnasts’ bodies, even though they differed on the extra amount of sports they deemed medically tolerable. A professor of anatomy and Czech Sokol official, Karel Weigner, for instance, argued in 1914 that a healthy body was one of humans’ “most valuable assets.”¹¹¹⁴ Sokol gymnastics, which cultivated the body as well as the mind, was therefore not only in the “utmost interest of the individual” but also a precondition for “society’s healthy evolution” and a guarantee of a “higher development of the entire nation.”¹¹¹⁵ Additionally, Weigner also drew on Taylorist discourses of scientific labor management, which conceptualized human bodies in mechanical terms. The goal was to study the workings of such a “human machine” and optimize it by managing its energy intake as well as output, in order to avoid the dual dangers of underemployment and early fatigue.¹¹¹⁶ Positioning himself within this framework, and arguing that economic competition was more fundamental in modern societies than an armed “struggle for existence,” Weigner maintained that diligent Sokol exercise both adapted human bodies for

¹¹¹³ Duchoslav Panýrek, “Tělocvik či sport: S hlediska lékařského uvažuje Zdrav. odbor ČOS” [Gymnastics or Sport: From a Medical Perspective, Consideration by the Health Department of the Czech Sokol Organization], *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 2, no. 1 (1910): 3–8. From a somewhat different angle, the issue was also discussed by eugenics supporters among temperance activists. Gyula Donáth, “Die Alkoholfrage in der österreichisch-ungarischen gemeinsamen und Honvédarmee und in den ungarischen Sportvereinen,” *Der Alkoholgegner* 4, no. 6 (March 15, 1907): 1–6.

¹¹¹⁴ Karel Weigner, “Cíle a prostředky tělesné výchovy: Úvodní přednáška v 20. sekci pro tělesnou výchovu” [Goals and Means of Physical Education: Introductory Lecture in the 20th Section for Physical Education], in *Otázka tělesné výchovy na V. sjezdu českých přírodopytců a lékařů v Praze roku 1914* [The Question of Physical Education at the V. Congress of Czech Naturalists and Physicians in Prague in 1914] (Prague: Grégr, 1914), 5–17.

¹¹¹⁵ Ibid. Weigner’s choice to speak about “higher development” [vyšší rozvoj, Höherentwicklung], “the greatest asset of mankind” [nejcennější statek člověkův], as well as his emphasis on scientific labor management and energetic metaphors suggests that his eugenic thinking was inspired by the Viennese sociologist Rudolf Goldscheid, even though Weigner did not acknowledge this source.

¹¹¹⁶ Rabinbach, *The Eclipse*; Kučera, *Rationed Life*, passim.

disciplined labor and rejuvenated them afterward, thereby increasing national economic efficiency.¹¹¹⁷

In the earliest decades of their associations' existence, the *Turners* and the *Sokols* intermingled, even in Prague, which was increasingly contested by German and Czech nationalists.¹¹¹⁸ Furthermore, these exchanges continued for a much longer period beyond the capital of Bohemia.¹¹¹⁹ The same was often true in other parts of Austria-Hungary, where individuals of other ethnicities also interacted with the Sokols. Even during the interwar period, ethnic Germans in Yugoslavia participated in local Sokol events, including young individuals who would later become radical German nationalists.¹¹²⁰ Importantly, advocates of eugenics within the Turner and Sokol associations followed the same pattern. They apparently followed each other's texts, and their arguments circulated between both associations. For example, in his eugenically infused texts for the Sokols from the 1910s and 1920s, Weigner clearly echoed Hueppe's claims about the alleged "degenerative" potential of modern industrial labor, nearly verbatim, although he did not acknowledge his source.¹¹²¹ The Turnverein and Sokol associations were thus an important space where eugenics knowledge was both produced and circulated. Ironically given the nationalism of these associations, this circulation of eugenic knowledge transcended national boundaries.

After the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, both Sokol and Turner associations redefined their objectives. In Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the newly formed states promoted integrative nationalist ideologies of Yugoslavism and Czechoslovakism,

¹¹¹⁷ Karel Weigner, *Tělesná výchova: Její význam a cesty* [Physical Education: Its Significance and Paths] (Prague: Vilímek, 1916).

¹¹¹⁸ Claire Elaine Nolte, "Voluntary Associations and Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Prague," in *Different Paths to the Nation*, ed. Laurence Cole (London: Palgrave, 2007), 95.

¹¹¹⁹ King, *Budweisers*, 54.

¹¹²⁰ I express my gratitude to Lucija Balikić for bringing this to my attention. Caroline Mezger, *Forging Germans: Youth, Nation, and the National Socialist Mobilization of Ethnic Germans in Yugoslavia, 1918-1944* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 90–91.

¹¹²¹ Weigner, *Tělesná výchova: Její význam*, passim.

respectively.¹¹²² The Sokol associations in both contexts actively endorsed these endeavors. Within these associations, proponents of eugenics advocated for various biopolitical strategies aimed at forging a new national identity by assimilating the existing diversity within these states.¹¹²³ By asserting that Sokol could shape the envisioned national community in terms of both culture and biology, the associations positioned themselves as participants in the nation-building project. While the nationalists at the *völkisch* Turner movement in Austria could now also claim that they represented a large majority of the new state's population, they pursued a different strategy. Radicalizing their nationalism further, they explored biopolitical strategies of biological purification of the imagined national community. Crucially, they newly mapped them on the entire territory of the new state. In effect, they extended their influence on Burgenland, Austria's new borderland, engaging in intensive associational and paramilitary activities.¹¹²⁴

Conversely, the *völkisch* Turner movement in Czechoslovakia aimed to forge an amalgamated minority identity for the diverse and fragmented groups of German speakers in the new state. This project involved cultural and biopolitical dimensions, and the German Turner movement in Czechoslovakia had been deeply permeated with tropes associated with race hygiene as early as the late 1910s. In 1919, the association introduced updated guidelines for gymnastics and "national education" that defined its goals as "the creation and strengthening of spiritual, moral and physical fitness as well as the tribal consciousness" for Germans in the Czechoslovakia.¹¹²⁵ Among other things, the guidelines demanded that all Turner gymnastics

¹¹²² Adam Hudek, Michal Kopeček, and Jan Mervart, *Czechoslovakism* (London: Routledge, 2021); Andrew Wachtel, *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation: Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

¹¹²³ Balikić and Pojar, "Politics of Plastic Nationhood," 155–79.

¹¹²⁴ Andreas Streibel, "Von der Alm zur Puszta: Zur Rolle völkischer Schutzvereine bei der Angliederung des Burgenlandes an Österreich," *Burgenländische Heimatblätter* 56, no. 2-3 (1994): 49–77, 89–118.

¹¹²⁵ "Turnfachausschusssitzung des Deutschen Turnverbandes," *Turnzeitung des Deutschen Turnverbandes* 1, no. 3 (March 15, 1920): 17–19.

instructors pass an exam of “national [völkisch] knowledge.”¹¹²⁶ A 1920 brochure, designed in the form of a catechism to prepare candidates for the exam, for example, incorporated such racial and eugenic tropes. Notably, it began with answers to the following four questions: “Why is there an exam of national knowledge? What does the Aryan paragraph in the statutes of the German *völkisch* gymnasts say and why do we have the Aryan paragraph? Which nations belong to the Aryan race? What does nation and nationality mean, and what is a German nationality?”¹¹²⁷ A purified “race” thus became a key aspect for the Turner movement, particularly for advocates of race hygiene within the association, in shaping Czechoslovakia’s ethnic Germans into a national minority group.¹¹²⁸

While before 1918 these alternative states served as parallel structures to the imperial state, in the post-Habsburg countries they became entangled with the state at various points during the interwar period. These connections were crucial for those advocating eugenics within these associations, as they provided an important channel through which they could establish a connection to the central state administration. In Yugoslavia, the state and the Sokol association became deeply intertwined after 1929 when the king and ruling elite of the country responded to the ongoing political crisis by implementing a royal dictatorship. As Pieter Troch points out, during the dictatorship, Sokol “transformed into a quasi-state institution for strengthening Yugoslav national consciousness,” and this change was the result of both self-cooptation by the Sokol leadership and the state’s demands.¹¹²⁹ On an institutional level, the integration of the

¹¹²⁶ “Turnfachausschusssitzung,” 17–19.

¹¹²⁷ Dr. B. “Praktische Dietwartarbeit,” *Turnzeitung des Deutschen Turnverbandes* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1920): 46–47.

¹¹²⁸ See, for instance, Konrad Henlein, “Beispiel eines Vortrages: Rassenreinheit,” in *Führer-Lehrgänge im deutschen Turnen: Der Vorturner*, Vol. 2 (Teplitz-Schönau: Deutscher Turnverband, 1931), 13–17.

¹¹²⁹ Pieter Troch, “Interwar Yugoslav State-Building and the Changing Social Position of the Sokol Gymnastics Movement,” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d’histoire* 26, no. 1 (2019): 73.

state and the gymnastics association reached its peak when the Ministry for Physical Education of the People was established in 1931, with its first ministers recruited from the Sokol ranks.¹¹³⁰

After the establishment of the ministry, the Yugoslav state implemented several measures that increased the power of both Sokol and the medical doctors and other supporters of eugenics within the association. Firstly, in 1934, obligatory gymnastic exercises based on the Sokol model were introduced for schoolchildren and young male adults. The scope of these exercises explicitly included measures to “stimulate the natural development of the organism, exclude and prevent all harmful influences and their impact,” and to “raise awareness for physical education and hygiene as the basis for the health of present and future generations.”¹¹³¹ Additionally, in 1935, a School for Physical Education was established with the aim of educating physical education trainers. The school employed medical doctors, and its curriculum covered medical and hygienic topics. Students were required to provide a medical certificate proving they were “entirely healthy and able” as well as to undergo an additional examination conducted by the school’s medical committee.¹¹³² Since prospective students had to be unmarried, this measure, in practice, amounted to a premarital health certificate. Furthermore, in 1935, the ministry established a special advisory body for physical education, where Sokol members were prominent.¹¹³³ However, by this point, the dictatorship had eased, public trust in Sokol had suffered due to its association with the regime, and its influence in Yugoslavia was declining.¹¹³⁴

The Sokol association in Czechoslovakia also enjoyed significant backing from the state. After 1918, its representatives lobbied for the establishment of a separate ministry of

¹¹³⁰ Troch, “Interwar Yugoslav,” 74.

¹¹³¹ Troch, “Interwar Yugoslav,” 74.

¹¹³² “Natečaj za prijem slušača u školu za telesno vaspitanje” [Competition for Admission to the School for Physical Education], *Sokolski glasnik* 6, no. 36 (September 27, 1935): 2–3.

¹¹³³ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 935, Inv. No. 24238/1935, Report, Ustavení poradních sborů pro tělesnou výchovu v cizině.

¹¹³⁴ Troch, “Interwar Yugoslav,” *passim*.

physical education. However, such a ministry did not materialize, and the agenda was assigned to the Ministry of Public Health instead. As compensation, a powerful Advisory Committee for Physical Education was created within the latter ministry, with Sokol exerting a significant amount of influence within it. Karel Weigner, an official of Sokol and a eugenicist, was appointed as the head of this committee and fulfilled this role until the mid-1930s.¹¹³⁵ Sokol had a strong representation within the committee, as it had the right to nominate one of its members, and appointees from other organizations often had Sokol affiliations. Supporters of eugenics held prominent positions within the committee as well. While some of the appointees suggested by Sokol or other organizations supported eugenics, one committee member was directly nominated by the Czech Eugenics Society. Thus, within the committee appointed in 1920, there were at least five prominent Czech advocates of eugenics: Karel Weigner, psychiatrist Ladislav Haškovec, physical anthropologist Jindřich Matiegka, special educator Otakar Kádner, and lawyer and social worker Antonín Tůma.¹¹³⁶ To a significant extent, it was thus due to voluntary associations such as Sokol and their initiatives that eugenicists began to permeate the central administration in Czechoslovakia.

Less than a year after its establishment, the Advisory Committee produced two draft laws that would have clearly benefited the Sokol association if they had been passed. The first draft aimed to introduce a state-sponsored higher education institution that would train gymnastics instructors, providing an official institutional framework for Sokol advocates of eugenics. The second draft law was more far-reaching, attempting to establish compulsory physical education and mass gymnastics for children and young adults, with Sokol being one

¹¹³⁵ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 935, Inv. No. 38510/1934, Poděkování členům Poradního sboru pro tělesnou výchovu za minulé období 1931-1933 a rok 1934.

¹¹³⁶ They were nominated by the Czech Eugenic Society, the Faculty of Natural Sciences of Prague University, the Faculty of Arts, and the Ministry of Social Welfare, respectively. National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 935, Inv. No. 39145/1934, Důvodová zpráva k zákonu o zřízení 1920.

of the associations responsible for delivering these services. The eugenic agenda of the law was made quite explicit. The official commentary accompanying the draft of the law claimed that physical education is “generally a significant part of human culture” and listed its goals, highlighting its “ethical, eugenic, medical-educational, rational, aesthetic, practical, economic, and defensive” purposes. It further specified that its eugenic goals included “the improvement of the race.”¹¹³⁷ Yet, neither of these laws was passed in the 1920s.

The *völkisch* nationalist Turnverein in Austria maintained a close connection to the eugenic movement. According to Thomas Mayer, the first explicitly nationalist and antisemitic association of race hygiene supporters in interwar Austria, which was established in Linz in 1923, was intertwined with the local Turner movement.¹¹³⁸ The leader of this association published texts framing mass gymnastics as a tool for race hygiene, some of which appeared in the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie*.¹¹³⁹ Another eugenics association in Austria, the *Wiener Gesellschaft für Rassenpflege (Rassenhygiene)*, with a similar agenda, was also embedded in a *völkisch* and gymnastics-oriented associational setting.¹¹⁴⁰ However, the Turnverein did not have to rely on eugenics associations to influence the state's policies on physical education. They had a more direct avenue through Karl Gaulhofer, a trained biologist and physical educator who emerged as a key Austrian expert on this issue. Gaulhofer facilitated the influence of the Turnverein on the state's physical education policies.

Gaulhofer (1885-1941) was a member of the Turner club in Graz already as a high school student at the age of 15, and he also had a connection to the *Wandervogel* youth movement. From the early 1920s, Gaulhofer, in collaboration with Margarete Streicher,

¹¹³⁷ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 935, Inv. No. 26199/1931, Draft, Návrhy zákonů tělovýchovných [1921], 1.

¹¹³⁸ Mayer, “Eugenische Initiativen,” 55.

¹¹³⁹ Leopold Gschwendtner, “Wirkt der moderne Sport rassenerhaltend und -ertüchtigend?” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 17, no. 2 (1925): 170–80.

¹¹⁴⁰ Mayer, “Eugenische Initiativen,” 55.

developed an influential concept of “natural gymnastics” [Natürliches Turnen], which equated nature with biology, particularly emphasizing heredity and “race.” Eugenics, in other words, was a basic “frame of reference” for Gaulhofer’s arguments, as documented by Thomas Mayer.¹¹⁴¹ Crucially, in 1919, Gaulhofer became a secretary for physical education at the Austrian Ministry of Education, a position he held until 1932. This was the highest administrative position responsible for physical education. Additionally, he served as a lecturer at the *Institut für Turnerausbildung* of the University of Vienna, which was entrusted with the training of gymnastics and physical education instructors.¹¹⁴²

During his tenure at the Ministry, Gaulhofer spearheaded several important reforms in physical education. These reforms encompassed the reconfiguration of professional training for gymnastics instructors, the implementation of new curricula for physical education across various types of schools, the establishment of sports- and gymnastics-related infrastructure, and a comprehensive reorganization of the network and priorities of school physicians.¹¹⁴³ In 1932, Gaulhofer, a German nationalist, left Austria due to his conflicts with the increasingly powerful Christian Socialists. The Turnverein was marginalized during the Christian Socialists’ dictatorship in the 1930s. However, Catholic gymnastics associations established a similar mutually reinforcing relationship with the new authoritarian and corporatist regime and state.¹¹⁴⁴

¹¹⁴¹ Thomas Mayer, “Gesunde Gene im gesunden Körper? Die Kooperation von Eugenik und Turnreform am Beispiel des österreichischen Reformers des Turnunterrichts Karl Gaulhofer (1885-1941),” in *„mens sana in corpore sano“ Gymnastik, Turnen, Spiel und Sport als Gegenstand der Bildungspolitik vom 18. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert. Jahrestagung der dvs-Sektion Sportgeschichte vom 7.-8. Juni 2007 in Frankfurt am Main*, ed. Michael Krüger (Hamburg: Deutsche Vereinigung für Sportwissenschaft, 2008), 115–26.

¹¹⁴² Tellingly, the training received very positive coverage from the press of the *völkisch* nationalist Südmark. Erwin Mehl, “Fortbildungslehrgang für Turnkursleiter in Wien,” *Die Südmark: Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken* 4, no. 8 (August 1923): 364–68.

¹¹⁴³ Mayer, “Gesunde Gene,” 115.

¹¹⁴⁴ Reinhard Farkas, “Turnen und Sport in der Steiermark: Von der Subkultur zum Staatsmonopol (1862-1938),” *Blätter für Heimatkunde* 74 (2000): 139–53.

Even though the Sudeten German Turner association belonged to one of Czechoslovakia's minorities, its representatives, often medical doctors, joined the Advisory Committee for Physical Education within the Czechoslovak Health Ministry from the early 1930s onwards. Alongside them, there were several other German gymnastic, educational, and research institutions whose members, in many cases, also had close links to the Turner movement.¹¹⁴⁵ What mattered more than this surprising link to the state through membership in an influential expert committee, however, was the role that the *Turnverein* played in forming some key members of the leadership of the new Sudeten German nationalist party that emerged in the 1930s. With the Turner gymnastics trainer Konrad Henlein at its helm, the *Sudetendeutsche Partei* emerged as a dominant political force among Germans in Czechoslovakia, and eventually facilitated their incorporation into Nazi Germany in 1938.¹¹⁴⁶

Initially, Henlein and his allies embraced the corporatism promoted by the Austrian radical conservative sociologist Othmar Spann which in accordance with the latter's Catholic creed posited "race" neither as the primary nor as the ultimate point of reference.¹¹⁴⁷ Yet, Henlein's Turner texts and lectures had a significant biopolitical dimension, and framed the body of the Turner as pronouncedly racialized:

The foundation of our nation is the German family. [...] Marriage and motherhood are national duties! A healthy person guarantees healthy offspring. Herein lies the holiest commandment of the nation! You are a link in the long

¹¹⁴⁵ Overall, 33 different associations and governmental bodies nominated members to the Advisory Committee in the mid-1930s. Out of these, 10 belonged to the German minority, while one (the Csehszlovákiai Magyar Testnevelő Szövetség) was linked to the Hungarian minority. The German institutions included: the social democratic *Arbeiter-Turn und Sportverband*, the *Deutscher Hauptausschuss für Leibesübungen*, the German Technical University in Prague and Brno, the network organizing the courses for instructors of physical education, the *Deutscher Turnverband*, the Medical School of the Prague University, the Faculty of Natural Science, and the Faculty of Arts of the same university, *Reichsverband der deutschen Ärzte-Vereine in der Tschechoslowakei*, and the *Verein deutscher Lehrer und Lehrerinnen für Leibesübungen in der Tschechoslowakei*. National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 934, Inv. No. 9749/1935, Poradní sbor pro tělesnou výchovu při ministerstvu veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy, 1935-1937.

¹¹⁴⁶ Ralf Gebel, *Heim ins Reich!: Konrad Henlein und der Reichsgau Sudetenland, 1938-1945* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999); Mark Cornwall, *The Devil's Wall: The Nationalist Youth Mission of Heinz Rutha* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

¹¹⁴⁷ Janek Wasserman, *Black Vienna: The Radical Right in the Red City, 1918-1938* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014).

chain of your ancestors and should inherit the German blood of your ancestors
in purity to future generations! Make sure the chain doesn't break off on you!
Keep yourself pure and strong!¹¹⁴⁸

Apart from such pro-natalist calls, the Turner also required his audience “to prevent inferior [minderwertig] offspring by keeping one’s body healthy,” particularly by avoiding alcohol, nicotine, and sexually transmitted infections.¹¹⁴⁹ Placing these racial hygienic tropes into a social Darwinist framework, finally, Henlein insisted that such health was a precondition of the Sudeten Germans’ survival “in the struggle for blood and life-space, for the Nation and Homeland.”¹¹⁵⁰ The Turner trainer and future political leader thus drew on race hygiene in his calls to purify and thereby rejuvenate the imagined national community.

The close intertwining between mass gymnastics associations and the state facilitated the integration of eugenics advocates associated with the former into the central state administration. However, this does not imply that their demands always found fertile ground. Often, these eugenics advocates were frustrated by what they perceived as a slow, ineffective, and risk-averse functioning of the state bureaucracy. This highlights a crucial point: once they became connected to the state, these voluntary associations and their eugenics proponents developed an increasing interest in a strong, interventionist, and possibly even authoritarian state. Instead of acting as a counterbalance to state power and resisting encroachments on their autonomy, these associations and their biopolitical experts placed their confidence in such an expansion of state authority.

This emerging synergy and mutually radicalizing dynamic between the state, voluntary associations focused on mass gymnastics, and eugenics also becomes apparent in Hungary and

¹¹⁴⁸ Konrad Henlein, “Worte Konrad Henleins,” in *Reden und Aufsätze zur völkischen Turnbewegung 1928-1933*, ed. Willi Brandner (Karlsbad: K. H. Frank, 1934), 109–110.

¹¹⁴⁹ Konrad Henlein, *Die völkische Turnbewegung*, 4th ed. (Gablitz an der Neise: Deutscher Turnverband, 1937), 44–45.

¹¹⁵⁰ Konrad Henlein, “Leibesübung und ihre volkspolitische Bedeutung,” in *Reden und Aufsätze zur völkischen Turnbewegung 1928-1933*, ed. Willi Brandner (Karlsbad: K. H. Frank, 1934), 61.

among Romanian nationalists in Transylvania. Before 1918, neither Hungarian nor Romanian nationalists had a mass gymnastics association comparable in its scale to the *Turner* or *Sokol* movement. It was only in the interwar period that they were established. The Sokol, in particular, served as a model for these associations. Crucially, its analogues – the *Levente* movement in Hungary and the *Șoimii Carpaților* in Transylvania – were created by the state authorities in the former case and by one of Romania’s eugenic associations in the latter. The authorities and eugenicists, in other words, realized that voluntary associations promoting mass gymnastics were a useful vehicle for state influence and the dissemination of eugenics, to the extent that they needed to be created from above where they had previously been absent.

In Hungary, the *Leventemozgalom* (Levente movement) that foregrounded gymnastics as a tool of Christian nationalist education and a form of pre-military training was set up by a law on physical education in 1921.¹¹⁵¹ One of the preparatory documents made it clear that the authorities intended to establish an association “that would be called to fulfill the same tasks in our country as the Sokols work on among the Slavs.”¹¹⁵² However, this genealogy was not publicly acknowledged, nor did it mean that the actual *Levente* members interacted with the Sokol. Rather, *Levente* was as pronouncedly nationalist in its institutional setup as it was in its ideology. The everyday practices of *Levente* were medicalized to a significant extent, and the association became one of the settings in which radical nationalist race hygiene was circulated and promoted among its youthful members.¹¹⁵³

¹¹⁵¹ Gergely Ferenc, “Leventeintézmény, cserkészmozgalom, militarizáció (1919-1939)” [Levente Institution, Scout Movement, Militarization, 1919-1939], *Pedagógiai Szemle* 23, no. 12 (December 1, 1973): 1153. I am grateful to Lucija Balikić for pointing out this study to me.

¹¹⁵² Ráday Tudományos Gyűjtemény (RTGy) Imre II. Sándor iratai. Katonás nevelés c. dosszié. Cited in Ferenc, “Leventeintézmény,” 1152.

¹¹⁵³ Bihar vármegye tisztiorvosi kara [Faculty of Medical Officers of Bihar County], *Egészségtan a leventék részére: Kérdésekben és feleletekben* [Health Education for the Levente: In Questions and Answers] (Budapest: Pesti Könyvnyomda Részvénytársaság, 1928); *Tansegédlet leventék egészségügyi kiképzéséhez* [Study Guide for the Health Training of the Levente] (Homok: Csernai Nyomda, 1937).

The Sokol association also served as a model for a eugenically-oriented mass gymnastics association in Romania. The *Șoimii Carpaților* (Carpathian Falcons), as the association was called, was established in 1928 in Transylvania, had largely a regional scope, and its structure mirrored many features of the *Sokol*. Notably, the by-laws of the Polish *Sokół* – founded in 1867 in Lwów/Lviv/Lemberg – are still part of the papers belonging to one of the authors of the *Șoimii*'s by-laws, physician Iuliu Moldovan.¹¹⁵⁴ Moldovan served in the Galician capital during the war, and his Polish-speaking wife was likely able to translate the document easily. Furthermore, the establishment of the association was accompanied by a series of lectures in the National Theater in Cluj, including presentations by Czech officials, about the *Sokol* physical education system. These lectures were combined with screenings of Czechoslovak films that shared identical themes.¹¹⁵⁵ Unlike the Hungarian *Levente*, the *Șoimii* highlighted their *Sokol* genealogy through certain symbols and public rituals in which they participated. In particular, they took part in Sokol gatherings in Prague, Uzhhorod/Ungvár/Užhorod, and Belgrade, demonstrating their cross-border alliance.¹¹⁵⁶ Thus, the emergence of the *Șoimii* is an example of the mobility of actors and the circulation of knowledge between various parts of the former Cisleithania, and the regional Transylvanian context on the other side.

As Moldovan's name already indicates, Romanian eugenicists in Transylvania were crucial for the creation of this gymnastics association. Indeed, the project was first deliberated within the *Secția feminină-biopolitică* (Feminine and Biopolitical Section), and particularly within its subsection for physical education, headed by Moldovan's ally, the physician Iuliu

¹¹⁵⁴ The file contains the by-laws of the Polish boy scouts, as well. National Archives of Romania, Cluj-Napoca Branch, Fund 231, Iuliu Moldovan Papers, Publicații, Inv. No. 29, Statut towarzystwa gimnastycznego “Sokół”, Warsaw: Drukarnia i Litografia Feliks Kasprzykiewicz [after 1925]. On Moldovan as a co-author of the association's statutes, see Dragoș Petrescu and Daniela Petrescu, “Organizația ‘Șoimii Carpaților’ în perioada interbelică” [The Organization Carpathian Falcons During the Interwar Period], *Carpica* 32 (2003): 187.

¹¹⁵⁵ Atanasie Popa, “Șoimii Carpaților” [Carpathian Falcons], *Boabe de Grâu* 1, no. 6 (1930): 339–46.

¹¹⁵⁶ Ion Breazu, “Șoimii Carpaților la serbările Sokolilor dela Praga” [Carpathian Falcons at the Celebrations of the Sokols in Prague], *Șoimii Carpaților* 1, no. 2–3 (1938): 10–19.

Hațieganu.¹¹⁵⁷ (The Section, one of the first eugenic associations in Romania, was a part of the Romanian nationalist cultural association, ASTRA.)¹¹⁵⁸ As the politics in Romania was heading towards the introduction of a royal dictatorship in 1938, the *Șoimii* were increasingly enjoying the backing of the king and the state authorities.¹¹⁵⁹

Like its Sokol model, the emerging *Șoimii* had a eugenic agenda. Yet, it went one step further, and declared eugenics as its central tenet:

The ideology of the *Șoimii* is biopolitical, based on the belief that education is best conducted according to biological laws. [...] The education of *Șoimii* means a life according to the individual and national biological doctrine. It aims for the physical, moral, and intellectual prosperity of the individual and the nation by harnessing the physical, moral, and intellectual forces, and by placing these forces of the individual in the service of the community.¹¹⁶⁰

In practice, the commitment of the *Șoimii* to eugenics assumed the form of regular medical examinations for its members, in some cases carried out by Moldovan's eugenically-oriented students, and an article within its by-laws that obliged its members to seek a medical health certificate before entering marriage.¹¹⁶¹ The *Șoimii* were also dedicated to temperance, and they prohibited alcoholics from becoming members. Additionally, "those who consciously infect another" were discouraged from joining, a policy that was in line with Moldovan's focus on the STIs.¹¹⁶² Finally, the Romanian nationalist *Șoimii* did not explicitly prohibit ethnic others from joining, although they did not promote the idea of amalgamating Romania's multiethnic inhabitants into co-nationals like their Yugoslav counterparts.¹¹⁶³

¹¹⁵⁷ Petrescu and Petrescu, "Organizația," 187.

¹¹⁵⁸ On the Section, see Bucur, "Awakening," 172–85.

¹¹⁵⁹ Ion Agârbiceanu, "Înalta încurajare" [High Encouragement], *Tribuna* 2, no. 191 (August 23, 1939): 1.

¹¹⁶⁰ Iuliu Hațieganu, *Șoimii Carpaților* [Carpathian Falcons], Biblioteca populară a asociațiunii ASTRA 226–227. (Sibiu: Editura Asociațiunii ASTRA, 1935), 6.

¹¹⁶¹ Hațieganu, *Șoimii*, 81 and 99.

¹¹⁶² Cited in Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 183.

¹¹⁶³ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 184.

Even though this brief and necessarily selective analysis of gymnastics associations primarily focused on those with pronounced nationalist agendas and genealogical links to the Turner and Sokol movements, it is important to bear in mind that the range of mass gymnastics associations was much broader. As Todd Presner points out, Zionist gymnastics associations such as the Makkabi sought to shape the bodies of their members, aiming to create a form of “muscular Judaism.”¹¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, there was also a thriving field of social democratic and communist workers’ mass gymnastics. Additionally, Catholic mass gymnastics associations were widespread in East Central Europe. A more extensive and detailed analysis is needed to demonstrate both the varying degrees of engagement with eugenics within these associational settings, as well as the diverse genealogies and applications of this body of knowledge. Despite these limitations, this subsection presented evidence suggesting that mass gymnastics associations and other “alternative states” played a vital role in the history of eugenics in interwar East Central Europe. They not only disseminated eugenic knowledge and practices among their vast membership, but also created a leeway through which eugenicists associated with these organizations could permeate the state.

Conclusion

The argument presented in this chapter centers around eugenic practices in the post-Habsburg countries during the first interwar decade. It studies these practices across national boundaries, rather than within a single context. In doing so, the chapter reveals family resemblances between biopolitical strategies in comparable social settings across these various post-Habsburg national contexts. In other words, biopolitical strategies displayed remarkable similarities across metropolitan areas, as they did within the newly acquired borderlands, rural regions, and nationalist associations, respectively. Conversely, the individual national contexts

¹¹⁶⁴ Todd Samuel Presner, *Muscular Judaism: The Jewish Body and the Politics of Regeneration* (London: Routledge, 2007).

resembled a hodgepodge of different biopolitical practices, even though some local supporters of eugenics sought to counteract this fact by constructing narratives emphasizing the purported coherence and distinctiveness of their national styles.

Both the internal heterogeneity and the cross-national similarities are attributed to a common cause: imperial legacies. Consequently, the chapter not only challenges the prevalent methodological nationalism in the field but also presents a different overarching narrative. This narrative revolves around the nature of these states as “little empires,” characterized by differentiated forms of governance.

At the same time, the analysis suggests that such similarities were not limited only to the practices. Actors across multiple national contexts also shared a similar conceptual toolkit, as is clearly evident in the case of biopolitics in metropolitan areas. These similarities were not accidental; rather, they indicate that imperial legacies in eugenics in these post-Habsburg countries often extended even to the conceptual tools. The following chapter takes up and elaborates on this observation. It explores the continuities and reinterpretations of several selected eugenic concepts during the post-imperial transitions, demonstrating their lasting impact on eugenicists and beyond.

EUGENIC CONCEPTS IN TRANSITION, C. 1920–1930S

In 1931, as interwar Hungary's counterrevolutionary, "National Christian" regime was on the brink of shifting even further to the right, a new book titled *Az élő múlt: Politikai téveszmék - társadalmi babonák* (The Living Past: Political Delusions - Social Superstitions) appeared on the shelves of bookstores. Spanning several hundred pages, this polemical study by Hungarian legal scholar Ruzstem Vámbéry attempted to uphold his belief in progress amidst the escalating anti-liberal tendencies of the 1930s, while offering a sociological explanation for their causes.

In his book, Vámbéry expressed his hope that in a global tug-of-war between tradition and modernity, the latter would ultimately triumph. He believed that growing economic interdependence was bound to bring about an "increasing cooperation of human society," even amidst a rising tide of nationalism, and sometimes even as its unintended consequence.¹¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, to achieve this outcome, it was imperative to overcome what Vámbéry described as "subconscious survivals of bygone times" and the corrosive effect which they had on "our current notions of moral, political and social life."¹¹⁶⁶ Among these "invisible specters of the human mind [...] chiefly responsible for the reactionary spirit that unfortunately prevails nowadays in certain parts of Europe," prominently including Horthy's Hungary, Vámbéry counted racial theories, anti-Semitism, and radical nationalism.¹¹⁶⁷ In its core passages, the book provided an in-depth sociological examination and critique of these phenomena.

Unlike Hungarian civic radical sociologists of the early 1900s, of whom he was a leading intellectual and political heir, Vámbéry refused to draw on biological theories or

¹¹⁶⁵ Ruzstem Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt: Politikai téveszmék - társadalmi babonák* [The Living Past: Political Delusions - Social Superstitions] (Budapest: Pantheon, 1931), 36.

¹¹⁶⁶ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 3.

¹¹⁶⁷ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 3.

reinforce his belief in progress with evolutionary metaphors. In line with most of his contemporaries, Vámbéry saw sociology as a field whose identity was guaranteed by its object, “the social,” which was now strictly insulated from the sphere of biology. Consequently, the patterns that could be identified in society were of a fundamentally different order than those in the natural world. “Although there may be similarities between the forms of living beings and social phenomena,” Vámbéry observed, “it is now almost a sociological commonplace that the regularities of society cannot find a satisfactory explanation in the biological laws of nature.”¹¹⁶⁸ These fundamental assumptions also shaped Vámbéry’s attitude towards eugenic ideas, which were a part of the intellectual baggage of his predecessors’ generation.

Despite Vámbéry’s reluctance to engage with biology, there were subtle echoes of turn-of-the-century eugenic arguments in his book. Notably, these echoes arose when Vámbéry sought metaphors for “a plan-based cooperation of nations and individuals,” which he believed would ultimately supersede their conflicts.¹¹⁶⁹ One term of choice encapsulating his ideas on the contemporary internationalist tendencies was none other than the biological notion of symbiosis. Internationalism, he wrote, was “a symbiosis [szimbiózis] of nations.”¹¹⁷⁰ Mutual aid was another, related metaphor he used for such attempts at cooperation within and across societies. Insisting that “mutual aid, as demonstrated by numerous animal species, is not unique to humans,” Vámbéry acknowledged a certain equivalence between the fundamental features of “mutual aid” in nature and in society.¹¹⁷¹ However, he also emphasized that such cooperation was significantly more complex in human societies. Seeking to underscore the idea that cooperation could occur across real or imagined group boundaries, Vámbéry posited that mutual aid in human societies displayed a distinct level of organization and was coupled with

¹¹⁶⁸ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 45.

¹¹⁶⁹ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 36.

¹¹⁷⁰ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 7.

¹¹⁷¹ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 36.

a sense of commonality that he also saw as uniquely human.¹¹⁷² In making his case for cooperation, Vámbéry thus echoed concepts promoted nearly two decades earlier by eugenicists such as Kammerer and Madzsar.

Of course, the fact that these notions were genealogically connected to eugenic debates in the late imperial setting does not make Vámbéry a eugenicist. Rather than showing a preference for this ambiguous body of knowledge, the presence of these ideas in his book indicated their significant and enduring importance, even for some of those, like Vámbéry, who were otherwise quite skeptical of eugenics, and racial theories more broadly.¹¹⁷³ Indeed, as this chapter demonstrates, Vámbéry was not alone in utilizing concepts coined or promoted by proponents of eugenics in former Austria-Hungary to think about cooperation across ethnocultural lines in its successor states and between them.

This chapter centers on eugenic concepts such as cooperation, human economy, and constitution. Based on these examples, it argues that the collapse of the empire did not diminish the relevance of eugenic concepts developed within the Habsburg imperial context, including those that aimed to emphasize the cultural and alleged biological differences among the empire's subjects. Instead, these concepts were creatively adapted and put to new uses. The chapter documents the varied political and epistemic recalibrations of these concepts in various post-imperial settings, ranging from their incorporation into modernist political vocabularies to more sinister applications.

This outcome was not counterintuitive, as the post-Habsburg states faced many realities similar to those that the now-defunct Habsburg Empire had to contend with. As Pieter Judson

¹¹⁷² Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 36–7.

¹¹⁷³ For an example of Vámbéry's ambiguous, but ultimately rejecting, stance on certain elements of eugenics, see Rusztem Vámbéry, "Töltsétek be a földet" [Fill the Earth], in *Születésszabályozás* [Birth Control], ed. Totis Béla ([Budapest]: Szociáldemokrata Párt, 1932), 3–7.

points out, these states effectively inherited and incorporated various strategies that the empire had developed earlier to address these challenges. Consequently, there were notable similarities between the empire and these successor states, even when it came to “governing their populations, establishing legitimacy, and conceptualizing cultural differences.”¹¹⁷⁴ This chapter suggests that biopolitics was initially one such area of connection.

The central argument of this chapter is that the eugenic categories originally serving the cognitive management of the imperial diversity in Austria-Hungary were adapted to suit the post-imperial context. They were now used to underpin various theories of what might be termed “mini-imperial hybridity” in its successor states, as well as biopolitical strategies for managing it.

The individuals who engaged with these concepts and chose to incorporate them into their arguments were manifold. Some were active members of eugenic societies, including some of the pivotal figures within these networks. However, these concepts also resonated beyond these narrowly defined eugenic circles, appealing to sociologists, scholars of the humanities, and politicians, even to those who were either skeptical of or indifferent to eugenics. Through these actors, ideas like symbiosis or human economy became intertwined with various agendas. As Mitchell Ash insightfully argued, science and politics can act as resources for each other.¹¹⁷⁵ One could rephrase his statement and posit that the imperial legacies, even those associated with ambiguous bodies of scientific knowledge like eugenics, served as resources for various political and identity-related endeavors, and vice versa.

¹¹⁷⁴ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 387–88.

¹¹⁷⁵ Mitchell G. Ash, “Wissenschaft und Politik als Ressourcen für einander,” in *Wissenschaften und Wissenschaftspolitik: Bestandaufnahmen zu Formationen, Brüchen und Kontinuitäten im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch and Brigitte Kaderas (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002), 32–51.

In effect, instead of being discarded in the post-Habsburg countries, these eugenic concepts found their way into various theories. Strikingly, there was a notable non-nationalist engagement with these eugenic ideas. As the first section of this chapter demonstrates, some thinkers used these concepts as a foundation for their reflections on the collapse of multiethnic Austria-Hungary and the potential futures of coexistence in the area. Others explored how these concepts could be repurposed into biological justifications for national indifference. Yet other authors sought to refine biological categories such as human economy or constitution/condition in a way that would produce “objective” scientific guidance to the administration without discriminating against subjects based on their ethnicity, or even highlighting it.

The most influential reading was one that co-opted and partially repurposed these concepts for the state- and nation-building projects in post-Habsburg countries. The crucial context for these attempts was the “synthetic,” “integration-oriented,” or “amalgamating” state ideologies that marked countries such as Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, particularly in the early interwar period.¹¹⁷⁶ While these synthetic state ideologies did not emerge from the spirit of eugenics or racial anthropology, parts of these fields offered themselves as resources in their support. By conceptualizing the multiethnic societies that post-Habsburg countries inherited, they aimed to transform them into new polities. Interestingly, this engagement was not limited only to the members of the new national majorities, but also to some thinkers belonging to the national minorities within these states.

Going beyond supra-ethnic nation-building, there were also numerous attempts to incorporate concepts like symbiosis, human economy, and constitutional medicine into radical nationalist projects. These projects often employed coercive methods by promoting forced

¹¹⁷⁶ On these ideologies, see Paul Brykczynski, “Reconsidering ‘Piłsudskiite Nationalism,’” *Nationalities Papers* 42, no. 5 (September 2014): 771–90; Hudek, Kopeček, and Mervart, *Czechoslovakism*, 5; Wachtel, *Making a Nation*, 6.

assimilation into a predefined national community and/or by advocating for its reorganization along alleged racial lines. In these instances, the moderate and rational nature of these concepts, as well as their historical origins, were primarily used to obscure the extent of radicalization among the advocates of such nationalist ideas.

Thus, this chapter builds on the argument proposed in the preceding one. While the previous chapter showed that the form and *modus operandi* of eugenics reflected the differentiated rule within post-Habsburg countries, this chapter further demonstrates that some eugenic theories in these successor states were, in essence, mini-imperial even in terms of their genealogy and content.

Cooperative Mini-Empires: Thinking through Imperial Collapse, Conceptualizing State-Building

From the 1900s onwards, some early advocates of eugenics in Austria-Hungary adopted the concepts of mutual aid and symbiosis as tools for the cognitive management of imperial diversity. Consequently, these two concepts of cooperation were closely linked to the Habsburg imperial context, even though they did not originate there. Despite this connection, they did not entirely lose their relevance with the empire's collapse. This was largely because the successor states of the Habsburg Empire inherited its ethnocultural diversity, employing strategies reminiscent of their predecessor for its management. This subchapter reveals that some eugenicists persisted in using these concepts after the collapse of Austria-Hungary. By conceptualizing coexistence and cooperation in both nature and society, these notions served dual purposes. On one hand, they helped cognitively manage the ethnocultural diversity that made these post-imperial countries resemble mini-empires as much as they did nation-states. Conversely, some authors critically engaged with these biosocial concepts in their initial reflections on the empire's collapse.

The most salient prewar promoter of the concept of symbiosis in the late imperial context, the biologist Paul Kammerer, continued to engage with this issue even after 1918. In interwar Austria, he employed this concept to shed light on the collapse of the multinational state and to imagine the possible futures of the region. Initially, his predictions were optimistic. Kammerer argued that the support for the mobilization among the empire's multiethnic population at the beginning of the First World War provided a proof that a deep sense of commonality had emerged in the old empire, and thus exemplified a "triumph of state unity over national unity."¹¹⁷⁷ "When the multinational [gemischtvölkisch] state could still enter the battlefield as one man," he noted, "it was due to processes of fusion that had taken place on a large scale over a long stretch of time [...]"¹¹⁷⁸ Kammerer invoked this past mainly to predict the future: as the "fusion" within the old empire had advanced so much, it could not be easily reversed, and it would continue to matter despite the empire's collapse.

For this reason, Kammerer appeared confident that cooperation across national lines would remain widespread both within and between the successor states of Austria-Hungary. The natural and human diversity of its successor states, he argued, would compel them to accept multiethnicity as a natural fact and develop new strategies to accommodate it. Alluding to the legal scholar Karl Brockhausen and describing the defunct Habsburg Empire as an experiment in coexistence, he expressed his hope that "the 'testing ground' persists, even if it should never again assume the constraining framework of collective statehood."¹¹⁷⁹ In making this striking argument, the Viennese biologist did not mention any concrete examples of what character and form this cooperation might now assume beyond the imperial state. Yet, it is plausible that

¹¹⁷⁷ Kammerer, *Menschheitswende*, 89.

¹¹⁷⁸ Kammerer, *Menschheitswende*, 89.

¹¹⁷⁹ The text published in 1919 was a reworked version of an internal memo that Kammerer wrote back in 1916. The part of the argument that referred to Brockhausen, and that serves as the introduction to this dissertation, was already present verbatim in the 1916 version. Austrian State Archives, Vienna, Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Armeeoberkommando, Evidenzbüro, Akten, Box 3742, Inv. No. 3720, Paul Kammerer: Die soziologischen Fragen der Gefangenekorrespondenz, [1916], 9; Kammerer, *Menschheitswende*, 90.

Kammerer may have had in mind the theories of the federative reorganization of post-Habsburg Central Europe that mushroomed in the early interwar period, and that echoed particularly among the supporters of the republican form of the successor states.¹¹⁸⁰

While Kammerer asserted that the tendencies towards cooperation were a part of human nature and historically conditioned by the preceding imperial experience, he also pleaded for their deliberate strengthening through what he called “organic technology” and education. Education, the biologist suggested, must prioritize “the training of a readiness to engage in mutual aid”:

As mutual aid or universal symbiosis [Pansymbiose] embodies a general phenomenon of life and the productive counterpoint to the struggle for existence, and the instinct to help is thus grounded deep in our nature, education does not try to create it anew, but only to awaken it.¹¹⁸¹

Kammerer, in other words, made cooperation appear both as a natural given and as something that required a deliberate and forceful intervention into human nature for it to actualize. Even more than his preceding arguments, this tension laid bare the conflict between Kammerer’s Austro-Marxist optimistic belief in education and social evolution, and the experience of increasingly virulent nationalism that permeated the public arenas of Austria-Hungary’s successor states.

Indeed, as the mid-1920s approached, Kammerer became significantly more pessimistic about the past capacity of the defunct Habsburg Empire to mold humans into symbiotic creatures. The empire, he now claimed, could not have hoped to create preconditions for such cooperation, and “there was nothing that indicated any real unity” as a result.¹¹⁸² Seeking to

¹¹⁸⁰ Balázs Trencsényi, Michal Kopeček, Luka Lisjak Gabrijelčič, Maria Falina, Mónika Baár, and Maciej Janowski, *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe: Volume II: Negotiating Modernity in the “Short Twentieth Century” and Beyond, Part I: 1918-1968* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 30–53.

¹¹⁸¹ Paul Kammerer, *Das biologische Zeitalter: Fortschritte der organischen Technik* (Vienna: Verlag der Gruppen Währing-Döbling und Hernals des Vereins Freie Schule, 1920), 9.

¹¹⁸² Paul Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel Amerika,” *Urania* 1, no. 2 (November 1924): 38.

identify the causes of this failure, Kammerer pointed to factors that were both environmental and cultural.

Kammerer concluded that the lands and environments that composed the empire and now constituted post-Habsburg Central Europe were, after all, too varied to allow for cooperation. The “old Austria Hungary,” he wrote in 1924, “offered extraordinary diversity. The highlands of the Alps, the steppes of Galicia, and the subtropical coasts of the Adriatic did not provide a uniform atmosphere where different things could become the same.”¹¹⁸³ What is more, this diversity also extended to the populations of the defunct empire. It was again in a stark contrast to his prewar optimism when Kammerer now noted that “in the old Austria-Hungary, there was such a concert of nations [Völkerkonzert] that cannot be matched even in [the United States of] America.”¹¹⁸⁴ No longer framing Habsburg diversity as providing a unique breeding ground for symbiosis, Kammerer now suggested that this diversity could instead be misused by divisive nationalist politics.

It was this cultural factor which Kammerer brought to the fore that he now saw as most important. He argued that the nationalism and anti-Semitism that became rampant in the late Habsburg Empire precluded the emergence of a sense of commonality even in multiethnic urban contexts, such as in Vienna: “This negative result apparently had its cause in the extraordinary national and racial hatred that was deliberately fueled for the sake of political parties and the selfish goals of individuals.”¹¹⁸⁵ If, before the collapse of the empire, Kammerer implied that a shared environment and mutual interactions could be sufficient factors to overcome the cultural differences between Austria-Hungary’s diverse ethnicities, his arguments from the mid-1920s ascribed a comparable, or even decisive, role to a culture stimulating

¹¹⁸³ Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel,” 38.

¹¹⁸⁴ Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel,” 38–39.

¹¹⁸⁵ Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel,” 39.

cooperation: “a similar environment is not sufficient to balance out racial differences. Good intentions, such as replacing the struggle for existence [Kampf ums Dasein] with aid in existence [Hilfe im Dasein], are also necessary if a good and uniform mixture is to succeed.”¹¹⁸⁶ Shifting the ultimate preconditions of cooperation from the sphere of biology to the sphere of culture, Kammerer started to perceive its emergence in post-Habsburg Central Europe as unlikely.

This pessimism about the fate of Central Europe did not mean that Kammerer abandoned his optimistic tone altogether. The Viennese biologist now transferred his utopian hopes from the old, landed empire ruled by the Habsburgs to the modern United States of America. Kammerer’s reading of the anthropologist Franz Boas played a significant role in motivating this shift, particularly Boas’s notion of biological plasticity and his anthropometric observations of the physical characteristics of American immigrants.¹¹⁸⁷ If Boas showed that these individual characteristics were changing in a new environment, Kammerer went a step further. He presented them as proofs for the inheritance of acquired characteristics and reinterpreted them as manifestations of a “convergent adaptation” that in the course of evolution merged fundamentally different lines of development into surprisingly analogous, yet almost never identical, endpoints.¹¹⁸⁸

The political implications of this finding were clear according to Kammerer: “if at least some characteristics are capable of being changed or exchanged for some characteristics of other races, such exchange builds bridges that promote further reconciliation and enable people

¹¹⁸⁶ Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel,” 39. On Viennese radical politics, see Schorske, “Politics,” 116–80; Wasserman, *Black Vienna*, passim.

¹¹⁸⁷ On Boas, see Mitchell B. Hart, “Racial Science, Social Science, and the Politics of Jewish Assimilation,” *Isis* 90, no. 2 (June 1999): 268–97; Maria Kronfeldner, “‘If There Is Nothing beyond the Organic...’: Heredity and Culture at the Boundaries of Anthropology in the Work of Alfred L. Kroeber,” *NTM Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin* 17, no. 2 (May 2009): 107–133; Amos Morris-Reich, *The Quest for Jewish Assimilation in Modern Social Science* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

¹¹⁸⁸ Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel,” 37; Paul Kammerer, “Ist die Rasse veränderlich?” *Der Morgen: Monatsschrift der Juden in Deutschland* 2, no. 4 (October 1926): 331.

to recognize themselves as brothers.”¹¹⁸⁹ Kammerer was still developing this line of argumentation when scandalous allegations of his scientific fraud surfaced in 1926.¹¹⁹⁰ One of his most extensive treatments of the topic was published only after his suicide in September of the same year.¹¹⁹¹ Nevertheless, it is clear that the recurring thinking about and rethinking of biological strategies that would make it possible to engineer a sense of commonality in multiethnic contexts constituted a thread that ran through most of Kammerer’s work, comparable with his better-known reflections on the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

If Kammerer’s thinking about symbiosis had a utopian horizon, Tandler retooled the same idea for pragmatic, local goals. Cheryl Logan convincingly argues that Tandler “incorporated Kammerer’s emphasis on the potential of reciprocal cooperation and the resulting natural ethical drive it would produce.”¹¹⁹² However, he did so for a different purpose than Kammerer. Like some other post-Habsburg eugenicists, Tandler witnessed the failure of attempts to codify eugenic principles by law on the state-wide level after 1918 and scaled down his eugenic proposals to the municipal level. If many eugenically-oriented objectives in interwar Vienna were subsequently enforced by local authorities, others, such as prenuptial medical consultations, were conducted on a voluntary basis. In a context where the Viennese responded to some of these policies with indifference, Tandler used the concept of cooperation to claim that the collectivist environment of the city would ultimately make the Viennese develop a natural, instinctive “sense of responsibility” towards the whole, and this, in turn, would make these measures more broadly accepted as time proceeded.

¹¹⁸⁹ Kammerer, “Schmelztiegel,” 38.

¹¹⁹⁰ The opinions on Kammerer’s alleged manipulation of the results of his research on midwife toads differ substantially. Yet, in spite of these differences, recent scholarship seems to concur that Kammerer did not intentionally commit scientific fraud. Sander Gilboff, “The Case of Paul Kammerer: Evolution and Experimentation in the Early 20th Century,” *Journal of the History of Biology* 39, no. 3 (2006): 525–63; Klaus Taschwer, *Der Fall Paul Kammerer: das abenteuerliche Leben des umstrittensten Biologen seiner Zeit* (München: Carl Hanser, 2016).

¹¹⁹¹ Kammerer, “Ist die Rasse,” 323–38.

¹¹⁹² Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 154.

Tandler framed this instinctive, collectivist “sense of responsibility” as an acquired characteristic and claimed that it would eventually make the Viennese internalize their purported obligations toward society. He expected them to subordinate their individual behavior to the alleged interests of the whole, particularly when it came to their reproduction and parenting.¹¹⁹³ “Only once the marriage counseling becomes so established that no bridal couple marries without it, only when all people are aware of the high responsibility [hohe Verantwortung] they assume through procreation,” Tandler claimed in a turn of phrase that became a recurrent feature of his interwar texts, “only then will we be able to implement rational population policy.”¹¹⁹⁴ For Tandler, therefore, invoking the concept of cooperation was only loosely connected to the cognitive management of diversity. Rather, Tandler used it to project the moral authority of nature onto his collectivism and to legitimize the eugenically-influenced policies that the Viennese municipal government pursued at the local level.

Among Hungarian-speaking authors, the émigré sociologist Jászi shared Kammerer’s interest in the causes of the collapse of the empire, and in cooperation between its diverse groups. He saw it as a failed experiment to “unite [...] nations through a supranational consciousness into an entirely free and spontaneous cooperation,” and thus to overcome “the narrow limits of the nation state.”¹¹⁹⁵ In conceptualizing this cooperation, he continued to use some metaphors that blurred the boundary between biology and society. Even in his most influential work, the *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy* written and published in 1929 in the United States of America, Jászi chose to describe the collapse of the empire as an “organic” or “evolutionary” process.¹¹⁹⁶ Nevertheless, Jászi’s analysis centered on institutions and social processes, almost entirely decoupled from the realm of biology. What’s more, a

¹¹⁹³ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 154.

¹¹⁹⁴ Julius Tandler, *Ehe und Bevölkerungspolitik* (Vienna: Perles, 1924), 22.

¹¹⁹⁵ Oszkár Jászi, *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), 3.

¹¹⁹⁶ Jászi, *The Dissolution*, 3.

careful reading of Jászi's argument reveals that he fundamentally distanced himself from the assumptions that underpinned Kammerer's ideas.

One of the questions that Jászi raised in his book was whether the empire could have been successfully preserved by fostering a supranational sense of commonality through civic education. However, he strongly rejected this notion in a passage that stood out for its frequent use of biological metaphors:

This [supranational] consciousness can without doubt be directed, influenced, and modified to a certain degree by a careful educational activity of the state, exactly as the gardener can modify and influence the right development of his trees by improving the soil, by pruning the branches, and by altering to some extent the climatic relations. But in spite of this still the general conditions of the soil and climate will be decisive for the development of the trees in all cases where there is no possibility of creating *a purely artificial kind of environment*, transferring the plant from the normal natural conditions into a hot-house atmosphere.¹¹⁹⁷

Jászi's use of the gardener and hothouse metaphors, along with his references to climate control and the engineering of artificial environments, were not coincidental; they formed a subtle critique of his former Viennese, eugenically-inflected allies.

The arguments of early Viennese eugenics supporters, which the journal *Huszadik Század* echoed under Jászi's editorship in the late imperial context, were often based on experiments conducted at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, a Viennese institute for experimental biology where Kammerer worked, or relied on assumptions that its research was seen as supporting. What made this institute stand out, Deborah Coen argues, was its technological equipment that allowed it to create “an array of precision-engineered, climate controlled micro-environments.”¹¹⁹⁸ These environments, in turn, allowed the institute's researchers to study the impact of various environmental influences on research organisms. In

¹¹⁹⁷ The emphasis is mine. Jászi, *The Dissolution*, 24–25.

¹¹⁹⁸ Deborah R. Coen, “Living Precisely in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna,” *Journal of the History of Biology* 39, no. 3 (2006): 498.

other words, the institute was a “techno-natural assemblage” that, as the chief precondition for its program of animal breeding, prioritized “the controllability of the conditions of the artificial environments” and controlled “as many environmental factors as possible.”¹¹⁹⁹ By opposing the idea that the defunct empire had anything in common with such a controllable setting, Jászi also dismissed the arguments of the Viennese eugenicists that portrayed an increasing cooperation within the empire as a natural and almost inevitable outcome. Instead, Jászi went on to argue that Austria-Hungary was “an organic, almost a natural impossibility,” whose social, economic, and political institutions ultimately favored the centrifugal forces over the forces that brought it together, and thus led to the empire’s cataclysmic collapse.¹²⁰⁰

While the émigré sociologist used the biological concept of cooperation inherited from the late imperial context as a foil against which he formulated his own theory of the collapse of the empire, some of those who remained in Hungary continued to invoke the biological tropes of cooperation. Vámbéry’s arguments, opening this chapter, are a case in point, showing the continuing impact of these ideas among some civic radicals. Socialist authors, additionally, used the notions of mutual aid or symbiosis to project the moral authority of nature on working-class cooperation, as well as on socialist political ideology and practice more broadly. Writing in interwar Hungary, which was significantly less diverse than its larger predecessor, they stripped the notion of its previous concern with imperial diversity, yet they replaced it with an emphasis on socialist internationalism.

These ideas came to the fore, for instance, when the second, updated edition of Kropotkin’s *Mutual Aid* in Madzsar’s translation appeared with a social democratic publishing

¹¹⁹⁹ Christian Reiß, “The Biologische Versuchsanstalt as a Techno-Natural Assemblage: Artificial Environments, Animal Husbandry and the Challenges of Experimental Biology,” in *Vivarium: Experimental, Quantitative, and Theoretical Biology at Vienna’s Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, ed. Gerd B. Müller (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2017), 124.

¹²⁰⁰ Jászi, *The Dissolution*, 4.

house in 1924.¹²⁰¹ An anonymous reviewer, writing in the journal *Szocializmus* [Socialism], contended that labor organizations should work to enhance “cooperation based on mutual aid,” expanding it “beyond national borders to foster a fraternal union of all mankind and thereby form a society aligned with the laws of nature.”¹²⁰² Another reviewer claimed that the book was an essential resource for the “natural scientific worldview” and also posited that it served as “the foundation and initiation for every conceivable socialist ethic.”¹²⁰³ (Another reviewer, this time with a nationalist inclination, criticized the book’s editor for not adding a coda that lauded the prewar Hungarian eugenicist István Apáthy as the parallel and purportedly independent progenitor of the concept.)¹²⁰⁴ The concept of cooperation thus remained a point of reference for some left-wing authors in Hungary into the 1920s, albeit not a central one.

It was in Czechoslovakia that the concepts of cooperation resurfaced in the political debates about the country’s diversity, and nation building. They were used by some in the country’s German speakers, as well as by some Czech speakers. The individuals who embraced these concepts of cooperation, it will be shown, were directly informed by the eugenic debates in the late imperial context. Crucially, the range of political ideologies that interacted with these biological concepts of cooperation was even wider in interwar Czechoslovakia than in the late imperial context. It stretched all the way from social democrats and liberals to conservative agrarians and nationalists.

¹²⁰¹ Pyotr Alexeyevich Kropotkin, *A kölcsönös segítség mint természettörvény* [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution], trans. József Madzsar, 2nd ed. (Budapest: Népszava, 1924); Madzsar also summarized and accepted Kropotkin’s arguments in his encyclopedia entry on evolutionary theory written for the *Társadalmi Lexikon*, a popular encyclopedia from the 1920s with a socialist tendency. “Származástan” [Theory of Evolution], in *Társadalmi Lexikon* [Social Lexicon], ed. József Madzsar (Budapest: Népszava, 1928), 632–33.

¹²⁰² “Kölcsönös segítség mint természettörvény: Irta Kropotkin Péter, fordította dr. Madzsar József” [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution: Written by Peter Kropotkin, Translated by Dr. József Madzsar], *Szocializmus* 15, no. 1 (January 1925): 35–37.

¹²⁰³ József Migray, “Kölcsönös segítség, mint természettörvény (Kropotkin Péter könyve. Fordította dr. Madzsar József)” [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution. Book by Peter Kropotkin. Translated by Dr. József Madzsar], *Népszava* 52, no. 263 (November 23, 1924): 5–6.

¹²⁰⁴ “Kropotkin Péter: Kölcsönös segítség, mint természettörvény” [Peter Kropotkin: Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution], *Magyarország* 6, no. 37 (February 15, 1925): 12.

The ways how some adherents of these political ideologies appropriated the concepts of cooperation diverged, and where they placed emphasis differed significantly. First, the speakers disagreed whether cooperation was taking place solely or predominantly within a single social group, or whether they could be equally intensive within as well as between different groups. Second, the views differed on the question of who had agency, and even ontological primacy, in the processes of symbiosis and mutual aid. Was it the groups or the individuals? According to the response to these two questions, one can identify several distinct epistemic-political options.

First, the “socialist internationalist” reading of the concepts of cooperation assumed that the mutually benefitting relationships could evolve between different groups, for instance, across national or ethnic boundaries. It also emphasized the primacy of collective interests, and particularly of class interests, in propelling such cooperation. Second, a “liberal individualist” reading of these concepts also left the door open for possible cooperation across various boundaries, but instead of alleged group interests, it foregrounded individual interests, values, and preferences. Third, a “neo-traditionalist” reading sought to legitimize cooperation within the new state by highlighting the historically determined local and individual particularities as necessary preconditions for mutually beneficial cooperation. Such cooperation was claimed to take place primarily within communities but could extend to a neighboring group as long as they were tied by deep and “organic” connections, literally rooted in soil. Fourth, and final, was a “nationalist homogenizing” position which assumed that the interests of the community were qualitatively different and preceded the interests of individuals who constituted it. Cooperation was seen as largely limited to the space within communities, primarily within the imagined national community, and could extend beyond its boundaries only in the interests of the community’s security.

Some authors in interwar Czechoslovakia had a direct genealogical connection to the eugenic discussions about cooperation in the late-imperial era. This connection was particularly straightforward among certain social democratic thinkers, especially those who spoke German. A salient figure among them was the scientist Hugo Iltis (1882-1952), based in Brno/Brünn. Iltis, who had Jewish ancestors, was a biologist trained in botany with a deep interest in the theories of inheritance. In Moravia's capital, he taught biology at one of the city's foremost high schools and held private lectures at the German polytechnic. Additionally, he was the founder and director of the local *Volkshochschule*, a left-leaning popular education center established in 1920.¹²⁰⁵ Iltis was connected to the eugenic debates about cooperation in the imperial context through a link that was both political and genealogical.

Iltis was an active member of the German Social Democratic Party in interwar Czechoslovakia and interacted also with his political peers in Austria and Germany.¹²⁰⁶ Even though he wrote an influential biography of Gregor Mendel and directed a museum devoted to this monk whose experiments with peas provided the starting point of genetics, Iltis was committed for a long time to a form of neo-Lamarckism.¹²⁰⁷ He attempted to link this theory of inheritance of acquired characteristics closely to his socialist political commitments.¹²⁰⁸ Furthermore, not only did Iltis share the same socialist political views as Kammerer, but they were also close friends.¹²⁰⁹ Due to the proximity between the imperial metropolis and the capital of Moravia, Iltis and Kammerer frequently interacted even before the empire's collapse, and

¹²⁰⁵ Weindling, Introduction; Paul Weindling, "Central Europe Confronts German Racial Hygiene: Friedrich Hertz, Hugo Iltis and Ignaz Zollschan as Critics of Racial Hygiene," in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 263–82.

¹²⁰⁶ See, for instance, the correspondence between Iltis and the Bohemian-born theorist of German Social Democracy, Karl Kautsky. Karl Kautsky and Luise Kautsky, *Briefwechsel mit der Tschechoslowakei 1879-1939*, ed. Zdeněk Šolle (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1993), 230, 234 and passim.

¹²⁰⁷ For a recent overview of debates on Mendel, see Gregory Radick, "Mendel the Fraud? A Social History of Truth in Genetics," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 93 (June 2022): 39–46.

¹²⁰⁸ Loren Graham, "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," *The American Historical Review* 82, no. 5 (December 1977): 1133–64; Weindling, Introduction; Weindling, Central Europe.

¹²⁰⁹ Taschwer, *Der Fall*, 24.

their contacts continued afterwards, too. Iltis also spent two extended research stays at Kammerer's home research institute in Vienna.¹²¹⁰ As a result, the link connecting Iltis to Kammerer was both direct and obvious, with Iltis acknowledging Kammerer, along with Kropotkin, as a significant source of his arguments about cooperation.

Iltis delineated his views on cooperation most clearly in a 1926 essay *Kampf und Gemeinschaft in Natur und Gesellschaft* (Struggle and Community in Nature and Society). Tellingly, the text appeared as a part of a volume published by the leadership of the German Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia that contained materials for political education. As the title indicates, Iltis argued that both Darwin's struggle for existence, and the phenomena of cooperation outlined by Kropotkin and Kammerer were ubiquitous both in nature and society, and listed multiple manifestations of social conflict which he subsumed under the Darwinian metaphor, notably the Marxist class struggle. "The struggle for existence," he asserted, was "a general phenomenon in nature, and the class struggle is only one of its manifestations."¹²¹¹ The latter embodied a motor of social change, Iltis argued, as it removed the fragments of the past and reinforced the collective consciousness of the working class.

Yet, Iltis also questioned the prominence of the struggle for existence as "a principle too often touted by bourgeois theorists," and highlighted cooperation as an equally important process.¹²¹² If workers "owe the close bond among members of our class to the class struggle," Iltis argued, he also asserted that "we observe mutual aid and general symbiosis as an equally crucial phenomenon that is closely linked to the struggle for existence and occurs everywhere in nature."¹²¹³ While Iltis went beyond the more moderate, yet still Austro-Marxist, Kammerer

¹²¹⁰ Hans Przibram, "Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt in Wien: Ausgestaltung und Tätigkeit während des zweiten Quinquenniums (1908-1912), Bericht der zoologischen, botanischen und physikalisch-chemischen Abteilung," *Zeitschrift für biologische Technik und Methodik* 3 (1913): 234.

¹²¹¹ Hugo Iltis, *Kampf und Gemeinschaft in Natur und Gesellschaft* ([Bodenbach]: Deutsche sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei in der Tschechoslowakischen Republik, 1926), 5.

¹²¹² Iltis, *Kampf und Gemeinschaft*, 7.

¹²¹³ Iltis, *Kampf und Gemeinschaft*, 6.

in embracing class struggle and casting it as a manifestation of the Darwinian struggle for existence, he ultimately agreed with Kammerer by celebrating peaceful social cooperation.

Iltis was convinced that his biological arguments had significant implications for socialist political theory, and he made them explicit. On the one hand, his arguments legitimized socialist internationalism. Iltis conjured up an optimistic, internationalist vision of the world in which “a new, global human community is in the making,” and stressed that “even though it may seem that fanatical nationalism and greedy imperialism are preparing for new attacks, we know that [...] we internationalists shall prevail when we overturn capitalism and its ideologies.”¹²¹⁴ On the other hand, and more implicitly, Iltis also suggested a closer cooperation of social democratic movements across national lines in Czechoslovakia, when he warned that “our comrades, the proletarians, can be artificially provoked into struggle by national or religious ideologies.”¹²¹⁵ In short, by stressing the collective interests driving cooperation, and the cooperation between groups, the arguments of Iltis are very close to what we identified above as the socialist internationalist reading of the idea of cooperation.

Although some social democrats in interwar Czechoslovakia embraced eugenic concepts of cooperation, these ideas also influenced the arguments of their right-wing electoral competitors (and intermittent political allies) in the *Bund der Landwirte*, the German agrarian party. Franz Spina (1868-1938), the long-term chairman of the party, made the concept of symbiosis the centerpiece of his political thinking and used it to justify political cooperation between German- and Czech-speakers in Czechoslovakia.¹²¹⁶ While it is evident that Spina drew on contemporary biological discourse for this concept, his texts and public statements do

¹²¹⁴ Iltis, *Kampf und Gemeinschaft*, 14.

¹²¹⁵ Iltis, *Kampf und Gemeinschaft*, 6.

¹²¹⁶ Eva Broklová, *Politická kultura německých aktivistických stran v Československu 1918-1938* [Political Culture of German Activist Political Parties in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1938] (Prague: Karolinum, 1999), 74.

not explicitly reveal his intellectual sources.¹²¹⁷ At first glance, it may seem unlikely that Spina would be associated with the same debates as Ittis. As a conservative-minded intellectual with a background in humanities, Spina was not involved in Kammerer's and Ittis' network, and did not share their interest in biological experimentation or their politics. Nevertheless, a close analysis of Spina's use of the concept suggests that the eugenic debates of the late imperial context, indeed, were his most likely source.

Before joining politics, Spina was a literary scholar who lectured on Slavic literatures at the German section of Prague University. It was in the context of his research on the exchanges between German and Czech literary cultures in Bohemia that Spina first gestured towards the phenomenon that he would later describe as symbiosis. In an essay written in 1911 for a German nationalist revue *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* (German Social Review), for example, he argued that an "interlocking and interweaving of cultures" and a "dense fabric of relationships" emerged in Bohemia, enabled by "a lively economic, social, and political interaction that extends into the prehistoric twilight."¹²¹⁸ However, back then Spina did not yet find the concept that would help grasp this phenomenon. He spoke interchangeably about the "community of spiritual goods," "intimate cultural community," or "coexistence in close proximity," and, disturbingly, also about the absence of a "smell of the foreign race."¹²¹⁹ It was only several years later, in 1917, that Spina adopted the concept of symbiosis to frame his arguments about the "dense fabric of relationships" between German- and Czech-speakers in Bohemia.

¹²¹⁷ For a careful reconstruction of Spina's uses of the concepts, see Michael Havlin, "Eine Begriffsgeschichte der deutsch-tschechischen Symbiose nach Franz Spina," in *Franz Spina (1868-1938)*, ed. Steffen Höhne and Ludger Udolph (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2011), 261–80.

¹²¹⁸ Franz Spina, "Über deutsch-tschechische Kulturbeziehungen," *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* 1, no. 3 (September 1, 1911): 67.

¹²¹⁹ Spina, "Über deutsch-tschechische," passim.

As we have seen, the eugenic debate about mutual aid and symbiosis in the imperial context reached its peak shortly before the beginning of World War I. The manner in which Spina used this concept in 1917 contains several clues that point to this debate as its likely origin. First, Spina was now more than before eager to stress that these processes were allegedly determined by nature and thus crisscrossed the boundaries between biology and society. “Nature is the unchangeable fundamental primary,” Spina argued in 1917, and “social, economic, national [völkische], and constitutional-political conditions act on peoples and states alongside and after it, both in and among themselves.”¹²²⁰ The second shift in Spina’s argument followed directly from this increased emphasis on nature. The commonality that Spina claimed to identify was as equally biological as it was cultural. He now argued that “the consequence of the German-Czech symbiosis” was a cultural assimilation of the two peoples, as well as the latter’s alleged “loss of racial particularities [Rasseeigentümlichkeiten] that is more pronounced than in any other Slavic nation.”¹²²¹ Third, he situated this commonality that was in his argument strangely both timeless and in the making, in the broader context of the civilizing mission of the Habsburg Empire: “our Monarchy will [...] continue to fulfill its historical mission to amalgamate the medley of Central European nations.”¹²²² After the collapse of the empire, Spina retooled the concept of symbiosis once again, in order to frame the relationship of the German-speaking minority to the new Czechoslovak state.

In the 1920s, now as a member of Czechoslovakia’s parliament, Spina used the concept of symbiosis to legitimize the emerging German activist politics, stressing even more than before the mutual dynamic of these exchanges. Upon becoming the first German nationalist

¹²²⁰ Franz Spina, “Aus der Welt der Slawen III: Das tschechische Problem,” *Deutsche Arbeit* 17, no. 2 (1917): 61.

¹²²¹ Spina, “Aus der Welt,” 63.

¹²²² Spina, “Aus der Welt,” 111.

minister in the Czechoslovak government in 1926, Spina delivered what is his best-known statement about symbiosis:

We have lived with the Czechs for a millennium [...] and we are so closely connected with them through economic, social, cultural, even racial ties that we form a single unit. We form, to draw a comparison, different patterns of the same carpet. While it is possible to cut a carpet into pieces, you cannot extract individual flowers from it. We live with the Czechs in a state of symbiosis. We entered a ‘marriage of convenience’ with them, and no one can separate us.¹²²³

Even though Spina spoke about symbiosis, he nevertheless assumed that collaboration within groups was more fundamental and posited the cooperation between groups as its mere extension, enabled by a close cultural and even biological relatedness. Moreover, he did not stipulate that a propensity for cooperation was a universal phenomenon rooted in human nature, but saw it as a contingent and somewhat exceptional outcome of a specific natural environment in, and the historical development of, the area which he described as “the Bohemian Basin and the Sudeten Mountain range.”¹²²⁴ All in all, these emphases made Spina’s arguments into an example of a neo-traditionalist re-reading of the eugenic concept of symbiosis.

The biological concepts of cooperation not only entered the political language of some representatives of these two German activist parties but also shaped the arguments of Czech advocates of eugenics, including Jaroslav Kříženecký (1896-1964). Trained in biology and agricultural sciences, Kříženecký joined the eugenics movement while he was still a university student. When the *Czech Eugenics Society* was established in early 1915, Kříženecký became

¹²²³ “Une conversation avec le docteur F. Spina, ministre d’origine allemand dans le nouveau gouvernement tchéco-slovaque,” *Le matin* 43, no. 15621 (December 26, 1926): 3.

¹²²⁴ *Príloha k těsnopisecké zprávě o 91. schůzi poslanecké sněmovny Národního shromáždění republiky Československé v Praze ve středu dne 16. listopadu 1921* [Attachment to the Minutes of the 91st Meeting of the Chamber of Deputies of the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia in Prague on Wednesday, November 16th, 1921] (Prague: Národní shromáždění, 1921).

its secretary and maintained a connection to the association even after he started working as a researcher at an animal breeders' station in Brno/Brünn in the early 1920s.¹²²⁵

Initially, Kříženecký was strongly committed to the neo-Lamarckian concept of inheritance of acquired characteristics and became familiar with Kammerer. Even though the latter “was having constant feuds with all his scientific colleagues, Professor Kříženecký enjoyed his sympathy,” as one of their acquaintances put it.¹²²⁶ As we have already seen, they corresponded from the mid-1910s to Kammerer's death, occasionally exchanged their papers, and Kříženecký often referred to the research of his Viennese colleague to support his arguments.

Until the early 1920s, Kříženecký also shared Kammerer's politics, and argued that there was a “deep ideological connection between eugenics and socialism.”¹²²⁷ Citing Kammerer and Kropotkin among others, Kříženecký drew on the debates about mutual aid and symbiosis to claim that one would be mistaken “to limit the concept of collective life only to cases of association of homogeneous beings where the so-called collective consciousness arises,” because “the emergence of collective consciousness is precisely a matter of studying collective life, as collective consciousness arises only through collective life.”¹²²⁸ Symbiosis, in this context, enabled cooperation and a feeling of commonality between different individuals, even across linguistic or ethnic lines. These remarks that Kříženecký made in 1919 can be read in the context of discussions about the newly emerging Czechoslovak state, and its multiethnic

¹²²⁵ For a biography of this scientist, see Vítězslav Orel and Anna Matalová, “Kříženeckého chápání Mendelova objevu pod vlivem teorie dědičnosti získaných vlastností [The Understanding of Mendel's Discovery by Kříženecký Under the Influence of the Theory of Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics],” *Dějiny věd a techniky* 23, no. 2 (1990): 79–91.

¹²²⁶ The sentence was underlined in the original letter. Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Jaroslav Kříženecký Papers, Inv. No. 2777, Letter, January 29, 1928.

¹²²⁷ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Eugenika a socialismus [Eugenics and Socialism],” *Budoucnost: Revue českého socialismu* 2, no. 10 (1920): 531.

¹²²⁸ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Studium kolektivního života, sociologie a biologie [The Study of Collective Life, Sociology, and Biology],” *Lékařské rozhledy* 7, no. 4–5 (1919): 120.

population, and were not fundamentally different from the argument advanced by Hugo Iltis. However, in the years that followed, Kříženecký abandoned socialist ideology, and increasingly embraced the liberalism advanced by a part of Czech intellectual elite.

When the influential liberal periodical *Přítomnost* (The Present) was launched in 1924, Kříženecký became one of its commentators. In 1924 and 1925, the liberal periodical published a programmatic series of articles by public intellectuals and scientists. These articles were framed as responses to the question, “Why am I not a Communist?” Kříženecký was one of these contributors. In these articles, and in the ensuing debate, he repurposed the eugenic concepts of cooperation to defend liberal individualism.

In his essay, Kříženecký critiqued not only the practices of communist dictatorships but also their underlying ideological assumptions. He contended that both cooperation and individualism were pivotal forces shaping human life and were deeply rooted in nature. Hence, neither could be disregarded, as “life would be jeopardized if we tried to elevate one of these tendencies to omnipotence while suppressing the other.”¹²²⁹ The biologist further posited that the principle of individualism was not just on par with collective cooperation but held a significant ontological precedence. Individualism, he believed, was the catalyst for innovation, indispensable due to its “creative energy,” and thereby a principal driver of human development.¹²³⁰ Kříženecký did not deem societal cooperation irrelevant. However, he ascribed to it merely an auxiliary role, facilitating the innovations spurred by individual endeavors: “Innovation in development is driven by individuals, while the collective simply accepts, broadens, and implements it.”¹²³¹

¹²²⁹ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Proč nejsem komunistou? [Why I am not a Communist],” *Přítomnost* 1, no. 52 (January 8, 1925): 820.

¹²³⁰ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Biologie a sociální etika [Biology and Social Ethics],” *Morava* 2, no. 1 (January 1926): 8.

¹²³¹ Jaroslav Kříženecký, “Život a individualita II [Life and Individualism],” *Přítomnost* 2, no. 6 (February 19, 1925): 92.

In what constituted the key to his essay, Kříženecký argued that private property was “a manifestation of individuality” and “a given, namely a biologically and psychologically based given and necessity.”¹²³² He, in other words, dismissed a Marxist interpretation that saw private property as “something that a few strong and violent individuals created and made reality through force.”¹²³³ From this perspective, a communist demand to abolish private property did not only undermine individuality and innovation, but became an affront to nature and life more broadly: “evolution cannot be heading towards something that negates its driving force, that negates life by destroying one of its important aspects.”¹²³⁴

Kříženecký’s liberal appropriation of the concept of symbiosis assumed the primacy of individuals. However, it also allowed for association and cooperation between individuals across national lines. It can be best interpreted as an attempt to find a middle road between social cooperation and individualism, on the one hand, and nationalism and internationalism, on the other hand. “The tendency to associate is as inherent in life as the isolating selfish efforts of the individualist,” Kříženecký concluded in one of his essays, and “the individual’s struggle with society and vice versa is the struggle of two equally basic functions of life.”¹²³⁵ By trying to strike a balance between these principles, Kříženecký’s argument was symptomatic of the moderate worldview of Czechoslovakia’s leading liberal intellectuals.

There was also a darker variation on the theme of cooperation among Czech eugenicists. In that reading, the concepts of mutual aid and symbiosis were enlisted in the service of a Czech or Czechoslovak nationalist project and became symbolic codes for the erasure of ethnic differences in the course of the nation-building process. Interestingly, the eugenicist who adopted this nationalist-homogenizing position most clearly, Vladislav Růžička (1870-1934),

¹²³² Kříženecký, “Proč nejsem komunistou,” 820.

¹²³³ Kříženecký, “Proč nejsem komunistou,” 820.

¹²³⁴ Kříženecký, “Proč nejsem komunistou,” 820.

¹²³⁵ Kříženecký, “Biologie a sociální etika,” 10–11.

initially had much in common with Kříženecký. As a professor of general biology at the Prague University, Růžička led the lab where Kříženecký worked right at the outset of his career. In his numerous publications on the theory of inheritance, Růžička defended neo-Lamarckian positions well into the 1920s, and often cited Kammerer in his research. He also interacted with the Viennese biologist and his colleagues, such as Eugen Steinach, and even attempted to secure a job for Kammerer at a Czechoslovak research institution.¹²³⁶ He was also an influential member of the eugenics movement who for many years presided over the *Czech Eugenics Society* and directed a research Institute of National Eugenics in Prague.¹²³⁷ During the 1920s, his arguments were becoming increasingly nationalist and socially conservative, even though Růžička's eugenics still foregrounded the inheritance of acquired characteristics and arguments on cooperation.

In 1923, Růžička published the book *Biologické základy eugeniky* (Biological Foundations of Eugenics), a large, systematic outline of biological and eugenic theories. Spanning nearly 800 pages, the book was intended to create a blueprint of eugenics as a Czech national science and provide this design with theoretical underpinnings in the science of heredity. Even though neo-Lamarckism and constitutionalism – in the form of a plastic, environmentally conditioned “national constitution” – were the centerpiece of Růžička's project, the eugenicist also included the notion of cooperation.¹²³⁸ However, he interpreted them in a nationalist key.

¹²³⁶ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, Box 2, File 1521, Correspondence between Vladislav Růžička and Eugen Steinach, 1910s and 1920s.

¹²³⁷ Jan Janko, *Vznik experimentální biologie v Čechách, 1882-1918* [The Emergence of Experimental Biology in Bohemia, 1882-1918] (Prague: Academia, 1982), passim; Jan Janko, *Vědy o životě v českých zemích, 1750-1950* [Life Sciences in the Bohemian Lands, 1750-1950] (Prague: Archiv Akademie věd České republiky, 1997), passim.

¹²³⁸ Růžička's engagement with constitutional medicine will be discussed later in this chapter. Růžička, *Biologické základy*.

The community overshadowed the individual in Růžička's nationalist argument, and the interests of the former trumped the interests of the latter. The community, moreover, was imagined as an organic entity, and its imputed interests were expressed with biological metaphors drawn from social Darwinist (or better, in this case, social Lamarckist) discourses. Given this ontological primacy of the community, cooperation was taking place primarily within groups, and interactions between groups were ultimately driven by these groups' interest in survival:

No organism is isolated in nature. [...] all living bodies and organisms are in constant exchange and connection with each other. On the one hand, when it comes to organisms whose vital interests and needs interfere with each other, these contacts are selfish, therefore hostile. On the other hand, some contacts may be mutual, altruistic. Yet, even these reciprocal contacts are mostly dictated by selfish motives, primarily by the most powerful motive, self-preservation.¹²³⁹

Biological concepts of mutual aid and symbiosis, in this nationalist-homogenizing reading, were envisioned by Růžička as tools to construct an amalgamated Czechoslovak nation.

Nation-building was a central issue of Růžička's project of Czech "national eugenics." The concepts of cooperation were recast as instruments of building a unified nation and underpinned a biopolitical project of assimilating Czechoslovakia's ethnic minorities into the country's titular nation. "Another important question of national eugenics," he asserted, "is the assimilation of other national elements in our state."¹²⁴⁰ Růžička thus embraced the integration-oriented ideology of Czechoslovakism, while exhibiting an unusual interest in national synthesis and in the differences between the diverse natural environments of the new state.¹²⁴¹ As a neo-Lamarckian, Růžička discussed the option that such assimilation would take place

¹²³⁹ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 714–15.

¹²⁴⁰ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 737.

¹²⁴¹ Hudek, Kopeček, and Mervart, *Czechoslovakism*, 10.

when the differences could be exposed, and evened out, by a shared natural and cultural environment.

However, Růžička's key contention was that a shared environment would not be sufficient to create an amalgamated national community, and his biopolitical project thus culminated in a vision of an assimilation of entire populations through intermarriage:

There are two options: either those elements adapt to us, or we adapt them to ourselves. [...] The most abundant sexual mixing [between these nations] needs to take place so that their constitutions amalgamate in their offspring. In such a manner, at least those elements that are racially close to the Czechs [...] can be assimilated. Their mixing with us could give rise to a new and quite harmonious constitution. [...] From a biological point of view, racial crossing is the most reliable method of assimilation.¹²⁴²

Remarkably, Růžička's assimilation proposal through shared environment and intermarriage deviated from the conventional understanding of Czechoslovakism. He emphasized the amalgamation of what he perceived as ethnic Czechs not only with ethnic Slovaks but also with German- and Polish-speakers. Even though Růžička's phrasing implied a degree of coercion, moreover, the nationalist eugenicist did not specify whether the state authorities should be involved in the process that he thus outlined; indeed, he did not suggest any specific practical steps that should follow from his suggestions, and it is not clear if his recommendations had any immediate impact on actual policy.¹²⁴³ Nevertheless, Růžička's arguments were an example of a nationalist-homogenizing reading of the concepts of cooperation that made mutual aid and symbiosis into justifications for policies of voluntary or coerced assimilation.

¹²⁴² Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 737.

¹²⁴³ It is worth noting that the Czechoslovak police forces, primarily the gendarmerie, advocated for and implemented assimilation practices aimed at the Sinti and Roma. These practices were underpinned by arguments that intriguingly paralleled Růžička's ideas. See Pavel Baloun, "*Metla našeho venkova!*": *Kriminalizace Romů od první republiky až po prvotní fázi protektorátu, 1918-1941* ["The Scourge of the Countryside": Criminalization of Roma between the First Republic and the first Phase of the German Protectorate, 1918-1941] (Dolní Břežany: Scriptorium, 2022), *passim*.

If in Czechoslovakia the biological concepts of cooperation became a toolkit for the cognitive management of the country's diversity, serving both some German-speaking and some Czech-speaking authors, in the equally diverse interwar Yugoslavia, these tropes did not enjoy such prominence. Vedran Duančić argues that it was rather geography and its practitioners that “found themselves in a unique position” to make sense of the country's “radically different constitutional, legal, economic, educational, and cultural traditions that reflected the divergent historical trajectories of its regions and communities.”¹²⁴⁴

An early, influential proponent of this framework was the geographer Jovan Cvijić, who was trained at the University of Vienna but often exhibited a “fierce anti-Austrian attitude.”¹²⁴⁵ In his argument, the combined influences of the environment, past centuries of migrations, and intermarriage resulted in an “ethnic and ethno-biological assimilation [izjednačivanje] and amalgamation [stapanje],” forging the alleged ethnic and biological unity of the Yugoslavs.¹²⁴⁶ Other Yugoslav geographers expanded, radicalized, or challenged Cvijić's arguments.¹²⁴⁷ Therefore, anthropogeography, rather than biology, furnished the prevalent toolkit for negotiating the diversity of interwar Yugoslavia, even though it foregrounded many similar themes, including human plasticity, intermarriage, and the “amalgamation” of diverse communities.

It is striking that, in spite of the influence of anthropogeography in the public debates of interwar Yugoslavia, there were some scholars who continued to embrace the biological theories of cooperation with which they had become familiar in the imperial context. Interestingly, these scholars tended to be physicians or biologists and to support some form of

¹²⁴⁴ Vedran Duančić, *Geography and Nationalist Visions of Interwar Yugoslavia* (Cham: Springer, 2020), 1–2.

¹²⁴⁵ Duančić, *Geography and Nationalist Visions*, 62.

¹²⁴⁶ Jovan Cvijić, *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje: Osnove antropogeografije* [The Balkan Peninsula and the South Slavic Countries: Fundamentals of Anthropogeography], trans. Borivoje Drobnjaković. Vol. 1. (Zagreb: Hrvatski štamparski zavod, 1922), 237. Cited in Duančić, *Geography and Nationalist Visions*, 79.

¹²⁴⁷ Duančić, *Geography and Nationalist Visions*, 4.

eugenics. One of these scholars was Andrija Štampar, the towering promoter of public health in Yugoslavia during the 1920s.¹²⁴⁸ Enabled by his education in and persisting ties to Vienna, Štampar continued to work with some of the concepts that he inherited from the debates in the late Habsburg Empire, including the concepts of cooperation and Goldscheid's human economy.

Štampar transformed these concepts into the foundations of his biopolitical framework, as evidenced by his 1923 lecture titled *O socijalnoj medicini* (On Social Medicine). In the lecture, which reads as a systematic overview of Štampar's theoretical references reframed for the purposes of state-building in rural Yugoslavia, the physician prominently engaged with the concept of mutual aid:

In the philosophical works of various authors, we come across discussions about whether culture really brings happiness to humanity, the necessary peace and mutual aid [uzajamno pomaganje]. Is humanity heading toward mutual struggles, which bring misfortune, or toward mutual aid, which would bring complete happiness? [...] The very history of social medicine, from the earliest times to the present day, best shows that it has always been about mutual aid [...].¹²⁴⁹

Put simply, Štampar contended that mutual aid epitomized the primary objective of social medicine and served as the overarching goal for cultural evolution at large.

Many of Štampar's disciples made a similar intellectual move. For example, the physician Josip Rasuhin (1892-1975) invoked Kropotkin's idea of mutual aid in a lecture as late as 1936. He asserted that "this law is more important for the maintenance of life and for the evolution of species" than the struggle for existence emphasized by the Darwinists.¹²⁵⁰ One reason why physicians like Rasuhin repeatedly engaged with Kropotkin was to present rural

¹²⁴⁸ Kuhar, "Eugenika," 50.

¹²⁴⁹ Andrija Štampar, "O socijalnoj medicini" [On Social Medicine], *Glasnik Ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 4, no. 1 (1923): 11–12.

¹²⁵⁰ Josip Rasuhin, "Da li liječnički stalež može danas snositi odgovornost za narodno zdravlje" [Can Today's Medical Profession Bear Responsibility for Public Health?], *Liječnički vjesnik* 58, no. 10 (October 1936): 446. Cited in Kuhar, "Eugenika," 129.

communities as spaces of cooperation between various social strata, rather than of conflict, in line with their agrarian populist politics. In this lecture, indeed, Rasuhin was more unambiguous than Štampar about the political stakes involved in this epistemic choice:

It is our task as doctors to communicate to society that only such a social order is beneficial for the happiness of the people, which is in harmony with human nature. [...] We are convinced that among the social systems that are currently struggling for their triumph, those based on the peasant ideology, as set forth by the immortal [Stjepan] Radić in the book *Seljački nauk* [Peasant Doctrine], best correspond to this view.¹²⁵¹

Far from subscribing to Kropotkin's anarchist communism, therefore, Rasuhin used these ideas to naturalize the gradualist and interventionist political ideology of agrarian populism represented by the Croatian Peasant Party and its late leader.¹²⁵²

In the context of interwar Yugoslavia, the fact that the concept of mutual aid opened up space for cooperation across ethnocultural boundaries was equally important. As Martin Kuhar perceptively puts it, “the specific configuration of the new state, which included ethnically, religiously, culturally, and historically very heterogeneous populations and peoples,” meant that

invoking the ‘struggle for survival,’ an idea that could be misused politically in various ways in the context of the Yugoslav nation, was extremely counterproductive in conditions where peaceful collaboration and coexistence between various peoples was needed for nation building.¹²⁵³

Tellingly, the vision of social cooperation which Rasuhin conjured up had an ethnocultural point of reference, too, rejecting any attempts to pit the “masters” against the “servants,” divide nations into “superior and inferior,” and to transform the people into “wolves and lambs.”¹²⁵⁴

¹²⁵¹ Rasuhin, “Da li liječnički stalež,” 446.

¹²⁵² For another example, see the representation of the village Visoko near Varaždin in a survey conducted in 1936 by a group of female students of public health nursing in Zagreb. However, the sociographic survey curated and published by Rasuhin is also symptomatic of the radicalization of eugenic arguments in the 1930s. It employed anthropometric and serological methods in a search for alleged racial types and sought to prove the purported autochthonous national character of the village. Josip Rasuhin, “Selo Visoko: Socijalno-medicinska anketa” [Village Visoko: Social-Medical Survey], *Liječnički vjesnik* 1, no. 6 (June 1939): 70–79.

¹²⁵³ Kuhar, “Eugenika,” 50.

¹²⁵⁴ Rasuhin, “Da li liječnički stalež,” 446. Cited in Kuhar, “Eugenika,” 129.

In other words, these doctors inherited the concept of cooperation from the late imperial context and reused it for the cognitive management of diversity in a mini-empire that was Yugoslavia.

Inheriting these tropes about cooperation was a conscious choice. This becomes clear from the trajectories of those scholars who had been educated in the imperial context and were familiar with this conceptual toolkit; yet, they chose to discard it in interwar Yugoslavia. A striking example is the biologist Jovan Hadži (1884-1972), who was born and raised in Temesvár/Timișoara in what was then the Kingdom of Hungary. He obtained his degree in biology from Vienna, where he also spent a year as a researcher at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, in the zoological department.¹²⁵⁵ Symbiosis was a major theme of his research at the institute.¹²⁵⁶ Following the war, Hadži secured a professorship at the newly founded university in Ljubljana in the newly formed Yugoslavia and became a prominent member of the local *Prirodoslovno društvo* (Natural Science Society).¹²⁵⁷

An article that Hadži published in 1927, titled *Pojavi udruživanja u životinjstvu* (The Phenomena of Association in Animals), shows that he was familiar with the concepts of cooperation, and aware of their political ramifications. While he noted that there was a “vast array” of interrelationships that have developed between individuals of different species, including some that amounted to “perfect symbiosis,” he did not intend to use them as metaphors for Yugoslavia’s diversity. He claimed that such interrelationships “generally do not lead to the development of real societies [that bring together] masses of individuals with any ethical character.”¹²⁵⁸ Instead, he foregrounded those metaphors that clearly prioritized

¹²⁵⁵ Hans Przibram, “Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt in Wien: Zweck, Einrichtung und Tätigkeit während der ersten fünf Jahre ihres Bestandes (1902-1907), Bericht der zoologischen, botanischen und physikalisch-chemischen Abteilung,” *Zeitschrift für biologische Technik und Methodik* 1 (September 1908): 19.

¹²⁵⁶ Hadži, “Vorversuche,” 38–47.

¹²⁵⁷ Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika*, 107; “Sekcija za antropologijo, genealogijo in evgeniko” [Section for Anthropology, Genealogy, and Eugenics], *Evgenika* 3, no. 2 (May 1937): 28–29.

¹²⁵⁸ Jovan Hadži, “Pojavi udruživanja u životinjstvu” [Phenomena of Association in Animal Life], *Priroda* 17, no. 6 (June 1927): 111.

homogeneity, insisting that the “most important animal societies are largely formed by individuals of the same species.”¹²⁵⁹

Hadži further blurred the boundaries between biological observation and normative political prescription in these reflections. He noted that while the free will of individuals within societies may initially produce a higher level of cultural development, it nevertheless seriously threatened the community’s stability. He argued that:

one-sidedness and unfairness in the leadership of a free society leads to revolutionary perturbations, as well as to the collapse of ‘culture’ and the achieved social order. In insect societies, there are no discontents, no revolutions.¹²⁶⁰

Extolling the animal societies that were hierarchically organized and homogeneous both physically and mentally, Hadži’s argument seemed to imbue the ideas of an authoritarian, centralizing dictatorship with the moral authority of nature, thus anticipating the Yugoslav royal dictatorship that would be installed two years later.

Human Economy: The Many Uses of a Technocratic Concept

The closely linked notions of human economy and biological capital were coined and popularized by the left-wing sociologist Rudolf Goldscheid in Vienna in the 1900s. They fused the realms of nature and society, economizing biology and biologizing the economy. The evolutionist and neo-Lamarckian concept of “human economy” claimed to bolster the labor efficiency of humans by acting on their natural, cultural, social, and economic environment. These arguments were couched within a broad narrative about the rising economic value of humans and their working skills in modern industrial society. By promising to optimize individuals, and thus their assumed utility to society, Goldscheid sought to bolster the state’s

¹²⁵⁹ Hadži, “Pojavi udruživanja,” 111.

¹²⁶⁰ Jovan Hadži, “Pojavi udruživanja u životinjstvu: II. Životinjske države” [Phenomena of Association in Animal Life: II. Animal Societies], *Priroda* 17, no. 7–8 (July 1927): 146–47.

emerging interest in welfare policies. Harnessing these policies, he believed, was crucial for reinforcing a multinational state like Austria-Hungary. Thus, this technocratic, reformist framework was strategically crafted by Goldscheid as an alternative to eugenic blueprints based on racial nationalism.

In post-Habsburg countries the concept of human economy continued to inform an array of political projects and target various constituencies. It notably influenced the biopolitical discussions within two significant manifestations of mass politics in interwar East Central Europe: the socialist movement in urban areas and the agrarian populism in the countryside.

The enduring appeal of the notion of a human economy in post-Habsburg countries exemplifies the persistence of eugenic concepts that were originally developed within the Habsburg imperial context. Multiple authors embraced the notion of human economy and followed Goldscheid's intention to reinforce a multinational state through welfare policies. However, the state in question was no longer Austria-Hungary but the mini-empires that faced many similar challenges as the defunct empire.

Interwar deliberations on human economy also highlight that Goldscheid's concept was highly flexible, but deeply ambiguous, and not only because of its technocratic and productivist objectives. Although the Viennese sociologist initially anticipated that "organizational internationalism would ultimately supersede narrow particularistic nationalism," numerous interwar authors who engaged with the idea of human economy adapted it to serve nationalist ends.¹²⁶¹ In these instances, the economic efficiency of the envisioned national community, and perhaps even its ability to expand, emerged as the primary frame of reference for what these eugenicists referred to as human economy. Indeed, in certain post-Habsburg settings, the

¹²⁶¹ Goldscheid, *Höherentwicklung und Menschenökonomie*, 555 and 584.

concepts of human economy and organic capital became foundational to the newly formed narratives of national eugenics.

The link between human economy and modernism had also weakened in the 1920s. While some nationalized concepts of human economy still accommodated ethnocultural diversity within the envisioned shared urban or rural modernity, the anti-modernist constructs of human economy portrayed the “accumulation of organic capital” as a highly confrontational, even zero-sum process. Nevertheless, the fact that even these nationalist and anti-modernist projects ultimately incorporated an imperial epistemic toolkit – all while attempting to divest it of its politics – stands as a powerful testament to the distinctly “mini-imperial” nature of eugenic discourses in post-Habsburg Central Europe during the 1920s.

The impact of Goldscheid’s human economy in post-Habsburg Central Europe was most pronounced in large urban areas, where municipal governments and voluntary associations pursued programs of modernist social reform, with a clearly biopolitical edge. The previous chapter documented how the concept of the human economy underpinned public health and social welfare policies in Budapest, Vienna, and Prague during the 1920s. It also highlighted the involvement of actors and networks who rose to power during the wartime. In Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, however, Goldscheid’s concepts also spread beyond these metropolitan contexts and entered the political vocabulary of some country-wide modernist political movements that focused on urban constituencies.

To start with, some German-speaking supporters of eugenics in interwar Czechoslovakia, particularly among those aligned with the social democratic movement, adopted the notion of the human economy. The ambiguity of Goldscheid’s ideas regarding the nation enabled these professionals and politicians to center their eugenic arguments on working

people in general, rather than exclusively on their claimed nationals, which, in turn, facilitated their exchanges with the state's administration.

That the biologist Hugo Iltis would again be among these authors is not surprising, given his geographic, political, and epistemic proximity to the Viennese eugenicists. Throughout much of the 1920s, Iltis defended the neo-Lamarckian concept of human economy against competing eugenic projects based on hard heredity. He did so even in his comprehensive biography of Gregor Mendel, arguably Iltis's most significant publication of the decade, which encompassed an exhaustive survey of ongoing discussions surrounding heredity and eugenics. He maintained that it was "a duty of a humane society" to create "equal conditions for all its members for a positive development of their body and mind" and to learn "how to deal economically with humans, society's most valuable asset."¹²⁶² To reach this goal, Iltis suggested a strategy which he hoped would "eliminate social grievances," "improve hygiene and education," and avoid war, thus echoing Goldscheid's emphasis on social reform as well as on pacifism.¹²⁶³

At the same time, however, Iltis went further than Goldscheid in incorporating Mendelism into his eugenic blueprint. He disturbingly asserted that eugenics also "must seek to raise the quality of the people who are to come, of the future generation, through the systematic [planmäßig] regulation of reproduction and the elimination of serious hereditary burdens, and assume the form of reproductive hygiene [Fortpflanzungshygiene] based on the results of genetics."¹²⁶⁴ Iltis thus called for eugenic policies that would mold modern subjects, while sidestepping their nationality.

¹²⁶² Hugo Iltis, *Gregor Johann Mendel: Leben, Werk und Wirkung* (Berlin: Springer, 1924), 383.

¹²⁶³ Iltis, *Gregor Johann Mendel*, 383.

¹²⁶⁴ Iltis, *Gregor Johann Mendel*, 402–3.

More consequential, however, was the adoption of Goldscheid's notion of the human economy by Ludwig Czech, a prominent German-speaking politician. Already during the late Habsburg Empire, Czech was actively involved in the Moravian social democratic movement, both at the provincial and at the municipal level. Even though he was trained as a lawyer, and not as a physician, Czech developed an interest in population policy, built links to the left-wing supporters of eugenics in Vienna, and joined the *Österreichische Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* in 1917.¹²⁶⁵ Following the empire's collapse, Czech was elected to preside over the German Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia, a position he held for most of the interwar period.

Due to the party's policy of cooperation with Czechoslovakia's authorities, Czech served as a member of several Czechoslovak governments. Significantly, he served as the minister of social welfare from 1929 to 1934, and subsequently took on the role of minister of public health from 1935 to 1938. It was in the latter function, for instance, that Czech argued in 1936 that the state's population policy must be centered on "a human economy [Menschenökonomie] following economic and social considerations."¹²⁶⁶ This case shows that Goldscheid's ideas were relevant even for the actors who actively shaped public health and social welfare policies in interwar Czechoslovakia.

Left-wing intellectuals and professionals in Hungary engaged with Goldscheid and his concept of human economy already in the late Habsburg Empire. Testifying to the trust that he enjoyed among these left-wing intellectuals and professionals, even after the collapse of the empire, Goldscheid was invited to Budapest in April 1919, shortly after the establishment of the Hungarian Republic of Councils, to study the political and economic strategies of the

¹²⁶⁵ "Mitgliederverzeichnis," 9–13.

¹²⁶⁶ Ludwig Czech, "Im Dienste der Volksgesundheit," *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 3, no. 9–10 (December 1936): 125.

revolutionary government. During this visit, he had access to a large part of the country's leadership. Goldscheid maintained these networks, even after the revolution's defeat and the emigration of some of its leading representatives, interacting both with those who stayed and with the Hungarian émigrés in Vienna. In fact, in the words of one well-informed contemporary, at the time "there was no leading man in Austria who knew the Hungarian situation so intimately and who had as many close Hungarian friends as he had."¹²⁶⁷ Yet, the defeat of the revolution also spelled the end of Goldscheid's intellectual influence on Hungarian émigré supporters of eugenics and lessened the impact of his ideas among those who remained.¹²⁶⁸

Despite Goldscheid's extensive networks with Hungarian émigrés, their Viennese publications barely engage with his eugenic concepts, and the sociologist's name appears there only in brief announcements of various public events which he attended.¹²⁶⁹ This was not due to a lack of interest in the questions at the intersections of politics and biology, which were, in fact, repeatedly covered in these publications.¹²⁷⁰ Instead, it appears that their publishers, who had now been disconnected from public office and from the administrative apparatus, lost some of their interest in policy-oriented, technocratic concepts, such as Goldscheid's human economy.

Those who remained in Hungary drew on Goldscheid's ideas to a lesser extent than before the defeat of the revolution. Of course, some left-leaning intellectuals, particularly the remaining civic radicals, continued to engage with these ideas. Symptomatic of this continuing,

¹²⁶⁷ Pál Szende, "Rudolf Goldscheid (1870–1931)," *Századunk* 7, no. 1 (1932): 18–20, 20. See also Litván, *A Twentieth-Century Prophet*, passim.

¹²⁶⁸ As will be shown below, some Hungarian-speaking intellectuals in Romania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia exhibited a pronounced interest in Goldscheid's arguments.

¹²⁶⁹ For a detailed bibliography of these publications, see Ferenc Galambos, *A bécsi magyar emigráció újságjai és folyóiratai* [The Newspapers and Periodicals of the Hungarian Emigration in Vienna] (Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 1967).

¹²⁷⁰ See, for example, N. Sz., "Evolúció-revolúció" [Evolution-Revolution], *Új világ* 1, no. 2 (1920): 15–16; "Koppányi Tivadar laboratóriumában" [In the Laboratory of Tivadar Koppány], *Jövő* 1, no. 266 (December 25, 1921): 4; Skiz., "Méhely, a kormány fajbiológusa" [Méhely, The Government's Racial Biologist], *Panoráma: képes hetilap* 2, no. 25 (1922): 10–11.

yet limited resonance was a translated essay on “human economy” by the Austrian sociologist that appeared in 1926 in the first volume of the journal *Századunk* (Our Century). The journal sought to continue the positivist sociology and radical politics that marked the revue *Huszadik Század*, which ceased its publication in 1919.¹²⁷¹ However, within civic radical circles and beyond, the interest in Goldscheid’s arguments was most marked among those physicians and other professionals who were closely connected to welfare practices.

One example of this embrace of Goldscheid’s human economy was the physician Ödön Tuszkai, who was involved in several voluntary associations dealing with child welfare and sexually transmitted infections in Budapest, balancing his associational embeddedness with an intermittent practice as a spa doctor, and other commitments.¹²⁷² In the course of the 1920s, Tuszkai delivered a series of lectures and published several texts in Hungarian and in German that extolled “human economy [embergazdaság, Menschenökonomie],” defined as “public hygiene on an economic basis.”¹²⁷³ As the preceding chapter has already documented, another example was the economist János Szekeres, who was linked to the *Stefánia Association* and served as a co-editor of the *Századunk* journal in its earliest years of existence. Even though they provided important expert advice to the voluntary associations engaged in welfare provision in urban areas or directly to the municipal authorities, professionals such as Szekeres and Tuszkai were hardly the most influential supporters of eugenics in interwar Hungary. Rather, they were increasingly marginalized. Nevertheless, due to their connection to welfare

¹²⁷¹ Rudolf Goldscheid, “Embergazdaság” [Human Economy], *Századunk* 1, no. 4 (1926): 276–82.

¹²⁷² Tuszkai started his medical practice in the spa town of Marienbad at the turn of the century and continued it even after the empire’s collapse when it became part of Czechoslovakia. “Dr. Ödön Tuszkai, lékařská praxe v Mariánských Lázních” [Dr. Ödön Tuszkai, Medical Practice in Marienbad], *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 5, no. 12 (December 20, 1923): 359; Alexander Emed, “A magyar orvostudomány sokoldalú, színes alakja: Tuszkai Ödön (1863–?)” [The Versatile, Colorful Figure of Hungarian Medicine: Ödön Tuszkai, 1863–?], *Ezredvég* 14, no. 8–9 (2004): 121–22.

¹²⁷³ Ödön Tuszkai, “Embergazdaság” [Human Economy], *Új Magyar Szemle* 2, no. 3 (1921): 305–13; Ödön Tuszkai, “Menschenökonomie: Die öffentliche Hygiene auf volkswirtschaftlicher Grundlage,” *Archiv für soziale Hygiene und Demographie* 15 (1924): 1–12; “Tuszkai Ödön: A socialis hygiéne újabb problémái (A Szegedi Egyetem barátok Egyesülete orvosi szakosztályának február 19-i ülése)” [Ödön Tuszkai: New Issues in Social Hygiene: Meeting of the Medical Section of the Friends Association of the University of Szeged on February 19], *Orvosi Hetilap* 71, no. 11 (March 13, 1927): 303.

practices, they were among the last to continue foregrounding Goldscheid's modernist ideas in interwar Hungary.

The supporters of eugenics discussed thus far subscribed to socialist or liberal political ideologies, and primarily focused on urban industrial areas. However, this should not obscure the fact that in post-Habsburg Central Europe, the concept of the human economy was also repurposed for rural spaces and rural populations. In terms of political ideology, these projects were intimately linked to or influenced by various forms of agrarian populism. The political parties embracing this political ideology rose to prominence in East Central Europe after World War I and became one of the most powerful vehicles for mass politics in these countries.¹²⁷⁴ Their political ideology extolling the rural population was bolstered by the wartime experience of food shortage that reconfigured the imagined social hierarchies, elevating those groups that produced food and/or had immediate access to it.¹²⁷⁵ In effect, the peasants' imagined place in society was revalued, and portrayals that mythologized the peasants as a crucial repository of national spirit proliferated. This also tended to be the repertoire of tropes that the agrarian populist parties used to frame the rural spaces and their inhabitants and to call for redistributive policies.¹²⁷⁶ Reflecting these changes, the supporters of eugenics in the agrarian parties' orbit translated these tropes into a clearly biological language.

In their quest for a biological concept that would reevaluate the peasants and their purported rejuvenative potential, these eugenicists frequently converged on the idea of the human economy. This adoption necessitated a significant reinterpretation of the term. Even though Austria-Hungary's industry extended beyond its major cities, Goldscheid's underlying

¹²⁷⁴ Alex Toshkov, *Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019), 6–11.

¹²⁷⁵ Kučera, *Rationed Life*, 12–56.

¹²⁷⁶ Helga Schultz, and Angela Harre, eds., *Bauerngesellschaften auf dem Weg in die Moderne: Agrarismus in Ostmitteleuropa 1880 bis 1960* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010).

presumption was that the main subjects of the human economy would largely be urban, at least in their professional and lifestyle choices. However, these eugenicists reoriented the concept to fit a rural backdrop. Furthermore, Goldscheid's stress on efficiency was toned down, and while labor remained a focal point, it was often paired with or even eclipsed by an emphasis on peasant identity. In many instances, this adaptation meant the concept acquired a distinctly nationalist and conservative slant.

In interwar Yugoslavia, this notion underpinned a eugenic project that was still incorporated into a modernist framework and aimed to construct modern peasants in a modern countryside. Advocates of social medicine and medical prevention, trained, led, and epitomized by Andrija Štampar, set out “to strengthen the rural areas of the country from the inside, mobilizing the potential of its population,” as historians Stella Fatović-Ferenčić and Martin Kuhar succinctly put it.¹²⁷⁷ Their strategy included a series of public health, veterinary, and engineering solutions, accompanied by large-scale popular science education.¹²⁷⁸ The emphasis on the countryside, framed as the repository of untapped national energy, was indicative of Štampar's negotiations with the left-wing agrarian populist political ideology.¹²⁷⁹ However, despite this shift towards the countryside, some ideas inherited from the Habsburg context remained crucial for the conceptualization and legitimization of Štampar's project.

Throughout the 1920s, Goldscheid was a vital point of reference in Štampar's texts. Indeed, Štampar repeatedly claimed that Goldscheid's eugenic concepts of human economy and organic capital constituted a fundamental theoretical basis that underpinned his social hygienic practice. In 1923, for instance, Štampar acknowledged that “Goldscheid established

¹²⁷⁷ Stella Fatović-Ferenčić and Martin Kuhar, “‘Imagine All the People’: Andrija Štampar's Ideology in The Context of Contemporary Public Health Initiatives,” *Acta Medico-Historica Adriatica* 17, no. 2 (2020): 279.

¹²⁷⁸ Dugac, *Protiv bolesti*, passim; Željko Dugac, *Kako biti čist i zdrav: zdravstveno prosvječivanje u međuratnoj Hrvatskoj* [How to be Clean and Healthy: Health Education in Interwar Croatia] (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2010).

¹²⁷⁹ Murard, “Designs within Disorder,” 148.

the principles of the science of human economy and the value of organic capital in his famous works.”¹²⁸⁰ In the same breath, he stressed the importance of Goldscheid’s concepts for his thinking:

Social medicine takes the science of human economy as the foundation of its actions and strongly emphasizes the great value of humans, highlighting that human resources are the most important of all. Taking the value of organic capital as the main guiding line that runs through its various disciplines, social medicine assigns a completely different and much greater importance to the doctor as the main factor in social-medical work [...]. In this way, doctors become social-economic factors because they are called to protect and promote the greatest good, namely human beings themselves. Alongside social politicians, doctors occupy an outstanding position in society and the state as guardians of this greatest good.¹²⁸¹

Štampar reiterated the same argument nearly verbatim as late as 1933 when he outlined his principles to an international audience.¹²⁸² Goldscheid’s concepts were thus transformed by Štampar as a framework for a modernist project of rural regeneration.

Goldscheid was not Štampar’s only reference. Going beyond his former imperial context, Štampar also frequently referred to the German left-wing eugenicist Alfred Grotjahn, as well as to the towering popularizer of eugenics in prewar Serbia and interwar Yugoslavia, Milan Jovanović Batut. He thus combined references from the eugenic debates in the late Habsburg Empire, which were devised as tools of diversity management, with concepts that took the imagined nation as its main object.

¹²⁸⁰ Štampar, “O socijalnoj medicini,” 4–5.

¹²⁸¹ Štampar, “O socijalnoj medicini,” 5.

¹²⁸² In 1933, Štampar made this argument on three occasions. First, he presented it in a lecture delivered to physicians in Hungary and published in German by the local journal *Orvosképzés*. Second, the same argument was featured in a lecture delivered to a group of medical doctors in Czechoslovakia and published in an abridged Czech translation in their professional bulletin. Thirdly, this abridged text was then reprinted in Štampar’s native language in a Croatian medical outlet. Andrija Štampar, “Soziale Medizin und die Gemeindeärzte,” *Orvosképzés* 23, no. 1 (January 1933): 199–200; Andrija Štampar, “Sociální lékařství a praktičtí lékaři” [Social Medicine and General Practitioners], *Věstník českých lékařů* 45, no. 6 (February 10, 1933): 153; Andrija Štampar, “Socijalna medicina i praktični liječnici” [Social Medicine and General Practitioners], *Staleški glasnik: prilog Liječničkog vjesnika* 55, no. 3 (March 1933): 72–73.

Štampar's eugenic arguments from the 1920s can be best understood as mini-imperial in their scope and ambition. On the one hand, Štampar advocated for a eugenically-inflected social hygiene as a method of nation-building. He stressed that "[o]nly those nations that prioritized care for national health in their programs, possibly as their top priority, made significant progress in all forms of culture," thus framing it as an indispensable strategy for increasing national efficiency.¹²⁸³

On the other hand, the nation he referred to remained ambiguous, perhaps strategically so. To Štampar, the Croatian Peasant Party often appeared as a convenient ally, given their shared focus on rural subjects and the web of powerful voluntary associations that the party built.¹²⁸⁴ While some of his priorities and utterances may suggest correspondingly that the imagined Croatian nation was his actual target, others would indicate that his arguments pertained to a more broadly defined Yugoslav national project.¹²⁸⁵ Yet, in Yugoslavia of the first interwar decade, these imagined communities were not seen as contradictory. As Rory Yeomans puts it, the discourse about "race" at that time "reflected priorities about the construction of a Yugoslav person by drawing on the attributes of all its national groups in a state under construction" and was intended "to overcome ethnic, national, and religious differences in the long march toward modernity rather than to reinforce them."¹²⁸⁶ Scaled down to a mini-imperial context, Goldscheid's concepts were easily adaptable for such an agenda.

Štampar argued that in order to modernize, educate, and simultaneously regenerate rural areas and their inhabitants, as he and his followers intended, "great interventions of social and

¹²⁸³ Štampar, "Naša ideologija," 229.

¹²⁸⁴ Murard, "Designs within Disorder," 48.

¹²⁸⁵ For instance, Štampar insisted that "we will be stronger and more able to reach and even overtake other nations," even when he was writing for *Srpsko kolo*, a popular calendar for a Serb audience. Andrija Štampar, "Ministarstvo narodnog zdravlja" [Ministry of Public Health], in *Srpsko kolo: kalendar za prestupnu godinu 1920* [Serb Circle: Calendar for the Leap Year 1920] (Zagreb: Ign. Granic, 1919), 74.

¹²⁸⁶ Rory Yeomans, "Racial Politics as a Multiethnic Pavilion: Yugoslavs, Dinarics, and the Search for a Synthetic Identity in the 1920s and 1930s," in *National Races: Transnational Power Struggles in the Sciences and Politics of Human Diversity, 1840-1945*, ed. Richard McMahon (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), 333–34.

medical nature” would have to take place.¹²⁸⁷ This placed the state at the forefront for these physicians, at least in their programmatic articles. Although in practice these physicians relied on transnational, provincial, and local actors in addition to the state, Štampar’s texts from the 1920s viewed the latter as the necessary supporter of this agenda. In an influential essay titled *Naša Ideologija* (Our Ideology), published in 1928 in a prominent periodical targeting an urban, liberal, and Yugoslavist audience, Štampar wrote, “The issue of people’s health cannot be understood apart from biological politics,” and argued that such “biological politics” should become the primary objective of the state.¹²⁸⁸ According to Štampar, it should permeate much of the state administration’s operations and encompass not only its health agenda but also its broader social and economic policies. Thus, Štampar presented biopolitics as the state’s top priority, defining many of its agendas, although he discussed this topic with less detail compared to his counterparts in Poland and Romania, which will be analyzed below.

The emphasis on the economic utility and efficiency of humans, which characterized Goldscheid’s concept, could be readily harnessed for state-building agendas, as did its linking of citizenship, welfare, and stability of multiethnic states. Furthermore, the concept could also easily shed its modernist roots. In this form, it subordinated the economic logic of the human economy to a narrative that emphasized the alleged conservative nature of rural areas and framed them as the primary source of the nation’s vital energy. The peasants’ imagined purity, rather than their labor, coupled with their high birth rates, had thus been recast as the nation’s most valuable resource.

This was the trajectory that the notion of the human economy took in the writings of Tomasz Janiszewski, the Polish physician and former health minister, who used it as the basis

¹²⁸⁷ Andrija Štampar, “Jugoslavie a zdravotnické zvelebení venkova” [Yugoslavia and Rural Health Improvement], *Věstník českých lékařů* 45, no. 8 (February 24, 1933): 208.

¹²⁸⁸ Štampar, “Naša ideologija,” 229.

for a conservative, nationalist vision aimed at regenerating the rural areas. In the interwar Polish context, Janiszewski aligned himself with the conservative strand of Polish agrarian populism, and a portion of his writings from that era can be interpreted as an effort to establish a biopolitical groundwork for its political ideology. This objective was explicitly stated in Janiszewski's programmatic pamphlet titled "What should the populist movement strive for?" published in 1923, which bore the subtitle "An attempt at the ideology of the peasant movement."¹²⁸⁹ The alleged conservatism and purity of the rural areas were the central assumptions underpinning his argument and helped Janiszewski inject biopolitics into the agendas of nation- and state-building.

Janiszewski clearly biologized the Polish national identity. "The peasant stratum is conservative and stable by nature, and therefore the most suitable to base the rule of the state on it," he claimed, and asserted that "this layer is also, from a biological point of view, not only the most numerous but also the most qualitatively valuable part of the nation, from which our race is being reborn."¹²⁹⁰ He admitted that if this social stratum were to dwindle, it would not impede the development of the country's industry, science, arts, commerce, or even agriculture. However, he also asserted that "there would be neither the Polish nation nor the Polish state, as a different race would have taken our place and governed here."¹²⁹¹ By associating the Polish national identity with the peasant stratum, and invoking "racial" anxieties, Janiszewski positioned both in an antagonistic relationship toward social and economic modernity.

In this context, the concept of human economy served Janiszewski to outline an economic program for the reconstruction of rural areas that was subordinated to an overarching

¹²⁸⁹ Tomasz Wiktor Janiszewski, *Do czego dążyć powinien ruch ludowy?: Próba ideologii ruchu ludowego* [What Should the Populist Movement Strive For?: An Attempt at the Ideology of the Peasant Movement] (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Obywatelskiego Komitetu odbudowy wsi i miast, 1923).

¹²⁹⁰ Janiszewski, *Do czego dążyć*, 11.

¹²⁹¹ Janiszewski, *Do czego dążyć*, 10.

eugenically oriented population policy. In doing so, he positioned biopolitics as the primary political objective of the agrarian populist movement but also as the centerpiece of the state-building agenda: “The concern for increasing the number and quality of the population and for preserving its health are one of the basic elements of the Polish idea of the state.”¹²⁹² However, some of the economic demands he raised appear to have garnered significantly more attention within the Polish agrarian populist movement than his eugenic concerns.¹²⁹³ Linking Goldscheid’s human economy with a conservative and nationalist narrative of rural regeneration, Janiszewski nevertheless continued to appeal to its tropes, including its key claim that “the most important factor in the national wealth is the value of a humans,” way into the interwar period.¹²⁹⁴

In Romania of the 1920s, the eugenicist Iuliu Moldovan also opted to engage with the political ideology of agrarian populism. If Janiszewski aimed to influence the conservative *Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe “Piast”* (Polish People’s Party Piast), whose electoral stronghold was in post-Habsburg Galicia, in Romania, Moldovan and some of his eugenic allies forged a pragmatic relationship with the *Partidul Național Țărănesc* (National Peasant Party), whose center of electoral support was in post-Habsburg Transylvania.¹²⁹⁵ In line with this political positioning, the references to the alleged conservative nature and regenerating force of the rural areas for the imagined and biologized national community assumed a prominent place among Moldovan’s arguments. Symptomatically for his emerging conservative and nationalist vision

¹²⁹² Janiszewski, *Do czego dążyć*, 10.

¹²⁹³ Andrzej Wojtas, *Problematyka agrarna w polskiej myśli politycznej 1918-1948* [Agrarian Issues in Polish Political Thought, 1918-1948] (Warsaw: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1983), 247–60.

¹²⁹⁴ Tomasz Wiktor Janiszewski, *Sprawy zdrowia publicznego wobec reformy administracji* [Public Health Issues in the Face of Administrative Reform] (Warsaw: s.n., 1926), 20.

Tomasz Wiktor Janiszewski, “Społeczne obowiązki stanu lekarskiego” [Social Responsibilities of the Medical Profession], in *Sprawozdanie z Kursu Doksztalczącego dla lekarzy w Ciechocinku* [Report on the Continuing Education Course for Doctors in Ciechocinek], ed. Julian Drac (Warsaw: skł. gł. Biblioteka Szkoły Podchorążych Sanitarnych i Główna Księg. Wojskowa, 1929), 7.

¹²⁹⁵ Daniel Brett, “What Was the National Peasant Party?: Internal Division and Organizational Conflict 1900-1947,” in *Politics and Peasants in Interwar Romania: Perceptions, Mentalities, Propaganda*, ed. Sorin Radu and Oliver Schmitt (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Press, 2017), 187–214; Livezeanu, *Cultural*, passim.

of the countryside, for instance, in a 1925 text, Moldovan sharply pitted the rural population “characterized by the tranquility and harmony of life that conserves energy” against the urban life that allegedly walked hand in hand with “the reduction or reversal of conservative instincts, the almost complete severing of the connection with nature, and the relaxation of familial life.”¹²⁹⁶

While Janiszewski’s attempt to integrate eugenics into the political ideology of Polish agrarian populists had been derailed, perhaps due to their commitment to Catholicism, Moldovan’s eugenic arguments were embraced by the Romanian agrarian populists. By the mid-1920s, the party’s program adopted a clearly eugenically-influenced language to call for public health reform.¹²⁹⁷ Moreover, by that time, some of the leading politicians of the party, including both the more centrist Iuliu Maniu and the conservative Alexandru Vaida-Voevod, were familiar with and supportive of Moldovan’s eugenic arguments.¹²⁹⁸ In 1927, for example, the latter enthusiastically lectured on “National Politics and the National Biological Capital.”¹²⁹⁹ Maria Bucur points out that the Romanian agrarian populists were particularly intrigued by what they saw as Moldovan’s “pioneering effort in caring about the rural population not only as a workforce but also as a vital resource for the Romanian nation.”¹³⁰⁰ In other words, an appropriation of the narrative about economizing humans and the notion of “biological capital,” which both originated in the former imperial context, facilitated Moldovan’s strategic alliance with the local agrarian populists.

Moldovan and his followers used the terms “human capital [capitalul uman]” and “biological capital [capitalul biologic]” as synonyms and turned them into some of the most

¹²⁹⁶ Moldovan, *Igiena națiunii*, 62.

¹²⁹⁷ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 30.

¹²⁹⁸ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 30.

¹²⁹⁹ Alexandru Vaida-Voevod, “Politica națională și capitalul biologic național” [National Policy and National Biological Capital], *Gazeta Transilvaniei* 90, no. 51 (May 13, 1927): 1–2.

¹³⁰⁰ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 30.

frequently recurring keywords in their eugenic arguments, whether on the pages of their flagship journal *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* or beyond. However, unlike Štampar in Yugoslavia, who was ready to openly credit Goldscheid's ideas, and unlike Janiszewski in Poland, who acknowledged the Viennese eugenicist through proxies, Moldovan kept silent about the intellectual sources of his ideas.¹³⁰¹ This move facilitated the decoupling of the concept from its initial socialist and imperial connotations, and made it appear to some as Moldovan's original coinage.¹³⁰² With its genealogy obscured, "biological capital" thus became not only the central tenet, but also an emblem of Moldovan's project of Romanian national eugenics.

The insistence that biopolitics, foregrounding the biological capital, had to become the primary goal of the state was an important part of Moldovan's arguments. As early as 1924, Moldovan claimed that these principles must permeate the entire state and guide its key policies:

[H]uman capital, the care for it, and its future must be the foundation of the program of every state's activity. All other branches of activity in the state must be consistent with its progress. Economy and culture cannot be goals in themselves but only means for the state to optimally fulfill its duties towards human capital. Instead of a dominant economic policy, we have a biopolitics as a program of activity, and an organization of the state. Its basis and purpose are the present and future human biological capital.¹³⁰³

In embracing Goldscheid's concept of "biological capital," Moldovan followed a similar trajectory as the eugenicists discussed above. He applied the concept to rural areas, forming a partnership with the local powerful agrarian populist movement, and sought to infuse their political ideology and program with eugenic ideas. If the mass agrarian populist movement

¹³⁰¹ In a text from 1926, for example, Janiszewski referred to Ödön Tuzskai and Heinz Potthoff, both of whom were deeply influenced by Goldscheid. Tomasz Wiktor Janiszewski, "L'importance sociale de la santé." *Revue internationale de sociologie* 34 (1926): 269.

¹³⁰² An example of the resulting confusion was the Bucharest-based physician and journalist Iosif Glicsman who reported that "the term 'human capital' comes to us from Transylvania, from the hygiene institute of Professor Iuliu Moldovan." Iosif Glicsman, "Capitalul uman: O conceptie biopolitică" [Human Capital: A Biopolitical Concept], *Adevărul* 42, no. 13855 (February 21, 1929): 1.

¹³⁰³ Iuliu Moldovan, "Un program biopolitic" [A Biopolitical Programme], *Societatea de Măine* 1, no. 3 (April 27, 1924): 69.

were to wrest power and exert its influence on state-building, biopolitics was to become one of its chief elements. However, in crafting a vision of this new, biopolitically-administered state, Moldovan was much more systematic and far-reaching than his other post-Habsburg counterparts. His influential 1926 book, entitled simply *Biopolitica*, presented a detailed blueprint for a reframed state administration, in which all the ministries and public agencies were ultimately subordinated under a eugenic rationale. Moldovan thus presented a comprehensive eugenic theory of the state, with a notable technocratic and corporatist tinge.¹³⁰⁴

Either overtly or tacitly, these eugenicists in interwar Yugoslavia, Poland, and Romania adapted Goldscheid's tropes about human economy and organic capital as a tool for building their country's titular national majorities. They embraced what Marius Turda labelled as "eugenic pastoralism," arguing that the peasantry was the main depository of their nation's organic capital, and representing the countryside as the chief locus of the alleged regeneration of the national community.¹³⁰⁵ While all three eugenicists identified with the national majorities of their countries, the concepts derived from Goldscheid's human economy were adopted, and very similar arguments were advanced as tools of nation-building also by some intellectuals and professionals who identified with the ethnic minorities within the states of post-Habsburg Central Europe.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, Goldscheid's concepts resonated among some young Hungarian-speaking minority authors from Romania, Yugoslavia, and, most notably, from Czechoslovakia, even though they did not dominate the discussion in any of these contexts. To begin with, among the Hungarian-language publications in Romania, the socialist revue *Korunk* (Our Epoch), published from 1926 onwards in Kolozsvár/Cluj, the center of post-Habsburg

¹³⁰⁴ Marius Turda, "Romanian Eugenic Sub-Culture and the Allure of Biopolitics, 1918–39," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 114 (2016): 29–58.

¹³⁰⁵ Turda, "Minorities and Eugenic Subcultures," 11.

Transylvania, stood out by engaging with eugenic issues. The revue covered eugenics both in original articles by its Hungarian-speaking contributors and through translations.¹³⁰⁶ As part of its interest in eugenics, *Korunk* published a translation of an article by Goldscheid as late as 1930 and shortly afterward reported on a lecture that the Viennese eugenicist held at an international congress for sexual reform.¹³⁰⁷ This interest in Goldscheid by these young, left-wing intellectuals may have been sparked by their attempt to adopt the legacy of the turn-of-the-century Hungarian civic radicalism as a part of their intellectual genealogy.

While it would be an exaggeration to claim that Goldscheid's human economy shaped the biopolitical thinking of this group of intellectuals, it did impact their reaction to the arguments of the Romanian-speaking eugenicists in the area. These latter eugenicists forcefully embraced Goldscheid's coinage of "organic capital," albeit without its modernism or socialist politics, as we have seen. Tellingly, the reaction of the Hungarian-speaking intellectuals to these arguments was divided. On the one hand, one of the revue's contributors, Imre Bányai, wrote in 1936 that the "biosociology" promoted by Iuliu Moldovan and his followers was "the only comprehensive scientifically disguised theory of Romanian fascism."¹³⁰⁸ He condemned it for its "protection of the wealthy peasantry, anti-Semitism, and anti-minority sentiments."¹³⁰⁹ On the other hand, a Hungarian-speaking medical doctor from Transylvania, Dénes László, commended the eugenic ideas of Moldovan, preferring their explicit nationalist focus over Francis Galton's initial definition of eugenics, as Marius Turda observes.¹³¹⁰ While the Romanian-speaking eugenicists showed their Hungarian-speaking counterparts the utility of

¹³⁰⁶ Turda, "Introduction," xix.

¹³⁰⁷ Rudolf Goldscheid, "A szaporodás forradalma" [The Reproductive Revolution], *Korunk* 5, no. 3 (March 1930): 175–79; István Szende, "Szexuális kongresszusok" [Sexual Congresses], *Korunk* 5, no. 11 (November 1930): 810–14.

¹³⁰⁸ Imre Bányai, "A bioszociológia világgépe" [The World View of Biosociology], *Korunk* 11, no. 4 (April 1, 1936): 297.

¹³⁰⁹ Bányai, "A bioszociológia," 297.

¹³¹⁰ Turda, "Minorities and Eugenic Subcultures," 12; Dénes László, "Eugénia, fajbiológia és sterilizálás" [Eugenics, Racial Biology and Sterilisation], *Korunk* 8, no. 12 (December 1933): 917–20.

appropriating Goldscheid's categories for the nation-building agenda, they also demonstrated that the resulting epistemic toolkit could easily enter a conflict course with its original political values.

Nevertheless, the strong doubts about Moldovan did not produce questions about his unacknowledged Viennese point of reference, as testified by a text written by a communist Theodor Balk, which the revue *Korunk* published in 1935. Born in 1900 to a Jewish family in Zemun/Zimony, which was then a part of the Hungarian territories of Austria-Hungary and later became a part of Yugoslavia, Balk was trained in medicine in Zagreb and Vienna, and he combined the profession of a physician with journalism. After the formation of the royal dictatorship in Yugoslavia in 1929, Balk lived in exile, first in Germany, then in Czechoslovakia, and later in France.¹³¹¹ His text for *Korunk* presented a Marxist critique of racial theories, particularly those in Nazi Germany, and linked them to the history of class struggles. In developing his argument, he engaged with eugenics and drew on a number of authorities in his discussion. Even in the mid-1930s, Balk's essay, which *Korunk* chose to publish, implied that Goldscheid's neo-Lamarckian eugenic arguments were compatible with anti-fascism.¹³¹²

In particular, Balk used the arguments of the Viennese eugenicist to support his criticism of Malthusianism, which he dismissed as an ideological reflection of the early stages of capitalist development. Instead, he called for policies based on the notion of inheritance of acquired characteristics that would reshape the social and cultural environment of the workers as a whole. Balk rhetorically asked, "Does the doctrine of the inheritance of acquired characteristics not lead to the conclusion that poverty is the mother of degeneration?" and

¹³¹¹ Jiří Veselý, "Theodor Balk (Fodor Dragutin)," in *Azyl v Československu 1933-1938* [Asylum in Czechoslovakia, 1933-1938] (Prague: Naše vojsko, 1983), 275.

¹³¹² This linkage, as we will see in the following chapter, was not uncommon. For instance, both Friedrich Hertz and Hugo Iltis initially subscribed to a similar position.

asserted, in line with Goldscheid, that “to attain a higher level of life [magasabb életfokozat], it is not poverty but bread that is necessary.”¹³¹³ The multilingual Balk also repeated and expanded the same argument in a book that he published in Yugoslavia in its official language in the same year.¹³¹⁴ Balk’s text shows that the Hungarian-speaking left-wing networks in Romania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia were not isolated from each other; rather, their interconnectedness enabled some ideas to circulate between different post-Habsburg spaces.

Among Hungarian-speakers in Czechoslovakia, the concept of human economy influenced the eugenic debates among intellectuals and professionals who strongly embraced a generational discourse in the late 1920s. Combining agrarian populism and, increasingly, Marxism, they formed a group called *Sarló* (Sickle) in 1928. Although some of them eventually joined the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the members of *Sarló* were also deeply nationalist. They aimed to redefine the imagined Hungarian national community in a post-imperial context, seeking to capture its minority status in Czechoslovakia as well as its cross-border nature.¹³¹⁵ *Sarló*’s members dismissed the cultural definition of the nation, and constructed it instead as an entity that was natural and could be defined using “objective” criteria furnished by positivist science. Racial discourses played a fundamental role in this process. As one of *Sarló*’s leading intellectuals, Edgár Balogh, put it, the Hungarian nation was “no longer a legal formula, no longer a failed state consciousness, but an immeasurable racial force [mérhetetlen faji erő], a natural reality.”¹³¹⁶ Having biologized the identity of the

¹³¹³ Theodor Balk, “A fajelmélet két évezrede” [Two Millennia of Race Theory], *Korunk* 10, no. 5 (May 1935): 335.

¹³¹⁴ Theodor Balk, *Sumrak nauke: knjiga o rasi* [The Twilight of Science: A Book on Race] (Beograd: Medicinska biblioteka Lekar, 1935), 10–13.

¹³¹⁵ Ildikó Bajcsi, *Kisebbségi magyar küldetés Csehszlovákiában: A sarlós nemzedék közösségi szerepvállalása Trianon után* [The Hungarian Minority Mission in Czechoslovakia: The Community Engagement of the *Sarló* Generation after Trianon] (Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2021); Deborah Cornelius, *In Search of the Nation: The New Generation of Hungarian Youth in Czechoslovakia, 1925–1934* (Boulder, CO: Columbia University Press, 1998).

¹³¹⁶ Edgár Balogh, “A regösjárásról a szociografiai intézetig” [From the Regösjárás to the Sociographic Institute], *Erdélyi Fiatalok* 1, no. 6 (June 1930): 82.

Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia, *Sarló*'s intellectuals turned towards the countryside, embarking on sociological, descriptive field research to discover it.¹³¹⁷

The self-described representatives of the “new Hungarian intelligentsia” involved in the *Sarló* attempted to enlist professionals into the movement, including engineers and physicians with socialist inclinations, and encourage them to conduct empirical observations in rural areas.¹³¹⁸ While there were relatively few physicians who effectively aligned themselves with the *Sarló*, they displayed a keen interest in eugenics, which was one of the specific topics covered during their first seminar in 1929, along with closely related demographic and public health concerns.¹³¹⁹ In a programmatic article published simultaneously, Mihály Csáder, one of *Sarló*'s founders and an informal leader of this group of physicians, asserted, “The Hungarian villages [in Czechoslovakia] are plagued by illness.” His response to this challenge framed the issue of rural health in unmistakably eugenic terms. Invoking the trope that portrayed the peasantry as the ultimate source of national vitality, he cautioned that “the village will not remain the last bastion of primeval qualities, health, and energy for much longer.”¹³²⁰ The physicians aligned with the *Sarló* thus shared a set of similar eugenic concerns. Yet, they did not draw on a shared set of eugenics references.

On the face of it, it would appear unlikely that Goldscheid's notion of human economy would be among the references for *Sarló*'s physicians. Unlike the Transylvanian *Korunk*, these Hungarian-speaking intellectuals from Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia defined

¹³¹⁷ Edgár Balogh, “Tíz nap Szegényországban I: Beszámoló a sarlósok ruszinszkói vándorlásáról” [Ten Days in a Land of Poverty I: An Account of the *Sarló*'s Wandering in Ruthenia], *Prágai Magyar Hírlap* 9, no. 218 (September 24, 1930): 4–5.

¹³¹⁸ Edgár Balogh, “Nékol'ko slov o sociografickej práci Sarló” [A Few Words about the Sociographic Work of *Sarló*], *Dav* 4, no. 9–10 (September 1931): 14–15.

¹³¹⁹ As we have already seen, Csáder was previously a contributor to the journal *A Gyermekek-Diet'a-Das Kind*. The journal also brought some reports of the Hungarian youth networks that would eventually transform into the *Sarló*. Mihály Csáder, “A pozsonyi orvosi szeminárium első szemesztere” [First Semester at the Bratislava Medical Seminary], *Vetés: A csehszlovákiai magyar egyetemi hallgatóság röpirata* 1 (April 1929): 11.

¹³²⁰ Mihály Csáder, “Az új orvosnemzedék feladata” [The Task of the New Generation of Doctors], *Vetés: A csehszlovákiai magyar egyetemi hallgatóság röpirata* 1 (April 1929): 11.

themselves in opposition both to the imperial legacy as well as to the turn-of-the-century Hungarian civic radicalism, which they labelled as too “urban,” “abstract,” and “devoid of life.”¹³²¹ Yet, as the *Sarló* sought to expand its networks among physicians and students of medicine, it also included individuals who were older than its other members, whose national identifications were much more complex, and who had links to socialist eugenics in nearby Vienna. For instance, they were joined by the physician Jakab Tuscherer from Bratislava/Pressburg/Pozsony, who published interchangeably in Hungarian, German, and Slovak, used several variations of his name, and was in contact with the socialist supporters of eugenics in Vienna, particularly with Tandler.¹³²² This connection influenced Tuscherer’s arguments.

As the *Sarló* movement negotiated between agrarian populism and socialism and expanded its professional networks, Goldscheid’s ideas entered some of its members’ arguments. In a 1931 book published in German, for instance, Tuscherer argued that a new medicine was emerging while he was writing, yet the future advent of a socialist society was a precondition for this medicine’s full materialization. The vision of a modern medicine that Tuscherer outlined was imbued with eugenics, and its envisioned content reiterated many tropes of human economy, even though Tuscherer preferred to speak about *Gesundheitsökonomie*, or health economy. He argued that socialism would bring about “a society for which human life is the most valuable asset and the preservation of the health and workforce of all humans is considered the best capital investment.”¹³²³ This new society would also transform the physicians into “co-administrators of the most valuable national asset.”¹³²⁴

¹³²¹ Edgár Balogh, “Nová maďarská generácia” [The New Hungarian Generation], *E Brno: List etického hnutí československého studentstva* 2, no. 5 (February 1930): 44–47.

¹³²² Historical collections of the Medical University of Vienna - Josephinum, Julius Tandler Papers, Letter, From Jakub Tuscherer to Julius Tandler, November 19, 1935.

¹³²³ Jakub Tuscherer, *Die kranke Medizin: Ausweg aus der heutigen Krise* (Bratislava: Bleier, 1931), 6.

¹³²⁴ Tuscherer, *Die kranke Medizin*, 69.

The paradigm of constitutional medicine was an important component of the envisioned new medicine in Tuscherer's argument, especially if it also emphasized the significance of the environment in shaping human bodies and triggering illnesses.¹³²⁵ Concurrently, Tuscherer strongly criticized race hygiene for its emphasis on "national selection and categorical protection of the racial community," and argued that "in fact, reasonable eugenics has no connection to racial purity."¹³²⁶ Unlike Balogh or Csáder, Tuscherer did not associate the nation with "race," and his discussions on health economy left significant strategic ambiguity about his perspectives on the alleged biological elements of the envisioned national community.

When the circle of physicians within the *Sarló* published an extensive questionnaire in 1930 to be answered by their colleagues visiting rural areas and carrying out empirical observations, Tuscherer was one of its authors. The questionnaire contained precisely one hundred questions and was published separately in Hungarian and Slovak language versions. Revealing the influence of Goldscheid's socialist neo-Lamarckism, transposed to the countryside, the questions primarily covered the natural environment, economy, hygiene, and culture of the rural population, including their reproductive strategies. The observers were encouraged to foreground social characteristics – "property (or class position), occupation, and degree of culture" – while none of the questions led them to measure the alleged "racial" features of the rural subjects.¹³²⁷ The impact of eugenics on many questions within the

¹³²⁵ Tuscherer, *Die kranke Medizin*, 43.

¹³²⁶ Tuscherer, *Die kranke Medizin*, 106.

¹³²⁷ Although the contents of the two pamphlets are largely identical, the authors listed in these respective versions only partially overlap. Déri Museum, Debrecen, Literary Collection, Csáder, Mihály, Johanna Dávid, Jenő Freiberg, and Miksa Német. *Népegészségügyi kérdések. A Sarló szociográfiai füzetek 1.* Pozsony: Slovenská Grafia, 1930; Mihály Csáder, Johanna Dávid, Emerich Fischer, Julius Frank, Jenő Freiberg, Max Német, and Jakub Tuscherer, *Otázky ľudového zdravotníctva: Sociografický sošit socialistických lekárov* [Issues of People's Health: The Sociographic Workbook of Socialist Doctors] (Bratislava: Dr. Tuscherer, 1930). I would like to express my gratitude to the staff of the Déri Múzeum in Debrecen, Hungary, for kindly providing me with a copy of the Hungarian version of the pamphlet.

questionnaire was clear. However, due to the influence of Goldscheid's ideas, the doctors' construct of "race" was ultimately less radical than that of the *Sarló*'s other members.

Goldscheid's ideas resonated beyond the former territories of Austria-Hungary. Paul Weindling highlights that in Weimar Germany, "more advanced social thinkers" chose to appropriate the notion of the human economy, so as to conceptualize the relationship between society and biology in a way that was "in keeping with Weimar modernism."¹³²⁸ However, the reception of Goldscheid was not limited to these modernist authors. Physicians and other experts involved in sports medicine and labor-related medicine adopted the human economy as a framework for "enhancing people's performance capacity."¹³²⁹ Their goal was to regenerate the biology of the German nation and reconstruct Germany's national economy after the World War, moving away, in part, from their previous preoccupation with enhancing the *Wehrkraft*, or Germany's military fitness. Far from being exclusively associated with Weimar modernism, therefore, these technocratic, nationalist agendas were also compatible with right-wing political projects and were embraced by them, as Michael Hau carefully documents. They persisted even in Nazi Germany, now connecting the "performance principle" with the project of forging a "racial community of productive citizens," anti-Semitism, and renewed mobilization for military aggression.¹³³⁰ In other words, while Goldscheid's ideas influenced biopolitical debates in Weimar Germany, they did not serve identical purposes as in the post-Habsburg states. In the latter context, they were employed not only as tools for enhancing the alleged national efficiency but also as a toolkit for negotiating post-imperial state-building and managing the diverse local populations.

¹³²⁸ Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics*, 481.

¹³²⁹ Hau, *Performance Anxiety*, 5.

¹³³⁰ Hau, *Performance Anxiety*, 7–9.

Biological Constitution: Between National Indifference and National Homogenization

In the late imperial period, anatomist Julius Tandler attempted to adapt eugenics for a multiethnic Austria-Hungary by reorienting it toward constitutional medicine and toward the individual person. His ambiguous eugenic proposal aimed to accommodate imperial diversity, emphasizing that the notion of “race” as defined by racial nationalists could not accurately characterize individual persons. Instead, he presented the individual constitution as the pivotal concept allegedly offering deeper insights into their physique. At the same time, Tandler, as a neo-Lamarckian advocate of social reform, presented an optimistic-sounding vision where the “race” was not predetermined, at least in the long term. It could be altered – possibly even deliberately – by environmental impulses that would change the individual condition, subsequently influencing the intergenerational constitution and, in turn, the “race.” Fusing constitutional medicine with eugenics, Tandler’s ideas found their most significant application in interwar Red Vienna.

Under Tandler’s direct supervision, these ideas shaped certain aspects of Red Vienna’s municipal policy.¹³³¹ Significantly, even while in public office, Tandler articulated these policies using his distinctive conceptual language. For example, in his influential 1924 essay *Ehe und Bevölkerungspolitik* (Marriage and Population Policy), Tandler framed the municipal health and social welfare initiatives as examples of “the qualitative population policy for the current generation” that targeted “individual conditions and can thus be termed a conditional population policy.”¹³³² In addition to these, he advocated for more direct eugenic measures that aimed immediately at “future generations,” seeking to shape their constitution. Tandler labelled

¹³³¹ For a detailed analysis of the impact of Tandler’s eugenic ideas on these policies, see the previous chapter.

¹³³² Julius Tandler, “Ehe und Bevölkerungspolitik III.” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 74, no. 6 (February 2, 1924): 307.

these measures as “constitutional population policy.”¹³³³ While he particularly recommended measures like voluntary marriage counseling, he repeatedly expressed reservations about more radical approaches, such as eugenic sterilizations.¹³³⁴ However, similar to the concepts of cooperation and human economy, Tandler’s ideas about constitutional medicine circulated beyond Austria and extended beyond the social democratic left.

Numerous supporters of eugenics drew on constitutional medicine in the post-Habsburg states, with many considering Tandler as a primary reference. Engaging with his ideas on constitutional medicine, these individuals expanded upon and adapted them to serve varied epistemic and political purposes. The inherent ambiguity of Tandler’s concepts provided this flexibility. In particular, there was a tension in Tandler’s approach that split the concept of “race.” On the one hand, his approach depicted “race” as inherent to groups, while on the other, it portrayed it, under the guise of constitution, as quasi-individual and effectively non-national. The post-Habsburg eugenicists inspired by Tandler resolved this tension in various ways. While some interpreted and used Tandler’s ideas about individual constitution as a toolkit indifferent to nationalism, others recast his emphasis on the malleability of biology as a tool for nation-building. They asserted that the nation also possessed a constitution, that it was malleable, and could therefore be normalized. As the ideas about the inheritance of acquired characteristics came under increasing scrutiny in the 1920s, some post-Habsburg eugenicists also sought to reconcile Tandler’s ideas with Mendelism. Thus, in the 1920s, adopting Tandler’s ideas often meant simultaneously departing from them.

This section delves into the divergent adaptations of Tandler’s constitutional medicine through an analysis of two influential interwar eugenic projects. On the one hand, it re-evaluates

¹³³³ My translation and paraphrase attempts to unpack the densely constructed original sentence: “Die qualitative Bevölkerungspolitik für die lebende Generation ist sozusagen nur konditionelle Bevölkerungspolitik, die für die kommende aber konstitutionelle.” Tandler, “Ehe und Bevölkerungspolitik III,” 307.

¹³³⁴ Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, passim.

the involvement of the Viennese physician Julius Bauer with constitutional medicine as an effort to accommodate the ethnocultural diversity of imperial and interwar Austria. It is argued that Bauer employed the notion of constitution to create a biological, and indeed eugenic, conceptual toolkit that remained indifferent toward nationality. However, Bauer rejected Tandler's assumptions about the inheritance of acquired characteristics and, as a result, his toolkit became genetically determinist. On the other hand, in Czechoslovakia, the biologist Vladislav Růžička placed the concept of constitution at the heart of his emerging blueprint for Czech national eugenics. Unlike Bauer, Růžička maintained the neo-Lamarckian orientation evident in Tandler's approach to constitution, yet he employed it to advance a nationalist agenda. Even when he claimed to "normalize" the envisioned national community, however, Růžička aimed to mold it primarily through the influence of a shared natural and social environment on adaptable individual bodies, rather than through the pursuit of ethnic purification.

The first eugenicist this section focuses on is the eugenically-oriented physician Julius Bauer (1887-1979), who emerged as one of the leading researchers on constitutional medicine in interwar Vienna.¹³³⁵ He shared this interest with Tandler and was initially heavily influenced by him.¹³³⁶ What is more, he co-edited the first journal on constitution medicine alongside its founder, Tandler.¹³³⁷ Furthermore, Bauer shared with Tandler and several other Viennese physicians an interest in the overlaps between constitutionalism and endocrinology, particularly in the early stages of his career.¹³³⁸ By the 1920s, Bauer tempered the focus on the determining role of hormones on individual constitution in favor of genetics, though he did not completely abandon it.¹³³⁹ Nevertheless, he continued to be recognized as an authority on how internal

¹³³⁵ Logan, "Cases and Prototypes," 78.

¹³³⁶ Logan, "Cases and Prototypes," 78.

¹³³⁷ Bauer is first mentioned as one of the co-editors in the tenth volume of the journal in 1925.

¹³³⁸ Logan, "Cases and Prototypes," 78.

¹³³⁹ Logan, "Cases and Prototypes," 78.

secretion influenced individual body types, both among German-speaking doctors and within the Anglophone context.¹³⁴⁰ To sum up, Bauer was impacted by Tandler's concepts and worked together with him.

A crucial point of convergence between the two Viennese physicians was that Tandler employed the concepts of human constitution and condition to address the ethnocultural diversity of imperial Austria and its successor state, while Bauer confronted the same challenge. However, Julius Bauer's response was individualistic and apolitical. It differed not only from Tandler but also from Otto Bauer, a close relative of Julius, who, as an Austromarxist thinker and politician, responded to Austria-Hungary's diversity by advocating for a personal, non-territorial national autonomy.¹³⁴¹ While Julius Bauer's approach placed the individual person at the forefront, he depicted their physical and psychological makeup as profoundly biologically determined. However, Julius Bauer remained indifferent to the supra-individual community envisioned by nationalists. He deliberately refrained from linking individual traits with a presumed national or even "racial" identity. Concentrating solely on the individual body, he simply did not presuppose that nationality was imprinted upon it. Bauer's emphasis on individual constitution, in other words, not only sidestepped nationalism but also legitimized an indifference towards it in a modern urban context.

Some of Bauer's other views departed from Tandler even more forcefully. Crucially, unlike the neo-Lamarckian Tandler, Bauer embraced the concept of hard heredity and concurred with those who characterized Mendelism as an "atomistic theory of life."¹³⁴² For Bauer, this shift also signaled a departure from the pursuit of presumed constitutional types,

¹³⁴⁰ Julius Bauer, "Individual Constitution and Endocrine Glands," *Endocrinology* 8, no. 3 (May 1, 1924): 297–322; Julius Bauer, *Innere Sekretion* (Berlin: Springer, 1927).

¹³⁴¹ Julius Bauer, *Medizinische Kulturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts im Rahmen einer Autobiographie* (Vienna: Maudrich, 1964).

¹³⁴² Julius Bauer, *Praktische Folgerungen aus der Vererbungslehre* (Vienna: Urban und Schwarzenberg, 1925), 30.

and he transitioned instead to an individualized exploration of the genetic determinants of a person's characteristics. As he stated in a lecture delivered to the association of physicians in Budapest, "today's constitutional pathology has moved beyond yesterday's typological approach," and has advanced into "something distinctly individual, tied to the individual person," forming a "science about the genotype and its progression and development into a phenotype."¹³⁴³ Bauer's goal, as he clarified elsewhere, was to elaborate on "the smallest, independently inheritable units, the so-called hereditary factors or genes, and to determine their phenotypic manifestations and their mutual relationships."¹³⁴⁴ These altered assumptions about heredity also marked a departure from Tandler's approach to social reform. Bauer replaced Tandler's preference for large-scale environmental transformation and collective change with an individualized, clinical intervention.

At the same time, Bauer also adopted a more complex view on human psychology, and integrated the individual psychology approach of the Viennese Alfred Adler into his clinical practice.¹³⁴⁵ What is more, some of Bauer's students would subsequently – after emigrating from Austria to the United States of America – significantly contribute towards the establishment of psychoanalysis in New York.¹³⁴⁶ Bauer, therefore, diverged from Tandler not only in his assumptions about the mechanism of heredity but also about the workings of human psychology.

Grounded in genetic determinism, Bauer's approach did not exclude eugenics, even though his approach was indifferent towards nationalism. Indeed, Veronika Hofer shows that

¹³⁴³ Julius Bauer, "Konstitutionspathologie einst und jetzt," *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 87, no. 15 (April 10, 1937): 402–403.

¹³⁴⁴ Julius Bauer, "Erbpathologie und ihre praktischen Konsequenzen," *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 84, no. 49–51 (1934): 1352.

¹³⁴⁵ Veronika Hofer, "Positionen und Posen eines Experten: Der Konstitutionsforscher Julius Bauer (1887-1973) und die Eugenik in der Wiener Zwischenkriegszeit," in *Eugenik in Österreich. Biopolitische Methoden und Strukturen von 1900-1945*, ed. Thomas Mayer, Veronika Hofer, and Gerhard Baader (Vienna: Czernin, 2007), 43.

¹³⁴⁶ Hofer, "Positionen und Posen," 51.

eugenic proposals were the ultimate culmination of Bauer's project that sought to locate the genetic foundations for various illnesses, and to integrate the resulting research and therapeutic program into clinical practice.¹³⁴⁷ Bauer's involvement in eugenics was recognized by his Austrian peers, resulting in his appointment to the scientific advisory board of the *Österreichischer Bund für Volksaufartung und Erbkunde* (Austrian League for Regeneration and Heredity), a self-proclaimed non-partisan platform that convened nationalist, liberal, and socialist eugenicists, where he also gave lectures.¹³⁴⁸

While Bauer's approach to constitutional medicine had a strong individualist inclination, he departed from it when discussing his eugenic proposals, arguing that "both individual and collectivist interests must be considered."¹³⁴⁹ As Hofer demonstrates, some of his proposals were benign, yet they still enforced what the physician deemed normal. While certain proponents of constitutional medicine increasingly vocally expressed pessimism regarding medicine's capacity to provide effective therapeutic solutions, Bauer retained his optimism and advocated for modifying inherited physical traits through surgical interventions.¹³⁵⁰ Nevertheless, Bauer also endorsed restrictive and coercive eugenic strategies. Employing an old eugenic trope, Bauer referred to the alleged financial losses incurred by a state (without mentioning the nation) due to individuals with hereditary illnesses and disabilities, and advocated for widespread usage of premarital health examinations and prenuptial health certificates. Furthermore, Bauer supported eugenic sterilizations in the 1920s, although his stance became more skeptical in the subsequent decade, and he strongly criticized the forced sterilizations in Nazi Germany.¹³⁵¹ While Bauer's eugenics was programmatically

¹³⁴⁷ Hofer, "Positionen und Posen," 35.

¹³⁴⁸ Weindling, "A City Regenerated," 95 and 98.

¹³⁴⁹ Bauer, *Praktische Folgerungen*, 28.

¹³⁵⁰ Hofer, "Positionen und Posen," 59.

¹³⁵¹ Hofer, "Positionen und Posen," 59 and 61.

indifferent to the nation, it was also more genetically determinist than that of the left-leaning Viennese eugenicists of the 1910s, and advocated for some radical interventions.

The Czech biologist Růžička was also influenced by Tandler's arguments about constitutional medicine, even before the collapse of the empire. Yet he chose to inherit a different part of the latter's ideas than Bauer. Unlike the latter, Růžička remained committed to neo-Lamarckism. Indeed, he went one step further than Tandler in his emphasis on the plasticity of human bodies, arguing that what Tandler described as human condition and constitution could be both easily altered when they were exposed to new environmental influences.¹³⁵² Consequently, he claimed that there was “no fundamental difference between Tandler's notion of constitution and condition, as they both represent [environmental] modifications.”¹³⁵³ These views underpinned Růžička's preference for social reforms, prioritizing changes in public health, the built environment, labor, and nutrition, and increasingly also his nationalism.

While the two Viennese physicians employed constitutional medicine primarily for purposes other than biologizing Austrian national identity, Růžička integrated the notion of constitution into his framework of Czech national eugenics. In his earliest eugenic texts, the nation was one of the objects of his eugenically-oriented calls for social reform, but not the exclusive one. However, later, in tandem with the emergence of Czechoslovakia, he elevated the homogenization and enhancement of the alleged “national constitution” to the central tenet of his eugenic blueprint.

By the late 1910s, Růžička's ideas about the malleability of human bodies were increasingly influenced by the theories of a Hungarian-born German biologist, Valentin

¹³⁵² Vladislav Růžička, *Dědičnost u člověka ve zdraví a nemoci* [Human Heredity in Health and Disease] (Prague: Otto, 1917), passim.

¹³⁵³ Vladislav Růžička, “O konstituci, dědičnosti u člověka a významu mendelismu pro eugeniku” [On Constitution, Human Heredity, and the Importance of Mendelism for Eugenics], *Časopis lékařů českých* 54, no. 17 (May 24, 1915): 527.

Haecker, who, like Růžička, balanced the belief that neo-Lamarckian heredity was supported by significant evidence with an interest in Mendelism.¹³⁵⁴ Haecker attempted to overcome the difference between genotypes, or the hereditary material, and the causes of phenotypes, or the visible characteristics of individuals, while systematically elaborating the relationship between these two fundamental Mendelian concepts.¹³⁵⁵ Emphasizing the role of the environment and biological plasticity in the process, Haecker laid the groundwork for the creation of a new field of phenogenetics, which involved an analysis of “the developmental processes that caused different phenotypic characters.”¹³⁵⁶ This emphasis became critical for Růžička’s eugenic thinking after 1918.

Building on Haecker’s ideas, Růžička proposed a concept of “progenetic constitution” that rested on the assumption of the “malleability, and, thus, an epigenetic nature of genes [měnitelnost a tím epigenetická povaha genů].”¹³⁵⁷ Moving back and forth between genetic theories and their application in eugenics, Růžička rejected race hygiene in Weimar Germany together with hard heredity. Instead, he stressed the importance of the environment for altering an individual constitution, and called for “adaptive eugenics” based on this foundation:

Praeformist genetic theory can lead no further and nowhere else but to make selection the main method of eugenics and thus collapse into the program of race hygiene. However, once we come to the realization that external developmental factors are equally important as internal ones, that genes are not immutable, i.e. that heredity is not an inevitable fate, that what is inherited is a progenetic constitution rather than preformed hereditary matter, that progenetic constitution is not a product of historical accumulation but of circumstances acting during its emergence (interbreeding and external factors), then adaptive eugenics, with its altruistic and humanistic perspectives, becomes possible as well [...].¹³⁵⁸

¹³⁵⁴ Uwe Hoßfeld, Elizabeth Watts, and Georgy S. Levit, “Valentin Haecker (1864–1927) as a Pioneer of Phenogenetics: Building the Bridge between Genotype and Phenotype,” *Epigenetics* 12, no. 4 (April 2017): 247–53.

¹³⁵⁵ Hoßfeld, Watts, and Levit, “Valentin Haecker,” 247–53.

¹³⁵⁶ Hoßfeld, Watts, and Levit, “Valentin Haecker,” 247–53.

¹³⁵⁷ Strikingly, the word “epigenetic” was a key analytical term in Růžička’s 1923 book, two decades before C. H. Waddington coined it as a biological concept. Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 125.

¹³⁵⁸ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, XXV.

Even though it invoked the values of altruism in its broad outlines even after 1918, in its more concrete form, Růžička's eugenics repurposed the flexible concept of constitution as a tool for nation-building.

While the individual constitution, defined as a simple “sum of all individual characteristics,” remained an important part of Růžička's eugenic blueprint, the Czech eugenicist nevertheless aimed to shape primarily another type of constitution, namely of the nation.¹³⁵⁹ Such purported national constitution, he claimed, emerged primarily as a result of shared environmental influences; it characterized “the organisms of common origin that lived in localities impacted by identical external factors, creating, in effect, groups of similar traits conditioned by a shared constitution.”¹³⁶⁰ By 1918, this “national constitution” became the central object of Růžička's eugenic arguments and featured prominently in his attempt to create a narrative about a distinctively Czech approach to eugenics, transforming it into a national science.¹³⁶¹

As the empire was falling apart, and the state of Czechoslovakia was in the making, Růžička started issuing public appeals to establish a dedicated eugenic institute. This institute would focus on “national eugenics,” as he defined it, and place the “national constitution” at the forefront of its research and practical interventions.¹³⁶² These appeals were eventually backed by the state. One indication of the state's support was a eugenic section that was established within the *Masarykova Akademie Práce* (Masaryk Academy of Labor), a semi-official umbrella organization for the Czech technocratic movement. What is more, a stand-alone research institution, the *Československý ústav pro národní eugeniku* (Czechoslovak

¹³⁵⁹ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 292.

¹³⁶⁰ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 612.

¹³⁶¹ Vladislav Růžička, “O národní konstituci” [On the National Constitution.], *Národní listy* 58, no. 100 (May 3, 1918): 1.

¹³⁶² Vladislav Růžička, “Ústav pro národní eugeniku” [Institute for National Eugenics], *Národ* 3, no. 2 (January 10, 1919): 17–18; Vladislav Růžička, “Eugenické výzkumnictví” [Eugenic Experimentation], *Budoucnost: Revue českého socialismu* 1, no. 6 (February 1919): 391–95.

Institute for National Eugenics), was created with state backing in 1923.¹³⁶³ While one should not overestimate the actual impact of these research institutions, they do serve as a testament to the integration of Růžička's national eugenics project into a network of state-backed technocratic institutions in Czechoslovakia.¹³⁶⁴

In line with the ideas of Růžička, who became its director, the new institute proclaimed as its main goal to “retrieve the normal constitution and normal health to the nation, society, and mankind.”¹³⁶⁵ The concept of the norm was crucial for Růžička's project. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Růžička did not define the norm and health as ideal types, but as the most commonly occurring traits of a population. The norm was essentially a statistical average.¹³⁶⁶ This choice was not accidental but strategic and was closely linked to the “mini-imperial” dimension of Růžička's eugenic project, specifically the attempt to merge some of Czechoslovakia's populations into a single, new nation, as demonstrated in his treatment of the concept of symbiosis. One vital aim of the “adaptive” dimension of Růžička's eugenics, therefore, was to instrumentalize the environmental influences and medical surveillance of marriage to “connect and homogenize” the resulting “constitutional features of a nation with mixed origins.”¹³⁶⁷

Even though Růžička's most systematic outline of these ideas was a monograph spanning nearly eight hundred pages, written in a highly technical style, this argument resonated with its reviewers. One of the key takeaways from the book, as noted by a reviewer writing for

¹³⁶³ Šimůnek, “Eugenics,” 157.

¹³⁶⁴ There was a constant stream of complaints about the institute's insufficient funding and numerous other factors that inhibited its research, which Růžička, as its director, addressed to various stakeholders. It appears that the institute did not have its dedicated premises – its seat being Růžička's lab at the university – lacked sufficient space and technology for experimental research, and tended to serve largely as an alternative or additional source of income for Růžička's doctoral students. Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, Box 3, File 1526, Odpověď na posudek ideových náčrtů na novostavbu ústavu biologického, Prague, January 14, 1931.

¹³⁶⁵ Vladislav Růžička, “Československý ústav pro národní eugeniku” [Czechoslovak Institute for National Eugenics], *Čas* 32, no. 305 (December 31, 1922): 1.

¹³⁶⁶ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 46.

¹³⁶⁷ Růžička, *Biologické základy*, 609.

the influential national liberal journal *Národní Listy* (National Papers), was that “the unification of mixed constitutions into a new, homogeneous one, under the influence of a shared geographic milieu” would bring about the emergence of the “feeling of national commonality in a mixed nation.”¹³⁶⁸ When Růžička, the eugenicist, claimed for himself the role of the caretaker and custodian of the national average, it was not only because he no longer shared the optimistic belief in social progress and human perfectibility of some of his socialist counterparts and positioned himself closer to the cautious modernism of Czechoslovakia’s authorities. The homogenization of the population and affirmation of the average was instrumental for his ultimate, mini-imperial agenda of integrating a new national community through biopolitics.

From Biological Constitution to Race: A Path Toward Radicalization

Boundary objects, as Susan Leigh Star and James Griesemer define them, are “scientific objects which inhabit several intersecting social worlds [...] and satisfy the informational requirements of each of them.”¹³⁶⁹ In post-Habsburg countries, the concept of the constitution emerged as one such boundary object. It connected supporters of eugenics, who themselves hailed from various disciplinary backgrounds, and linked them to other disciplines. Furthermore, constitutional medicine provided a platform for eugenics supporters to immerse themselves in a growing number of social contexts, aiming to connect eugenics with practical initiatives.¹³⁷⁰

After 1918, discussions about constitutional medicine to some extent supplanted and overshadowed the prewar interest in another boundary object: the notion of alcoholism. The

¹³⁶⁸ Dr B. Zelený, Review of *Biologické základy eugeniky* [Biological Foundations of Eugenics], by Vladislav Růžička. *Národní listy* 63, no. 180 (July 3, 1923): 4.

¹³⁶⁹ Star and Griesemer, “Institutional Ecology,” 393.

¹³⁷⁰ Hofer, “Positionen und Posen,” 31–32.

early failure of most temperance initiatives in post-Habsburg countries sped up this shift. Consequently, temperance associations never fully regained their earlier perceived importance, although they continued to exist in the interwar period. Conversely, constitutional medicine aligned itself with the technocratic movements and ideologies that were gaining traction in post-Habsburg countries during the interwar years. This allowed constitutional medicine to rise in importance alongside them, as this section argues.

Like elsewhere in interwar East Central Europe, post-Habsburg countries faced multiple challenges in postwar reconstruction and state-building. Martin Kohlrausch, Katrin Steffen, and Stefan Wiederkehr argue that, in response to these challenges, technocratic discourses flourished in this area. They promised “a strategy to develop the whole region” and to endow the new political entities with legitimacy as well as to showcase their modern aspirations.¹³⁷¹ The tangible effects of these technocratic discourses varied across the region, with interwar Poland and Czechoslovakia being among the states that most extensively translated them into reality.¹³⁷² Nevertheless, throughout the region, this technocratic drive led to the formation of specialized, interdisciplinary fields.¹³⁷³ Following the partly overlapping precepts of Taylorism and Fordism, these fields focused on the rationalization of various social practices.¹³⁷⁴

With the technocratic mantra of increasing efficiency on their lips, eugenics supporters applied their ideas to various industrial, administrative, and military endeavors, or at least made attempts to do so. Centering on the realms of vocational guidance and sports medicine, both deeply imbued with technocratic principles, this section contends that eugenicists perceived

¹³⁷¹ Martin Kohlrausch, Katrin Steffen, and Stefan Wiederkehr, “Introduction,” in *Expert Cultures in Central Eastern Europe. The Internationalization of Knowledge and the Transformation of Nation States since World War I*, ed. Martin Kohlrausch, Katrin Steffen, and Stefan Wiederkehr (Osnabrück: Fibre Verlag, 2010), 18.

¹³⁷² Kohlrausch, Steffen and Wiederkehr, “Introduction,” 18.

¹³⁷³ For an in-depth study of expert attempts to rationalize agricultural labor in Hungary and the varied outcomes across multiple political regimes, refer to Martha Lampland, *The Value of Labor: The Science of Commodification in Hungary, 1920-1956* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016).

¹³⁷⁴ Charles S. Maier, “Between Taylorism and Technocracy: European Ideologies and the Vision of Industrial Productivity in the 1920s,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 5, no. 2 (April 1970): 27–61.

their rise as a vital opportunity. They attempted to integrate themselves into these fields, to infuse their social practices with eugenic ideas and orient them towards eugenic rationales. The allure of these fields arose from the significant number of individuals they were presently influencing, coupled with their potential for an even wider impact in the future. This meant that these individuals could not only become targets of eugenic measures but also be enticed or coerced into becoming subjects of eugenic research, yielding large sets of data. For the eugenicists, the latter reason was nearly as important as the former.

During the interwar period, post-Habsburg Austria and Hungary experienced significant political polarization between the left and the nationalist right. However, in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and to some extent, Poland and Romania, there were still some bridges that remained intact between the two sides of the political spectrum. Nonetheless, in each of these instances, constitutional medicine was adopted by eugenicists from both the political left and the political right, frequently acting as a boundary object between these divergent political factions. As a result, the technocratic discussions about constitutional medicine were ambiguous from the outset, oscillating between a “mini-imperial” approach to diversity management and a more unequivocally nationalist approach. The notion of constitution, particularly among conservative nationalists, often served as a disguise for the politically more contentious word “race.”

As the interwar era unfolded, the nationalist perspective gained predominant influence. Far from being moderate and pragmatic, the eugenicists involved in these applied contexts increasingly employed constitutional medicine to justify a departure from imperial hybridity, both on the epistemic and political fronts. Viennese physicians such as Tandler or Bauer were no longer among their primary references. Rather, these eugenicists began gravitating towards theories emerging from fascist Italy, crafted by biotypologists such as Giacinto Viola and Nicola Pende. Additionally, research in Weimar Germany gained their attention, with

psychiatrist Ernst Kretschmer emerging as a pivotal figure. After 1933, they continued to regard constitutional medicine from Nazi Germany as a reference point. Moreover, they also began to shift their focus towards the search for purported racial types within the population, and towards the concurrent biologization of national identity. In other words, for many supporters of eugenics in Central Europe, who initially operated within a post-Habsburg conceptual landscape, constitutional medicine became an important vehicle for radicalizing their biopolitical blueprint.

Vocational guidance was a crucial applied field that took root in post-Habsburg countries during the interwar period, hand in hand with the scientific management of labor, with which it was closely conceptually and practically entangled. Like scientific management, ideas about vocational guidance originated in the industrial modernity of the United States and circulated globally. Economic historian Sanford Jacoby demonstrates how vocational guidance emerged in the 1900s from positivist social reform, particularly from efforts to align not only the training but also the expectations of future workers with the needs of an increasingly organized and rationalized industrial production.¹³⁷⁵ Oriented towards a reform of industrial employment, the proponents of vocational guidance, he explains, were among “the most active proponents of personnel management, and they infused the new profession with an abiding interest in employee selection and career development.”¹³⁷⁶ Vocational guidance linked its precepts to a vision of social efficiency and harmony. In this capacity, it served as an instrument of social policy and, on the local level, as a mechanism of social control.¹³⁷⁷ Crucially, already

¹³⁷⁵ Sanford M. Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy: Managers, Unions, and the Transformation of Work in the 20th Century* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004), 55.

¹³⁷⁶ Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy*, 50.

¹³⁷⁷ Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy*, 49.

in its original setting, these ideas were hoped to “ease the nation’s transition to urban industrialism,” an agenda that strongly resonated in interwar East Central Europe.¹³⁷⁸

What underpinned the nascent vocational guidance, in both its ethos and methods, was the notion that individuals possessed differing levels of talent, and, dubiously, that this talent was largely inborn.¹³⁷⁹ For many of the discipline’s pioneers, this view was deeply rooted in their social Darwinist and hereditarian views. They promoted vocational counseling as a deliberate intervention to complement the “natural selection” of the market, ensuring that individuals would be assigned to the purported “niches – no higher or lower – for which their biology had destined them.”¹³⁸⁰ A pioneer of vocational counseling, the American reformer Frank Parsons, used an evocative expression to encapsulate these views, likening his approach to an instrument “to put men, as well as timber, stone and iron in the places for which their nature fits them, – and to polish and prepare them for efficient service with at least as much care as is bestowed upon clocks, electric dynamos or locomotives.”¹³⁸¹ The biologically determinist idea of steering individuals towards a vocation that dovetailed with their allegedly fixed nature was as strong in this pronouncement as its Taylorist assumptions.

In most post-Habsburg countries, the burgeoning field of vocational guidance was chiefly driven by psychologists. For example, in Hungary, research in this domain began to surface after the turn of the century, intimately linked with the rising field of experimental psychology. The early epicenters of this research were the laboratories of Pál Ranschburg and László Nagy. Ranschburg was a trailblazer in experimental psychology and special pedagogy in the Hungarian context, while Nagy, an experimentally-inclined psychologist, was among the founders of the multidisciplinary realm of child studies. The first few vocational guidance

¹³⁷⁸ Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy*, 50.

¹³⁷⁹ Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy*, 54.

¹³⁸⁰ Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy*, 58.

¹³⁸¹ Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy*, 58.

centers that were established in Hungary in the 1920s were intimately linked to this scientific community.¹³⁸² While other post-Habsburg countries followed a similar pattern, the degree of support that vocational guidance received from state or local authorities tended to be higher than in Hungary.

In interwar Poland, psychologists were also at the forefront of the theory and practice of vocational guidance, particularly those who specialized in psychotechnics – an applied science that drew on psychology to optimize human behavior, especially in the workplace. The Polish state, which enthusiastically embraced technocracy as a strategy to build its state capacity, increasingly supported experiments with this form of applied psychology.¹³⁸³ Moreover, in interwar Czechoslovakia, a relatively dense network of vocational guidance centers emerged, and it was also closely linked to the local state-backed technocratic movement. The personnel of these emerging centers received their initial training from scientists specialized in psychotechnics, in particular.¹³⁸⁴

In Austria, and particularly in its capital, vocational guidance was also connected to the same field from the 1920s onwards. However, instead of receiving support from the central authorities, it gained powerful backing from Vienna's social democrats. The municipal government established public institutions that offered this type of counseling in Austria's metropolis: the Viennese *Berufsberatungsamt* (Vocational Guidance Office), and a dedicated

¹³⁸² Irén Sipeki, “A pályaválasztási tanácsadók tevékenységének és történetének áttekintése” [Overview of the Activities and History of Vocational Guidance], *Neveléstörténet* 2, no. 1–2 (2005): 126–34.

¹³⁸³ Janina Budkiewicz and Janina Kączkowska, *Z dziejów psychologii stosowanej w Polsce do roku 1957, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem poradnictwa zawodowego* [From the History of Applied Psychology in Poland until 1957, with Special Emphasis on Vocational Guidance] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1987).

¹³⁸⁴ Interestingly, many of these initial backers of the idea of career counseling were also involved in the fields of special education and child studies, and sympathetic toward eugenics. Julie Husáková, Otokar Chlup, Petr Růžek, Karel Herfort, Jan Mauer, and Cyril Stejskal, *O významu poradnictví při volbě povolání (Odbor pro vybudování poraden pro volbu povolání)* [On the Importance of Vocational Guidance: Department for the Establishment of Vocational Guidance Centres] ([Prague]: Psychotechnický ústav Masarykovy akademie práce, 1920); Alfred Dratva, “Ústředí poraden pro volbu povolání v Praze” [The Central of Vocational Guidance Offices in Prague], *Nová práce* 6, no. 12 (June 15, 1924): 183–85.

institute of psychotechnics.¹³⁸⁵ Significantly, women were increasingly represented among these researchers and personnel in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Austria. In fact, in the latter two contexts, the very first career counseling institutions were founded during the First World War by women activists, aimed at guiding the choices of women who were entering the labor market in large numbers.¹³⁸⁶

Given the strong biological determinism behind early vocational guidance and its assumptions about the legibility and permanence of the purportedly determining nature of individuals, the psy-scientists pioneering this field in post-Habsburg countries were not immune to eugenic ideas. Nevertheless, they faced challenges from medical doctors and physical anthropologists who were even more deeply entrenched in this body of knowledge. In effect, these eugenics supporters sought to further sharpen the racial focus of the field and to prioritize the body, along with anatomical and physiological measurements, as the primary source of perceived truth about an individual.

For the nationalist supporters of eugenics among vocational counseling experts, the stakes involved not only controlling their states' path to urban, industrial modernity but also ensuring its perceived ethnic content. What underpinned these ideas was a redefined meaning of group membership. As Gábor Egry points out, by the interwar period, membership in an imagined national community was believed to entitle individuals to benefit from a redistribution of resources, and even became the key qualification for accessing this entitlement. The state's piecemeal embrace of welfare policies in the late imperial period and, even more crucially, the partial outsourcing of these policies to nationalist associations during the escalating crisis at the

¹³⁸⁵ Karin Gugitscher, "Das Berufsberatungsamt der Stadt Wien und der Arbeiterkammer in Wien: Eine sozialhistorische Studie zur Bildungs- und Berufsberatung in Wien 1918-1933/34" (M.A. Thesis, Alpen-Adria Universität, 2013).

¹³⁸⁶ Juliana Lancová, "Poradnypro volbu povolání" [Vocational Guidance Centres], *Sociální péče* 2, no. 3–4 (May 1921): 26–27; Jadwiga Zawirska, "Poradnictwo Zawodowe i Psychotechnika w Wiedniu" [Vocational Guidance and Psychotechnics in Vienna], *Psychotechnika* 3, no. 12 (1929): 9–21.

end of the war was a major factor behind this shift.¹³⁸⁷ In the minds of many nationalists, entitlement to a qualified, respected, middle-class job became one of the benefits of group membership.

This shift impacted policy. Anti-Semitism was often at the forefront, such as in Hungary, where a *numerus clausus* restricting the number of students admitted to universities had been imposed by law, and in Poland and Romania, where it was applied de facto.¹³⁸⁸ Beyond these overt measures, also subtler methods linked career prospects to group membership. Some eugenicists believed vocational guidance could serve this role, and aimed to shift its emphasis from mind to body and from skills to notions of “race” or its surrogates. In promoting this racialized approach, they either equated nation with race or advocated for the dominance of a specific “race” within a nation. For example, in interwar Romania, both the Romanian nationalist eugenicists in Transylvania, as well as their Transylvanian Saxon counterparts, sought to adapt the technique of vocational guidance to carve out an ethnic elite.¹³⁸⁹

In the 1920s, however, other eugenicists remained influenced by eugenic ideas from the late imperial era. In effect, they focused on physical and mental capacities of individuals, without linking them to ethnic identity, even though these traits were still defined in biological and hereditary terms. Both positions thus aimed to use vocational guidance to bolster national efficiency, but their approaches diverged, with one foregrounding its ethnic dimension, while

¹³⁸⁷ Gábor Egry, “The Numerus Clausus: A Transitory Act between Liberal and Ethnic Nationalisms,” *Hungarian Studies Review* 48, no. 1 (2021): 88; See also Zahra, “Each Nation,” 1389–99.

¹³⁸⁸ Mária Kovács, *Törvénytől sújtva: A numerus clausus Magyarországon, 1920-1945* [Plagued by Law: The Numerus Clausus in Hungary, 1920-1945] (Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó, 2012); Lucian Nastasă, “Antisemitismul universitar în România (1919–1939)” [University anti-Semitism in Romania, 1919-1939], in *Antisemitismul universitar în România (1919-1939): mărturii documentare* [University anti-Semitism in Romania, 1919-1939: Documentary Evidence], ed. Lucian Nastasă (Cluj-Napoca: Kriterion, 2011), 13–98; Szymon Rudnicki, “Anti-Jewish Legislation in Interwar Poland 148,” in *Antisemitism and Its Opponents in Modern Poland*, ed. Robert Blobaum (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 148–70.

¹³⁸⁹ Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, 122–152; Georgescu, *The Eugenic Fortress*, 96 and 133–134.

the other leaning towards a rationalistic perspective. However, the distinction between the two positions, though clear in theory, was often more blurred in practice. Eugenists often combined elements from both positions or shifted between them based on specific historical circumstances.

In Vienna during the early 1920s, Viktor Lebzelter, a racial anthropologist, championed arguments that epitomized a rationalistic approach to vocational guidance. Lebzelter's research was also deeply shaped by the legacies of eugenic ideas articulated in the imperial context. Indeed, Lebzelter was prompted to embark on this research in early 1920 by Julius Tandler, who was then an undersecretary at the Austrian Public Health Office.¹³⁹⁰ Moreover, a part of Lebzelter's early results appeared in Tandler's journal.¹³⁹¹ Finally, Lebzelter initially fully embraced Tandler's ideas about condition, constitution, and "race," even though he was also aware of Bauer's and Haecker's theories. Lebzelter even concurred with the assumption of Tandler and his allies that "conditional, acquired changes can be transformed into constitutional, inherited changes through the mediation of the sex glands."¹³⁹² He agreed that this assumption can "mitigate some of the differences between Neo-Lamarckian and Neo-Darwinian views" and bring Tandler's clinically-oriented notion of constitution closer together with experimental biology.¹³⁹³ Even though Tandler was a towering representative of the Social Democratic politics in interwar Vienna, and Lebzelter was a conservative Catholic monarchist, their epistemic and partly also political goals seem to have briefly intersected in the early 1920s.

Lebzelter's research focused on the physical characteristics of workers in various jobs. Initially, he conducted anthropometric measurements on the students of the industrial

¹³⁹⁰ Viktor Lebzelter, "Anthropologie und Konstitutionsforschung: Diskussion," *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 51 (1921): 4.

¹³⁹¹ Viktor Lebzelter, "Konstitution und Kondition in der allgemeinen Biologie," *Zeitschrift für Konstitutionslehre* 8 (1921): 184–90; Viktor Lebzelter and Ernst Brezina, "Der Einfluß des Berufes und Wachstums auf die Dimensionen der Hand," *Zeitschrift für Konstitutionslehre* 10 (1924): 581–85.

¹³⁹² Lebzelter, "Konstitution und Kondition," 190.

¹³⁹³ Lebzelter, "Konstitution und Kondition," 190.

vocational schools in Vienna, as well as on apprentices and inmates of some sanatoriums.¹³⁹⁴ Eventually, he expanded his research to include more age cohorts and lines of work. Lebzelter collaborated increasingly with Ernst Brezina, a public official and hygienist with a keen interest in labor medicine and urban climatology, who also held eugenic beliefs and had active connections to eugenic networks.¹³⁹⁵

Lebzelter's and Brezina's objective was to investigate whether specific physical characteristics rendered individuals more suitable for certain jobs and if the nature of the job, in turn, influenced one's physique. Framing the question within Tandler's framework of condition and constitution, they proposed that certain constitutional features influenced "occupational selection." Moreover, they also suggested that the effects of the occupation could, in turn, alter one's condition. They posited that the qualifications for a job were primarily inscribed in one's body, inborn, and hereditary, while the job's effects represented environmentally induced changes that could but did not have to be passed on to subsequent generations.¹³⁹⁶

This research was not solely aimed at contributing to theoretical discussions on constitution; rather, it was undertaken with a practical application of this knowledge in mind, specifically for vocational guidance. Asserting that this approach was the "only way to provide a scientific justification for vocational guidance and to take appropriate measures in relation to industrial hygiene," their research aimed to reorient the evaluation of job seekers along eugenic lines by incorporating constitutional medicine into this procedure.¹³⁹⁷ Conversely, the neo-

¹³⁹⁴ Lebzelter, "Anthropologie und Konstitutionsforschung," 4.

¹³⁹⁵ Notably, Brezina served on the board of directors of the *Österreichischer Bund für Volksaufzucht und Erbkunde*. Coen, *Climate in Motion*, 271 and 351; Mayer, "Austria," 11; Weindling, "A City Regenerated," 95.

¹³⁹⁶ Viktor Lebzelter and Ernst Brezina, "Über die Dimensionen der Hand bei verschiedenen Berufen," *Archiv für Hygiene* 92, no. 1 (1923): 59.

¹³⁹⁷ Lebzelter and Brezina, "Über die Dimensionen," 59.

Lamarckian features of the notion of condition projected a moral authority of nature onto Vienna's labor regulations and onto its biopolitics more broadly.

While Lebzelter's and Brezina's arguments were rooted in biological determinism, they did not initially show concern regarding ethnicity and "race." In their analytical framework, future careers were determined by individual constitution, which in Tandler's framework was conceptually distinct from either "race" or nation.¹³⁹⁸ Indeed, according to Lebzelter's and Brezina's early findings, the supposed "racial" features of their research subjects were entirely occluded by their individual constitution and condition.¹³⁹⁹ (In line with Tandler, they also insisted that the constitution of an individual or a group, such as individuals in a similar profession, was malleable, although it could not undergo substantial changes during one's lifetime like the condition.) Putting constitution front and center for vocational guidance meant that it could leverage the authority of natural science without resorting to biases based on nationality or "race." In spite of Lebzelter's conservative inclinations, his research in the early 1920s thus negotiated with some manifestations of interwar Viennese modernity, even if it meant accepting the city's ethnocultural diversity and its drive towards social reform. Tandler's framework of constitution and condition made such intellectual and political position feasible.

In Czechoslovakia, vocational guidance emerged as a prominent focus within the realm of psychotechnics. Benefiting from substantial state support, psychotechnics operated within a complex network of institutions.¹⁴⁰⁰ When some Czech eugenicists sought to align themselves with this field and infuse it with hereditarian ideas as early as the 1920s, these attempts were motivated not only by a belief that eugenics would gain more state support if it found an

¹³⁹⁸ Lebzelter and Brezina, "Der Einfluss," 581–85.

¹³⁹⁹ Lebzelter and Brezina, "Der Einfluss," *passim*.

¹⁴⁰⁰ For an overview of the research conducted in the interdisciplinary field of psychotechnics in Czechoslovakia, and for insights into their international networks, see František Šeracký, *Comptes rendus, publiés par le Comité national d'organisation: VIIIe conférence internationale de psychotechnique* (Prague: Orbis, 1935).

industrial application, but also by the desire to access an ever-growing trove of data that was difficult to obtain otherwise.¹⁴⁰¹ However, these efforts initially yielded few tangible outcomes. They gained significant traction only in the 1930s, propelled by a new generation of physicians who also had a strong eugenic orientation.

These emerging physicians embraced the concept of constitution and closely associated it with concerns regarding national efficiency. For instance, in a paper titled *On the Importance of Constitutional Research for Medicine*, one of these young physicians, the biologist and medical doctor Bohumil Krajník (1895-1966), argued that while research on the purported constitutional types was important for all states, it was “even more necessary in our country, where we still have a large reservoir of healthy families that must be preserved for the future.”¹⁴⁰² His bibliography included a substantial number of German-speaking authors, including the Viennese eugenicists Tandler and Bauer.¹⁴⁰³ Even in the late 1930s, some of Krajník’s colleagues described Tandler as a “genial scientist.”¹⁴⁰⁴ While they lauded Tandler’s legacy, they also diverged from it to a significant extent.

The burgeoning network of young physicians, of which Krajník was a part, opted to brand themselves as pioneers of the discipline of biotypology in Czechoslovakia. Closely related to the notion of constitution, this emerging discipline aimed to develop a typology of human bodies and unravel the heredity of these alleged types. Biotypology flourished in the

¹⁴⁰¹ Interestingly, some of these endeavors were facilitated by the technocratic Masaryk Academy of Labor. Certain members of its leadership insisted that eugenics should be applied to industry. Artur Brožek, “Biologický význam rodokmenu I: Předneseno ve schůzi Ústavu psychotechnického 17. března 1921” [The Biological Significance of Pedigree I: Presented at a meeting of the Institute of Psychotechnics, March 17, 1921], *Nová práce* 3, no. 7 (June 25, 1921): 18–19; “Komise eugenicko demografická” [Eugenic and Demographic Commission], in *Zpráva o činnosti Masarykovy akademie práce podaná k oslavě X. výročí trvání Československé republiky* [Report on the Activities of the Masaryk Academy of Labour Submitted to Celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Czechoslovak Republic] (Prague: Masarykova akademie práce, 1929), 215–19.

¹⁴⁰² Bohumil Krajník, “Výzkum konstitute a její význam pro lékařství” [Research on Constitution and its Relevance to Medicine], *Biologické listy* 19, no. 3 (1934): 127.

¹⁴⁰³ Krajník, “Výzkum konstitute,” 117–28.

¹⁴⁰⁴ Vojtěch Tolar, “Lékařské prohlídky zdravých” [Medical Examinations of Healthy People], *Zdravotnická revue* 18, no. 10 (October 1936): 166.

1930s across multiple countries, particularly, though not exclusively, among those that embraced a narrative about their Latinity.¹⁴⁰⁵ Among these, it was the biotypology in France that seemed to resonate most with these Czech physicians.¹⁴⁰⁶ However, the selection of an allied democratic state reflected the cultural and geopolitical stance of these Czechoslovak doctors, as much as it highlighted their epistemic preferences, if not more so.

Although Czech biotypologists were officially affiliated with the *Société de Biotypologie* in France, their actual engagement with the organization was limited to a few instances.¹⁴⁰⁷ Conversely, their research papers integrated biotypological studies from fascist Italy and Germany.¹⁴⁰⁸ Notably, one of the prominent physicians within this network even traveled to Italy in 1936 to study at Giacinto Viola's clinic in Bologna, a notable hub for biotypological research. The work of the German physiatriist Ernst Kretschmer also exerted a significant influence.¹⁴⁰⁹ Despite the positioning of these physicians, their practices revealed a more intricate reality as they navigated among various epistemic and political models, encompassing both liberal and authoritarian regimes.

These physicians discovered a powerful patron that enabled them to conduct their research on an unprecedented scale. Succeeding where their predecessors had failed, they formed an alliance with the industry. Specifically, they began cooperating with the influential Baťa industrial conglomerate – one of Czechoslovakia's primary supporters of Taylorist and

¹⁴⁰⁵ Turda and Gillette, *Latin Eugenics*.

¹⁴⁰⁶ Karel Amerling, Marcel Aymonin, Karel Eisler, Bohumil Krajník, Stanislav Mentl, Josef Saidl, Jan Sotona, et al. *O lidské konstituci = La constitution humaine* [On the Human Constitution = La constitution humaine] (Prague: Mladá generace čsl. lékařů, 1939).

¹⁴⁰⁷ Jan Musil, "Měření Čechoslováků: Česká společnost biotypologická a konstituční medicína v ČSR mezi lety 1937–1959" [Measuring the Czechoslovaks: The Czech Society of Biotypology and Constitutional Medicine in Czechoslovakia, 1937–1959] (PhD Thesis, Charles University, 2018), 111.

¹⁴⁰⁸ Vojtěch Tolar, "Posuzování zdravotního stavu a tělesné konstituce ve zjišťovací a vyšetřovací akci Baťovy nemocnice ve Zlíně" [Assessment of Health Status and Physical Constitution in the Detection and Examination Action of the Baťa Hospital in Zlín], *Zdravotnická ročenka československá* 7 (1935): 258–61.

¹⁴⁰⁹ Musil, "Měření Čechoslováků," 80.

Fordist principles, which were applied not only to the shop floor but also beyond.¹⁴¹⁰ The footwear producer aimed to construct its central company town of Zlín according to a high modernist blueprint, with a clear biopolitical inflection. Furthermore, the industrialist who managed the concern for most of the 1930s, Jan Antonín Baťa, authored a plan to radically transform the Czechoslovak state along technocratic lines.¹⁴¹¹ The industrialist and his managers drew inspiration not only from American theories of scientific management but also from authoritarian models, such as those found in fascist Italy and the Soviet Union.¹⁴¹² Baťa, along with his managers and his press, also invoked racial tropes.¹⁴¹³ The ideas of the Czechoslovak promoters of biotypology resonated with the technocratic and biopolitical dimensions of Baťa's project and were integrated into it during the 1930s.

A dense network of health institutions that emphasized medical prevention emerged in Baťa's company town of Zlín during the 1930s, and biotypology became an integral part of it. Given the company's particular concern about high rates of work incapacity and employee turnover, the knowledge produced by this discipline was harnessed for the surveillance and management of the company's human resources. One of the leading doctors involved in biotypological research in Zlín, Vojtěch Tolar, summed up this goal in 1936 when he noted that "human body, like any other machine, requires a whole set of maintenance measures and appropriate work arrangements in order to be able to perform at its best without harming its health."¹⁴¹⁴ In particular, the biotypologists conducted a form of compulsory career guidance,

¹⁴¹⁰ Even though the Baťa concern expanded into the global market, the sources I consulted suggest that research on constitutional types and biotypology was confined solely to Zlín. It was not extended, for instance, to Baťa's factory in the Yugoslav town of Borovo. Nevertheless, further research is necessary to elucidate this issue.

¹⁴¹¹ Ondřej Ševeček and Martin Jemelka, eds., *Company Towns of the Baťa Concern: History - Cases - Architecture* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013), passim.

¹⁴¹² Zachary Austin Doleshal, *In the Kingdom of Shoes: Bata, Zlín, Globalization, 1894–1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2021), 168.

¹⁴¹³ Stanislav Holubec, "Silní milují život. Utopie, ideologie a biopolitika baťovského Zlína" [The Strong Love Life: Utopia, Ideology, and Biopolitics of Bata's Zlín], *Kuděj* 11, no. 2 (2009): 30–55.

¹⁴¹⁴ Vojtěch Tolar, *Základy zdravotní péče o pracující* [Basics of Occupational Health Care] ([Zlín]: Baťa, 1936), 1. Cited in Musil, "Měření Čechoslováků," 79.

advising on the type of work that each individual would carry out within the concern. In the assertions of Baťa's biotypologists, the company's efficiency was posited as constitutive of, and perhaps a model for, broader national efficiency.

Constitutional medicine and biotypology were institutionalized in Zlín through the establishment of a medical registry of employees in 1932, and were integrated with the company's psychotechnical examinations.¹⁴¹⁵ The physicians at the registry conducted comprehensive examinations on all current and prospective company employees. The mandatory assessments were standardized and encompassed a wide range of observations. These not only included the physicians' evaluation of the individual's perceived "normal" and "pathological" physical attributes but also entailed a series of anthropological measurements and blood tests. While the anthropometric method aimed to identify the individual's physical capabilities and their supposed constitutional type, the blood tests were utilized to uncover any concealed illnesses, such as tuberculosis and STIs, as well as to determine their blood groups. Additionally, genealogical information and reported family medical history were integral components of the resultant evaluation.¹⁴¹⁶ The health questionnaire designed by these physicians suggests that examinations of women were notably intrusive, encompassing not only gynecological assessments but also highly detailed descriptions of their past and present reproductive health, pregnancies, and intended reproductive choices.¹⁴¹⁷ As a consequence of these examinations, a substantial database of anthropological data emerged.

¹⁴¹⁵ Apart from the medical registry, these physicians were also preparing to set up an office for prenuptial health examinations, but it never materialized. A dedicated biotypological laboratory was established in Zlín in 1940 but was closed shortly afterwards. "Rozhovor s panem docentem RN et MUDr Krajníkem" [Interview with Associate Professor RN et MUDr Krajník], *Zlín* 17, no. 31 (August 10, 1934): 6; "Masarykův ideál sociální péče: Zabezpečovat národu tělesně zdatný a bezúhonný dorost" [Masaryk's Ideal of Social Welfare: To Provide the Nation with Physically Fit and Morally Upright Youth], *Zlín: Pondělník zlínského kraje* 8, no. 11 (March 14, 1938): 2.

¹⁴¹⁶ Vojtěch Tolar, "Základy zdravotní péče o zaměstnance" [Basics of Employee Health Care], *Zlín* 20, no. 35 (September 10, 1937): 4.

¹⁴¹⁷ Musil, "Měření Čechoslováků," Health Questionnaire reproduced on the pages XI-XVIII.

One of the cornerstones of Bat'a's rhetoric was the notion that "nationalism would wane as people organized around economic competition," as one of the concern's historians recently argued.¹⁴¹⁸ However, as the 1930s progressed, this belief gave way to an ambiguous mixture of internationalism, nationalism, and national indifference.¹⁴¹⁹ When constitutional research and biotypology were integrated into human resources management within the Bat'a concern, they aligned with this ambiguous stance. While the examining physicians required individuals to self-report their nationality, they placed far more emphasis on the person's gender, class, and alleged body type. Significantly, while these physicians aimed to gather a comprehensive array of information about the individuals' parents' physical and psychological traits and illnesses, nationality or their purported "racial type" conspicuously did not appear among their questions. Furthermore, there is no indication that the biotypologists made decisions about workers based on their assumed national identity. However, their research based on the extensive data they collected in Zlín and other locations became increasingly imbued with nationalist considerations related to the country's demographic development, economic efficiency, and defense capabilities.¹⁴²⁰ The stance of the biotypologists towards ethnocultural differences in Czechoslovakia was thus paradoxical: it was characterized by national indifference when it came to individuals, and by nationalist anxieties when dealing with large numbers.

In Hungary, where discriminatory policies had been enshrined in law since 1920, advocates of vocational guidance all the more resisted linking ability with ethnicity. In this

¹⁴¹⁸ Doleshal, *In the Kingdom*, 168.

¹⁴¹⁹ Doleshal, *In the Kingdom*, 168.

¹⁴²⁰ Bohumil Krajník, "Genetické základy preventivní péče o biologickou zdatnost národa" [Genetic Foundations of Preventive Care for the Biological Fitness of the Nation], in *Prevence a brannost: Soubor prací 6. konference preventivního lékařství v Jánských Lázních ve dnech 31. ledna a 1.-3. února 1936* [Prevention and Military Ability: Proceedings of the 6th Conference of Preventive Medicine in Janské Lázně on 31 January and 1-3 February 1936] (Prague: Státní zdravotní ústav, 1936), 11-20; Bohumil Krajník, *L'étude des types humains et son importance pour la defense nationale* (Prague: Vojenský ústav vědecký, 1938); Vojtěch Tolar, "O významu konstituce pro posouzení biologického zdraví populace" [On the Importance of Constitution in Assessing the Biological Health of the Population], *Styk: Časopis věnovaný společným zájmům lékařů, veterinářů, lékárníků a přírodovědců* 1, no. 11-12 (May 1935): 14-15.

context, the experimental psychologists who spearheaded vocational counseling promptly incorporated the newest notions of constitution into their theoretical framework during the 1920s. For instance, the experimental psychologist Ranschburg, in his 1923 book *Az emberi elme* (The Human Mind), extensively discussed the constitutional types proposed by the German psychiatrist Kretschmer.¹⁴²¹ Moreover, Ranschburg critically evaluated the hereditary viewpoints put forth by several proponents of eugenics, including Galton, Pearson, Goddard, and Rüdín, as well as figures such as Kammerer, Tandler, and Bauer.¹⁴²² Evidently, a considerable number of Ranschburg's disciples also demonstrated a keen interest in the concept of constitution.¹⁴²³ Nevertheless, the most pronounced call for reorienting vocational guidance toward eugenics was raised by Ödön Tuskai, a physician who did not receive training in Ranschburg's or Nagy's laboratories.

As we have already seen, Tuskai was a physician with eclectic interests, ranging from social medicine, balneology, and gynecology to school medicine. It was through his interest in the latter that Tuskai became involved in debates on vocational guidance. Tuskai wrote on this issue already before 1914, and in the interwar period, it became a recurring feature of many of his texts. Tuskai also became a member of professional bodies and forums related to this concern.¹⁴²⁴ From the outset, Tuskai framed the issue in hereditarian terms, asserting that the future practice of vocational guidance must emphasize the inherited and inborn characteristics of an individual.¹⁴²⁵

¹⁴²¹ Pál Ranschburg, *Az emberi elme* [The Human Mind] (Budapest: A Pantheon irodalmi intézet, 1923), 191–200.

¹⁴²² Ranschburg, *Az emberi elme*, 200–243.

¹⁴²³ Margit Révész, “Az erkölcsi fogyatékosok orvosi védelme” [Medical Protection for People with Moral Disabilities], *Magyar Gyógypedagógia* 15, no. 1–3 (1927): 44–55; Lipót Szondi, “A konstitúciós elmélet fontossága a speciális oktatás tanárképzésében” [The Importance of Constitutional Theory in the Training of Special Educators], *Magyar Gyógypedagógia* 18, no. 9–10 (1930): 134–40.

¹⁴²⁴ “Jogi szakosztály” [Legal Department], *A Gyermekek* 10, no. 9–10 (1916): 594–99.

¹⁴²⁵ Aladár Gyulai, Review of *Iskola-egészségi könyvtár* [Library of School Medicine], by Ödön Tuskai. *A Gyermekek* 7, no. 05 (1913): 354–55.

As the previous section of this chapter shows, Tuszkai frequently invoked Goldscheid's concept of human economy. His texts on vocational guidance were no exception. Tuszkai framed career counseling as a social technology of vital importance that could enhance Hungarian national efficiency during a time of postwar disruption.¹⁴²⁶ Significantly, it was constitution that Tuszkai emphasized as the central aspect of this social technology. Drawing on a notion of constitution informed by Bauer and Kretschmer, along with other German-speaking physicians and psychiatrists, Tuszkai argued that medical science must embrace pedagogy and create a "pedagogical medicine" that "places the greatest emphasis not only on heredity and disposition but also on the so-called constitution."¹⁴²⁷

By emphasizing that vocational guidance should place the supposed "relationship between physical constitution and mental constitution" at the forefront, Tuszkai aimed to shift this technology further away from the realm of the mind and closer to the realm of the body.¹⁴²⁸ Furthermore, he went on to suggest that eugenics should, in the future, become an extension of this activity, guiding parents' reproductive choices. In an echo of the Viennese advocates of constitutional medicine, moreover, he proposed enlisting the emerging science of endocrinology to guide "the development of the endocrine organs to the point where, through their assistance, we can influence physical and mental constitutions whenever it seems desirable or necessary."¹⁴²⁹ Despite his prioritization of national efficiency, heredity, and indeed eugenics, the physician did not utilize the alleged physical and mental constitutional attributes as proxies for an imagined national character or "race." In Tuszkai's interpretation, the

¹⁴²⁶ Ödön Tuszkai, "A pályaválasztási vizsgálatok szociálhigiénés fontossága" [The Social Hygienic Importance of Career Choice Tests], in *A pályaválasztás: Tanulmányok* [Choosing a Career: Studies], ed. László Nagy (Budapest: Magyar Gyermektanulmányi Társaság, 1924), 8–13.

¹⁴²⁷ Ödön Tuszkai, "Helytelen nevelés orvosi szempontból" [Incorrect Upbringing from a Medical Point of View], *A Gyermek* 19, no. 01–04 (1926): 38.

¹⁴²⁸ Ödön Tuszkai, "Testalkotás és jellem" [Constitution and Character], *A Gyermek* 20, no. 04–07 (1927): 80.

¹⁴²⁹ Tuszkai, "Testalkotás," 80.

biological narrative of national efficiency was entirely compatible with a multiethnic workforce and even legitimized it through its implications.

Experimental psychologists, particularly those who focused on the branch of psychotechnics, were also the main driving force behind vocational guidance in Poland. The first vocational guidance office managed by Polish psychologists began operating during World War I, and the practical activities of vocational counselors gained significant momentum in the second half of the 1920s. Not only did the volume of examinations provided by them grow exponentially, but their theoretical output also increased, as demonstrated by the contents of the journal *Psychotechnika* (Psychotechnics). The first issue of the journal with the revealing subtitle “A Quarterly Dedicated to Matters of Vocational Guidance and Career Selection,” was published in 1927.¹⁴³⁰ The relationship between advocates of psychotechnics and proponents of eugenics was close, yet ambiguous.

The psychotechnicians incorporated certain eugenic ideas into their arguments. This notably included the concepts of constitution and constitutional types, primarily drawn from the German psychiatrist Kretschmer.¹⁴³¹ Additionally, they engaged racial anthropologists in the multifaceted testing process on which their eventual career advice was based. As early as the 1920s, their pioneering vocational guidance office not only collected general applicant information such as age, education, and job preferences but also administered an intelligence test, conducted individual medical examinations, and performed anthropometric measurements

¹⁴³⁰ Piotr Macewicz, “Zarys powstania i działalności pierwszej pracowni psychotechnicznej w Polsce” [Outline of the Establishment and Activities of the First Laboratory of Psychotechnics in Poland], *Psychotechnika* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 1927): 45–49.

¹⁴³¹ See, for instance, “II Polski Zjazd Naukowej Organizacji” [Second Polish Scientific Organization Convention], *Psychotechnika* 2, no. 6 (April 1, 1928): 61–63; Janina Kączkowska, “Rola instynktu w wyborze zawodu: Z prac Dr. W. Lista i Dr. C. Coerpera” [The Role of Instinct in Career Choice: From the Work of Dr. W. List and Dr. C. Coerper], *Psychotechnika* 3, no. 9 (Autumn 1929): 1–17; Stanisław Mateusz Studencki, “Praca psychologiczna w szkolnictwie zawodowym” [Psychological Work in Vocational Education], *Psychotechnika* 2, no. 8 (October 1, 1928): 1–19; Stanisław Mateusz Studencki, “O typie psycho-fizycznym Polaka: przyczynek do charakterystyki psychologicznej typów antropologicznych wśród młodzieży polskiej” [On the Pole and His Psycho-Physical Type: A Contribution to the Psychological Characteristics of Anthropological Types among Polish Youth], *Kwartalnik Psychologiczny* 2, no. 1–2 (1931): 55–91.

of the body. The latter task was supervised by Kazimierz Stołyhwo, a racial anthropologist with a clear commitment to eugenics.¹⁴³² Stołyhwo was affiliated with the Polish Eugenics Society, had extensive international networks in physical anthropology and eugenics, and later assumed a professorship in physical anthropology at the University of Cracow. While Polish racial anthropologists demonstrated a wide range of political ideologies, and Stołyhwo was considered to hold left-wing or liberal views, the journal *Psychotechnika* also featured articles by Poland's right-wing anthropologists.¹⁴³³

For instance, in 1928, the journal published an article on vocational guidance by Ludwik Jaxa-Bykowski, a biologist with distinctly nationalist and conservative beliefs. Jaxa-Bykowski argued that the vocationalists should prioritize the presumed racial characteristics of the individual. Furthermore, he suggested that such counseling should particularly favor individuals who exhibited the supposed traits of the “Sarmatian racial type,” which, in alignment with other right-wing Polish racial anthropologists, he claimed to be prevalent among the Polish nobility, “especially among the gentry.”¹⁴³⁴ Clearly, Jaxa-Bykowski assumed that career counseling would contribute to their representatives having an “increasing presence among the professional intelligentsia.”¹⁴³⁵ Having integrated biologically deterministic arguments, the field of psychotechnics in Poland seems to have oscillated between an approach to career counseling that acknowledged the ethnically diverse workforce of a multiethnic state, and the opposing notion that career counseling would serve as a means to promote a perceived ethnic elite and extend its influence into more contemporary spheres of life.

¹⁴³² Macewicz, “Zarys powstania,” 49.

¹⁴³³ Olga Linkiewicz, “Applied Modern Science and the Self-Politicization of Racial Anthropology in Interwar Poland,” *Ab Imperio* 2016, no. 2 (2016): 156.

¹⁴³⁴ Ludwik Jaxa-Bykowski, “Właściwości antropologiczne a psychotechnika” [Anthropological Characteristics and Psychotechnics], *Psychotechnika* 2, no. 5 (January 1, 1928): 8–10.

¹⁴³⁵ This statement was also a symptom of the persisting impact in Poland of the turn-of-the-century German framework of anthroposociology, notably associated with Ludwig Woltmann. Jaxa-Bykowski, “Właściwości antropologiczne,” 8–10.

The Polish Eugenic Society also embraced vocational guidance in the 1920s, signaling both cooperation and competition with psychotechnicians. Following an update in 1921, the Society's bylaws included the promotion of vocational guidance as one of its primary practical objectives. A few years later, Leon Wernic, its president, identified "collecting data on vocational skills in various regions of the country" and "conducting genealogy research on exceptionally talented individuals" as urgent priorities for the Society's future endeavors.¹⁴³⁶ Aligned with these priorities, the eugenics consultation office run by the Polish Eugenics Society provided vocational guidance along other types of advice, such as marital counseling, guidance for athletes, and disease prevention.¹⁴³⁷

During the late 1920s, the Society, with state support, went as far as to organize a series of popular lectures on career selection. Ultimately, the material from these lectures, encompassing a range of professions including the physician, engineer, bureaucrat, and gymnastics trainer, was transformed into individual booklets and published as part of the Society's pamphlet series.¹⁴³⁸ Notably, these lectures scarcely touched upon the alleged physical traits that were deemed fitting for these professions. While they remained completely silent on constitutional medicine or "racial types," their focus was restricted to a few vague allusions to psychological attributes like "patriotism" or "idealism."¹⁴³⁹ In effect, these

¹⁴³⁶ Ryszard Zabłotniak, "Dzieje Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego" [History of the Polish Eugenics Society], *Kwartalnik Historii nauki i techniki* 16, no. 4 (1971): 775 and 778.

¹⁴³⁷ Józef Mikułowski-Pomorski, *O zawodzie rolnika: odczyt z cyklu wykładów "O wyborze zawodu" urządzanych dla maturzystów szkół średnich przez Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne* [On the Profession of a Farmer: A Lecture from the Series 'On the Choice of Profession,' Arranged for High School Graduates by the Polish Eugenics Society], Biblioteka Eugeniczna Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego 13 (Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne, 1927).

¹⁴³⁸ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 192.

¹⁴³⁹ This was the case even in lectures on professions such as medical doctors or gymnastics trainers, whose authors were otherwise acquainted with eugenic arguments. Czesław Wroczyński, *O zawodzie lekarza: z cyklu odczytów pod protektoratem Ministerstwa Oświecenia i Wyznań Religijnych "O wyborze zawodu"* [On the Profession of a Physician: From a Series of Lectures Under the Protectorate of the Ministry of Education and Religious Denominations, 'On the Choice of Profession'], Biblioteka Eugeniczna Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego 9 (Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne, 1928); Eugeniusz Witold Piasecki, *O zawodzie wychowawcy fizycznego: odczyt z cyklu wykładów "O wyborze zawodu," urządzanych dla maturzystów szkół średnich przez Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne* [On the Profession of a Physical Educator: A Lecture from the Series 'On the

progressive eugenicists held open the door to the professions for non-Polish citizens within the country.

Unlike in most other post-Habsburg contexts, it was the Polish psychologists who were keener on merging biological notions of “race,” constitutional medicine, and job qualifications to promote a national elite. Conversely, the Polish Eugenics Society deliberately adopted arguments primarily centered around psychological themes. Thus, the Polish Eugenics Society, whose leading members typically did not have backgrounds in the former Habsburg empire, did not adopt the same strategy as their post-Habsburg counterparts.

The impact of these eugenically-infused arguments on the way individuals chose their jobs was limited. This held true even in the case of biotypological research at the Baťa concern in Czechoslovakia, which collected files on around twelve thousand individuals during the two years of its existence, and over sixty thousand by the end of the 1930s.¹⁴⁴⁰ However, as a recent comprehensive study demonstrates, these doctors failed to put medicine in Czechoslovakia on new biotypological foundations.¹⁴⁴¹ Even on a smaller scale within the Baťa concern, fields such as psychotechnics or the more practically oriented branches of medicine had a more immediate impact on its operations.¹⁴⁴² Identifying tangible practical outcomes of these physicians’ arguments beyond the databases they had generated proves challenging, and the same holds true for the majority of the other cases discussed earlier. However, their applied research generated a large amount of data. Recognizing that there was only a limited demand for the utilitarian uses of their proposals, some of them subsequently repurposed this research and data to bolster various forms of racial metaphysics.

Choice of Profession,’ Arranged for High School Graduates by the Polish Eugenics Society], Biblioteka Eugeniczna Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego 16 (Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne, 1927).

¹⁴⁴⁰ Musil, “Měření Čechoslováků,” 77.

¹⁴⁴¹ Musil, “Měření Čechoslováků,” 108.

¹⁴⁴² Musil, “Měření Čechoslováků,” 108.

Consider the case of the Viennese physical anthropologist Lebzelter, who initially, like Tandler, strongly differentiated between constitution and race. In the early 1920s, there was a moment when he argued that his study of the constitution of Viennese workers had minimal relevance for inquiries about their alleged race. However, even before the middle of the decade, Lebzelter attempted – unsuccessfully – to establish a *Forschungsinstitut für Rassen- und Konstitutionsforschung* (Institute for Research on Race and Constitution), claiming that the constitutional data he had amassed would enable him to “evaluate” various “races.”¹⁴⁴³ As his research progressed, he thus increasingly merged constitutional types with racial types, giving precedence to the latter.

By the mid-1930s, the transition was complete. Lebzelter now interpreted his anthropometric measurements of the workers’ constitution to specifically claim that individuals allegedly belonging to the “Nordic race” were “unquestionably” overrepresented in highly skilled working-class roles.¹⁴⁴⁴ His broader conclusions from the same research were equally ominous: that an individual’s occupation was dictated by their race, and that similar anthropometric investigations into various professions would serve as “new pathways for the genuine evaluation of the significance of distinct racial components within the entire nation.”¹⁴⁴⁵ This research was symptomatic of the shift that gradually took place during the interwar period among many eugenically minded physicians in post-Habsburg Central Europe who engaged with constitutional medicine. In a dark twist, they no longer employed the concept of constitution as an alternative to race; instead, they used this concept to quietly introduce racial vocabulary into various fields.

¹⁴⁴³ Andre Gingrich and Peter Rohrbacher, eds., *Völkerkunde zur NS-Zeit aus Wien (1938-1945): Institutionen, Biographien und Praktiken in Netzwerken* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2021), 78.

¹⁴⁴⁴ Ernst Brezina and Viktor Lebzelter, “Über Körperbeschaffenheit von Lokomotivführern: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des Zusammenhanges zwischen Rasse und Beruf,” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 65, no. 1–2 (1935): 57.

¹⁴⁴⁵ Brezina and Lebzelter, “Über Körperbeschaffenheit,” 57.

At this point, it is worthwhile to recall that constitutional medicine in Weimar Germany was divided into two opposing camps, as Carsten Timmermann explains. These camps reflected the basic political and epistemic conflict in this country during the 1920s, which pitted the “rationalist and modernist tendencies” against the “traditionalist and neoromantic ones.”¹⁴⁴⁶ In his analysis, the “rationalist” approach is generally associated with the political left, while the “neoromantic” approach aligns with the political right. However, an analysis of various applications of constitutional medicine in the post-Habsburg setting reveals a different configuration. Here, apart from supporting some left-leaning biopolitical projects, the “rationalist” approach could also accommodate radical forms of racial nationalism. This was the case with many supporters of eugenics promoting vocational guidance in post-Habsburg countries, as the preceding paragraphs illustrate. As will be shown below, several pioneers of sports medicine in this region also followed a similar pattern. The rationalist approach to constitutional medicine allowed some of these eugenicists to give a veneer of pragmatism to a radical biopolitics.

Sports historians show that the 1920s marked a pivotal period in which sports medicine made significant strides toward establishing itself as a distinct field, separate from the general participation of physicians in sports and mass gymnastics. This was the case at both the transnational and national levels. Although the first sports medicine association had already emerged in Imperial Germany shortly before World War I, the 1920s saw the establishment of several other national sports medicine associations, primarily in Western Europe. Additionally, the first international body representing this budding discipline was founded at the end of this decade.¹⁴⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴⁶ Timmermann, “Constitutional Medicine,” 718.

¹⁴⁴⁷ Vanessa Heggie, “Sport (and Exercise) Medicine in Britain: Healthy Citizens and Abnormal Athletes,” *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 28, no. 2 (2011): 255.

Discussions about sports medicine in Germany played a pivotal role in shaping the field in most post-Habsburg countries. During the late Imperial period and the Weimar republic, German sports physicians primarily focused on the vast population of gymnasts and athletes deemed to have “normal” bodies. Their aim was to enhance these bodies to boost national efficiency, in terms of both military prowess and economic strength. By intertwining the concepts of sports, gymnastics, and labor, these physicians viewed physical exercise as a conduit to elevate labor performance. The influence of the discourse of scientific management was crucial in this regard. Many, perhaps even most, of the pioneers of sports medicine in post-Habsburg countries held similar assumptions.¹⁴⁴⁸

In institutional terms, the emerging field of sports medicine was predominantly associated with what the previous chapter references as “alternative states.” This means it was closely tied to powerful mass gymnastics associations and other similar organizations that promoted physical exercise, often with a nationalist emphasis. Beyond these associations, the relationship between sports medicine and the military was also notable in certain post-Habsburg settings. The pioneers of sports medicine in the area engaged in applied research. Using gymnasts’ bodies as their research subjects, they generated data on a notably large and, in some cases, unparalleled number of individuals. Their research frequently incorporated eugenic ideas and adopted the notion of “constitution,” initially employing it to connect these eugenic concepts with recommendations regarding gymnasts’ exercise regimens and the administration of sports and mass gymnastics activities.

¹⁴⁴⁸ This approach to sports medicine was compatible with the ideas of “human economy” which were widespread in post-Habsburg countries. Indeed, even in Weimar Germany, sports medicine negotiated with Goldscheid’s ideas, albeit while discarding his concerns about multiethnicity. Michael Hau, “Sports in the Human Economy: ‘Leibesübungen,’ Medicine, Psychology, and Performance Enhancement during the Weimar Republic,” *Central European History* 41, no. 3 (2008): 381–412.

A brief exploration of the pioneering research in sports medicine reveals that it was coordinated to some extent across several post-Habsburg contexts, including Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Behind this coordination were shared misgivings of the emerging sports physicians about the political modernity that characterized the post-Habsburg countries during the first interwar decade. Firstly, these sports doctors were uneasy with the growing empowerment of women during and following World War I. Secondly, they expressed some dissatisfaction with the “synthetic” or “integration-oriented” state ideologies widespread in their countries during the interwar period, especially in the first decade. While their eugenic arguments maintained a pragmatic orientation and did not entirely break with these nation-building projects, they increasingly sought to control and marginalize women and produced research that underpinned a more exclusive, hierarchical nationalist stance. Driven by this political agenda, they strategically conflated the previously distinct notions of “constitution” and race, in a gesture similar to the nationalists among the career counselors.

All these features were on display among the supporters of sports medicine in Poland. While the initial steps towards the medicalization of physical exercise were associated with nationalist gymnastics associations like *Sokół* and the scouting movement, during the interwar period, the military played a comparably important role.¹⁴⁴⁹ By establishing umbrella research institutions for sports and mass gymnastics, the military attempted to gain control over the field and shape related policies.¹⁴⁵⁰ The *Centralny Instytut Wychowania Fizycznego* (Central Institute of Physical Education, CIWF), founded in Warsaw in 1929, was pivotal in this regard. From its inception, this state-endorsed institution housed a specialized and well-equipped

¹⁴⁴⁹ Eugeniusz Witold Piasecki, “Lekarze w sokolstwie polskiem (1867-1932)” [Doctors in the Polish Sokół, 1867-1932], *Věstník českých lékařů* 44, no. 27–28 (July 1, 1932): 709–14.

¹⁴⁵⁰ Katrin Steffen, “Who Belongs to the Healthy Body of the Nation? Health and National Integration in Poland and the Polish Army after the First World War,” in *From the Midwife’s Bag to the Patient’s File: Public Health in Eastern and Southeastern Europe*, ed. Heike Karge, Friederike Kind-Kovács, and Sara Bernasconi (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2017), 133.

Institute of Anthropology, employing numerous racial anthropologists and physicians, including a substantial proportion of women.¹⁴⁵¹ The anthropological institute evolved into a focal point for racial and eugenic research, characterized by its applied nature, and it embraced the concept of constitution as its central framework.

The official sponsors of the CIWF, namely the Polish military and Poland's authoritarian leader, Piłsudski, subscribed to a policy of state assimilation. As Katrin Steffen points out, this approach aimed to “forge a pragmatic alliance between ethnic Poles and the national minorities in the country.”¹⁴⁵² As an integral component of the statist and technocratic program of state modernization, spearheaded by the Polish authorities, the military enlisted physical anthropologists to conduct extensive research on its soldiers. The objective was to collect data on the soldiers' physical attributes to develop appropriate equipment for them, while simultaneously constructing an ethnic catalog of the emerging state.¹⁴⁵³ These measurements that took place in the early 1920s were designed and directed by Jan Mydlarski, a former Habsburg officer and a graduate of Lemberg/Lwów/Lviv University. Mydlarski, who was also a member of the Polish Eugenics Society, joined the Anthropological Institute at the CIWF in 1929 and became its director in 1931, linking it with the Department of Physical Anthropology at Warsaw University.¹⁴⁵⁴ The selection of Mydlarski suggests that the institute appointed a researcher whom it deemed inclined towards applied research and an approach that would consider the state's multiethnic composition.

¹⁴⁵¹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 190; Aleksander Kelus, *Centralny Instytut Wychowania Fizycznego w Warszawie: przewodnik, informator* [Central Institute of Physical Education in Warsaw: Guide, Handbook] (Warsaw: Drukarnia Gospodarcza, 1933), 17.

¹⁴⁵² Steffen, “Who Belongs,” 144.

¹⁴⁵³ Steffen, “Who Belongs,” *passim*.

¹⁴⁵⁴ Milan Dokládál and Edmund Piasecki, “Profesor Dr Jan Mydlarski (1892-1956),” *Zpravodaj Anthropologické společnosti* 8, no. 3 (November 30, 1956): 5–6.

If this was indeed the rationale behind Mydlarski's appointment, he diverged from it. Even in his early research on soldiers, Mydlarski associated blood groups with racial types.¹⁴⁵⁵ Although his research at CIWF centered on the concept of constitution rather than race, he viewed both as largely synonymous. As early as 1929, Mydlarski asserted that separating constitution from race was "unjustified," contending that both represented deep-seated and overlapping "properties of the structural elements of the human species."¹⁴⁵⁶ His colleagues at the CIWF also used these terms nearly interchangeably.¹⁴⁵⁷ Mydlarski's arguments often led to conclusions that attributed specific physical capabilities and sporting achievements to distinct "races." In fact, defining the Polish nation in biological terms and assessing the performance of its presumed constituent races was his primary objective.¹⁴⁵⁸

Mydlarski was trained under the guidance of the prominent racial anthropologist, Jan Czekanowski, in Lwów.¹⁴⁵⁹ The conservative nationalist Czekanowski and his students were at the epicenter of a major repositioning of Polish racial anthropology. Richard McMahon explains that these racial anthropologists broke away from the earlier, pre-independence nationalist narratives of race that linked the Polish nation to an alleged Celto-Slav race. Instead, the Lwów school "adopted a German-style complex of intense Nordicism nationalism," casted the "Nordics" as the Polish "national race," and thus aimed to inject this construct into the core

¹⁴⁵⁵ Katrin Steffen, *Blut und Metall: Die transnationalen Wissensräume von Ludwik Hirsfeld und Jan Czochoński im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2021), 270.

¹⁴⁵⁶ Jan Mydlarski, "Z zagadnień konstytucjonalizmu" [On Questions of Constitutionalism], *Zagadnienia rasy* 11, no. 7–8 (August 1929): 345.

¹⁴⁵⁷ See the arguments of Milicerowa as discussed in Magdalena Gawin, "Niechciana pamięć - polski ruch eugeniczny w latach międzywojennych: Na marginesie artykułu Krzysztofa Kawalca" [Unwanted Memory - Polish Eugenics Movement in the Interwar Years: A Side Note to Krzysztof Kawalec's Article], *Medycyna Nowożytna* 8, no. 2 (2001): 81.

¹⁴⁵⁸ Jan Mydlarski, "Podstawowe zagadnienia eugeniki" [Fundamental Questions of Eugenics], *Zagadnienia rasy* 11, no. 6 (June 1929): 113–31.

¹⁴⁵⁹ Czekanowski's background was complex, encompassing involvement with Russian, Austrian, and German imperial race science, including research in the latter's colonies. Further research is required to determine whether and to what extent Austria-Hungary's racial discourses shaped Czekanowski's multilayered and dark intellectual profile.

of the Polish identity discourse.¹⁴⁶⁰ Mydlarski's arguments aligned with this goal, and assigned physical superiority in competitive physical exercise specifically to the "Nordic race."¹⁴⁶¹ Unlike the Nordacists in Germany, however, Czekanowski's anthropology did not foreground racial purity.¹⁴⁶² Consequently, Mydlarski's claims did not amount to a call for the erasure of Poland's hybridity. Nevertheless, he used the scientific toolkit of racial anthropology to naturalize and reinforce hierarchies within that multiethnic polity. Mydlarski's arguments thus indicated the gradual erosion of the idea of an authoritarian yet multiethnic state advocated by the founders of the CIWF.

At the same time, Mydlarski's research had an important gendered dimension. In particular, the race anthropologist aimed to gather data that allegedly supported the notion of fundamental biological differences between women and men.¹⁴⁶³ While Mydlarski's arguments were cautiously formulated and employed technical terminology, they supported a conservative concept of gendered division of labor. Similarly, Karol Stojanowski, a racial anthropologist who was also active in the field of sports medicine, extensively wrote on the participation of women in mass gymnastics and competitive sports.¹⁴⁶⁴ Unlike Mydlarski, however, Stojanowski was a strident proponent of Slav racial superiority, linked with equally strident anti-Semitic nationalism, which placed him on the fringe of the Polish scientific community.¹⁴⁶⁵

¹⁴⁶⁰ Richard McMahon, *The Races of Europe: Construction of National Identities in the Social Sciences, 1839-1939* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 287.

¹⁴⁶¹ Jan Mydlarski, "Charakterystyka antropologiczna uczestników Międzynarodowych Zawodów Narciarskich w Zakopanem 1929 r" [Anthropological Characteristics of Participants in the 1929 International Ski Competition in Zakopane], *Przegląd Sportowo-Lekarski* 3, no. 2-3 (April 1931): 107-80.

¹⁴⁶² McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 287.

¹⁴⁶³ Jan Mydlarski, "Sprawność fizyczna młodzieży w Polsce. Część II. Dziewczęta" [Physical Fitness of Youth in Poland. Part II. Girls], *Przegląd Fizjologii Ruchu* 6, no. 4 (1934): 403-86.

¹⁴⁶⁴ Stojanowski was a frequent contributor to *Wychowanie Fizyczne*, a leading Polish scientific journal on physical education. The notable overlaps between Mydlarski's arguments and those of the latter racial anthropologist are evident in works such as Karol Stojanowski, "Typy sprawności fizycznej a typy rasowe" [Types of Physical Fitness and Racial Types], *Wychowanie Fizyczne* 8, no. 11 (November 1927): 265-66; Karol Stojanowski, "Skład rasowy studentek i studentów Studium W. F. Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego" [Racial Composition of Female and Male Students of Physical Education at the University of Poznań], *Wychowanie Fizyczne* 12, no. 2 (February 1931): 49-56.

¹⁴⁶⁵ Jan Piskorski, "Polish Myśl Zachodnia and German Ostforschung: An Attempt at a Comparison," in *German Scholars and Ethnic Cleansing, 1919-1945*, ed. Ingo Haar and Michael Fahlbusch (New York: Berghahn, 2005), 268.

Nevertheless, despite the significantly different strategies Mydlarski and Stojanowski pursued in racializing the Poles, their views on women and the family seemed to largely overlap.

Mydlarski was part of a cooperative network of younger, nationalist post-Habsburg eugenicists with ties to sports medicine. In Yugoslavia, for instance, the budding field of sports medicine piqued the interest of Božo Škerlj, a physical anthropologist and advocate of eugenics. Based in Ljubljana, Škerlj had strong ties with the *Sokol* association, both locally and transnationally. With the backing of the association and leveraging its transnational networks, Škerlj forged close connections with sports physicians in Poland. He visited the Polish CIWF on two occasions: briefly in September 1934 and then for an extended three-month research trip in 1935.¹⁴⁶⁶ Consequently, Škerlj and the CIWF's director, Mydlarski, monitored each other's research, and their epistemic choices converged.

Škerlj also maintained close ties with physicians specializing in sports medicine in Czechoslovakia. These connections were fostered by his affiliation with Sokol and his status as an alumnus of a Czech university. For instance, in the late 1930s, Škerlj visited the town of Zlín where he presented three distinct lectures to physicians and other professionals in the field of sports medicine, along the local supporters of biotypology. The announced lecture titles were: "The Influence of Excessive Physical Education on the Female Body," "A Typology of the Female Constitution," and "Relationships between Sex, Constitutional, and Racial Types of Humans."¹⁴⁶⁷ It was no coincidence that Škerlj emphasized these topics in his lectures.

The lectures in Zlín underscored the tight interrelation between sports medicine and the concept of constitution, a connection evident not just for Škerlj, but also for his Polish and

¹⁴⁶⁶ Božo Škerlj, "Moj studijski boravak u C.I.W.F." [My Study Stay at the C.I.W.F], *Soko: List prednjaštva Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije* 6, no. 11 (November 15, 1935): 327–29.

¹⁴⁶⁷ "Vliv přehnané tělovýchovy na ženské tělo" [The Effect of Excessive Physical Exercise on Female Body], *Zlín* 9, no. 7 (February 13, 1939): 5.

Czech nationalist peers. Moreover, these topics revealed that one of his primary aims was to construct and reinforce what he viewed as inherent biological differences – and hierarchies – between men and women.¹⁴⁶⁸ Illustratively, in his 1934 popular book on “race,” biological sex, and human constitution, Škerlj proclaimed, “It is known that a woman fulfills her most significant role as a mother. Her entire body is fashioned for this purpose [...].”¹⁴⁶⁹ This claim underpinned his effort to regulate and reduce women’s participation in sports and mass gymnastics. More broadly, his objective was to push women back into the private sphere, emphasizing their reproductive roles.

In these instances, Škerlj drew a strategic distinction between race and constitution. He claimed that constitution was heavily influenced by gender, especially in women.¹⁴⁷⁰ Indeed, his international reputation in the fields of constitution research and sports medicine can be attributed particularly to his anthropological measurements of women. On a theoretical level, Škerlj aimed to complement Kretchmer’s constitutional typology, originally focused on males, by developing their female equivalents.¹⁴⁷¹ On a more empirical level, he studied the effects of competitive and professional gymnastics on women’s bodies, suggesting that they had an “undesirable” – though not heritable – impact on their fertility. In effect, he recommended that women engage in fundamentally different kinds of exercise than men, strongly opposing any form of competitive sports and emphasizing rhythmic gymnastics.¹⁴⁷² By invoking the image

¹⁴⁶⁸ Ana Cergol Paradiž, “Evgenika na Slovenskem v perspektivi spola” [Eugenics in Slovenia from a Gender Perspective], *Zgodovinski časopis* 63, no. 3–4 (2009): 408–25.

¹⁴⁶⁹ Božo Škerlj, *Človek* [The Human] (Ljubljana: Merkur, 1934), 53.

¹⁴⁷⁰ Božo Škerlj, “Čemu telesni uzgoj?” [What is Physical Education For], *Soko: List prednjaštva Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije* 6, no. 3 (March 15, 1935): 69–70.

¹⁴⁷¹ Vojtěch Fetter, “Ocenění vědecké práce prof. Božo Škerlja” [Assessment of Božo Škerlj’s Scientific Work], *Anthropologie* 1, no. 1 (1962): 52–53. See also Božo Škerlj, “Die Körperformtypen des Weibes,” *Acta neerlandica morphologiae, normalis et pathologicae* 2, no. 1 (1938): 20–46.

¹⁴⁷² Vojtěch Fetter, “Vliv tělocviku na tělo” [The Effect of Gymnastics on the Body], *Anthropologie* 15, no. 1–4 (1937): 122–24.

of genetically valuable bodies allegedly squandering their potential to increase the nation's population, Škerlj gave the issue a clearly eugenic framing.

Škerlj used the emphasis on constitution as a foundation for his calls to control women. In the 1930s, Škerlj seized various opportunities to reiterate and expand upon these arguments. Whether in lectures to the Yugoslav Sokol or through written communications, his alarmist stance was unmistakable. Crucially, he did not confine these views to Yugoslav audiences; he aimed to circulate them on a transnational level. His 1936 publication, *Menschlicher Körper und Leibesübungen* (Human Body and Physical Exercise), stood as a testament to this strategy. Widely regarded as his seminal work on the subject, it drew from measurements he undertook at the CIWF and found its place in a monograph series on physical anthropology published in Warsaw.¹⁴⁷³ What it perhaps most unsettling is the fact that some of his views even found their way into medical journals in Nazi Germany.¹⁴⁷⁴

While these arguments garnered both public and informal praise from several male sports physicians, they faced vocal opposition from women. This resistance was evident not just in Yugoslavia but also in Poland, where female physicians in the 1930s were becoming increasingly engaged in research on physical education. For example, Škerlj's views elicited a sharply critical response from the physician Halina Milicerowa. She analyzed data she had gathered on 88 female students at the CIWF and reached "entirely different conclusions."¹⁴⁷⁵ While her critique of Škerlj was fierce, however, she also opted to frame it within the context of constitutional medicine.

¹⁴⁷³ Božo Škerlj, *Menschlicher Körper und Leibesübungen*. Prace Antropologiczne Instytutu Nauk Antropologicznych i Etnologicznych Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego 2 (Warsaw: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie, 1936).

¹⁴⁷⁴ Božo Škerlj, "Menstruationszyklen und Leibesübungen," *Archiv für Gynäkologie* 162 (1936): 516–37.

¹⁴⁷⁵ Halina Milicerowa, "W sprawie w. f. kobiet (Ocena wyników pracy w C. I. W. F. a typy konstytucjonalne)" [On Physical Education of Women: Evaluation of Work at C.I.W.F. and Constitutional Types], *Wychowanie Fizyczne* 20, no. 9 (May 1939): 311.

Škerlj's ties to scholars from the erstwhile imperial Austria, including those in Czechoslovakia and Poland, along with interactions with the Austrian race anthropologist Lebzelter, aided his nationalist agenda. Škerlj, blurring the boundaries between "constitution" and "race" in this case, leveraged his racial studies to promote a theory linking Yugoslav ethnogenesis with the concept of the Dinaric race.¹⁴⁷⁶ As Rory Yeomans explains, Škerlj was one of the emerging Yugoslav racial anthropologists who thus used this racial concept common in contemporary Nazi racial theories. However, instead of pursuing ethnic purity, they integrated it into a "scientific framework for their notions of racial hybridity as synthesis," and for asserting national autonomy and territorial integrity.¹⁴⁷⁷

Nevertheless, within this synthesis-oriented framework, Škerlj sought to reinforce hierarchies and exclusions. For example, he suggested the distinctiveness and even superiority of the Slovenes, portraying them as tall and "unquestionably the whitest" among the Yugoslavs, with many having light-colored eyes.¹⁴⁷⁸ What is more, he linked these attributes specifically to the "Nordic race," asserting that the most proficient Slovene gymnasts exhibited "much more of the Nordic element" than he observed elsewhere in the population.¹⁴⁷⁹ He even went so far as to suggest, in a sinister echo of some Nazi race scientists, that within Yugoslavia's population, "we must take special care of what is ours, and that is the combination of the Dinaric and Nordic races."¹⁴⁸⁰ These radicalized racial nationalist arguments represented a notable shift from the early stages of his career in the 1920s when Škerlj sought to highlight the alleged

¹⁴⁷⁶ Yeomans, "Racial Politics," 316.

¹⁴⁷⁷ Yeomans, "Racial Politics," 317 and 333.

¹⁴⁷⁸ While the title does not explicitly state it, these arguments were claimed to be derived from an analysis of 189 male and 153 female Sokol gymnasts. Božo Škerlj, "Rasni tipi Slovencev" [Racial Types of Slovenians], *Evgenika* 1, no. 3 (August 1935): 37.

¹⁴⁷⁹ Again, these claims were purportedly based on Sokol gymnasts who participated in the 1935 International University Games. Božo Škerlj, "Telovadba in človeško telo: Prinos k problemu III" [Gymnastics and the Human Body: A Contribution to the Problem III], *Zdravniški vestnik* 7, no. 5 (May 31, 1935): 210.

¹⁴⁸⁰ Božo Škerlj, "Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. III. In Jugoslavien," *Prager Presse* 14, no. 330 (December 2, 1934): 4.

biological similarities among the Yugoslavs and maintained that one had to “strongly differentiate” between the purported constitutional and racial features.¹⁴⁸¹

In Czechoslovakia, doctors who ventured into the emerging field of sports medicine also started integrating the concept of constitution into their analytical frameworks. However, some of them were older and had an imperial background. Consequently, their arguments tended to be more moderate. For example, the eugenicist Karel Weigner, born in 1874 and an established member of Sokol’s senior leadership by the 1920s, was heavily influenced by the late imperial eugenic debates. He continued to reference notions of mutual aid and human capital into the 1920s.¹⁴⁸² While he connected physical exercise to national efficiency, he primarily emphasized its economic aspect, highlighting “the energy value that individuals gain for themselves and the collective, the nation, when striving for peak performance” in the economic arena. Thus, his arguments maintained a tone of liberal, Darwinist optimism, which he also linked to his support of the integration-oriented ideology of Czechoslovakism.¹⁴⁸³

When Weigner systematized his ideas about the concept of constitution and its relevance to physical exercise in the late 1920s, he drew upon theories developed in Weimar Germany and France. Nevertheless, he clearly leaned towards neo-Lamarckism, attributing a role in shaping human constitution not only to genes but also to the environment.¹⁴⁸⁴ Against this backdrop, Weigner advocated that every gymnast or sportsman should engage in exercise tailored to their individual constitutional makeup and further develop this constitution for future

¹⁴⁸¹ Božo Škerlj, “Kako naj razumemo dinarsko raso?” [How Should We Understand the Dinaric Race?], *Geografski vestnik* 4, no. 1–4 (1928): 39.

¹⁴⁸² Karel Weigner, “Tirševa baština lekarima” [The Legacy of Tyrš to Physicians], *Sokolski glasnik* 3, no. 44 (November 3, 1932): 1–2; Karel Weigner, “Tělesná výchova a její národní význam” [Physical Education and Its National Importance], in *Zdravím k síle národa: Výběr statí uveřejněných v letech 1911–1929* [Through Health to the Strength of the Nation: A Selection of Essays Published Between 1911 and 1929] (Prague: Česká obec sokolská, 1930), 32.

¹⁴⁸³ Weigner, “Tělesná výchova a její národní význam,” 4.

¹⁴⁸⁴ Weigner, “Tělesná výchova se zřením ke konstituci a pohlaví” [Physical Education with a Focus on Constitution and Sex], *Rozpravy České akademie věd a umění* 38, no. 28 (1928): 1–10.

generations.¹⁴⁸⁵ In line with this neo-Lamarckian approach, moreover, he placed high hopes in the perceived power of physical exercise to not only strengthen individual constitutions but also make them more similar within a nation. However, within this nationalist and biologicistic framework, individual constitution was not equated with race, and Weigner did not appear to be interested in the racist theories stipulating that various alleged “racial types” could perform differently.

While Weigner remained indifferent to racial types, his argument was highly gendered. In contrast to men, whom this eugenicist approached in a personalized way, Weigner portrayed women as a rather uniform group. He also emphasized their biological difference from men, implicitly treating men as the norm. He recommended a special regimen of physical exercises for women gymnasts, one that took “women’s constitution as its basis.”¹⁴⁸⁶ Differing significantly from that of men, the regimen for women highlighted the purportedly natural rhythmic gymnastics and encouraged women to embrace motherhood.¹⁴⁸⁷ This fusion of female citizenship with motherhood almost entirely replaced Weigner’s previous emphasis on labor and performance. In a manner reminiscent of the eugenicists discussed earlier, Weigner’s focus on constitution thus reinforced an attempt to control women’s bodies.

Starting from the late 1920s, a younger generation of Czech nationalist sports physicians and physical anthropologists took a more radical approach to constitutional medicine. This approach made it less likely that physical exercise could serve as a unifying force for a new national community. Almost invariably affiliated with the Sokol association, and in some cases also with the Baťa concern, they began conducting measurements on large numbers of individuals to gather data supporting their claims, much like Mydlarski and Škerlj. At the same

¹⁴⁸⁵ Weigner, “Tělesná výchova se zřením,” 8.

¹⁴⁸⁶ Weigner, “Tělesná výchova se zřením,” 8.

¹⁴⁸⁷ Weigner, “Tělesná výchova se zřením,” 8.

time, they crafted detailed empirical studies seeking to further reinforce the perceived gender differences and hierarchies in sports and mass gymnastics.¹⁴⁸⁸ As a result, the two *Slets*, or mass gatherings, of the Sokol gymnastic association that occurred in Czechoslovakia in the 1930s were accompanied by an array of systematic and multifaceted medical measurements.

This growing emphasis on large-scale racial and gendered research was already evident at the Ninth *Slet* of the Sokol association in 1932. During the event, physicians routinely assessed the overall health of participating gymnasts and monitored various physiological processes. Crucially, they also transformed the gymnasts' bodies into subjects of eugenically oriented research by conducting anthropometric measurements on seven hundred individuals. It is worth noting that this anthropometric research aimed to assemble a biological narrative about the imagined national community, which I will address below, but was limited to selected male participants of the event. In contrast, a separate survey, specifically focused on women gymnasts, sought to establish a causal connection between the impact of gymnastic exercise and the outcomes of childbirth.¹⁴⁸⁹ This implies that the physicians involved in this research once again regarded the male body as the norm while defining the female body primarily in terms of motherhood.

The anthropometric measurements at the Sokol *Slet* in 1932 were conducted by Jiří Malý (1899-1950). The emerging physical anthropologist assessed not only the height and

¹⁴⁸⁸ For example, one physician carried out meticulous measurements of the bones and joints on the hands of thirty male and thirty female Sokol gymnasts in two separate studies. While the physician concluded that the effect of exercise was conditioned by one's constitution and further modified it, he also warned women against competitive sports, as he saw their effects as significantly more detrimental than Sokol gymnastics. This contrasted with his findings on men, which also extolled the health effects of the Sokol exercise but did not discourage them from complementing it with alternatives. Karel Hora, "Změny na kostech a v kloubech horní končetiny, pozorované u sokolek" [Changes in the Bones and Joints of the Upper Limb Observed in Female Sokol Gymnasts], *Časopis lékařů českých* 72, no. 46–7 (1933): 1397–1405; Karel Hora, "Promjene na kostima i zglobovima gornjeg ekstremiteta promatrane kod vježbača na spravama (Sokola)" [Changes in the Bones and Joints of the Upper Extremities Observed in Sokol Gymnasts Exercising on Devices], *Liječnički vjesnik* 54, no. 11 (November 1932): 547–61.

¹⁴⁸⁹ Jiří Král, "Vědecká práce na sletišti" [Scientific Work at the Sokol Rally], *Věstník československých lékařů* 50, no. 25–27 (June 30, 1938): 1030–32.

weight of the gymnasts' bodies but also evaluated the color of their hair, eyes, skin, and other physical traits. These measurements were characterized by a keenness to link constitution and race, a perspective akin to that of Škerlj and Mydlarski, whose research Malý was familiar with. Consequently, Malý employed these measurements not only for categorizing constitutional types but also for attributing racial types to these individuals.¹⁴⁹⁰

The resulting argument revolved around the alleged distribution of racial types among the gymnasts and how this related to their performance, closely intertwining these issues with questions of collective identity. Unlike Škerlj and Mydlarski, Malý suggested that these purported racial types, including the Alpine, the Dinaric, and the Nordic, were all capable of top performance, arguing that this provided empirical evidence of their equality. However, he arrived at this conclusion by constructing a model of the racial composition of the Czechoslovak nation, which employed the Sokol gymnasts – largely ethnic Czechs and Slovaks – as a proxy. While this model highlighted its hybrid nature, it also proposed several alleged racial types as its defining elements.¹⁴⁹¹

As the decade advanced, state officials increasingly showed interest in the data generated by such research. Consequently, at the subsequent Sokol *Slet* in 1938, medical research on the gymnasts received significant support from Czechoslovakia's authorities. As a result of this robust funding, the scope of studied issues was significantly expanded, and the number of individuals examined increased as well.¹⁴⁹²

The similarities in the arguments and strategies of eugenicists involved in sports medicine, such as Malý, Mydlarski, and Škerlj, were not solely responses to parallel political

¹⁴⁹⁰ Jiří Malý, "Rovnocennost evropských plemen po stránce tělesné" [The Physical Equivalence of European Races], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 50–51.

¹⁴⁹¹ Malý, "Rovnocennost," 50–51.

¹⁴⁹² Král, "Vědecká práce," 1030–32.

and epistemic challenges, which were brought about by the gradual erosion of the synthetic concepts of nationhood and the growing influence of Nazi race science. Instead, they stemmed from their transnational exchanges. In the first interwar decade, many supporters of eugenics involved with mass gymnastics aimed to harness them for political projects seeking to amalgamate the diverse populations of post-Habsburg countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia. However, the exchanges between Malý, Mydlarski, and Škerlj signaled a coordinated shift away from this trend on a transnational level, even though they did not entirely break away from it. The concept of constitution that these eugenicists employed often served as a veneer to conceal the more exclusionary aspects of the racial nationalism they were ultimately enabling. In essence, while Tandler's earlier efforts sought to position constitutional medicine as an alternative to racial nationalism, by the 1930s this very notion was co-opted to legitimize it.

Conclusion

This chapter aimed to illustrate the conceptual continuity in eugenics between the Habsburg imperial context and the post-imperial era. It did so by focusing on the concepts of symbiosis, human economy, and condition/constitution, which were initially coined or adopted and reevaluated by eugenicists in the imperial context. As this chapter documented, these concepts had been repurposed to inform various attempts to manage the post-imperial hybridity in the post-Habsburg states. Together with the preceding chapter, this chapter has demonstrated the remarkable continuity of practices and concepts between the late Habsburg Empire and its successor states, especially during the first interwar decade.

In the post-imperial context, various actors invoked these concepts for political and epistemic agendas that often pointed in different directions or were even contradictory. Moreover, these agendas did not exclusively incorporate concepts with an imperial genealogy;

instead, they linked them to ideas and theories originating from other contexts. Finally, not all eugenic blueprints in the post-Habsburg states drew on the imperial conceptual toolkit; radical nationalists, in particular, either broke with this legacy or never adopted it in the first place. However, the contested nature, the blending with other theories, and the element of choice inherent in their adoption are not indicators of a decline of the eugenic concepts that embodied the legacy of the imperial situation. Instead, they serve as a prominent testament to the ongoing viability and relevance of these concepts well into the interwar period.

The chapter that follows further solidifies the conclusions made so far and reinforces the overarching argument of this dissertation by highlighting the continuity of networks. Numerous such networks drew on past imperial exchanges to connect eugenicists within the region even during the interwar period. For instance, Johannes Ude, a Catholic and nationalist supporter of eugenics in Austria, leveraged his early involvement in the temperance movement when engaging with peers in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In the late 1920s, Ude co-founded an international committee of eugenically oriented supporters of various facets of the *Lebensreform* movement and co-edited its flagship journal, published in Pressburg/Pozsony/Bratislava.¹⁴⁹³

The following chapter, however, does not seek to catalogue all of these varied and dynamic networks. Instead, it shows how the post-imperial networks were mobilized, one last time, in the mid-1930s, as various supporters of eugenics in post-Habsburg countries sought to

¹⁴⁹³ The committee was known as *Der Internationale Aktionskomité für die Realisierung der wissenschaftlichen Lebensform* [sic!], and many of its activities were centered on the newly coined concept of “eubiotics,” which was proposed by the Czech eugenicist Stanislav Růžicka. Johannes Ude, Stanislav Růžicka, and Hugo E. Feix. “Unsere Organisation,” *Internationale Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Lebensform* [sic!] 21, no. 5–6 (May 1930): 65–66. For the echoes of this somewhat eccentric eugenic project among Hungarian speakers within Hungary and beyond, see, for instance, Johannes Ude, “Akarsz egészséges lenni?” [Do You Want to be Healthy?], *Életreform* 1, no. 2 (June 1932): 11–13; Károly Köröspataki Kiss, *Szép életünk: Eubiotikus-vegetárius erdélyi kis szakácskönyve* [Our Beautiful Life: A Small Eubiotic Vegetarian Transylvanian Cookbook] ([Budapest]: Iránytű, 1932); “Tudományosan racionális alapon akarja újjászervezni életünket az eubiótikai társaság” [The Eubiotic Society Wants to Scientifically Reorganise Our Lives on a Rational Basis], *Brassói Lapok* 39, no. 236 (October 15, 1933): 111.

stake out their frequently ambiguous criticism of racial theories in Nazi Germany. The chapter thus shows the long afterlife of the imperial connections between eugenicists, but also the increasingly unbridgeable divergences and ultimate attrition of these legacies as the 1930s inaugurated more radical forms of nationalism, biopolitics, and their combinations.

PERSISTING REGIONAL LINKS: POST-HABSBURG NETWORKS AND THE RESISTANCE AGAINST NAZI RACIAL THEORIES

On April 23, 1938, Albert Einstein wrote a letter to the anthropologist Franz Boas. In the letter, Einstein drew Boas's attention to the predicament of Hugo Iltis in Brno, Czechoslovakia. Professor Iltis, he explained, was a biologist who wrote "a small pamphlet against the deception of German racial mysticism, and in the current situation, his life is no longer safe in Czechoslovakia."¹⁴⁹⁴ Einstein suggested they help him obtain an invitation to the United States, where Iltis would stay for the foreseeable future.¹⁴⁹⁵ Shortly before the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany, Iltis thus left Europe, never to return.

Iltis was one of several post-Habsburg scientists who observed the ominous rise of Nazism in Germany and raised their voices against the racial theories that they saw as underpinning it. Strikingly, like Iltis, many of these scientists previously supported eugenics, and their names will be familiar to those who have read the previous chapters in this dissertation. Some of these scientists continued to endorse eugenics even in the 1930s. This chapter examines a significant portion of this critical yet ambiguous reaction. It focuses on the writings of Iltis and a 1934 volume directed against Nazi racial theories, published by a collective of nationalist Czech physicians, geneticists, and racial anthropologists. By contextualizing their arguments and mapping the circulation of their ideas in post-Habsburg Central Europe, this

¹⁴⁹⁴ The translation of Einstein's statement, "dass er eine kleine Kampfschrift gegen den Schwindel der deutschen Rassen-Mystik hat erscheinen lassen, und die gegenwärtige Situation hat es auch schon mit sich gebracht, dass er seines Lebens in der Cechoslowackei nicht mehr sicher ist," is mine. American Philosophical Society Digital Library, Manuscripts Department, Franz Boas Papers, Inv. No. Mss.B.B61, Letter, Albert Einstein to Franz Boas, April 23, 1938, <http://www.amphilsoc.org/mole/view?docId=ead/Mss.B.B61-ead.xml> (accessed September 21, 2023). Another translation is available in Iltis, *Race, Genetics, and Science*, 21.

¹⁴⁹⁵ Iltis, *Race, Genetics, and Science*, 21.

chapter reveals the striking persistence of some eugenic theories and networks inherited from the imperial context, at least until the early 1930s.

Christopher Hutton explains that there was a profusion of racial theories in Nazi Germany, and that the key positions had already been formulated some time before the Nazis came to power. Consequently, Nazi Germany after 1933 was not characterized by a “new, clearly identifiable orthodoxy” on race, but rather by clashes between various racial theories vying for the regime’s support.¹⁴⁹⁶ Most scholars share this view and emphasize the resulting “incoherence, heterogeneity, and contradictions” of racial theories in Nazi Germany.¹⁴⁹⁷ This chapter, which examines the arguments and networks of the post-Habsburg critics of these racial theories, does not contradict these findings.

Scientists like Ittis were acutely aware of the numerous racial theories in Germany and the conflicts between them, both before and after the Nazis came to power. They also observed the tensions between these racial theories, on the one hand, and the racial ideology articulated by the prominent Nazis, on the other. Nevertheless, these critics had little doubt about the intimate association between the racial theories they opposed and Nazism when they wrote their first critiques, as early as the late 1920s or in the early 1930s. Moreover, the list of race scientists whose work they saw as complicit significantly expanded over time. Finally, after 1933, they also emphasized the corrosive real-world consequences of these theories in legitimizing Nazi rule. It was clear for Ittis, for example, that “racism is the ideological foundation of German National Socialism.”¹⁴⁹⁸ Describing racism as “intellectual poison gas [geistiges Giftgas],” he emphasized its crucial role in giving an appearance of legitimacy to the repression of “all

¹⁴⁹⁶ Christopher Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), 1.

¹⁴⁹⁷ Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell, “Introduction,” in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 12.

¹⁴⁹⁸ Hugo Ittis, *Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse* (Vienna: Rudolf Harand, 1936), 3.

political, national, and religious minorities” and, ultimately, to a “brutal politics of subjugation and conquest.”¹⁴⁹⁹

This is all the more striking when one considers that even such astute observers of the emerging Nazi regime as the foreign diplomats stationed in Germany did not view racism as a fundamental and distinctive feature of Nazi ideology, as Frank Bajohr recently showed. They also often showed little concern for Nazi racial policies.¹⁵⁰⁰ One factor that made the post-Habsburg scientists, such as Iltis, perceive Nazi racial theories with such a sense of urgency was their intimate experience of differences, clashes, and overlaps between various imperial and nationalist racial blueprints in the defunct Austria-Hungary and its successor states.

Criticizing racial theories they saw as legitimizing Nazi ideology and, eventually, also its policies, these post-Habsburg scientists detected many similar targets, both in terms of actors and arguments, and there was a high degree of agreement about their intellectual genealogy. The key individual who personified Nazi racial theories to these post-Habsburg critics was Hans F. K. Günther, a German linguist turned racial anthropologist promoting Nordacist ideas. This choice was not surprising, given that Günther’s texts, which he had been publishing since the early 1920s, had garnered chillingly broad acclaim.¹⁵⁰¹ Consequently, by the time Iltis and the others were writing, it was widely accepted that Günther was “the most famous race theorist in Nazi Germany,” as historian Dan Stone puts it.¹⁵⁰²

¹⁴⁹⁹ The metaphor appears repeatedly in Iltis’s texts written after 1933. Readers of his texts in East Central Europe sometimes picked up on this metaphor. See, for example, Felix Aderca, “Gaz otrăvitor” [Poison Gas], *Adevărul* 49, no. 15827 (August 23, 1935): 1–2. The citations is from Iltis, *Der Mythos*, 5.

¹⁵⁰⁰ Frank Bajohr, “Nationalist Mobilization: Foreign Diplomats’ Views on the Third Reich, 1933–1945,” in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 374.

¹⁵⁰¹ Rogahn, *Rassismus popularisieren*, passim.

¹⁵⁰² Some historians agree with Christopher Hutton’s argument that some leading Nazi bureaucrats involved in racial policy, such as Walter Gross, became unsympathetic to Günther’s theories in the late 1930s, and Günther’s impact thus diminished. Dan Stone, “Nazi Race Ideologues,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 50, no. 4–5 (2016): 451; Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich*, 149–160.

While their criticism of Günther's arguments had different emphases, all these post-Habsburg critics challenged his blueprint of racial "Nordicization" [Aufnordung] of the nation through a process of "unmixing" [Entmischung]. This notion encapsulated Günther's call for undoing the hybridity of the population in Germany and possibly beyond. Claiming that this unmixing would restore the "Nordic race" to its alleged initial, pure form, and make it prevalent in Germany, this argument directly stemmed from Günther's emphasis on its supposed superiority and his obsession with racial purity.¹⁵⁰³ For his post-Habsburg critics, this idea presented a grim challenge to their "mini-imperial" approaches to the hybridity of their countries, and the region more broadly. In effect, even though they often mentioned other prominent names, such as the racial anthropologist Eugen Fischer, as well, Günther was the primary declared target of these critics.

In confronting Günther's ideas of "unmixing," these post-Habsburg critics constructed some of their key arguments with conceptual tools inherited from their previous imperial situation. They once again drew upon Habsburg imperial tropes related to hybridity, emphasizing its cultural creative power and highlighting intermarriage as one of its non-violent driving forces. Even though they no longer used the concepts of "symbiosis" or "mutual aid" to encapsulate these tropes, the ideas they expressed were closely linked to them. By charting how scientists such as Iltis – who, at this point, also abandoned this vocabulary but not its spirit – contested Nazi racial theories, I show that some imperial eugenic ideas continued to play a fundamental role even more than a decade after the empire's collapse.

This continuity, however, was wedded to change. Apart from the danger posed by Nazi racial theories, there was an additional new development that challenged their critics. By the

¹⁵⁰³ Richard Wetzell, "Eugenics, Racial Science, and Nazi Biopolitics: Was There a Genesis of the 'Final Solution' from the Spirit of Science?" in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Richard Wetzell, Devin Pendas, and Mark Roseman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 154.

time they were writing, a significant epistemic shift related to the scientific theories of heredity had transpired in Germany and broader East Central Europe. As Amir Teicher puts it, Mendelism, a theory including, but not limited to, hard heredity, had become broadly accepted as the theoretical foundation for understanding heredity in humans by the end of the 1920s. What is more, it had also extended its role into a “framework for pursuing human improvement” and a “social theory” that reconfigured some key social, cultural, and political concepts.¹⁵⁰⁴

That was a significant break with the 1910s and most of the 1920s when there was “a rich variety of political-epistemic options” related to the theories of heredity, as sociologist Maurizio Meloni points out.¹⁵⁰⁵ Back then, there were still neo-Lamarckian options which stipulated the possibility of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. These soft-hereditarian approaches emphasized the biological plasticity of humans and, therefore, the prospect of their change. There was thus an available alternative to the strengthening Mendelian framework that posited the timeless essence of genes and, by extension, of human nature.¹⁵⁰⁶

To complicate things further, biological theories of heredity became closely intertwined with political ideologies by the crisis-ridden end of the 1920s. Before this “crystallization of political value links to specific biological interpretations” occurred, as Loren Graham argues in his classical study, hard-hereditarian approaches were flexible enough to interact with both left-wing and right-wing political thought.¹⁵⁰⁷ Conversely, neo-Lamarckism was originally widespread not only among socialists but also among conservatives. However, Graham argues that during the political confrontations of the 1920s, Mendelism became primarily associated with ideologies on the Right.¹⁵⁰⁸ In turn, neo-Lamarckism became closely linked to the political

¹⁵⁰⁴ Amir Teicher, *Social Mendelism: Genetics and the Politics of Race in Germany, 1900–1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 21–24, 70–100.

¹⁵⁰⁵ Meloni, *Political Biology*, 29.

¹⁵⁰⁶ Meloni, *Political Biology*, 29.

¹⁵⁰⁷ Graham, “Science and Values,” 1138.

¹⁵⁰⁸ Graham, “Science and Values,” 1153.

Left, before ultimately ceasing to be a viable option altogether, at least in Germany and much of East Central Europe.¹⁵⁰⁹

Well until the 1920s, most post-Habsburg scientists who later emerged as critics of Nazi racial theories, including Hugo Iltis, supported Neo-Lamarckism. Even though they did not see the inheritance of acquired characteristics and Mendelian heredity as strictly opposed, and selectively integrated some elements of Mendelism into their theories, Neo-Lamarckism was fundamental both for their science and for their politics.¹⁵¹⁰ It attenuated the hereditary determinism of their theories and underpinned their reformist politics, whether in a socialist or national liberal variant. If humans could shape their bodies by controlling their environment, they would cease to be – to use Kammerer’s metaphors – “slaves of the past,” but rather turn into “architects of their own future.”¹⁵¹¹ Like Kammerer, and sometimes inspired by him, they also embraced eugenics based on these assumptions, as the previous chapters have analyzed. Thus, when writing their critiques of Nazi racial science, they found themselves facing a significant epistemic and ideological dilemma.

The choice was stark: if they abandoned Lamarck and limited themselves to Mendel, they had to renegotiate the relationship between their political ideology and hard heredity. Conversely, should they include the inheritance of acquired characteristics, they ran the risk of defending reformist politics only at the expense of drawing on a theory that was increasingly regarded as discredited. In both cases, however, they needed to revisit their modernist eugenic project of regenerating the subject by mastering its environment. The chapter shows that many opted for the former, shifting from staunch defenders of neo-Lamarckism into Mendelians, and

¹⁵⁰⁹ Meloni, *Political Biology*, 94.

¹⁵¹⁰ Gliboff, “The Case of Paul Kammerer,” 529.

¹⁵¹¹ Paul Kammerer, *Sind wir Sklaven der Vergangenheit oder Werkmeister der Zukunft?: Anpassung, Vererbung, Rassenhygiene in dualistischer und monistischer Betrachtungsweise*, 2nd ed (Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1921).

attempting to use its intricacies against the simplistic hereditary determinism of racial theorists such as Günther.¹⁵¹² Their trajectory usually led from supporting left-leaning, neo-Lamarckian eugenic projects in the 1920s to a scientific criticism of Nazi racial theories, informed by Mendelism, in the 1930s. However, in some cases, this criticism was disturbingly accompanied by a continuing commitment to eugenics.

As already mentioned, this chapter ventures beyond reconstructing the arguments of these early and seemingly unlikely critics of Nazi racial theories. It also explores the circulation of their arguments and the networks that enabled it. I demonstrate that these individuals, including Hugo Iltis, Viktor Lebzelter, Vladislav Růžička, and Božo Škerlj, were acutely aware of each other's ideas, which circulated within post-Habsburg countries and, to some extent, also beyond. In fact, they often facilitated this circulation by citing, reporting on, and critically engaging with each other's works, as well as by modifying their own arguments in response to the views of their counterparts. In other words, I argue that their criticism was a transnationally negotiated phenomenon. My analysis in this chapter, therefore, departs from the existing scholarship, which, while it has uncovered most of these figures, analyzed them as isolated and somewhat eccentric cases within their national contexts.¹⁵¹³ Thus, this chapter again suggests that such methodological nationalism obstructs a more complex understanding of these actors and their arguments.

This circulation of ideas was often enabled by shared connections. While these critics did not form a formal international association, they had robust informal networks. These networks crossed ideological and religious divides and connected critics of racial theories from

¹⁵¹² In emphasizing this shift, I depart from previous scholarship that, influenced by Graham's argument, linked these critics of Nazi racial theories squarely with neo-Lamarckism. The cracks in this interpretation have recently become more visible, however. Paul Weindling, for example, now concedes that Iltis switched to Mendelism. Weindling, "Introduction," 35.

¹⁵¹³ For this scholarship, see the literature cited in individual subchapters.

various political groupings. Despite their informal and diverse character, however, it was these networks that enabled the circulation of ideas, which, in turn, sparked vigorous debates about racial theories in several national contexts. The crucial glue that held these informal networks together, the chapter shows, were the shared legacies of the Habsburg Empire and a shared regional setting.

Indicative of the shared Habsburg legacies that motivated these critics of Nazi racial theories were their past and present connections to early Viennese supporters of eugenics. One of the most striking examples of these connections was that several of these critics were previously involved with the Viennese biological experimental station known as the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*. In the late imperial period, the experimental station was the workplace of researchers such as Paul Kammerer or Eugen Steinach and stood out due to its sophisticated equipment, which allowed the researchers to create and control a wide variety of environments for their experiments.¹⁵¹⁴ Importantly, the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt* was not only entwined within the urban context of the Habsburg metropolis.

From its inception, the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt* offered opportunities to several researchers every year to use its facilities for their research. Those who chose to conduct research there were by no means limited to German-speaking Austrians; instead, they reflected the diversity of the empire. Consequently, dozens of researchers from regions that later became parts of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Romania conducted research at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, either before or after 1918.¹⁵¹⁵ Some of the earliest critics of Nazi racial theories were former researchers at the experimental station and maintained connections with their peers who had a similar formative experience. They were just one example of how

¹⁵¹⁴ For the literature on the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, refer to chapter 5 of this dissertation.

¹⁵¹⁵ Przibram, “Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt in Wien: Zweck, Einrichtung und Tätigkeit,” 17–20; Przibram, “Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt, Ausgestaltung und Tätigkeit,” 232–35.

imperial legacies, particularly the past connection to Viennese eugenicists, shaped the arguments and networks of early critics of Nazi racial theories in post-Habsburg countries.

Despite their shared legacy of connections, the trajectories of these individuals began to diverge significantly during the post-imperial transitions. Their positionality within the post-Habsburg countries was as decisive in this regard as their ideological positioning. Some of these critics became a part of the national majorities in these countries and aligned themselves with national liberal or conservative ideologies. While they vocally opposed Nazi racial theories, their primary goal was to find biological arguments in defense of majority-centric nation-building projects in their respective countries. To this end, their arguments heavily drew on contemporary genetics, as well as on racial anthropology. Disturbingly, they often contrasted a narrowly defined list of “pseudoscientific” racist theories that were compromised with Nazism, with the remaining “objective” racial anthropology. In line with these intellectual sources, moreover, they not only persisted in defining national identity in racial terms but also delved deeply into eugenics. In a final, dark twist on the imperial trope of intermarriage, their position allowed for a selective politics of assimilation paired with coercive eugenic measures.

Conversely, there were also those who had been marginalized in post-Habsburg countries, either as members of these countries’ ethnic minorities, as socialists, or as women. Their critiques of Nazi racial theories were much more fundamental and went beyond questioning whether these arguments had a basis in contemporary science of heredity. In their sociologically-informed arguments, these authors placed Nazi racial theories within a history of prejudice, domination, and oppression and ultimately scrutinized parts of contemporary genetics and physical anthropology for their complicity in justifying such ideas. While in some cases, their criticism remained limited to Nazi racial theories, in other instances, they pursued a more global critique of attempts to employ race to construct or defend social hierarchies. Crucially, many of these scholars adopted the term racism, translating it from contemporary

discussions in France. They subsequently played a pioneering role in using this critical concept in East Central Europe to grasp and condemn the phenomena they resisted.

At the Interface of Resistance: Czechoslovakia and The Critics of Nazi Racial Theories

In the early 1930s, Czechoslovakia became a hub for early critics of Nazi racial theories and their ideas. The sections that follow show that, for a brief moment, Czechoslovakia served as a vital interface linking global discourses of race with the post-imperial racial discussions within the countries that replaced Austria-Hungary. In this context, concepts of diversity management inherited from eugenic and other racial debates in the former Habsburg Empire were renegotiated in a critical response to the political challenge of emerging Nazi racial theories, as well as the changing epistemic landscape in genetics. The result was a combination of urgency and innovation in which different actors experimented with various arguments against Nazi racial theories and tested them with diverse audiences at the local, regional, or even global level.

This dynamic was not unprecedented, as the Bohemian Lands repeatedly acted as a “switchboard” for knowledge circulation, as pointed out by Franz Fillafer, both in the former imperial setting and in the interwar period.¹⁵¹⁶ In this case, however, the circulation was authorised by official policy. Andrea Orzoff argues that Czechoslovakia’s political leaders, including the country’s president, Masaryk, recognized the crucial importance of international alliances for the establishment and continued existence of the new state, given its growing regional challenges. Consequently, they adopted a cultural foreign policy as a “parallel effort

¹⁵¹⁶ Franz Leander Fillafer, “Böhmen interimperial. Die böhmische Jurisprudenz als Drehscheibe der zentraleuropäischen Wissenszirkulation,” *Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte Österreichs* 1 (2022): 163–80.

to engage with elites abroad.”¹⁵¹⁷ Indeed, it was the sociologist and somewhat reluctant observer of racial discussions in former Austria-Hungary, Masaryk, who emerged as the primary official in Czechoslovakia supporting several critics of Nazi racial theories. Importantly, as we will see, these critics came from various backgrounds and embedded their arguments within different projects of collective identity. Nevertheless, by endorsing their research and activism, Masaryk effectively linked these initiatives to Czechoslovakia’s cultural policy.

One crucial figure who clearly bridged the late imperial Viennese debates on race with interwar critiques of Nazi racial theories in Czechoslovakia was Ignaz Zollschan, a physician now based in Karlsbad. Earlier, however, Zollschan was based in the imperial metropolis, as Paul Weindling explains, and played a pioneering role as a critic of Houston Stewart Chamberlain’s racial theories. For Zollschan, however, this critique was simultaneously an opportunity. As a committed supporter of the Zionist movement, he leveraged his critique of Chamberlain’s anti-Semitism to propose a racial definition of Jewish identity.¹⁵¹⁸ Moreover, as Weindling elucidates, in the aftermath of the empire’s collapse and the upsurge of nationalism in the region, Zollschan further nuanced his position, moving away from his earlier emphasis on racial purity toward a view that “Zionism could be blended with internationalism, thereby upholding the ideals of international peace and cooperation.”¹⁵¹⁹

As detailed archival research by Michal Šimůnek shows, Masaryk had interacted with Zollschan already in the late imperial Vienna.¹⁵²⁰ Their subsequent alliance in the 1930s drew

¹⁵¹⁷ Andrea Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle: The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe, 1914-1948* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 15.

¹⁵¹⁸ Weindling, “Central Europe Confronts,” 267.

¹⁵¹⁹ Weindling, “Central Europe Confronts,” 268–69.

¹⁵²⁰ Michal Šimůnek, “‘...před areopagem učenců z celého světa’: tzv. Zollschanova akce (Zollschan-Aktion) mezi vědou, diplomacií a politikou, 1933–1938” [‘...Before the Areopagus of Scholars from all over the World’: The So-called Zollschan-Aktion Between Science, Diplomacy and Politics, 1933-1938], in *Za rovnocennost evropských plemen: Československá antropologie tváří v tvář rasismu a nacismu* [For the Equivalence of European

on this shared imperial entanglement. Zollschan's critique, now directed at Nazi anti-Semitism, was endorsed by Masaryk, and to some extent, coordinated with him.¹⁵²¹ However, at this juncture, Zollschan had further reframed his earlier ideas, now drawing on the theories of Franz Boas, with whom he had conducted research during his stay in New York in 1925.¹⁵²² As a result, his emphasis was now on culture, even though he retained his neo-Lamarckism, and the boundary between culture and biology remained indistinct.¹⁵²³ With his calls for a scientific critique of Nazi racial theories, Zollschan formed significant alliances in Northern and Western Europe, as well as across the Atlantic.¹⁵²⁴ However, their impact in post-Habsburg countries and broader East Central Europe was more limited. While this outcome warrants further study, one possible explanation may be that emphasizing culture as a liberal, accommodating alternative to race was difficult to reconcile with the dominance of cultural nationalism in this region, particularly considering its growing virulence and exclusionary nature in the interwar period.

In parallel with Zollschan, Masaryk also supported, and perhaps even co-instigated, another public statement against Nazi racial theories. In contrast to Zollschan, who belonged to Czechoslovakia's Jewish minority and had been marginalized by the local academia, this other statement was authored by a group of senior Czech scientists. As a positivist, Masaryk demanded that politics must be informed by science, and even transform into a science of its own. In line with this view, he believed such a statement would provide an objective, authoritative foundation for a potentially divisive political debate about race and racial theories that he expected would take place in Czechoslovakia.¹⁵²⁵ The result, a book titled *Rovnocennost*

Races: Czechoslovak Anthropology in the Face of Racism and Nazism], ed. Milan Ducháček (Prague: NLN, 2023), 77 and 83.

¹⁵²¹ Šimůnek, "před areopagem," 89.

¹⁵²² Weindling, "Central Europe Confronts," 269.

¹⁵²³ Weindling, "Central Europe Confronts," 274.

¹⁵²⁴ Šimůnek, "před areopagem," passim.

¹⁵²⁵ Milan Ducháček and Michaela Lenčářová, "Sborník Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování jako křížovka československé meziválečné antropologie i kulturní propagandy" [The Volume the

evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování (The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement) was published in 1934 by the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts.¹⁵²⁶

While interwar Czechoslovakia was a multiethnic state, all nine of the book's authors were nationalist Czechs. Written by scientists identifying with the country's titular national majority, the book viewed Nazi racial theories as a significant challenge to the project of post-imperial, integration-oriented nation-building in Czechoslovakia. It aimed to safeguard its alleged results, in their hybridity, distinctiveness, and territorial scope. By positing "the nation" as its central point of reference, the book's arguments resonated in other states of post-Habsburg Central Europe, which faced similar challenges.

The authors of the book also occupied some of the most influential positions within its academic field. For instance, three of them served as past or future rectors of the country's leading university. Furthermore, these scientists held influential positions within Czech eugenics networks, including the head of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society, all interwar editors-in-chief of the flagship anthropological journal, and the future director of the State Institute of Public Health.¹⁵²⁷ The contributors to *The Equivalence* thus represented the official voice of interwar Czechoslovak academia. This seniority also meant that a significant part of them commenced their careers already in the late Habsburg Empire and were shaped by its intellectual context.

Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement as an Intersection of Czechoslovak Interwar Anthropology and Cultural Propaganda], in *Za rovnocennost evropských plemen: Československá antropologie tváří v tvář rasismu a nacismu* [For the Equivalence of European Races: Czechoslovak Anthropology in the Face of Racism and Nazism], ed. Milan Ducháček (Prague: NLN, 2023), 12.

¹⁵²⁶ Karel Weigner, ed., *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement] (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934).

¹⁵²⁷ Janko, *Vědy o životě*, passim.

The principal contributors to the book recruited evenly from among physical anthropologists (Jindřich Matiegka and Jiří Malý), experimental biologists (Vladislav Růžička and Artur Brožek) and medical doctors (Karel Weigner and Hynek Pelc).¹⁵²⁸ In epistemic terms, this interdisciplinarity was made possible by a shared commitment to Mendelian genetics. For some of these authors, however, it represented a recent shift in perspective. For instance, as we have seen, both the biologist Růžička and physician Weigner continued to endorse neo-Lamarckism into the 1920s. However, by the time they contributed to this book, even these authors had repositioned themselves as Mendelians. Růžička now asserted that “the inheritance of racial features follows Mendelian rules; it does not differ in this regard from the inheritance of other characteristics of organisms.”¹⁵²⁹ Similarly, Weigner reluctantly acknowledged that, according to the science of genetics, one could no longer “believe that traits acquired through any form of training can be passed on to future generations.”¹⁵³⁰

While not all authors of *The Equivalence* shared a single political ideology, a significant number among them had an affinity with national liberalism.¹⁵³¹ As Oskar Mulej elucidates, in Central Europe, this political ideology exhibited a substantial tension between its liberal and nationalist elements. Consequently, despite its liberal origins, it gradually evolved toward a more illiberal, nationalist, and in some cases, even authoritarian stances.¹⁵³² Another layer of complexity was produced by the fact that the authors of *The Equivalence* navigated their way

¹⁵²⁸ The book also contained three appendices that were tilted towards the humanities.

¹⁵²⁹ Vladislav Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa plemennou hygienou či eugenikou” [Improving the State of the Nation through Race Hygiene or through Eugenics?], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 75.

¹⁵³⁰ Karel Weigner, “Význam tělesné výchovy pro zlepšení rasy” [The Importance of Physical Education for the Improvement of Race], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 110.

¹⁵³¹ For example, the racial anthropologist Matiegka was a long-term card-carrying member of the National Democracy, and a member of its medical committee. His personal documents prove that he was still a member in 1933, when the work on *The Equivalence* started. Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 1, Inv. No. 44 and 52, Membership cards for various years.

¹⁵³² Oskar Mulej, “National Liberals and Their Progeny. Approaching the Peculiar Developments in Central European Liberal Party Traditions, 1867–1918,” *Acta Poloniae Historica* 111 (2015): 68.

within a local political context in which some liberals did not follow this trajectory. Instead, they rejuvenated their ideology in the early twentieth century by embracing social reform. This numerically small group exerted an outsized influence on interwar Czechoslovakia's culture and politics.¹⁵³³ Significantly, Masaryk, the main political backer of the *The Equivalence*, played a pivotal role in initiating this shift in the Czech-speaking context around the year 1900 and served as its symbol during the interwar period.

Despite the overlaps in the epistemic and political values of the book's authors, they seem to have struggled to establish a consistent common position. Tellingly, the volume lacked a clearly formulated outline of what the authors perceived as the unifying thread in their interventions. The tensions that the volume revealed that its authors experimented with different ways of negotiating between Mendelism and their ideological commitments, often within the framework of national liberalism. Nevertheless, despite these internal tensions and ambiguities, the book did indicate a coalescing agreement on several key points.

One point of agreement between the authors of *The Equivalence* was their choice of Hans Günther as the primary target of their criticism. They rejected both his specific narrative of racial superiority, revolving around the construct of "Nordic race," and his proposed eugenic strategy. While they maintained the concept of racial types, treating them as if they constituted a real entity, they argued that none of these alleged types could be deemed superior. While this revision primarily targeted Nordicism ideas, whose emergence, as Matiegka observed, was "immediately and inextricably linked to anti-Semitism," it was not limited to them.¹⁵³⁴ Instead, citing various typologies of contemporary racial anthropologists, *The Equivalence* argued that

¹⁵³³ Mulej, "National Liberals," 78.

¹⁵³⁴ Jindřich Matiegka, "Dějiny problému o nerovnocennosti nebo rovnocennosti evropských plemen" [History of the Problem of Inequality or Equivalence of European Races], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 10.

these alleged “races” were equivalent in their supposed physical and mental abilities (which, additionally, were not straightforwardly connected). Moreover, in line with transnational racial anthropology of the time, the book represented European nations as hybrid entities constituted by various stipulated races. Finally, *The Equivalence* rejected the notion, dating back at least to Gobineau, that portrayed racial purity as the alleged cause of degeneracy, decline, and civilizational collapse. Instead, drawing on the old set of tropes inherited from the Habsburg context, they emphasized the culturally creative nature of hybridity.¹⁵³⁵ This critique of Nazi racial theories was linked with an emphasis on the critics’ commitment to positivist methods and framed their criticism as a clash between corrupt science and objective scientific knowledge.

Against Günther’s arguments for “unmixing,” *The Equivalence* drew on Mendelism, turning its complexities into a critique of racial hygiene. For example, the biologist Růžička argued that an attempt to recreate pure racial types by enforcing endogamy would be doomed to failure, as all individuals were “polyhybrid” from a Mendelian perspective. That is, they differed in manifold ways. Consequently, it would necessarily lead to “the emergence of as many combinations between parental traits as are mathematically possible, and the variability of the offspring would thus be immense.”¹⁵³⁶ Moreover, the biologist questioned the possibility that racial hygienists could even select the preferred individuals based on their appearance in the first place. Drawing on phenogenetics, he claimed that “the image of the nation detectable today corresponds, from a biological perspective, to [...] a mixture of so-called phenotypes, individuals in whom one cannot distinguish, through mere visual examination, whether or how deeply their characteristics are rooted in heredity.”¹⁵³⁷ Interpreting nations as “constitutionally highly complex Mendelian populations,” *The Equivalence* argued that a reversal of such

¹⁵³⁵ Weigner, *Rovnocennost evropských plemen*, passim.

¹⁵³⁶ Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa,” 76.

¹⁵³⁷ Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa,” 80.

hybridity was not only undesirable but also simply impossible.¹⁵³⁸ However, the argument against racial superiority and for hybridity put forth in *The Equivalence* was restricted in its scope.

As historian Devin Pendas points out, Nazi racial theories and policies differed from most “modern racializing regimes operat[ing] along what Du Bois called the ‘global color line.’”¹⁵³⁹ Instead, the Nazis brutally attempted to “constitute racial difference entirely among Europeans.”¹⁵⁴⁰ The authors of *The Equivalence* primarily aimed to counter these arguments in order to shield the integration-oriented nation-building project in Czechoslovakia. Consequently, they did not explore whether Nazi racial theories targeted groups beyond what they considered as Europeans. Nor did they consider other forms of racism that thrived outside of Nazi Germany, such as those in colonial contexts. In effect, the “equivalence” in the book’s title primarily referred to “European races”, with a strong emphasis on their position “on the ‘white’ side of the color line.”¹⁵⁴¹ This emphasis on whiteness was a recurrent feature in the book. Even the physical anthropologist Malý, who initially objected to theories of racial supremacy with regards to any human group, ultimately stressed the “equivalence of racial types within the white race in Europe.”¹⁵⁴²

Thus, the authors of *The Equivalence* inscribed themselves into an emerging transnational trend, provoked by the rise of Nazi racial theories, that proposed a move away from race as a political category in favor of a European commonality. For example, the British biologist Julian Huxley and ethnologist Alfred Haddon made a similar bid in their book *We*

¹⁵³⁸ Artur Brožek, “Biologický pojem rasy” [The Biological Concept of Race], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 28.

¹⁵³⁹ Devin Pendas, “Racial States in Comparative Perspective,” in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 118.

¹⁵⁴⁰ Pendas, Roseman and Wetzell, “Introduction,” 11.

¹⁵⁴¹ Pendas, “Racial States,” 118.

¹⁵⁴² Malý, “Rovnocennost,” 51. See also Brožek, “Biologický pojem,” 28.

Europeans, published in 1935. Philosopher Robert Bernasconi is one recent analyst who observes that while it suggested abandoning the word race as a political category, this proposal was underpinned by a strong emphasis on whiteness as foundational for the commonality of Europeans. “The book might as well have been called *We Whites*,” he adds.¹⁵⁴³ However, while these British scientists sought to undermine anti-colonial nationalism alongside their declared target, and proposed to abandon both “race” and “nation” in favor of a less politically charged notion of “ethnic groups,” the nationalist authors of *The Equivalence* retained the nation as their central analytical and political category.¹⁵⁴⁴

While *The Equivalence* primarily focused on countering Günther’s ideas, it also contained a critical engagement with another racial theory debated in Nazi Germany. This theory revolved precisely around the idea of nation, or *Volk*, casting it as the “German race” in the making. While its proponents, the botanist Friedrich Merckenschlager and racial anthropologist Karl Saller, held favorable views of Nazism, their attempt after 1933 to promote these theories to shape Nazi policy failed. Even though their ideas initially resonated with some Nazis, the theory early on lost to Günther’s Nordicism, and its proponents were suppressed.¹⁵⁴⁵ While the critique of the notion of the “German race” that *The Equivalence* contained was often implicit, it was nevertheless revealing of the ambiguous positioning and reframing of the book’s nationalist authors.

A brief explanation of Saller’s and Merckenschlager’s political and epistemic positioning is necessary at this juncture. Acknowledging that their primary political point of reference, the German *Volk*, was hybrid, they sought to recast this notion in a positive light, as Christopher

¹⁵⁴³ Robert Bernasconi, “A Most Dangerous Error: The Boasian Myth of a Knock-Down Argument against Racism,” in *Critical Philosophy of Race: Essays*, by Robert Bernasconi (New York: Oxford University Press, 2023), 225.

¹⁵⁴⁴ Glenda Sluga, “UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley,” *Journal of World History* 21, no. 3 (September 2010): 401.

¹⁵⁴⁵ Wetzell, “Eugenics, Racial Science,” 154.

Hutton explains. They did so by asserting that “as a collective [the Volk] was, or could become, a race.”¹⁵⁴⁶ What allowed Saller and Merckenschlager to claim that the molding of a new “German race” was possible was their assumption that “race” was constantly subject to change. This dynamic concept of race was, in part, predicated on a neo-Lamarckian emphasis on the “direct interaction between soil, plant, and man.”¹⁵⁴⁷ Additionally, they emphasized the widespread occurrence of “racial mixing” as another reason for the instability of “race.” Asserting that “racial mixing” was particularly significant in what they referred to as “contact regions,” they highlighted the supposedly active role of these areas in shaping German culture and the “German race.” They claimed that both were constantly being forged and reformed precisely in these “transitional and mixed zones where several races overlapped.”¹⁵⁴⁸ While Merckenschlager and Saller softened Günther’s concerns about racial purity and Nordic superiority, their emphasis on the fluidity of boundaries and the hybridity of “race” was also far from politically innocuous, as it underpinned a *völkisch* vision of territorial expansion.

Both Saller and Merckenschlager were influenced by the ideas of German intellectuals associated with the Conservative Revolution. They had a particular affinity for the circle of Ernst Niekisch, a theorist of National Bolshevism. Sharing to a significant extent his idea of German expansion to the East, and the absorption not only of the ethnic Germans but also of other local populations, they developed a racial concept that aligned with these goals.¹⁵⁴⁹ Tellingly, one of their volumes was subtitled “a German biology written from the East.”¹⁵⁵⁰ While the neo-Lamarckism and synthesis-oriented ideas of Saller and Merckenschlager had some analogies with the eugenic projects of mini-imperial nation-building in East Central

¹⁵⁴⁶ Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich*, 149.

¹⁵⁴⁷ Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich*, 154.

¹⁵⁴⁸ Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich*, 151.

¹⁵⁴⁹ Jürgen Elvert, *Mitteleuropa!: Deutsche Pläne zur europäischen Neuordnung (1918-1945)* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 312.

¹⁵⁵⁰ Wetzell, “Eugenics, Racial Science,” 155.

Europe, it is important not to overestimate them. Indeed, their approach fundamentally threatened to erase the specificity and boundaries of these supra-ethnic blueprints.

The authors of *The Equivalence* rejected the notion that there could be a single German, Czech, Slav, or any other “race” coextensive with the nation. To this end, they employed Mendelism and the arguments it presented against the possibility of the emergence of such an entity. Several contributors to *The Equivalence* pointed out that genetic differences were fixed, and could not be altered even by long exposure to shared environmental influences.¹⁵⁵¹ While the intricacies of Mendelism made hybrid groups impossible to disentangle (contrary to Günther), their insulation from the environment also made them impossible to amalgamate into a coherent whole.

When an author of *The Equivalence* stated that “the nation is composed mostly of multiracial hybrids,” this did not indicate a point of disagreement with Saller and Merckenschlager, who notably emphasized both the widespread occurrence and innovative potential of hybridity.¹⁵⁵² Nonetheless, their concept of an emerging “German race” was rooted in the belief that its various individual constitutive components would somehow combine to form a harmonious higher unity while preserving its national specificity. This emphasis, in turn, indicates that Saller and Merckenschlager, similar to other thinkers influenced by the Conservative Revolution, employed non-mechanistic explanatory approaches, such as holism.¹⁵⁵³

In contrast, their Czech critics largely remained committed to positivism and mechanistic approaches. Consequently, while the former believed that a new German racial synthesis would emerge from “racial mixing,” their critics did not share this view. For example,

¹⁵⁵¹ Brožek, “Biologický pojem,” 28.

¹⁵⁵² Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa,” 78.

¹⁵⁵³ Elvert, *Mitteleuropa!*, 312.

what the biologist Růžička saw as the nation was merely a sum of its parts: “the most complex mixture of characters of various races,” in which each individual represented “a very diverse mosaic of racial traits.”¹⁵⁵⁴ Thus, by emphasizing mechanistic explanations and the individualizing features of Mendelism, Růžička rendered the eugenic claims of Saller and Merckenschlager as unlikely as the ideas of their opponent, Günther. These arguments, directed against the notion of a “dynamic race,” illustrate that the authors of *The Equivalence* by this point to a certain extent retreated from their emphasis on integration-oriented nation-building that marked the 1920s, even though they did not entirely abandon it.

The authors of *The Equivalence* rejected attempts at radical revision of collective identity that sought a national ontology and claimed to have found it in a race. Instead, they sharply contrasted the concepts of nation and race. For example, Matiegka clearly stated that there was no inherent relationship between the two, asserting that “nation and race are not bound together.”¹⁵⁵⁵ That meant not only that *The Equivalence* rejected the notion that each nation represented a separate “race,” which most racial anthropologists had already abandoned by this point. The book also sought to discredit the more broadly held narratives of “national races.” These racial narratives posited one alleged type — “Nordic,” “Alpine,” or other — as the foundational element for the identity of the otherwise mixed imagined national community. Contrary to these beliefs, *The Equivalence* was adamant that it was culture, rather than biology, that constituted the central element of national identity. Defining nationhood as the “awareness of the commonality of cultural assets,” the book even emphasized the porous nature of its boundaries and the element of individual choice: it was “possible [for a person] to partially or completely renounce such commonality” and join another imagined community.¹⁵⁵⁶ Thus, *The*

¹⁵⁵⁴ Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa,” 77.

¹⁵⁵⁵ Jindřich Matiegka, “Dnešní stav znalosti evropských plemen” [Today’s State of Knowledge of European Races], in *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], ed. Karel Weigner (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934), 34.

¹⁵⁵⁶ Matiegka, “Dnešní stav,” 33.

Equivalence conceptualized biology as fixed but hybrid due to intermarriage, and culture as homogenous yet with boundaries porous enough to be crossed through cultural choices.

The devil was in the details. Drawing on a Habsburg imperial trope dating back to at least the mid-nineteenth century, when it assumed central role for imperial ethnographers like the statistician Karl von Czoernig, *The Equivalence* posited racial mixing as a driving force behind dynamic cultural development.¹⁵⁵⁷ Not only did *The Equivalence* portray regions like contemporary Austria and Czechoslovakia as hybrid areas of cultural innovation, but it also strongly implied that the claimed local cultural and psychological distinctiveness were a result of the particular mixture that had occurred there.

In this concealed racial ontology of the Czech national character, Matiegka – a former contributor to the Austrian *Kronprinzenwerk* and a Czech nationalist – drew on his previous racial research. He argued that the “Alpine type,” served as the foundation for the local population. (This purported entity was previously referred to as “Celtic” and played a central role in earlier Habsburg imperial ethnographies, including Czoernig’s.)¹⁵⁵⁸ In the population, Matiegka claimed it to have been interwoven with a prominent “Dinaric” element, purportedly pronounced in Bohemia, along with “Nordic” and “Baltic” additions.¹⁵⁵⁹ While the “Dinaric type” served as the central building block in the racial conceptualization of Yugoslav nationhood, and in Matiegka’s argument represented a claim of close affinity, he also asserted the racial construct most favored by German nationalists, and last of all, the “Baltic type” often associated with the Slavs.¹⁵⁶⁰ Having previously disentangled race and nation in the present,

¹⁵⁵⁷ Brigitte Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht: Anthropologische Diskurse in Österreich 1850-1960* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2003), 152–55 and 216.

¹⁵⁵⁸ On Czoernig’s Celticist imperial anthropology, see Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht*, 160–62.

¹⁵⁵⁹ Matiegka, “Dnešní stav,” 40.

¹⁵⁶⁰ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, passim.

this argument now partially reversed this liberal nationalist stance by reestablishing a connection between them in the (pre)historical past.

It should come as no surprise that Franz Boas, who learned about the project behind *The Equivalence* from Zollschan as early as January 1934 and received a German translation of the resulting book in March 1935, expressed his reservations regarding such line of argument. Specifically, he informed Matiegka that “I feel very strongly that further work, particularly on the border-line of anthropology and psychology, should be done.”¹⁵⁶¹

While *The Equivalence* presented a critique of Nazi racial theories, although rather ambiguous, it also vigorously endorsed eugenics. Indeed, the last part of this book’s title, referring to the “paths to their improvement,” denoted precisely this modernist strategy of alleged racial betterment. Here, the impact of the move away from neo-Lamarckism was also palpable. Even though *The Equivalence* still devoted some space to discussing mass gymnastics and public health policies, both of which previously constituted important measures embraced by several Czech eugenicists, in this 1934 book, not even the former neo-Lamarckians who previously supported these policies dared to claim they could have any tangible effect on heredity. (They still continued to support these policies, however, arguing that they contributed to the actualization of individuals’ inborn potentials during their lifetime.)¹⁵⁶² While these neo-Lamarckian strategies were no longer considered viable, eugenic sterilizations took their place, ironically most saliently in a chapter authored by another former vocal neo-Lamarckist, Růžička.

¹⁵⁶¹ Interestingly, in the letter, Boas apologized for writing in English, rather than in German. Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 7, Inv. No. 109, Letter, Franz Boas to Jindřich Matiegka, March 25, 1935. See also American Philosophical Society Digital Library, Manuscripts Department, Franz Boas Papers, Inv. No. Mss.B.B61, Letter, “Weigner [Sic!] to Boas,” December 22, 1933, <http://www.amphilsoc.org/mole/view?docId=ead/Mss.B.B61-ead.xml> (accessed September 21, 2023).

¹⁵⁶² Pelc, “O možnostech zdokonaliti lidský rod,” *passim*.

Růžička previously followed with interest the biological research at the Viennese *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, and actively engaged in exchanges with some of its researchers. However, his departure from neo-Lamarckism marked a significant shift in his eugenic project. Let us recall that in the 1920s, his aim was to amalgamate various groups into the Czech - or possibly, Czechoslovak - nation, defined in biological terms. Furthermore, he emphasized the alleged need to “normalize” the constitution of this population, primarily through public health policies and other measures that created a shared environment. While the focus on normalization and the concept of a “national constitution” became even more central to Růžička’s biopolitical thinking in the 1930s, it was extricated from its former assumptions about biological plasticity.

Having left neo-Lamarckism behind, but retaining his positivist commitment, Růžička now defined the norm as a dynamically changing statistical average within a population, disconnected from assumptions about the environment or prescriptions about national identity. Nevertheless, he now underlined even more emphatically that the next generation must “always inherit the normal constitution. We cannot allow the beneficial qualities of the population to fall below the average. At the same time, we must weaken the conspicuous negative features. Both must remain at the normal level.”¹⁵⁶³ As Růžička identified “racial fitness” with the norm, and the norm with the statistical average, anything diverging from this average became a potential vital challenge to the population in question. Exogamy, on the other hand, was not perceived as a significant threat by Růžička.¹⁵⁶⁴ Interestingly, the eugenicist stayed entirely silent about the definition or the boundaries of the population that he identified with the nation, which was particularly striking given that Czechoslovakia was a multiethnic country. In part, his inability to set apart the intended target of eugenic interventions was a consequence of

¹⁵⁶³ Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa,” 86.

¹⁵⁶⁴ Růžička, “Zlepšení stavu národa,” *passim*.

Růžička's emphasis on the hybridity and fragmentation of the nation's presumed biological characteristics. At the same time, there may have been a strategic element to this ambiguity, as it expanded the potential number of targets for the coercive measures he advocated.

Indeed, in a dark turn, Růžička also altered the biopolitical strategy he promoted to achieve his outlined goals. As environmental influences no longer played a decisive role in shaping human heredity, welfare policies and education were considered to have little substantial impact. Instead, Růžička placed a strong emphasis on eugenic control of reproduction for both those who embodied the "healthy average," according to his perspective, and those who deviated from it. His primary recommendation was a program of forced sterilizations that would apply to individuals with a wide range of illnesses and those he considered criminals. He even cited the forced sterilizations in Nazi Germany as a model to follow.¹⁵⁶⁵ In addition to this measure, Růžička proposed banning access to birth control for the working and peasant classes, arguing that they represented the healthy national average and should be compelled to reproduce abundantly.¹⁵⁶⁶ Representing the most clearly delineated eugenic proposal in *The Equivalence*, these ideas made it evident that by the 1930s, Růžička's biopolitical ideas had become highly coercive.

Růžička's proposal partially aligned with a claim made by the racial anthropologist Saller, which *The Equivalence* reported without any critical commentary. In particular, Saller claimed that "the proven combination" constituting a hybrid nation must be defended, and tasked eugenicists firstly with "preventing counterselection" and secondly with "preventing new combinations with foreign elements, the result of which, as in any biological experiment, cannot be predicted."¹⁵⁶⁷ If *The Equivalence* did not clearly distance itself from this assertion,

¹⁵⁶⁵ Růžička, "Zlepšení stavu národa," 88.

¹⁵⁶⁶ Růžička, "Zlepšení stavu národa," 87.

¹⁵⁶⁷ Matiegka, "Dějiny problému," 16.

it was because the ideology of national liberalism in Czechoslovakia had significantly veered towards the right by the mid-1930s.¹⁵⁶⁸ Thus, some echoes of this shift could be discerned in the book, although its language and conclusions were crafted to appeal to a left-leaning, liberal audience.

From the Margins: Affirming Post-Imperial Hybridity through Anti-Racist Education

The authors of *The Equivalence* were not the sole scientists in Czechoslovakia to early voice opposition to Nazi racial theories. Another early critic, Hugo Iltis, initiated his resistance to these ideas as far back as the late 1920s. As we have already seen, Iltis was a German-speaking biologist with socialist convictions and close ties to Vienna and some of its eugenicists. Notably, Iltis pursued some of his research at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt* before World War I and maintained links to this institution even in the interwar period.¹⁵⁶⁹ While the authors of *The Equivalence* were all members of Czechoslovakia's national majority and occupied powerful academic roles, the biologist Hugo Iltis was writing from the margins.

While Iltis was situated in Czechoslovakia's burgeoning second university town, his academic position remained precarious. Iltis struggled to obtain university tenure, ultimately without success, as institutional anti-Semitism presented a formidable impediment to his academic career.¹⁵⁷⁰ Instead, Iltis actively engaged in local popular education, with a strong focus on science, both in his role as the head of the Mendel Museum and, more significantly, as the director of the *Volkshochschule*. (The latter institution repeatedly received funding from

¹⁵⁶⁸ Oskar Mulej, "Interwar Perspectives on Liberalism in Central Europe: The Czech, Austrian and Slovene National Liberal Heirs, 1918-1934," (PhD Thesis, Central European University, 2018), 123-127.

¹⁵⁶⁹ Prziham, "Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt, Ausgestaltung und Tätigkeit," 74.

¹⁵⁷⁰ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Jaroslav Křiženecký Papers, Inv. No. 2772, Letter, Jaroslav Křiženecký to Paul Kammerer, February 7, 1922.

Masaryk and eventually added the president's name to its title.)¹⁵⁷¹ Throughout the entire interwar period, Iltis conducted a variety of courses at this popular education center, covering a wide spectrum of topics that encompassed biology, philosophy, and politics.¹⁵⁷² The involvement in popular education was as important a factor behind the form and content of Iltis' arguments as his socialist politics, as Paul Weindling points out, leading him to seek to assemble a popular alliance in the struggle against Nazi racism.¹⁵⁷³

Iltis sympathized with the intention behind *The Equivalence* to make a public statement against Nazi racial theories. Yet, as a marginalized scholar, he recognized that the criticism raised by these scientists was inconsistent and incomplete. Shortly after the volume's initial release, Iltis articulated his significant doubts about its content in a private letter to Matiegka, whom he correctly identified as a key driving force behind the project.¹⁵⁷⁴ In addition to highlighting the volume's lack of coherence and the tendency of some chapters to sidestep the core issue, he raised the question of whether certain contributors had failed to distance themselves adequately from the racial theories they were supposed to dismantle. Iltis was particularly uneasy with the article by the eugenicist Ružička, cautioning that his views on eugenic sterilizations "must give the reader the impression that the author agreed with the methods of German racism."¹⁵⁷⁵ However, while Iltis voiced these reservations in private, in his public interventions, he invoked *The Equivalence* in a positive light and sought to cooperate with the more critical members of the network behind it. For Iltis' key objective was to assemble

¹⁵⁷¹ Central, provincial, and municipal authorities were another significant source of the institution's funding. "Die Geldgebarung der Volkshochschule," *Licht ins Volk* 1, no. 1 (1928): 15–16.

¹⁵⁷² "Verzeichnis der in den letzten vier Jahren an der Deutschen Volkshochschule in Brünn abgehaltenen Vortragsreihen," *Licht ins Volk* 1, no. 1 (1928): 7–11; "Prof. Dr. Hugo Iltis, Leiter der Masaryk-Volkshochschule, 1921–1938," *Licht ins Volk* 11, no. 1 (1938): 1–3.

¹⁵⁷³ Weindling, "Introduction," passim.

¹⁵⁷⁴ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 218, Letter, Hugo Iltis to Jindřich Matiegka, December 3., 1934.

¹⁵⁷⁵ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 218, Letter, Hugo Iltis to Jindřich Matiegka, December 3., 1934.

an alliance against Nazi racism that was not only popular but also diverse, including various national and religious communities within interwar Czechoslovakia and beyond.

In pursuit of the goal to popularize his cause, Iltis transformed into a prolific writer, employing diverse genres and languages to effectively connect with his audience. To start with, he did so through public lectures, many of which he delivered locally at the *Volkshochschule*. For example, in Autumn 1932 Iltis held a lecture course titled “The Race Question in Science and Politics.” In the course of twelve lectures, Iltis critically examined the methods of craniology and serology, and challenged the claims of racial theorists and ideologists about purported racial types, hierarchies, racial purity, as well as their call for “unmixing” the “Nordic race.” The course concluded with reflections on socialism and race, preceded by a lecture titled “The Awakening of the Oppressed Races.”¹⁵⁷⁶ However, Iltis’ involvement in popular education was not merely local. Utilizing a network of analogous institutions in Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Germany, Iltis’ lecture activity crossed national boundaries.¹⁵⁷⁷ Crucially, Iltis published a number of brochures and journal articles, often writing down and elaborating on his lectures, that scrutinized racial theories and ideology.

In 1927, Iltis published his first essay entirely dedicated to critiquing racial theories in a German socialist journal. The main target of his criticism was Hans Günther and his assumptions regarding the immutability of race, as well as Günther’s model of racial hierarchy and his notion of unmixing of the “Nordic race.” Notably, even at that early juncture, Iltis detected the proximity of these theories to Nazi ideology.¹⁵⁷⁸ However, Iltis also proposed a tentative intellectual genealogy of such theories that traced their origins back to earlier

¹⁵⁷⁶ “Naturwissenschaftliche-medizinische Abteilung,” *Licht ins Volk* 5, no. 1 (September 1932): 30.

¹⁵⁷⁷ For a selection of Iltis’ lectures and texts that often emerged from them, see the citations in the footnotes below.

¹⁵⁷⁸ Hugo Iltis, “Rassenwissenschaft und Rassenwahn,” *Die Gesellschaft: Internationale Revue für Sozialismus und Politik* 4, no. 2 (1927): 108; Hugo Iltis, *Volkstümliche Rassenkunde* (Jena: Urania-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1930), 72.

manifestations of racial nationalism. This genealogy extended from Günther's Nordicism to the pan-Germanism of Chamberlain around the year 1900 and, ultimately, to the theory of Aryan supremacy propounded by Arthur de Gobineau.¹⁵⁷⁹ Soon, Iltis would also add the anthroposociology of the turn of the century, exemplified by Ludwig Woltmann.¹⁵⁸⁰ In drafting this genealogy, Iltis drew on his precursors who wrote elaborate critiques of racial theories in late imperial Vienna. In particular, aside from Ignaz Zollschan, the sociologist Friedrich Hertz, who also had Jewish ancestry, played an instrumental role in this endeavor. Before 1914, like Zollschan, Hertz formulated a pioneering critique of racial anti-Semitism targeting the arguments of its influential proponent, Chamberlain, who was also based in the Austrian capital. Significantly, their critiques were underpinned by neo-Lamarckian assumptions, and both pointed to the research conducted at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt* as providing evidence for the inheritance of acquired characteristics.¹⁵⁸¹ Initially, Iltis also adhered to this approach.

Iltis' early critiques of racial theories simultaneously represented an attempt to promote neo-Lamarckism. A specific understanding of what constituted racism was intertwined with this agenda. Consequently, Iltis' early critique of Günther's ideas targeted their underlying assumption about the fixity of race as much as, if not more than, his notion of racial hierarchy. Crucially, in Iltis' view, this notion of the timelessness of race was predicated on Mendelism. He asserted, "Modern genetics provided the scientific foundation of German nationalist race science."¹⁵⁸² What is more, Iltis also identified genetics as the major driving force behind the growing resonance of similar racial theories among both the general public and scientists, helping these theories become "a part of official science."¹⁵⁸³ Thus, Iltis positioned neo-

¹⁵⁷⁹ Iltis, "Rassenwissenschaft," 99.

¹⁵⁸⁰ Iltis, *Volkstümliche Rassenkunde*, 72.

¹⁵⁸¹ Weindling, "Central Europe Confronts," 269; Benoit Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer: Physical Anthropology and Modern Race Theories," in *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, ed. George Stocking (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 125.

¹⁵⁸² Iltis, "Rassenwissenschaft," 99.

¹⁵⁸³ Iltis, "Rassenwissenschaft," 99.

Lamarckism as the primary alternative to the hereditary determinism of the racial theories that he resisted.

In his texts from the late 1920s, Iltis intimately connected these epistemic considerations to his political values. An example is the brochure *Volkstümliche Rassenkunde* (Popular Race Science), which Iltis published in Jena in 1930, just a few months after Hans Günther obtained a chair at the local university. While making the argument that human biology was plastic, being constituted and constantly reshaped by the combined influences of the natural and social environment, Iltis emphasized the affinity of these ideas to socialist theory, remarking that this was what “Lamarck and Karl Marx are teaching us.”¹⁵⁸⁴ While neo-Lamarckism did allow for the possibility of racial assimilation, this concept held a less significant place in Iltis’s thinking compared to his emphasis on social reform. He contended that neo-Lamarckism opened up space for future-oriented collective agency, enabling humans to be purposely molded by their environment, with biopolitics in post-Habsburg metropolises as his likely point of reference. Of particular appeal to Iltis, of course, was Red Vienna’s endeavor to fashion a new socialist subject.¹⁵⁸⁵ Elsewhere, Iltis went beyond making neo-Lamarckism a guide for socialist policy and instead presented it as the cornerstone of socialist ideology more broadly, asserting that: “Marxism is Lamarckism transposed onto society.”¹⁵⁸⁶ Iltis thus positioned the inheritance of acquired characteristics as the foundation for socialist policy and even for socialism as a whole.

This does not mean that the biologist from Brno/Brünn was unaware of the fraught nature of merging neo-Lamarckism with socialism. On the one hand, Iltis realized that an increasingly influential current in Marxism insisted on the separation of the biological and social spheres, effectively disconnecting it from evolutionism in favor of a “purely” social

¹⁵⁸⁴ Iltis, *Volkstümliche Rassenkunde*, 60.

¹⁵⁸⁵ “Zweite Wiener Führerschule der Wiener Kreisorganisation der Sozialistischen Arbeiterjugend.” *Arbeiterzeitung* 44, no. 314 (November 14, 1931): 5.

¹⁵⁸⁶ “Sozialismus und Naturwissenschaft.” *Arbeiterwille* 42, no. 50 (February 19, 1929): 6.

theory.¹⁵⁸⁷ On the other hand, he was well aware of the diminishing influence of neo-Lamarckism in the realm of science, attributed to its lack of a viable experimental program. He argued that this theory could genuinely serve as a catalyst for socialist politics only “once Lamarckism has found its great methodologist, when as much time will be spent on its problems as is now devoted to the study of Mendelizing.”¹⁵⁸⁸ However, it was only in response to the reaction triggered by his early neo-Lamarckist critiques of Nazi racial theories that Iltis began to reevaluate his stance. These critiques were met with ridicule by *völkisch* nationalist proponents of racial theories in Germany, including figures like the racial hygienist Fritz Lenz, who derided Iltis for both his neo-Lamarckism and his socialist convictions.¹⁵⁸⁹

In response, Iltis shifted to Mendelism. His next major intervention is a case in point. In 1935, when Iltis edited two booklets, both titled *Race in Science and Politics*, in Czech and German, respectively, yet with differing content, he carefully avoided neo-Lamarckian explanations in either of them. His argument was, instead, informed by modern genetics. Rather than viewing human populations as products of their environment, Iltis now argued that they were mixed and exhibited “a great diversity of forms and a cornucopia of combinations of racial markers of the parental generation. This is, of course, a predictable outcome. It conforms to the laws of Mendelism.”¹⁵⁹⁰ While these markers were unchanging, the complexity of Mendelian inheritance made it impossible to “unmix” them. Moreover, Iltis was adamant that the widespread racial mixing, feared by racial theorists, was a driver of development: “It was precisely Mendelism that proved that racial crossing constitutes one of the most important, if not the most important, factors in upward development.”¹⁵⁹¹ Needless to say, he also stressed

¹⁵⁸⁷ “Sozialismus und Naturwissenschaft,” 6.

¹⁵⁸⁸ Iltis, “Rassenwissenschaft,” 113.

¹⁵⁸⁹ Graham, “Science and Values,” 1143.

¹⁵⁹⁰ Hugo Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě a v politice* [Race in Science and Politics] (Prague: Svaz národního osvobození, 1935), 68.

¹⁵⁹¹ Hugo Iltis, “Rassenforschung und Rassenfrage II,” *Sozialistische Bildung*, no. 2 (February 1929): 52.

the equality of individuals with mixed backgrounds that emerged from it. Having reshuffled his understanding of the relationship between biology and society, Iltis thus transitioned from a neo-Lamarckist emphasis on the potential for perfectibility present in all “races” to a Mendelian argument for their equality.

In other words, the Mendelian arguments that Iltis offered against Nazi racial theories were similar to those of *The Equivalence*. However, he did not align himself with the nationalist politics of its authors. Instead, he emphasized not only the distinctions between biological “race” and a culturally defined nation but also posited a state-oriented notion of citizenship as an alternative to both.¹⁵⁹² Therefore, emphasizing the equality of races, Iltis called for a notion of democratic citizenship that would accommodate their diversity.

Racial theories put forth by scientists in Nazi Germany were not entirely aligned with the racial ideology propounded by Nazi politicians. While the notion of the “Aryan race” was a crucial component of Nazi political vocabulary, for example, Nazi race scientists had abandoned the same term.¹⁵⁹³ Iltis was aware of this tension, pointing out that “the author of the book *Mein Kampf* apparently did not read the theorists of his own party [...]”¹⁵⁹⁴ Consequently, Iltis sought a concept encompassing both racial theories and racial ideology. He found it in the term “racism.” This represented a significant innovation, as this term was not commonly used in either German or Czech. In fact, Iltis pioneered its critical use in both contexts.¹⁵⁹⁵

¹⁵⁹² Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 5-6.

¹⁵⁹³ Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich*, 94.

¹⁵⁹⁴ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 77.

¹⁵⁹⁵ “Rasismus” [Racism]. In *Lístkový lexikální archiv (1911-1991)*. On-line. Accessed May 15, 2022. <https://psjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=rasmus>; Wulf D. Hund, “Die Befreiung der unterdrückten Rassen kann nur das Werk der unterdrückten Rassen selbst sein: Marginalie zur Kritik des Rassismus durch Hugo Iltis,” *Das Argument* 57, no. 4–5 (2015): 493–502.

While Iltis introduced the concept of “racism” into two languages, he did not coin it. Instead, he facilitated its circulation from the contemporary French political debates.¹⁵⁹⁶ (In English, as Robert Bernasconi points out, the term racism entered the vocabulary only at the end of the 1930s, and was particularly promoted by the Jewish-American anthropologist Franz Boas and his students.)¹⁵⁹⁷ In France, however, the word *racisme* was relatively widespread as early as the 1920s, serving as a strongly disapproving label for the German *völkisch* ideology which it denounced from the French, universalist perspective.¹⁵⁹⁸

While Iltis adopted this word, his understanding of the scope of racism was broader, defining it as the “targeting of a human group based on their race.”¹⁵⁹⁹ This inclusive definition had a certain affinity with Friedrich Hertz and his earlier sociological argument that “race theories are little more than ideological disguises for the interests of dominators and exploiters.”¹⁶⁰⁰ Therefore, Iltis’ anti-racism took on a French form while retaining its post-Habsburg content.

The circulation of this concept was facilitated by Iltis’ membership in the Czechoslovak chapter of the French *Ligue internationale contre l'antisémitisme*, or LICA. Originally established in 1928 in France as the *Ligue Contre les Pogromes*, the association shortly afterward changed its name to reflect both its goal to counter anti-Semitism and its international character. By the mid-1930s, moreover, it added the words “and against Racism” to its title, highlighting that the term became a fundamental part of its vocabulary.¹⁶⁰¹ Importantly, at about the same time, it also began using the terms “racism” and “anti-racism” as asymmetrical

¹⁵⁹⁶ To the best of my knowledge, the first instance in which Iltis used the term “racism” was in an article from 1929. In this article, he primarily defined it as “alldesutsche rassistische Ideologie,” even though he also pointed out that racism targeted many groups. Iltis, “Rassenforschung,” 45–52.

¹⁵⁹⁷ Robert Bernasconi, “Racism,” in *Key Concepts in the Study of Antisemitism*, ed. Sol Goldberg, Scott Ury, and Kalman Weiser (Cham: Springer, 2021), 247.

¹⁵⁹⁸ Bernasconi, “Racism,” 247.

¹⁵⁹⁹ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 13.

¹⁶⁰⁰ Cited in Weindling, “Central Europe,” 265.

¹⁶⁰¹ Catherine Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism in France* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 41.

counter-concepts.¹⁶⁰² By that time, the LICA had acquired a transnational dimension, with several international branches, including some in Czechoslovakia. Itis had strong connections to the latter, having played a key role in founding its Brno/Brünn chapter. This chapter boasted a multiethnic membership and placed significant emphasis on the “necessity for international defense against anti-Semitism.”¹⁶⁰³ Last but not least, it was also through LICA’s transnational networks that Einstein learned about Itis and his 1936 book *Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse*, the “short pamphlet against the deceptions of German racial mysticism” which he invoked in his letter to Boas.¹⁶⁰⁴

LICA’s approach largely aligned with Itis’ goals. To begin with, the LICA closely fused its anti-racism with anti-fascism, a link that also became crucial for the socialist Itis. Moreover, in its anti-fascism, the LICA sought to rally a broad alliance on the French political left, and beyond, closely aligning itself with the Popular Front strategy.¹⁶⁰⁵ Finally, on the rhetorical level, this alliance-building was reflected in an “anti-fascist discourse couched in terms of republican, democratic values.”¹⁶⁰⁶ Inspired or reinforced by the LICA, all these aspects became integral to Itis’ interventions in the 1930s. However, for Itis, who aimed to gather a broad democratic alliance against Nazi racism, the multiethnicity of post-Habsburg countries posed an additional challenge.

As one of its historians perceptively puts it, the LICA maintained a “careful balance between particularism and universalism.”¹⁶⁰⁷ While it foregrounded the specificity of anti-Semitism, therefore, the LICA also “attempted to link anti-Semitism to other racist aspects of

¹⁶⁰² The LICA likely coined the latter term. Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism*, 32.

¹⁶⁰³ The constitutive session of Lica’s Brno branch took place in March 1934 at the Volkshochschule. Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Jaroslav Kříženecký Papers, Box 1, File 15, Inv No. 2483, Letter, Hugo Itis and Fritz Jellinek to Jaroslav Kříženecký, March 3., 1934.

¹⁶⁰⁴ “Unser Brünner Mitarbeiter,” *Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus* 2, no. 3–4 (April 1937): 8.

¹⁶⁰⁵ Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism*, 91.

¹⁶⁰⁶ Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism*, 103.

¹⁶⁰⁷ Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism*, 104.

fascism.”¹⁶⁰⁸ This moment was crucial for Iltis, who, in an attempt to assemble a cross-national coalition against racism, significantly expanded the scope of what the term encompassed. This did not mean that Iltis ceased to emphasize the specificity of anti-Semitism, which, he argued, was a “spiritual father-nurturer of today’s racism” in Nazi Germany.¹⁶⁰⁹ However, in his texts from the 1930s, Iltis pointed out that racism in Nazi Germany was not limited to anti-Semitism but was likely to attack multiple other targets, including in France on its western borders and in the post-Habsburg countries on its eastern borders.

As Iltis expanded the scope of his critique of racism, he did not limit it to Europe but gave it a more global dimension. He pointed to forms of racism that were not inherently linked to fascism or anti-Semitism, ultimately surpassing the LICA in the scope of his critique. This was evident in his genealogy of racism, which he substantially reworked in the early 1930s. Beyond Europe, Iltis identified another origin of racism in the United States, where, he explained, racism was used to discredit the political demands of African Americans.¹⁶¹⁰ Moreover, he identified the romanticized image of native Americans in popular culture as another manifestation of racism, this time employed by settlers against a group which they had dispossessed of its land.¹⁶¹¹ He also rebuked a racist narrative that stipulated that the native peoples of Australia faced a process of “natural extinction [Aussterben],” retorting that it obscured the “extermination [Ausrottung]” wrought on them by the Europeans.¹⁶¹² All in all, these arguments pointed to Iltis’ conclusion that “the liberation of the oppressed races can only be the work of the oppressed races themselves.”¹⁶¹³ Unlike the LICA, which was ambiguous about the French imperial project and linked its anti-racist agenda to anti-colonialism only in

¹⁶⁰⁸ Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism*, 105.

¹⁶⁰⁹ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 99.

¹⁶¹⁰ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 13.

¹⁶¹¹ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 14.

¹⁶¹² Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 8.

¹⁶¹³ Hund, “Die Befreiung,” 493–502.

the 1950s, therefore, Iltis took some steps in this direction already in the early 1930s.¹⁶¹⁴ While scholars often see the early critiques of racism as focused exclusively on anti-Semitism, Iltis detected numerous manifestations of racism.¹⁶¹⁵

Iltis' arguments against racism oscillated between a more broadly conceived critique of the role of racial anthropology and genetics in producing and legitimizing racism and a narrower perspective that contrasted racism with an "objective" science. On the one hand, while challenging the coalescing of Mendelism with the political Right in Germany, Iltis highlighted this complicity in stark terms: "Mendelism had been enlisted to support the notion that there are higher and lower races, and that this is a natural given. It was made to support the view that these differences are hereditary, or permanent. [...] Geneticists, outstanding anthropologists and archaeologists thus weighted in to endorse the idea of Germanic racial supremacy."¹⁶¹⁶ On the other hand, Iltis also argued that this science was "purely subjective," and the Nazis used it as a "political tool, only to be replaced by myth when it is convenient."¹⁶¹⁷ This tension, revealing Iltis' double role as a positivist scientist and political activist, ultimately remained unresolved.

Similarly, Iltis remained ambiguous towards eugenics. His initial, vocal endorsement of neo-Lamarckism was connected to a support for eugenic policies based on these principles.¹⁶¹⁸ As we have seen, however, Iltis suspended his neo-Lamarckism in his interventions of the 1930s. Yet rather than radicalizing his eugenic project like Růžička, or trying to balance his socialist and Mendelian commitments, Iltis chose to opt out. Appeals to eugenics disappear

¹⁶¹⁴ Lloyd, *Discourses of Antiracism*, 92.

¹⁶¹⁵ Bernasconi, "Racism," passim.

¹⁶¹⁶ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 36.

¹⁶¹⁷ Iltis, *Rasa ve vědě*, 67 and 75.

¹⁶¹⁸ Hugo Iltis, "Zur Rassenfrage," *Prager Presse* 9, no. 64 (March 5, 1929): 3.

from Iltis' books and lectures after 1932 when he held his last lecture course on the topic at the *Volkshochschule*.¹⁶¹⁹

Both Iltis and the authors of *The Equivalence* aimed to turn their critique into a transnational endeavor. Consequently, Iltis, who primarily wrote in German, published one of his books in Czech and facilitated the translation of another into Dutch.¹⁶²⁰ He also tried to persuade the German-American anthropologist Franz Boas to arrange for the translation of his final book on racism, written in 1936, into English, but these efforts yielded no discernible results.¹⁶²¹ Similarly, translations of *The Equivalence* into German and French quickly followed the publication of the Czech original.¹⁶²² Nevertheless, neither of these attempts was able to garner significant attention among French- or English-speaking audiences. The reviews these texts received were few, and often brief. For example, the historian William L. Langer, writing for *The Foreign Affairs*, encapsulated the latter book as follows: "A work by six professors, likewise proving racial theories to be unscientific."¹⁶²³ In the same vein, a reviewer in the *Eugenics Review*, the leading journal of British eugenicists, pointed out that the authors of the work were "probably known only to a very limited number of persons in England."¹⁶²⁴ While these texts did not succeed in reaching audiences further afield, they did have an immediate and significant impact in many post-Habsburg countries. In particular, they had an intriguing reception in Yugoslavia, Austria, and Romania, which the remaining sections of this chapter set out to examine.

¹⁶¹⁹ "Naturwissenschaftliche-medizinische Abteilung," 30.

¹⁶²⁰ Iltis, Hugo, ed. *Het rassenprobleem in politiek en wetenschap* [The Race Problem in Politics and Science], trans. Maurice Bernard Coêlho (The Hague: Confidentia, 1936); "Sektion Mähren-Schlesien," *Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus* 2, no. 1 (January 1937): 8.

¹⁶²¹ Weindling, "Introduction," 35.

¹⁶²² Karel Weigner, ed., *Die Gleichwertigkeit der europäischen Rassen und die Wege zu ihrer Vervollkommenung* (Prague: Tschechische Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste, 1935); Karel Weigner, ed., *L'Égalité des races européennes et les moyens de les améliorer* (Maastricht: Editions A.A.M. Stols, 1935).

¹⁶²³ William L. Langer, Review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit der europäischen Rassen*, ed. Karel Weigner, *Foreign Affairs* 14, no. 3 (April 1936): 536.

¹⁶²⁴ T., review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit*, *The Eugenics Review* 27, no. 2 (July 1935): 161.

The reverberations of *The Equivalence* in the region can be partly attributed to the semi-official support of Czechoslovakia's authorities in promoting it. For instance, its publication in the Fall of 1934 was accompanied by a series of ten articles authored by racial anthropologists from various countries that were considered part of Central Europe. These articles were featured in the pages of the *Prager Presse*, a semi-official German-language journal established to serve as a tool for Czechoslovak cultural diplomacy.¹⁶²⁵ Edited by Jindřich Matiegka, the series was an ostensible attempt to showcase that the arguments of the recently published *The Equivalence* dovetailed with the views held by the transnational community of “respectable” racial anthropologists.

The roster of contributors, tasked with discussing the research in their respective countries, was international yet highly ambiguous. It encompassed several post-Habsburg anthropologists with differing levels of nationalist engagement, whose names and arguments will become apparent in the subsequent sections of this chapter. Another contributor was the influential national-conservative Polish racial anthropologist Jan Czekanowski, a representative of the Lwów/Lviv/Lemberg school of anthropology which subscribed to a form of Nordicism. Moreover, there was also his Jewish student Salomon Czortkower, who wrote an article on the Jewish people for the series.¹⁶²⁶ Defining Central Europe in a very broad way, moreover, the series also featured an essay on Switzerland by the anthropologist Eugène Pittard, who otherwise specialized in South-Eastern Europe, as well as an essay on France, written by Georges Montandon. The last choice was particularly striking, as Montandon would later emerge as a prominent scientific racist and public anti-Semite in Vichy France. However, as Alice Conklin points out, Montandon was for a long time able to conceal his central aim, “to

¹⁶²⁵ Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle*, 71–74.

¹⁶²⁶ Shmidt, “Race Science,” 6–7.

recast in acceptable scientific terms a mixture of fin-de-siècle philosophy and Gobineau's racism," and remained "uncriticized by his peers in the field."¹⁶²⁷

In his concluding remarks, Matiegka pointed out that the series showed that the contemporary anthropologists with a claim to scientific respectability shared the view that nations were "racial mixtures."¹⁶²⁸ One might add that the series also made it clear how closely their claims became associated with nationalism and its anti-liberal, exclusivist manifestations. However, this might have been the editors' underlying goal from the outset. Shortly after the series began, Matiegka confessed in a private letter that, in fact, the series was "intended to offer representatives of anthropology in various Central European states the chance to articulate their perspectives on the racial issue, with the expectation that, primarily, each individual would advocate their own [nationalist] agenda."¹⁶²⁹ The hope was that by presenting several mutually exclusive models of racial hierarchy side by side, a composite image would be created, revealing the biased nature of racial theories promoting national superiority. This, in turn, would indicate a move toward "rejecting the favoritism of a single race," whether it be Nordic, or any other "race" that racial nationalists advocated for in their particular contexts.¹⁶³⁰ If this was the genuine motivation, the outcome turned out to be quite the opposite. While, as Andre Gingrich suggests, there was indeed "a liberal paradigm in the history of anthropology in continental Europe" before 1914, the series in the *Prager Presse* demonstrated just how little of it remained by the 1930s.¹⁶³¹

¹⁶²⁷ Interestingly, prior to his transformation into a scientific racist and Nazi supporter in France, the Swiss-born Montandon spent some time in revolutionary Russia, initially associating with the White Russians and then, intriguingly, becoming involved with the Bolsheviks. Alice Conklin, *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France, 1850-1950* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), 4, 93 and passim.

¹⁶²⁸ Jindřich Matiegka, "Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. X. In Deutschland," *Prager Presse* 15, no. 19 (January 20, 1935): 4–5.

¹⁶²⁹ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 218, Letter, Matiegka to Iltis, December 9., 1934.

¹⁶³⁰ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 218, Letter, Matiegka to Iltis, December 9., 1934.

¹⁶³¹ Andre Gingrich, "Liberalism in Imperial Anthropology: Notes on an Implicit Paradigm in Continental European Anthropology before World War I." *Ab Imperio* 2007, no. 1 (2007): 224.

That the series, as it stood, backfired was not lost on Matiegka and the journal's editors. Tellingly, their initial plan to publish these texts as a stand-alone volume was tacitly abandoned.¹⁶³² While Matiegka concluded the article series by drawing the readers' attention to Zollschan's call for a cross-national critical scientific dialogue about racial theories, the editors of the journal went one step further. Even more uneasy than Matiegka about the illiberal message that the series conveyed, they subsequently asked the liberal-minded Zollschan, who repeatedly described *The Equivalence* as "an excellent piece of writing," to pen a kind of postscript to it.¹⁶³³

In his afterword, Zollschan reiterated his call for setting up an international, multidisciplinary forum that "in the interest of peace, Europe, and culture" would issue a consensual assessment "testing the scientific foundations of racial philosophy for their accuracy," with a particular focus on the Nordacist racial theories.¹⁶³⁴ Interestingly, to describe this "racial philosophy" whose foundations he hoped such a forum would challenge, Zollschan also echoed Itis by using the word "racism."¹⁶³⁵ Therefore, in Czechoslovakia, the majority-linked and minority-linked critics of Nazi racial theories established alliances of convenience, mutually reinforcing their positions in public, despite their differing views. In Yugoslavia, however, the authors they inspired openly clashed, and the following section explores this revealing polemic.

¹⁶³² Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 218, Letter, Matiegka to Itis, December 9., 1934.

¹⁶³³ Šimůnek, "před areopagem," 87.

¹⁶³⁴ Ignaz Zollschan, "Wissenschaft und Rassenfrage," *Prager Presse* 15, no. 26 (January 27, 1935): 3.

¹⁶³⁵ Zollschan, "Wissenschaft und Rassenfrage," 3.

Contesting the Social Role of the Racial Anthropologist: A Polemic in Yugoslavia

Given the attempts to circulate their arguments against Nazi racial theories beyond Czechoslovakia, pursued both by the authors of *The Equivalence* and by Iltis, their immediate reverberations in the allied and closely connected country of Yugoslavia are not surprising. Indeed, when a polemic about the epistemic and political ramifications of racial theories flared up in Yugoslavia in 1934, both of its key participants cited texts recently published in Czechoslovakia to support their opposing positions.¹⁶³⁶

The polemic was initiated by a booklet titled *Laž rasizma* (The Lie of Racism), authored by Zagreb-based ethnologist and sociologist Miroslav Kus-Nikolajev. Prompted by the rise of Nazi racial theories, the booklet presented a sharp indictment of race science from a Marxist standpoint.¹⁶³⁷ (Shortly afterwards followed another booklet, *Antisemitizam bez maske* [Antisemitism Unmasked], by the same author.)¹⁶³⁸ The brochure, in turn, drew the ire of the physical anthropologist and eugenicist Božo Škerlj from Ljubljana, who sought to project scientific legitimacy onto racial nationalism while distancing himself from some ideas emanating from Nazi Germany.

Trained in the natural sciences and philosophy in Zagreb and Berlin, Kus-Nikolajev frequently delved into the intersections between the biological and the social spheres. Reflecting his interdisciplinary background, his long-term research interest, and his Marxist methodology, Kus-Nikolajev's booklet *The Lie of Racism* was not primarily concerned with human difference as a biological fact. His analysis revolved around what he argued constituted

¹⁶³⁶ To my knowledge, Anna Cergol Paradiž was the first one to highlight this debate. My argument expands on her findings by tracing the genealogies of both interventions and mapping the transnational networks that made them possible. Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika na Slovenskem*, 203-4.

¹⁶³⁷ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, *Laž rasizma* [The Lie of Racism] (Zagreb: Naš front, 1934).

¹⁶³⁸ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, *Antisemitizam bez maske* [Antisemitism Unmasked] (Zagreb: Naš front, 1935).

the ideology of racism and its social functions. While his argument drew heavily on Hugo Iltis, from whom he also likely adopted his key analytical category, Kus-Nikolajev went beyond Iltis to propose a sociological theory of the essential role of racism in every class society.

Looking at the social function of racism primarily through the rigid lens of class analysis, Kus-Nikolajev argued that it was not merely a by-product of Nazism. He claimed that racism, modernized and legitimized by the natural sciences, functioned as an underlying ideology of the entire bourgeoisie. It served the purpose of legitimizing social inequality within individual nations while justifying colonial violence and exploitation further afield.¹⁶³⁹ Drawing on socialist theorists who regarded the family as a crucial site of women's exploitation, Kus-Nikolajev argued that racism cemented this exploitative form of social organization as well. According to him, racism was an attempt to preserve the family by relegating women to the private sphere and consigning them to reproductive work.¹⁶⁴⁰ The myth of the struggle of races, finally, served as an instrument against its real alternative: the class struggle, he asserted.¹⁶⁴¹ Kus-Nikolajev thus gave a radical Marxist twist to Iltis' arguments, constructing a more overarching critique of the complicity of racism – and by extension, of biology, physical anthropology, and medicine – in co-producing hierarchies between social classes, between colonizers and the colonized, and between men and women.

Kus-Nikolajev contrasted the concept of nation, defined in cultural terms, and “race,” denoting physical differences between populations. Echoing Iltis, Kus-Nikolajev argued that in reality, modern nations were hybrid, and their “racial” make-up had nothing to do with their presumed cultural distinctiveness.¹⁶⁴² Seeking to show that the alleged biological differences between humans were not primordial, moreover, Kus argued that they emerged in the course of

¹⁶³⁹ Kus-Nikolajev, *Laž rasizma*, 4-6.

¹⁶⁴⁰ Kus-Nikolajev, *Laž rasizma*, 23-27.

¹⁶⁴¹ Kus-Nikolajev, *Laž rasizma*, 7.

¹⁶⁴² Kus-Nikolajev, *Laž rasizma*, 10-18.

history as a result of adaptation to a wide variety of environments, as well as migrations.¹⁶⁴³ This emphasis on the inheritance of acquired characteristics made it clear that Kus-Nikolajev was unaware of Iltis' more recent turn towards Mendelism and continued to emphasize his earlier, pronouncedly neo-Lamarckian arguments.¹⁶⁴⁴ This coupling of political radicalism with a biological theory that had lost much of its credibility by the point he was writing made Kus-Nikolajev an easy target, as we will see.

Despite his sharp indictment of racial theories, Kus-Nikolajev did not suggest abandoning the concept of race, nor eugenics as a purported means to improve it. Indeed, at the beginning of his career, Kus-Nikolajev advocated for eugenics, inspired mainly by its socialist, neo-Lamarckian form that became prominent in Red Vienna. Like many other post-Habsburg eugenicists, Kus-Nikolajev argued that the notion of human economy advanced by the sociologist Rudolf Goldscheid provided a modern eugenic blueprint for how to mold the post-imperial states' citizens through welfare policies.¹⁶⁴⁵ Later, Kus-Nikolajev became more skeptical of biology's ability to provide a foundation for the analysis of social relations, emphasizing the malleability of biology that "provided arguments that served equally well to the father of scientific anarchism, Kropotkin, as they served to Haeckel, who was an admirer of the Iron Chancellor."¹⁶⁴⁶ Nevertheless, Kus-Nikolajev still considered it possible to use eugenics – and more broadly, biology – as a complement to social analysis and policy.¹⁶⁴⁷ Kus-Nikolajev thus not only reproduced many of the arguments from Hugo Iltis' early, neo-

¹⁶⁴³ Kus-Nikolajev does not offer the reader any clues as to whether he chose to emphasize this idea because the neo-Lamarckist arguments of Iltis and Cvijić dovetailed in this regard. Kus-Nikolajev, *Laž rasizma*, 12.

¹⁶⁴⁴ While repeatedly and explicitly citing Iltis and adapting larger parts of his argument, Kus-Nikolajev never made it clear which of his books he was referring to. However, as he was writing in 1934, it is most likely that he was familiar with Iltis' *Volkstümliche Rassenkunde*.

¹⁶⁴⁵ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, "Ekonomija života i eugenetika" [Economy of Life and Eugenics], *Jugoslavenska njiva* 5, no. 40–41 (October 1921): 634–36, 649–51.

¹⁶⁴⁶ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, *Problemi biološke sociologije* [Problems of Biological Sociology] (Zagreb: Štamparija "Gaj," 1924), 66.

¹⁶⁴⁷ Kus-Nikolajev, *Problemi*, 68.

Lamarckian critique of Nazi racial theories but also their underlying agenda: to discredit racism while preserving eugenics as a usable social technology for the socialist movement.

The ensuing debate revolved around the notion of scientific objectivity and the complicity of scientists in advancing racist theories. It was the questioning of physical anthropology's status as an "objective" science by Kus-Nikolajev that prompted an aggressive response from his interlocutor, Božo Škerlj, in the first place. Trained in the 1920s in Prague under the auspices of Jindřich Matiegka, Škerlj was one of the first physical anthropologists in Yugoslavia specifically educated in that discipline. However, in Škerlj's home country, this posed more of a challenge than an advantage. In Yugoslavia, physical anthropology, both in institutional terms and in its claim to generate authoritative knowledge about the nation, played a secondary role to the more influential discipline of anthropogeography.¹⁶⁴⁸ In this context, Škerlj was concerned that if many people were convinced that physical anthropology was influenced by particular interests, that its findings were biased, and that it had connections to Nazi ideology, as suggested by Kus-Nikolajev, it would undermine Škerlj's endeavors to establish physical anthropology as an officially recognized discipline in Yugoslav universities. He had been actively advocating for this recognition at the time and had even sought Matiegka's assistance in this regard.¹⁶⁴⁹ Škerlj's expert status and job prospects were thus staked on the claims he could make about his discipline's authoritative knowledge.

In his response to Kus-Nikolajev, written in October 1934, Škerlj defended physical anthropology, and particularly the study of "races." Škerlj's position was an example of what Thomas Gieryn describes as boundary work, a practice in which scientists seek to achieve

¹⁶⁴⁸ Christian Promitzer, "'Betwixt and Between'. Physical Anthropology in Bulgaria and Serbia until the End of the First World War," in *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, ed. Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010), 141–68.

¹⁶⁴⁹ Archives of the Group of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Božo Škerlj papers, Letter, Božo Škerlj to Jindřich Matiegka, May 24, 1933.

various professional agendas by demarcating the boundaries between science and non-science.¹⁶⁵⁰ He contrasted the allegedly objective status of racial anthropology to the theories that he deemed unscientific. Tacitly adopting Kus-Nikolajev's key analytical category, Škerlj conceded that "in scientific terms many a point can be made against racism."¹⁶⁵¹ However, his definition of racism was significantly narrower and did not cover most racial theories, which he continued to treat as if they were unbiased. Furthermore, he asserted that the activist detractors of racial theories had no legitimate claim to the title of scientists. Due to his outspoken neo-Lamarckism, Kus-Nikolajev was an easy target for Škerlj, who received his training in Mendelian heredity not only from Matiegka but also from the first Czechoslovak professor of genetics, Artur Brožek. In the key sentence of his intervention, clearly directed at Kus-Nikolajev, Škerlj deplored that "very often these laypeople confuse race science with racism, and imply that physical anthropology has a political agenda which – being an objective science – it does not and cannot have."¹⁶⁵² In assuming the role of an ostensibly impartial, scientific critic of racism, Škerlj claimed authority over the boundaries of science, and sought to disqualify other critical voices from the discussion.

Škerlj was less concerned with the real-world consequences of racial theories than with the public image that their criticism imparted to his discipline. His positioning as a critic of racism was vital for his attempt to endow his contentious racial arguments and promotion of eugenics with an aura of scientific objectivity. Indeed, Škerlj was a prolific eugenicist, and in 1936, he founded a Section for Anthropology, Genealogy, and Eugenics, the only scientific society in Yugoslavia exclusively devoted to eugenics, as Ana Cergol Paradiž points out.¹⁶⁵³

¹⁶⁵⁰ Thomas Gieryn, "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists," *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 6 (December 1983): 781–95.

¹⁶⁵¹ Božo Škerlj, "Laž rasizma?" [The Lie of Racism?], *Jutro* 15, no. 234 (October 11, 1934): 7–8; Božo Škerlj, "In vendar demagogija!" [And yet it is Demagoguery!], *Jutro* 15, no. 280 (December 6, 1934): 3–4.

¹⁶⁵² Škerlj, "Laž rasizma?" 8.

¹⁶⁵³ Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika na Slovenskem*, 107.

While Škerlj became the society's secretary, he nominated the zoologist Jovan Hadži, a former intern at the Viennese *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, as its first president.¹⁶⁵⁴ Like his allies at the eugenics society, Škerlj remained committed to the positivist episteme. However, Škerlj also harnessed eugenics and racial anthropology to further a more unequal, exclusivist understanding of the Yugoslav national community and a hierarchic, gendered division of labor in the society.

As the discussion of Škerlj's anthropometric research on gymnasts in the previous chapter shows, this research backed his attempt to partially revise the synthetic Yugoslav nation-building project from a racial perspective, centered on the concept of the "Dinaric race." Additionally, he sought to utilize the racial framework to delineate the distinctiveness of the Slovenes within the larger Yugoslav imagined community. Nevertheless, despite his darker emphases, Škerlj still ultimately accepted the supra-ethnic, hybrid nature of the Yugoslav nation-building project.¹⁶⁵⁵ This, in turn, made him partially receptive to the arguments of *The Equivalence*.

Beyond his racial conceptualization of the Yugoslav and Slovene nations, Škerlj employed the tools provided by constitutional medicine to argue for the control and marginalization of women in mass gymnastic associations and in society more broadly. Importantly, Škerlj also advocated for a wide range of eugenic measures aimed at controlling and constraining the reproductive choices of people with illnesses or disabilities.¹⁶⁵⁶

These eugenic measures, forcibly intervening in human reproduction, prominently included Škerlj's calls for the policy of forced eugenic sterilizations. "In the context of population policy," Škerlj asserted in 1934, "sterilization can only be considered a success when

¹⁶⁵⁴ Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika na Slovenskem*, 107.

¹⁶⁵⁵ Yeomans, "Racial Politics," passim.

¹⁶⁵⁶ Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika na Slovenskem*, passim.

it is carried out according to a special law that allows for forced sterilization when necessary, as envisaged by the German sterilization law.”¹⁶⁵⁷ (Such a law was never introduced in interwar Yugoslavia, despite the support of eugenicists such as Škerlj or his ally, the criminologist Avgust Munda).¹⁶⁵⁸ These emphases neatly overlapped with Škerlj’s ideological commitment to Slovene national liberalism, which, by this point, had become exclusivist, subjugated the rights of the individual to the alleged interests of the majority, and staunchly opposed women’s rights, including suffrage.¹⁶⁵⁹

The intensive exchanges that Škerlj maintained with Czech nationalist anthropologists significantly influenced his subsequent arguments in the polemic with Kus-Nikolajev. Škerlj acquired a copy of *The Equivalence* from Matiegka in November 1934, shortly after its publication and not long after the polemic had begun. “I received the book on the equivalence of races three days ago,” he confirmed in a letter to Matiegka, “and I am thankful for it. I have already started reading the book, which will prove extremely valuable to me this semester.”¹⁶⁶⁰ Indeed, when a socialist periodical published Kus-Nikolajev’s response and an excerpt from his booklet, Škerlj used the review of *The Equivalence* in the pages of the Slovene national liberal daily as a postscript to the debate.¹⁶⁶¹

In his review of *The Equivalence*, Škerlj distanced himself from several racial theorists in Nazi Germany, including Eugen Fischer, even though only a few years before, in 1932, Škerlj

¹⁶⁵⁷ Božo Škerlj, “Sredstva negativne evgenike” [The Means of Negative Eugenics], *Zdravniški vestnik* 9, no. 6 (September 30, 1934): 501.

¹⁶⁵⁸ Avgust Munda, “Problem sterilizacije in kazensko pravo” [The Problem of Sterilisation and Criminal Law], *Slovenski pravnik* 48, no. 10–12 (1934): 244–69; Cergol Paradiž, “Yugoslavia I,” passim.

¹⁶⁵⁹ Mulej, “Interwar Perspectives,” passim.

¹⁶⁶⁰ See Archives of the Group of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Božo Škerlj papers, Letters, Jindřich Matiegka to Božo Škerlj, October 30., 1934 and Božo Škerlj to Jindřich Matiegka, November 11., 1934.

¹⁶⁶¹ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, “Kaj je z rasami?” [What About the Races?], *Svoboda* 6, no. 11 (1934): 281–84; Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, “Docent dela reklamo” [An Assistant Professor Promotes Himself], *Svoboda* 6, no. 12 (1934): 345–47.

had used a Rockefeller scholarship to research at his institute in Berlin.¹⁶⁶² However, his review also disagreed with several ideas expressed in *The Equivalence* that he found “not entirely convincing,” including the central argument encapsulated in the book’s title, which Škerlj described as “rushed in this general form.”¹⁶⁶³ Moreover, he also used the book, and particularly the chapter by the eugenicist Ružička, to support his call for eugenic sterilizations.¹⁶⁶⁴ Thus, while Škerlj still operated within a positivist episteme and refrained from engaging with vitalism, holism, and other non-mechanistic explanatory models characteristic of the more metaphysical aspects of Nazi racial theories, he nonetheless strongly endorsed both racial nationalism as well as coercive eugenic strategies in the service of socially conservative agendas.¹⁶⁶⁵ On the level of epistemology, and perhaps even more so, on the level of public perception, his instrumental and performative criticism of Nazi racial theories allowed him to balance these agendas.¹⁶⁶⁶

Catholicism, Racial Theories, and Eugenics: Austrian Variations

Even though Vienna and Brno/Brünn were now located in two different post-Habsburg countries, their public spheres remained intertwined, certainly among the German-speakers. The activities of supporters of eugenics make this interconnection evident. Left-leaning

¹⁶⁶² Paul Weindling, “Racial Expertise and German Eugenic Strategies for Southeastern Europe,” in *Health, Hygiene, and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, ed. Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta, and Marius Turda (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011), 53.

¹⁶⁶³ Božo Škerlj, “O enakovrednosti evropskih ras” [On the Equivalence of European Races], *Jutro* 16, no. 1 (January 1, 1935): 12.

¹⁶⁶⁴ Božo Škerlj, “Prof. Ružička in Weigner o evgeniki” [Prof. Ružička and Weigner on Eugenics], *Zdravniški vestnik* 6, no. 12 (December 31, 1934): 650–53.

¹⁶⁶⁵ For the metaphysical aspects of Nazi racial theories, see Amit Varshizky, “Non-Mechanistic Explanatory Styles in the German Racial Science: A Comparison of Hans F. K. Günther and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß,” in *Recognizing the Past in the Present: New Studies on Medicine before, during, and after the Holocaust*, ed. Sabine Hildebrandt, Miriam Offer, and Michael A. Grodin (New York: Berghahn Books, 2020), 21–43.

¹⁶⁶⁶ A decade later, Škerlj resumed, and successfully advanced, his career as a physical anthropologist in socialist Yugoslavia. At that juncture, he emphatically pointed to his ongoing exchanges with Czechoslovak authors in an attempt to present himself as a seemingly anti-racist, socialist physical anthropologist. For example, his 1949 book *O človeških rasah in rasizmu* [On Human Races and Racism], which concluded this reframing, opened with a dedication to the memory of Jindřich Matiegka, “an early fighter against racism.” Božo Škerlj, *O človeških rasah in o rasizmu* [On Human Races and Racism] (Ljubljana: Slovenski knjižni zavod, 1949), [I].

eugenicists from Vienna, in particular, frequently visited the Moravian capital to deliver lectures to the local audience. For instance, Paul Kammerer and Rudolf Goldscheid both lectured there before their death in 1926 and 1931, respectively, the former on many different occasions.¹⁶⁶⁷ These names should come as no surprise since these lectures were often organized with the support of their ally, Hugo Ittis, and were frequently hosted by the city's *Volkshochschule*, which he directed.

The practice continued even in the 1930s. Julius Tandler alone lectured on at least three different occasions at this institution during that decade.¹⁶⁶⁸ One of his lectures, delivered in 1933, dealt with his key eugenic theme, "Race and Constitution."¹⁶⁶⁹ Moreover, the *Volkshochschule* organized an ambitious, critical lecture series on racial theories in 1935. The speakers included Julius Bauer, a Viennese critic of race hygiene and forced sterilizations. Moreover, they featured the critics of racial theories Friedrich Hertz and Ignaz Zollschan.¹⁶⁷⁰ Importantly, their prewar critiques of racial theories that were rooted in neo-Lamarckism supported reformist eugenic strategies.¹⁶⁷¹ Hertz even explicitly endorsed Goldscheid's notion of human economy, positing it as the primary alternative to Chamberlain's racism.¹⁶⁷² As the names of these lecturers demonstrate, Ittis thus maintained close ties with Viennese eugenicists and sought to enroll them in his project of popularizing scientific and political critique of racial theories.

¹⁶⁶⁷ "Wissenschaftliche Vorträge," *Volksfreund* 41, no. 4 (January 8, 1921): 3; "Paul Kammerer gestorben," *Volksfreund* 46, no. 225 (September 25, 1926): 3.

¹⁶⁶⁸ "Arzt und Wirtschaft," *Volksfreund* 52, no. 82 (April 6, 1932): 8; "Das Herbstprogramm der Brüner Masarykvolkshochschule," *Volksfreund* 55, no. 202 (August 30, 1935): 6.

¹⁶⁶⁹ "Volkshochschule: Julius Tandler: Rasse und Konstitution," *Tagesbote aus Mähren und Schlesien* 83, no. 72 (February 12, 1933): 8.

¹⁶⁷⁰ Zollschan spoke about "Racism and the Future of Mankind," Bauer's lecture was on "Race Hygiene and Sterilization," while Hertz's lecture was titled "Was culture created by the Nordic race?" The roster of lecturers also included Ittis, who emphasized the significance of intermarriage, as well as Vojtěch Suk, a Czech racial anthropologist, and a member of LICA's Brno chapter. "Masaryk-Volkshochschule: Vorträge über das 'Rassenproblem,'" *Tagesbote aus Mähren und Schlesien* 85, no. 499 (October 30, 1935): 8.

¹⁶⁷¹ Weindling, "Central Europe Confronts," *passim*.

¹⁶⁷² Weindling, "Central Europe Confronts," 266.

Conversely, Iltis actively participated in public debates in Vienna. He delivered lectures in Austria's capital and even made live appearances on Radio Vienna's broadcasts.¹⁶⁷³ Moreover, Iltis also contributed to Viennese journals, such as the social-democratic theoretical revue *Der Kampf* (Struggle), even before its editorial office relocated to Czechoslovakia following the Austro-Fascist takeover.¹⁶⁷⁴ Crucially, in 1936, he published his final major critique of Nazi racial theories, titled *Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse* (The Myth of Blood and Race), in Vienna.¹⁶⁷⁵ However, long after the Austro-Fascist takeover, Iltis could no longer rely on his social democratic networks when seeking a publisher in the Austrian capital.

Iltis found an unexpected ally in Irene Harand, a Christian Social activist. Not only was the publisher of his book a close relative of hers, but her periodical *Gerechtigkeit* (Justice) was the only one that advertised *The Myth of Blood and Race* even before it had appeared on the market.¹⁶⁷⁶ While Harand was a conservative Catholic woman loyal to the new powerholders, she simultaneously launched a vigorous campaign against the manifestations of anti-Semitism, both within the official discourse and within the Catholic Church. The periodical she published bore the motto, "I fight anti-Semitism because it harms our Christianity." John Connelly argues that in doing so, Harand did not hesitate to go "beyond the boundaries of Christian orthodoxy" of the time.¹⁶⁷⁷ She also sought to forge alliances with various scientists critical of anti-Semitism and racial theories more broadly, even when it meant cooperating across ideological or national boundaries.

¹⁶⁷³ See, for instance, "Sozialismus und Naturwissenschaft," 6; "Hugo Iltis in Wien." *Arbeiterzeitung* 45, no. 29 (January 29, 1932): 4.

¹⁶⁷⁴ Some of these texts were already focused on dismantling racial theories. See Hugo Iltis, "Rassenforschung und Rassenfrage," *Der Kampf: Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift* 24, no. 5 (May 1931): 220–25.

¹⁶⁷⁵ Iltis, *Der Mythos*, passim.

¹⁶⁷⁶ For the press coverage in Harand's newspaper, see Hugo Iltis, "Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse," *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 141 (May 14, 1936): 2; "Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse," *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 143 (May 28, 1936): 5; Paul Gasser, Review of *Die Maske heruntergerissen*, by Hugo Iltis. *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 144 (June 4, 1936): 2–3.

¹⁶⁷⁷ John Connelly, *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1933-1965* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 146.

The publication of *The Myth of Blood and Race*, and its timing in particular, were integral to Harand's agenda. The book was released on Pentecost of 1936, precisely when Vienna hosted an international congress of Catholic medical doctors. The primary objective of the congress was to discuss matters related to eugenics. While they did not explicitly condemn eugenics, its participants strongly rejected the violent strategies of negative eugenics.¹⁶⁷⁸ One of the key voices at the congress was the Austrian Catholic physician Albert Niedermeyer, a proponent of what he described as "Christian eugenics" with a pro-natalist emphasis, and a focus on the institutionalization of people he deemed hereditarily ill.¹⁶⁷⁹

Importantly, before the war, Albert Niedermeyer, part of whose ancestry was Jewish, studied biology in Vienna and completed an internship at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*.¹⁶⁸⁰ Later, he moved to Germany, which he left only after the rise of the Nazis to power. Upon his return to Vienna, Niedermeyer was appointed to lead the reopened and overhauled municipal eugenic marriage counseling clinic, which had been closed after the fall of Red Vienna. Both earlier in Germany and now in Austria, Niedermeyer was a vocal critic of eugenic sterilizations, a practice promoted by many race hygienists.¹⁶⁸¹ However, as John Connelly demonstrates, the stance of German-speaking Catholics toward racial theories was ambiguous. Even such a prominent critic of Nazi race hygiene as Niedermeyer had not yet found a convincing language to condemn racism and even went so far as to oppose mixed marriages.¹⁶⁸² It is noteworthy in this context that Iltis' book not only summarized the key arguments from his earlier Czech-

¹⁶⁷⁸ Löscher, *der gesunden Vernunft*, 89-94.

¹⁶⁷⁹ Löscher, *der gesunden Vernunft*, 128-32.

¹⁶⁸⁰ To the best of my knowledge, Niedermeyer's internship has, to date, eluded the attention of scholars, partially because he remains silent about this matter in his memoirs. However, his research interests in natural sciences aligned with the institution's agenda, and his name is clearly indicated on the list of interns for several consecutive years. Prziham, "Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt, Zweck, Einrichtung und Tätigkeit", 19; Prziham, "Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt, Ausgestaltung und Tätigkeit," 234. Cf. Albert Niedermeyer, *Wahn, Wissenschaft und Wahrheit: Lebensbekenntnisse eines Arztes* (Salzburg: Pustet, 1934).

¹⁶⁸¹ Thomas Mayer, "Albert Niedermeyer," in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 53-54.

¹⁶⁸² Connelly, "From Enemy to Brother," 24-25.

language booklet, *Race and Science and Politics*, but also included numerous references to Catholic dignitaries and intellectuals and their stance on race. Thus, Iltis' book hoped to provide an anti-racist language to a Catholic audience, exemplified by Niedermeyer.¹⁶⁸³

The eugenicists based in Prague continued to engage in Viennese debates during the interwar era. Even more so than their counterparts in Moravia, however, they relied on intermediaries. Interestingly, Irene Harand's journal covered the publication of *The Equivalence* as well and featured other relevant research by Matiegka and his allies.¹⁶⁸⁴ She even hoped that Matiegka would deliver a keynote lecture on race and racism at a congress she was planning at the time.¹⁶⁸⁵ However, it was the anthropologist Viktor Lebzelter, working at the *Naturhistorisches Museum* (Museum of Natural History) in Vienna, who emerged as the crucial intermediary for the editors of *The Equivalence*.

Lebzelter's intellectual background was complex, crisscrossing Austria's polarized political right and left. While he was trained in late imperial Vienna under the auspices of the nationalist racial anthropologist Rudolf Pösch and the Catholic ethnologist Wilhelm Schmidt, Lebzelter was also a former intern at the *Biologische Versuchsanstalt*.¹⁶⁸⁶ In the early interwar years, some of Lebzelter's research was linked to Austria's social welfare institutions, leading to his engagement with the socialist neo-Lamarckian eugenicist Julius Tandler and Tandler's

¹⁶⁸³ There are some indications that Iltis' book did, indeed, have an impact within the Austrian Catholic milieu. The priest Martin Gusinde, for instance, carefully read the book. He later even contacted the Czech anthropologist Matiegka to request offprints of the series of articles on racial anthropology published by the *Prager Presse* several years earlier, emphasizing that he learned about them from Iltis' brochure. Despite reading Iltis' book, however, Gusinde developed a problematic relationship with Nazism after the Anschluss of Austria. Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 7, Inv. No. 175, Letter, Martin Gusinde to Jindřich Matiegka, March 16., 1937.

¹⁶⁸⁴ See e.g. "Jüdische Schulkinder: blond und blauäugig," *Gerechtigkeit* 2, no. 65 (November 29, 1934): 3; Jan Bělehrádek, "Die Tschechische Akademie über die Rassenfrage," *Gerechtigkeit* 3, no. 87 (May 2, 1935): 2.

¹⁶⁸⁵ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Box 10, Inv. No. 544, Letter, Harand-Bewegung to Jindřich Matiegka, February 22., 1937; Christian Klösch, Kurt Scharr, and Erika Weinzierl, *Gegen Rassenhass und Menschennot: Irene Harand - Leben und Werk einer ungewöhnlichen Widerstandskämpferin* (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2004), footnote 354.

¹⁶⁸⁶ Archives of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Fund Biologische Versuchsanstalt, Box 1, *Verzeichnis der Arbeitenden an der Biologischen Versuchsanstalt der Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1918, 1919.

approach to constitutional medicine.¹⁶⁸⁷ While he remained a committed Catholic and Christian Social, Lebzelter's networks spanned across political divides.

Brigitte Fuchs argues that since the mid-1920s, Lebzelter had been a vocal critic of the emerging racial theories that would eventually become intimately associated with Nazism. One of the main targets was Otto Reche, a German racial anthropologist who, at the time, was a professor at the University of Vienna. Reche promoted sero-anthropology and advocated for a form of racial hygiene centered on coercive, interventionist measures, and Lebzelter shared neither of these views. Moreover, Lebzelter sought to unveil the political agenda behind Hans Günther's model of racial hierarchy.¹⁶⁸⁸ Finally, he also found himself in conflict with the young Austrian racial anthropologist and eugenicist Eberhard Geyer, who, like Reche and Günther, held *völkisch* nationalist views and sympathized with the Nazi movement.¹⁶⁸⁹ What all these targets of Lebzelter's criticism had in common was that they denied any alleged biological distinctiveness to the imagined Austrian community, seeking to dissolve it within a pan-German project.

As the 1920s in Austria were drawing to a close, as Robert Pyrah explains, the public debate was replete with an array of "conceptualizations of Austrian specificity, many drawing on Habsburg models of historicity and culture."¹⁶⁹⁰ The case of Lebzelter shows that these conceptualizations had also been translated into racial tropes. Indeed, Lebzelter appropriated key narratives and concepts from imperial Austrian racial anthropology, downsizing, reshaping, and employing them as a framework for a racial conceptualization underpinning post-imperial

¹⁶⁸⁷ Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht*, 283.

¹⁶⁸⁸ Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht*, 283.

¹⁶⁸⁹ Viktor Lebzelter, Review of *Grundzüge der Rassenhygiene, zugleich Einführung in die Vererbungslehre*, by Hermann Werner Siemens, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 55 (1925): 48–49; Eberhard Geyer, "Grundsätzliches zur Rassenhygiene," *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 55 (1925): 286–88; Viktor Lebzelter, "Grundsätzliches zur Rassenhygiene," *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 55 (1925): 361–62.

¹⁶⁹⁰ Robert Pyrah, "Heinrich von Srbik," in *Anti-Modernism: Radical Revisions of Collective Identity*, ed. Diana Mishkova, Marius Turda, and Balázs Trencsényi (New York: Central European University Press, 2014), 261.

Austria's state-building project.¹⁶⁹¹ In this endeavor, he claimed to have discerned the hybrid yet purportedly specific "racial" character of the Austrian nation.¹⁶⁹² His neo-traditionalist, racial conceptualization of Austrian national identity pursued a separatist agenda, opposing its incorporation into a broader German ethnonationalist project. Even though Lebzelter's understanding of the Austrian identity can thus be described as "sub-ethnic," it drew on a similar updated Habsburg imperial vocabulary as some post-Habsburg eugenicists who supported the supra-ethnic nation-building projects in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

From this perspective, it does not come as a surprise that Lebzelter saw the notion of unmixing as a significant threat to the state-building project he supported, and that his arguments against the emerging Nazi racial theories proceeded along very similar lines as *The Equivalence* would later do. In other words, he argued from a Mendelian perspective that the populations of Austria and other post-Habsburg countries were hybrid, asserting that the past process of intermarriage that gave rise to it was a positive phenomenon. Moreover, in the 1920s, he still maintained that the alleged "races" that comprised this mixture were equal, particularly arguing against the ideas of Nordic racial superiority. This criticism, as Brigitte Fuchs puts it, made Lebzelter a dissident voice among the Viennese school of racial anthropology, which was more attuned to *völkisch* nationalism.¹⁶⁹³

By the mid-1930s, Lebzelter's views became more ambiguous, especially as he began to emphasize alleged hierarchies within his biological concept of the Austrian people. Despite this disconcerting shift, many in Vienna continued to regard him as a "consistent opponent of

¹⁶⁹¹ Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht*, 284.

¹⁶⁹² Viktor Lebzelter, "Kleine Rassenkunde Österreichs," *Monatsschrift für Kultur und Politik* 1, no. 8 (August 1936): 708–16.

¹⁶⁹³ Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht*, 284. For the views held by other members of the Viennese school of racial anthropology, see Maria Teschler-Nicola, "Volksdeutsche and Racial Anthropology in Interwar Vienna: The 'Marienfeld Project,'" in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 55–82.

Nazi racial theories” and a potential ally, due to his prior convictions.¹⁶⁹⁴ For example, in 1936, Lebzelter joined Julius Bauer and Friedrich Hertz as a speaker in a lecture course that critically dealt with “Science of Heredity and Race Science.” (The course unfolded at the Viennese *Volksheim*, a popular education institution formerly associated with the social democrats.)¹⁶⁹⁵ Furthermore, Irene Harand’s journal documented a range of Lebzelter’s viewpoints and engagements.¹⁶⁹⁶ Finally, during the early 1930s, Lebzelter, a Catholic monarchist, also became the primary Vienna-based ally of the racial anthropologists associated with *The Equivalence*.

Shortly after a German translation of *The Equivalence* had been published, Lebzelter reviewed it in the flagship journal of the Austrian society of physical anthropology. In his review, he emphasized the key arguments of the book that aligned with his agenda.¹⁶⁹⁷ Tellingly, he highlighted Růžicka’s Mendelian argument against racial hygiene, suggesting that an attempt to unmix hybrid populations and thus extract a “pure Nordic race” was impossible.¹⁶⁹⁸ Significantly, on the same page, Lebzelter also highly critically reviewed Günther’s recent pamphlet, concluding that “several chapters of the book are not scientific at all, but rather an exercise in political theology.”¹⁶⁹⁹ Moreover, Lebzelter had also been encouraged by Jindřich Matiegka to contribute to the accompanying series of articles on racial anthropology, which the latter edited in the *Prager Presse*. Reflecting the amount of trust Lebzelter enjoyed with its editors, he was not solely charged with writing an essay on Austria, but also on Romania, Czechoslovakia’s important ally.¹⁷⁰⁰ One key factor that made this

¹⁶⁹⁴ Fuchs, *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht*, 283.

¹⁶⁹⁵ “Aus der Volksheimwoche: Neue Kurzurse,” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 123 (January 9, 1936): 12.

¹⁶⁹⁶ Gustav Hofstetter, “Es graut ihnen von sich selber...” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 142 (May 21, 1936): 5.

¹⁶⁹⁷ Viktor Lebzelter, Review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit der europäischen Rassen und die Wege zu ihrer Vervollkommenung*, by Karel Weigner, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 65 (1935): 243–44.

¹⁶⁹⁸ Lebzelter, Review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit*, 244.

¹⁶⁹⁹ Viktor Lebzelter, Review of *Herkunft und Rassengeschichte der Germanen*, by Hans Günther, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 65 (1935): 244.

¹⁷⁰⁰ Viktor Lebzelter, “Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. II. In Österreich,” *Prager Presse* 14, no. 323 (November 25, 1934): 4; Viktor Lebzelter, “Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. IV. In Rumänien,” *Prager Presse* 14, no. 336 (December 8, 1934): 4.

unlikely transnational cooperation possible was the challenge of Nazi racial theories to their nationalist projects, which both Lebzelter and the authors of *The Equivalence* defended from the position of members of national majorities.

The cooperation between Lebzelter and these Czech racial anthropologists both preceded *The Equivalence* and continued after it. Moreover, these links were not limited to an exchange of ideas; they also involved material exchanges, including research objects and practices. To start with, Lebzelter published one of his major monographs with the Czech Academy of Science and was involved in a research project funded by a Czechoslovak foundation.¹⁷⁰¹ What is more, Lebzelter conducted anthropometric research in Czechoslovakia in 1932 and in the following year when he carried out field research in the borderland region of Böhmerwald/Šumava, emphasizing that his research straddled the purported language frontier between Czech- and German-speakers.¹⁷⁰² In order to overcome expected resistance from local authorities, Lebzelter sought Matiegka's help, and the latter provided him with a letter of recommendation, backing Lebzelter with his official and nationalist credentials.¹⁷⁰³ Ultimately, Lebzelter measured more than 3300 individuals in that area.¹⁷⁰⁴ However, Czechoslovakia was only one node in Lebzelter's transnational network that spanned most of the former Habsburg empire, facilitating exchanges of ideas, objects, and practices.

Lebzelter sought to embed his racial conceptualization of the Austrian nation within a broader regional framework, with ambiguous outcomes. On the surface, his framework looked

¹⁷⁰¹ For a detailed discussion of these exchanges, please refer to the subsequent chapter.

¹⁷⁰² The choice of the surroundings of the town of Prachatitz/Prachatice was facilitated by the fact that Lebzelter's wife, whom he does not mention by name, hailed from this particular area, and that her extended family stretched into villages coded as German as well as into those coded as Czech. Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 274, Letter, Viktor Lebzelter to Jindřich Matiegka, March 11., 1933.

¹⁷⁰³ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 274, Letter, Jindřich Matiegka to Viktor Lebzelter, June 10., 1933.

¹⁷⁰⁴ The results were published after Lebzelter's death and reframed by the editors to dovetail with Nazi racial ideology. Anna Sittenberger, Josef Wastl, and Viktor Lebzelter, "Rassenkundliche Untersuchungen an Deutschen und Tschechen im südlichsten Böhmerwald (Quellgebiet der Moldau)," *Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien* 52 (1941): 397–457.

distinctly post-imperial. From 1930 onwards, Lebzelter pursued research in various borderlands of the states that replaced the Habsburg Empire, such as in Czechoslovakia's border region discussed above. Predictably, Lebzelter carried out a part of these anthropometric measurements in Austria, namely in the multiethnic Burgenland, and in the area of Lavanttal in Carinthia.¹⁷⁰⁵ The latter village was located near the Yugoslav border and on the perceived language frontier between German and Slovene speakers. Moreover, Lebzelter was also intrigued by, and attempted to study the Kočevje/Gotschee region in north-western Yugoslavia.¹⁷⁰⁶ Also aligned with his agenda were his measurements that took place among the Transylvanian Saxons in Romania, where Lebzelter competed with the German racial anthropologist Eugen Fischer and his followers.¹⁷⁰⁷ The results of these research projects had not yet been published in most cases when Lebzelter interacted with *The Equivalence* and some of its authors in 1934.¹⁷⁰⁸

Far from being disparate, these research projects in various post-Habsburg territories focused on borderlands inhabited by speakers of various German dialects, even though Lebzelter also measured people of other ethnicities in these areas. In a certain tension with Lebzelter's "separatist" emphasis on Austrian "racial" specificity, this transnational research, in effect, showed Lebzelter increasingly re-linking Austrian identity to a *völkisch* framework that constructed connections and commonality between ethnic Germans strewn across Central and Eastern Europe. Lebzelter's research thus aligned with an Austro-centered approach to the cross-border history of the German *Volk* that was not uncommon among conservative Austrian

¹⁷⁰⁵ Within Austria, Lebzelter also commenced research in the vicinity of Pöggstall and Herzogenburg in Lower Austria. This research was likely connected with his attempt to construct a racial argument about the alleged specificity of the Austrian population. Verena Pawlowsky, "Quelle aus vielen Stücken: Die Korrespondenz der Anthropologischen Abteilung des Wiener Naturhistorischen Museums bis 1938," in *Vorreiter der Vernichtung: Eugenik, Rassenhygiene und Euthanasie in der österreichischen Diskussion vor 1938*, ed. Wolfgang Neugebauer and Heinz Eberhard Gabriel (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005), 157-61.

¹⁷⁰⁶ Archives of the Group of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Božo Škerlj papers, Letter, Viktor Lebzelter to Božo Škerlj, January 3., 1934.

¹⁷⁰⁷ Georgescu, *The Eugenic Fortress*, 43-51.

¹⁷⁰⁸ In fact, some of the resulting papers appeared only posthumously in 1936 or had not been published at all.

intellectuals of the 1930s. Such views were propounded, for instance, by the historical narratives of Heinrich von Srbik, who argued that Austria's alleged mission within German history was to unite the "non-German nations with its German core nation, and that was one of its greatest achievements for German culture until the Monarchy's end."¹⁷⁰⁹

Symptomatic of this position were the arguments that Lebzelter made after he was invited by Romania's authorities to conduct anthropometric measurements on a large number of Romania's soldiers. As Marius Turda points out, while Lebzelter was ready to recognize Romanian nationalist claims for racial authenticity and autochthonous ethnic origins, he departed from these nationalist ideas by situating the purported origins of Romanians specifically in the Romanian Old Kingdom. To wit: he refused to locate the Romanian ethnogenesis either in post-Habsburg Transylvania, or in the other post-imperial territories that Romania incorporated after 1918.¹⁷¹⁰

While pursuing his ambiguous agenda, Lebzelter garnered several allies in post-Habsburg countries. One of them was Božo Škerlj in Yugoslavia. Lebzelter even sought to convince Škerlj to aid him with his planned research on the German-speakers of the Gotschee/Kočevje area, ultimately without success. Škerlj, in turn, saw this link as important for his career prospects. He asked Lebzelter to provide a letter of reference for his application to a professorship, to publish reviews of his work, and to facilitate a series of popular lectures for him in Vienna.¹⁷¹¹ Lebzelter also partnered with Hungarian racial anthropologist Lajos Bartucz. In 1936, together, they curated an exhibition at the Viennese Museum of Natural History centered on Hungary's racial anthropology, aligning with their respective

¹⁷⁰⁹ Heinrich von. Srbik, "Austria in the Holy Roman Empire and in the German Confederation," in *Anti-Modernism: Radical Revisions of Collective Identity*, ed. Diana Mishkova, Marius Turda, and Balázs Trencsényi (New York: Central European University Press, 2014), 263.

¹⁷¹⁰ Turda, "In Search of Racial Types," 6.

¹⁷¹¹ Archives of the Group of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Božo Škerlj papers, Letter, Božo Škerlj to Viktor Lebzelter, March 26., 1933.

viewpoints.¹⁷¹² In other words, the networks of Lebzelter and *The Equivalence*'s authors show that there were a number of racial anthropologists in post-Habsburg countries who were linked by robust, multi-layered, and overlapping informal ties. In pursuit of their ambiguous nationalist agendas, these individuals selectively criticized Nazi racial theories that they deemed incompatible with the nation- or state-building endeavors in their respective countries.

Lebzelter supported eugenics. Even one of the last articles Lebzelter wrote before his death in December 1936 was dedicated to this theme, as its title *Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe* (The Task of Our Racial Hygiene) clearly indicated.¹⁷¹³ In his Mendelian perspective, biology and society were separated, and there was no hope that a favorable social environment could enduringly improve human nature. Lebzelter's Mendelism thus led him to envision some eugenic policies aimed at reducing the number of people whom he stamped as "carriers of pathological inheritance [Träger der krankhaften Erbanlagen]."¹⁷¹⁴ Despite this turn of phrase, however, Lebzelter was critical of race hygiene in Nazi Germany and categorically opposed eugenic sterilizations, like other Catholic eugenicists in 1930s Austria.¹⁷¹⁵

In his quest for alternative strategies to eugenic sterilizations, Lebzelter subtly aligned many of his views with the Viennese Catholic eugenicist Albert Niedermeyer. To begin with, Lebzelter followed Niedermeyer by calling for the institutionalization of people with hereditary mental illnesses and disabilities, in pursuit of eugenic objectives. He also supported the introduction of prenuptial health certificates, an old and commonly voiced eugenic demand that

¹⁷¹² "Ein Volk rückt ab vom Rassenwahn," *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 173 (December 24, 1936): 3; "Ausstellung einer Mischrasse," *Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus* 2, no. 3–4 (April 1937): 8.

¹⁷¹³ Viktor Lebzelter, "Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe," *Monatsschrift für Kultur und Politik* 2, no. 1 (1937): 19–24.

¹⁷¹⁴ Lebzelter, "Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe," 19.

¹⁷¹⁵ Austria of the 1930s, as Monika Löscher documents, did not have Catholic eugenicists like Hermann Muckermann in Nazi Germany, who went on a collision course with the church by supporting eugenic sterilizations. Löscher, *der gesunden Vernunft*, passim.

was also close to Niedermeyer's own position.¹⁷¹⁶ More surprisingly, Lebzelter also echoed, in an equally tacit manner, an argument put forth by Julius Bauer. Similar to the Viennese critic of eugenic sterilizations, he contended that many individuals with hereditary conditions should simply have access to reconstructive surgeries that could enhance their quality of life, rather than being subjected to eugenic interventions.¹⁷¹⁷ However, beyond echoing these ideas, Lebzelter also introduced some eugenic suggestions of his own.

Lebzelter's own suggestions focused particularly on the countryside and on the urban working class. Unlike many other Central European eugenicists who mythicized the peasantry as the timeless spring of national purity, Lebzelter cast the villages as an alleged source of degeneration. Specifically, he contended that endogamy was much more widespread in the villages than in larger communities, leading to increased genetic relatedness and a higher frequency of hereditary conditions among their inhabitants. Consequently, fusing his Catholic conservatism with a vision of eugenic improvement, Lebzelter argued that "In the Middle Ages the canon law [of the Catholic church] prohibited the marriage of two closely related relatives within six degrees of consanguinity. It would be a eugenic measure of extraordinary importance to return to this practice of the medieval times."¹⁷¹⁸ For Lebzelter, the modern theory of genetics could thus contribute to the formation of a neo-traditionalist society.

Social policies influenced by pronatalism found favor among Catholic eugenicists in Austria, as they did not collide with the teachings of the church.¹⁷¹⁹ This was also true for Lebzelter, whose proposed eugenic measures ultimately emphasized such policies. Specifically,

¹⁷¹⁶ As civil marriages were not obligatory in interwar Austria, Lebzelter's suggestion, if it were ever enacted, would have to be voluntary in practice. Maria Mesner, *Geburten/Kontrolle: Reproduktionspolitik im 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 72.

¹⁷¹⁷ Lebzelter, "Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe," 21.

¹⁷¹⁸ The canon law of the Western Church prohibited the marriage of two closely related relatives within six degrees of consanguinity from the early 9th century to the early 13th century. Lebzelter, "Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe," 21.

¹⁷¹⁹ Löscher, *der gesunden Vernunft*, passim.

Lebzelter advocated for the implementation of marriage loans and financial compensation for families with a greater number of children. Furthermore, he pleaded for a program of rural sanitation and legal reforms that would regulate the inheritance of land, thereby enabling peasants to marry at an earlier age. Even though Lebzelter positioned himself among the more moderate figures in Austria's radicalizing conservative milieu of the 1930s, and while he rejected eugenic sterilizations, he disturbingly suggested Nazi Germany as a model for some of these policies.¹⁷²⁰ Writing from the position of a member of his country's ethnic majority, therefore, Lebzelter drafted a highly ambiguous critique of Nazi racial theories that negotiated with, rather than outright rejected, some aspects of Nazi policies, not unlike his allies in Czechoslovakia and in Yugoslavia.

Beyond the Post-Habsburg Context: Reception in Romania

The arguments presented by Hugo Iltis and *The Equivalence* also found resonance in interwar Romania, even though it was primarily not in the regions of the country which had a Habsburg imperial past. One notable critic of racial theories in 1930s Romania was a physician and supporter of eugenics, Iosif Glicsman.¹⁷²¹ As this section demonstrates, he chose to engage with both the arguments of Iltis and *The Equivalence*.

With a background in medicine, Glicsman chose a career in journalism. Writing in the left liberal daily *Adevărul* (The Truth) under the pseudonym Doctor Ygrec, he regularly published popular articles on various medical issues. Among many other topics, Glicsman frequently covered eugenics. In fact, in the 1920s, he became one of the most vocal journalistic

¹⁷²⁰ Lebzelter, "Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe," 22.

¹⁷²¹ Marius Turda and Maria Sophia Quine, *Historicizing Race* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), 96.

supporters of this science in Romania, as Maria Bucur and Marius Turda concur, and even went so far as to promote the idea of eugenic sterilizations on a voluntary basis.¹⁷²²

Born in 1871 in the Romanian Old Kingdom and educated in his hometown, Iași, Glicsman did not initially have strong ties to the Habsburg lands.¹⁷²³ That changed in the second half of the 1920s, however, as Glicsman started engaging with the framework of constitutional medicine. Even though he was aware of the alternative options hailing from other Latin countries and from Germany, respectively, Glicsman chose to draw mainly on the Viennese advocates of this framework, Julius Tandler and Julius Bauer.¹⁷²⁴ Glicsman particularly leaned on the latter. By the mid-1930s, he reported with approval on Bauer's clash with advocates of racial hygiene and his critique of eugenic sterilizations.¹⁷²⁵ They apparently even were in contact. In 1937, when Glicsman launched one of his final projects, a journal on medical issues for a broad audience titled *Medicul Nostru* (Our Physician), one of its first issues featured a specially requested, original article written by none other than Julius Bauer.¹⁷²⁶ The advertisement for this popular medicine journal made much of this fact, framing it as the testimony of the internationally-oriented, scientific perspective of its publisher.

Apart from helping Glicsman establish ties with Central Europe, constitutional medicine shaped his eugenic outlook in one more crucial way. It helped him renegotiate the boundary between the biological and the social. While Glicsman had long adhered to neo-Lamarckist views, by the 1930s, he firmly asserted that heredity was governed by Mendelian laws, and

¹⁷²² His intervention to the debates on eugenics have been widely discussed, mainly by Maria Bucur and Marius Turda. See e.g. Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization*, passim; Turda, "To End the Degeneration," 103.

¹⁷²³ For these details about Glicsman's life, I am drawing on his obituary. Al. Manolescu, "Comemorarea D-rului I. Glicsman-Ygrec" [Commemoration of Dr I. Glicsman-Ygrec], *Mișcarea medicală* 12, no. 3–4 (1939): 235–37.

¹⁷²⁴ Iosif Glicsman, "Eugenia și ereditatea patologică" [Eugenics and Pathological Heredity], *Sănătatea Publică* 1, no. 4 (July 1927): 4–5.

¹⁷²⁵ Iosif Glicsman, "Șlagvorturi" [Slogans], *Adevărul* 50, no. 15936 (January 2, 1936): 1.

¹⁷²⁶ Julius Bauer, "Importanța glandelor endocrine" [The Importance of Endocrine Glands], *Medicul nostru* 1, no. 2 (February 18, 1937): 4.

there was no evidence supporting the inheritance of acquired characteristics.¹⁷²⁷ With the aid of Viennese constitutional medicine, Glicsman could embrace hard heredity without having to abandon his left-leaning politics. Even though Bauer's strictly hereditarian approach contended that human constitution was inherited and fixed, the individual, non-heritable condition was a different story. It developed during one's life and could be altered, giving doctors the option to intervene and address a wide range of individual challenges.¹⁷²⁸ By the time Glicsman raised his voice against Nazi racial theories, therefore, he was not only embedded in post-Habsburg scientific networks but also embraced a version of Mendelian eugenics.

In the summer of 1935, Glicsman published a lengthy booklet titled *Rasa și rasismul: Cea mai mare escrocherie științifică a secolului* (Race and Racism: The Biggest Scientific Fraud of the Century).¹⁷²⁹ What Glicsman aimed to expose as fraud were the racial theories that claimed human "races" were unequal and that they defined the identity of nations. Given his engagement with post-Habsburg eugenic networks, it is not surprising that Glicsman's argument often drew on the authors from Czechoslovakia, alongside contemporary French journalistic and scientific texts, an influence that he acknowledges himself on several occasions in the booklet.¹⁷³⁰

The ideas of Hugo Iltis were particularly significant for Glicsman's attempt to characterize and contextualize the racial theories that he opposed. Like Iltis, Glicsman defined

¹⁷²⁷ Consider, for instance, the entry on heredity in a popular medical encyclopaedia that Glicsman wrote and which went through several editions. Iosif Glicsman, "Ereditatea" [Heredity], in *Medicul nostru: Dicționar enciclopedic medical* [Our Physician: Encyclopedic Medical Dictionary] (Bucharest: Adeverul, 1937), 197–200.

¹⁷²⁸ For further information on Bauer's approach to constitutional medicine and eugenics, as well as relevant literature, please refer to the previous chapter.

¹⁷²⁹ The title was perhaps a bitter allusion to the scandal that discredited the socialist Lamarckian experimentalist Paul Kammerer a decade earlier, labeled by contemporary journalists as the biggest scientific fraud of the century. Iosif Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul: Cea mai mare escrocherie științifică a secolului* [Race and Racism: The Biggest Scientific Fraud of the Century] (Bucharest: Adam, [1935]). For the exact publication date, see Iosif Glicsman, "Arianomania" [Aryan Mania], *Adevărul* 49, no. 15817 (August 11, 1935): 3.

¹⁷³⁰ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 8, 50–54.

these theories as instances of racism, becoming one of the first to use this term in Romanian.¹⁷³¹ He also partly accepted Ittis's genealogy of these ideas and critically engaged with the writings of Gobineau, Woltmann, and Chamberlain as he moved to refute the ideas of Nazi racial theorists.¹⁷³² He even reproduced some of Ittis' more context-specific points, such as his attempt to highlight a refusal of racism by a part of the German Catholic hierarchy.¹⁷³³ More emphatically than Ittis, and closer to *The Equivalence*, Glicsman also strongly contrasted racist theories with the purported objectivity of racial anthropology, describing them as an outright scientific fraud. However, his conceptualization also distinguished itself from the authors who influenced him by underscoring what he saw as the irrational, mystical, occult, and quasi-religious content of racism.¹⁷³⁴

In what appears to be a hastily written brochure, Glicsman treated the multiple conflicting racial theories in Nazi Germany as if they constituted a coherent whole, held together by a mystical belief in a racialized notion of national superiority.¹⁷³⁵ However, by drawing on disparate sources, and perhaps without intending to do so, Glicsman's text ultimately achieved to cite arguments against several influential racial theories in Nazi Germany. Glicsman placed emphasis on the equality of races, which, in effect, contradicted the Nordicist theories of racial supremacy.¹⁷³⁶ He also presented genetic arguments implying that their goal of selectively breeding this purportedly superior "race" into purity was highly unlikely to produce the intended results.¹⁷³⁷ Conversely, some of Glicsman's arguments also effectively contradicted the Nazi theories that stipulated an emerging, dynamic "German race."

¹⁷³¹ Glicsman was also familiar with the usage of the term in the French context, and it is not entirely clear if Ittis or French-language debates had a more decisive impact on this choice; likely the two influences reinforced each other.

¹⁷³² Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 6, 25-34.

¹⁷³³ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 4.

¹⁷³⁴ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 3-4.

¹⁷³⁵ Glicsman did not identify many names that he saw as associated with Nazi racism, beyond Hitler and Alfred Rosenberg.

¹⁷³⁶ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 7.

¹⁷³⁷ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 73-75.

Glicsman's emphasis that all nations were "racially mixed," as well as his stressing of the stability of these constitutive "races" – defined by "fixed, homogeneous, physical characters, transmitted over the ages through heredity" – suggested that such a view was untenable.¹⁷³⁸ Interestingly, Iltis and *The Equivalence* not only supplied Glicsman with some of these arguments but also served as a source of information about the relevant views of other scholars.¹⁷³⁹

While in reality, there was a marked tension in Nazi racial theories between the notions of race and *Volk*, Glicsman believed that all of these theories equated the nation with a single, pure "race."¹⁷⁴⁰ Consequently, his major concern was to demonstrate that nation and race were not coterminous. He was particularly intent on highlighting this fact for both the German and the Romanian imagined communities, and he delved into some detail regarding contemporary scientific research that suggested these populations, too, were of mixed origin. To support his argument regarding the Germans, Glicsman referred to an overview of anthropometric measurements published in 1933 by Jindřich Matiegka in the semi-official encyclopaedia *Československá vlastivěda* (Czechoslovak Patrimony).¹⁷⁴¹ Glicsman reported that this research suggested both the Czech- and German-speaking populations of Czechoslovakia were "racially mixed" and that the physical abilities of various alleged racial types were equal.¹⁷⁴²

¹⁷³⁸ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 8 and 52. Glicsman also mounted his critical attack against the notion of the "Aryan race," which was characteristic of Nazi racial ideology but had been repudiated by Nazi racial scientists. Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich*, 3.

¹⁷³⁹ For example, Glicsman supported his arguments on the "racially mixed" nature of nations, as well as on the equality of races, by citing German liberal racial anthropologists, while emphasizing that he was taking these citations from *The Equivalence*. Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 7-8.

¹⁷⁴⁰ Mark Roseman, "Racial Discourse, Nazi Violence, and the Limits of the Racial State Model," in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devin O. Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard F. Wetzell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), passim.

¹⁷⁴¹ Jindřich Matiegka, "Fysická anthropologie obyvatelstva v Československu" [Physical Anthropology of the Population in Czechoslovakia], in *Československá vlastivěda. Díl 2: Člověk* [Czechoslovak Patrimony. Volume 2: Man], ed. Václav Dědina (Prague: Sfinx, 1933), 115–254; Jindřich Matiegka, "Němci v Československu" [Germans in Czechoslovakia], in *Československá vlastivěda. Díl 2: Člověk* [Czechoslovak Patrimony. Volume 2: Man], ed. Václav Dědina (Prague: Sfinx, 1933), 270–76.

¹⁷⁴² Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 52-54.

To illustrate a similar point about Romanians, Glicsman referenced the Austrian race anthropologist Lebzelter, specifically his anthropological measurements of Romanian soldiers. Glicsman was less concerned with Lebzelter's arguments supporting Romanian nationalism and more interested in his assertion that a variety of "races" made up the Romanian nation.¹⁷⁴³ He invoked both of these bodies of research to support his central argument that "there are no pure physical somatic races," and thus to extricate the nation from the realm of biology.¹⁷⁴⁴

Even though Glicsman did not elaborate extensively on the issue of heredity, the assumptions about the fixity of "races" and about the inheritance of traits, which underpinned his argument, were Mendelian. Significantly, Glicsman, who advocated Jewish assimilation, drew on the British early Mendelian researcher and eugenicist, Redcliffe Salaman, to support his arguments.¹⁷⁴⁵

Ultimately, however, Glicsman's book suggested that it mattered little whether human nature was plastic because collective identity was rooted in culture rather than in nature. These spheres were strictly separate. Moreover, it was no longer nature but culture that became the embodiment of plasticity and was shaped by the influences of the external environment. "The only thing that is real," Glicsman contended in the key passage of his book,

are psychic races, and these races are, in fact, called nations. These 'races' share the same mentality, the same habits, the same temperament, the same tastes and ideologies, and the same language. All these things are made and conditioned by common geographical, social, economic, historical, and cultural environment. This is the naked, pure truth about the problem of human races.¹⁷⁴⁶

Crucially, citing Ernest Renan, Glicsman argued that rather than being determined by "race" or "soil," national belonging was ultimately a choice of an individual.¹⁷⁴⁷ Ultimately, therefore,

¹⁷⁴³ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 39. See also Turda, "In Search of Racial Types," 1–21.

¹⁷⁴⁴ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 39.

¹⁷⁴⁵ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 73–75.

¹⁷⁴⁶ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 39–40.

¹⁷⁴⁷ Glicsman, *Rasa și rasismul*, 80–81.

Glicsman used the arguments provided by Mendelian critics of Nazi racial theories to emphasize the separation between the spheres of biology and culture and thus sought to preserve room for a liberal definition of nationhood.

While Glicsman's arguments did not fundamentally challenge the status of physical anthropology as a scientific discipline, they were followed by an aggressive response from Iordache Făcăoaru, a Romanian racial anthropologist. As Marius Turda carefully documents, Făcăoaru was born in the Romanian Old Kingdom and received his training at the University of Bucharest as well as in Munich, where his focus was on anthropology, genetics, and racial hygiene. Starting in the early 1930s, Făcăoaru became associated with Iuliu Moldovan's institute in Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg and local eugenic networks.¹⁷⁴⁸ Consequently, neither Glicsman nor Făcăoaru had inherent connections to Habsburg imperial legacies. However, it is evident that Făcăoaru was also familiar with the arguments presented in *The Equivalence*.

The circulation of *The Equivalence* in this region was facilitated by shared networks. Already in the late 1920s, some exchanges between Romanian eugenicists in Cluj and their Czech counterparts were taking place, albeit their depth and persistence is unclear.¹⁷⁴⁹ Moreover, as we have already seen, additional channels of communication between the two were established through the Sokol mass gymnastics association. Finally, while the eugenicists in Cluj did not subscribe to any eugenics-oriented periodicals published in Czechoslovakia, they exchanged copies of their own publication for new issues of *Evgenika* (Eugenics), a journal

¹⁷⁴⁸ Marius Turda, "Iordache Făcăoaru," in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 328–31.

¹⁷⁴⁹ For example, in its official annual report for the year 1929, the Institute of National Eugenics in Prague pointed out that it maintained "regular contacts with the representative of eugenics in Romania, Prof. Moldovan in Cluj." However, to the best of my knowledge, these exchanges left no paper trail in either of the two countries. Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, Box 3, File 1526, Zpráva o činnosti ústavu pro národní eugeniku za r. 1929, January 1930.

published in Yugoslavia by Božo Škerlj.¹⁷⁵⁰ Consequently, a copy of the book (or a summary of its contents) quickly reached Cluj, likely through at least one of these channels. Indeed, Făcăoaru cited it as early as 1935 in an article published in Iuliu Moldovan's *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic*.¹⁷⁵¹ However, Făcăoaru did so only to make an empirical point, as there was a significant gap between his political and epistemic values and those of *The Equivalence*.

While the strictly Mendelian eugenicist “followed, to some extent, the model of national eugenics or biopolitics advocated by Iuliu Moldovan,” Marius Turda argues, “there was a racist element in Făcăoaru’s interpretation of anthropology.”¹⁷⁵² In fact, as another historian of racial anthropology in interwar Romania points out, Făcăoaru injected local debates with “intense Nordicism,” and ultimately linked his views with fascist ideology.¹⁷⁵³ Consequently, Făcăoaru had no use even for the tepid nationalist critique of Nazi racial theories put forth in *The Equivalence*, as his texts, including his response to Glicsman, make clear.

In 1936, Făcăoaru was invited by the editors of the radical-right-wing daily *Ideea Națională* (National Idea) to write a serialized article on “Race and Racism” as an extended reply to Glicsman.¹⁷⁵⁴ Făcăoaru’s demagogic response bundled together Glicsman’s Jewishness, along with his alleged neo-Lamarckism and Marxism.¹⁷⁵⁵ He thus followed a similar strategy as Fritz Lenz’s earlier retorts to the left-wing critics of racial theories, even though Glicsman was now arguing along Mendelian lines and could hardly be described as a

¹⁷⁵⁰ Iordache Făcăoaru, “Reviste streine în schimb cu Buletinul eugenic și biopolitic” [Foreign Journals in Exchange with the Buletin eugenic și biopolitic], *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 8, no. 10–12 (December 1937): 381–82.

¹⁷⁵¹ Iordache Făcăoaru, “Criteriile pentru diagnoza rasială” [Criteria for Racial Diagnosis], *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 6, no. 10–11–12 (1935): 357.

¹⁷⁵² Turda, “Iordache Făcăoaru,” 329.

¹⁷⁵³ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 329.

¹⁷⁵⁴ Făcăoaru was a recurrent contributor to this outlet, even featuring within the narrow circle of its editors and collaborators. “Redacția și colaboratorii Ideii Naționale” [Editors and Collaborators of the Ideea Națională], *Ideea Națională* 3, no. 1–2 (April 5, 1935): 7.

¹⁷⁵⁵ On Glicsman’s alleged neo-Lamarckism, see Iordache Făcăoaru, “Rasa și rasismul, o punere la punct a unei probleme de actualitate VII” [Race and Racism: An Analysis of a Topical Issue], *Ideea Națională* 4, no. 7 (July 18, 1936): 1–2.

Marxist. As Lenz was one of Făcăoaru's teachers in Munich, this similarity may not have been accidental.¹⁷⁵⁶

Făcăoaru's reaction boiled down to promoting the alleged Nordic supremacy and a call for maintaining its "purity," with racial ideology and policy in Nazi Germany clearly in mind. In a key passage of his text, which, like the rest of his response, was replete with anti-Semitic tropes, Făcăoaru contended that:

"The Jews are free to do whatever they consider salutary for their community, but why don't they allow other nations to do the same thing? Their spiritual leaders [conducătorii] maintain the exclusivity of their own nation, but do not mince their words now when an Aryan nation dares to do what they have been practicing for thousands of years. The hatred of the Jews against the Nordic thought is thus understandable [...]."¹⁷⁵⁷

The view on race that Făcăoaru outlined in this article was again close to Lenz's own, both in his vocal Nordicism and his preference for infusing natural science with anti-mechanistic explanations and metaphysical speculation; it was also ultimately wedded to analogous political positions.¹⁷⁵⁸ This view was irreconcilable not only with Glicsman's liberal critique of racial theories, but also with the ambiguous positivist nationalism of *The Equivalence*.

No Circulation Despite Persisting Connections: Hungary and Poland

In other post-imperial contexts, namely in Poland and Hungary, the arguments of *The Equivalence* did not have any significant reverberations, and the same was true for the texts of Hugo Iltis. That these critiques largely failed to circulate in these two countries is, on the surface, striking, since the local supporters of eugenics had a degree of connection with their

¹⁷⁵⁶ Turda, "Iordache Făcăoaru," passim.

¹⁷⁵⁷ Iordache Făcăoaru, "Rasa și rasismul, o punere la punct a unei probleme de actualitate V," *Ideea Națională* 4, no. 5 (July 4, 1936): 1.

¹⁷⁵⁸ Amit Varshizky, "Between Science and Metaphysics: Fritz Lenz and Racial Anthropology in Interwar Germany," *Intellectual History Review* 27, no. 2 (April 2017): 247–72.

counterparts in Czechoslovakia, in some cases drawing on shared imperial legacies. However, the reasons for this result become more obvious when one takes into account the relationship that crystallized between scientific and political values in racial anthropology and genetics in these two contexts.

In interwar Poland, as Richard McMahon argues, racial anthropology developed a high profile, and the country became “a leading international player” in this field.¹⁷⁵⁹ However, there were several competing narratives of race, propounded by different networks of Polish racial anthropologists. Neither of these projects linked epistemic and political values in a way that was compatible either with *The Equivalence*’s hesitant critique of racial theories, let alone with Iltis’s more substantial objections. Consequently, their statements against racial theories largely met with silence, even though Polish racial anthropologists had a “special relationship” and occasional alliances with their Czech nationalist counterparts, due to their shared anti-German position, and even though the Lwów school’s Czekanowski and Czortkower contributed to the series in the *Prager Presse*.¹⁷⁶⁰ Thus, Polish racial anthropologists neither adopted these arguments nor publicly denounced them.

While the Kraków school of racial anthropology updated an earlier nationalist racial narrative about a Celto-Slav ontology of Polishness, with an ambiguous liberal and French-oriented inflection, the influential conservative Lwów anthropologists sought to reconfigure Polish nationalism with a theory of Nordic racial superiority. In effect, it “racially associated superior Nordics with modern Poles and ancient Slavs.”¹⁷⁶¹ Although neither of these schools linked its claims to a strong emphasis on racial purity, each, as Richard McMahon points out, devised an exclusivist narrative of racial superiority, “condemning half the Polish population,

¹⁷⁵⁹ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 287.

¹⁷⁶⁰ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 310.

¹⁷⁶¹ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 287.

though the other half, to the inferior non-Aryan race.”¹⁷⁶² Thus, even the nationalist critique of theories of racial superiority presented in *The Equivalence*, primarily directed at Nordicist theories in Nazi Germany, challenged both of these positions in Poland in its implications. Finally, its arguments about hybridity were even more difficult to reconcile with the extreme nationalists such as Karol Stojanowski. If the Lwów anthropologists mirrored a form of Nordicism, Stojanowski mimicked German *völkisch* racism, but with a Slavic content. The resulting position linked anti-Nordicism and an emphasis on racial purity, with a rabid anti-Semitic inflection.¹⁷⁶³

While Iltis’ Mendelian arguments from the 1930s, as well as those of *The Equivalence*, failed to circulate in Hungary, the reasons differed from the Polish setting. In this case, it was obvious that a rivalry in foreign policy made cooperation or the circulation of ideas between Hungary’s racial anthropologists and their counterparts in Czechoslovakia both undesirable and undesired. This tension was manifest even from the series of articles in the *Prager Presse*, which ultimately did feature a contribution by one of the leading Hungarian racial anthropologists, Lajos Bartucz.¹⁷⁶⁴ However, the article appeared only after Bartucz withdrew his contribution for political reasons, before reversing his position again, likely after further consultation with Hungary’s authorities.¹⁷⁶⁵

What is more, the epistemic incentives were absent for either Bartucz or any of his colleagues linked to official institutions in Hungary. As Marius Turda observes, although Bartucz “dissociated himself from Nazi racism,” he was one of the anthropologists seeking to

¹⁷⁶² McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 303.

¹⁷⁶³ Kamila Uzarczyk, “Moses als Eugeniker? The Reception of Eugenic Ideas in Jewish Medical Circles in Interwar Poland,” in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, ed. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 285.

¹⁷⁶⁴ Lajos Bartucz, “Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. IX In Ungarn,” *Prager Presse* 15, no. 12 (January 13, 1935): 4.

¹⁷⁶⁵ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 218, Letter, Jindřich Matiegka to Hugo Iltis, December 9., 1934.

create a racial narrative of Hungarian racial specificity. On the one hand, Bartucz claimed the existence of a distinctively Magyar racial type, which he labeled the “Alföld type.” On the other hand, he asserted the existence of a “Magyar race,” which “harmoniously” combined various alleged racial types through a process of historical fusion.¹⁷⁶⁶ One could add that in response to the demands of Hungary’s official nationalism, this approach appears to have selectively mimicked and synthesized some ideas from both German Nordicists and their *völkisch* competitors like Saller. Needless to say, any of the critiques of racial theories that circulated through post-Habsburg spaces would challenge such a position.

For substantial critiques of racial theories, one must consider those Hungarian-speaking left-wing intellectuals who experienced marginalization, often multi-layered, not only in Hungary itself but also in other post-Habsburg countries. Even though their texts incorporated scientific arguments influenced by either neo-Lamarckism or Mendelism, however, they seldom framed their critiques as natural-scientific. Given the degree of their marginalization, adopting a stance of scientific authority could not have eased their entry into the mainstream debate. Rather, they primarily employed these biological arguments, often formulated prior to 1918, to lay the groundwork for their engagement with theories that emanated from the social sciences. For these authors, the sphere of intellectual and political experimentation centered on the social domain rather than the biological one.

For some Hungarian-speaking intellectuals, neo-Lamarckism remained pertinent, even into the 1930s. One reason behind its enduring relevance can be traced back to imperial legacies. In the long nineteenth century, the liberal vision of Hungarian physical anthropology was shaped by the neo-Lamarckian assumption that acquired changes could be hereditary and races

¹⁷⁶⁶ Disturbingly, his term of choice for this purported merger was “biological synthesis.” Marius Turda, “Entangled Traditions of Race: Physical Anthropology in Hungary and Romania, 1900–1940,” *Focaal* 2010, no. 58 (2010): 41.

plastic, thereby allowing for a politics of assimilation.¹⁷⁶⁷ Moreover, during the last years of Austria-Hungary, some civic radicals adopted this framework to support their calls for social reform.¹⁷⁶⁸ Even in the interwar period, many marginalized left-leaning authors lacked a strong incentive to strategically embrace Mendelism. Instead, they embedded their neo-Lamarckian, assimilation-oriented biology within a broader anti-fascist project.

Béla Neufeld's 1934 article *A fajelmélet és a tudomány* (Racial Theory and Science) is an example of such a neo-Lamarckian, anti-fascist case against Nazi racial theories.¹⁷⁶⁹ Neufeld was born in 1894 in Nagyszőlőss/Syvlush (today: Vynohradiv), in what was then Hungary. While pursuing his law degree at the University of Budapest, Neufeld, who was then sympathetic to civic radicalism, became part of the intellectual network that coalesced around the leading publication of Hungarian sociology, *Huszadik Század*. Following the ascent of the Horthy regime in Hungary, Neufeld, who was Jewish, found himself unable to pursue a legal career in the country. Instead, he chose to pursue a different degree, this time in medicine, at the German section of Charles University in Prague. After graduating in 1926, Neufeld continued his work in various locations in Austria, Germany, and Czechoslovakia. Following the Nazi rise to power, Neufeld intensified his involvement in left-wing causes and ultimately became a member of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.¹⁷⁷⁰ In a manner akin to numerous other Hungarian-speaking left-wing intellectuals, Neufeld's trajectory was post-imperial and

¹⁷⁶⁷ Emese Lafferton, "The Magyar Moustache: The Faces of Hungarian State Formation, 1867–1918," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 38, no. 4 (December 2007): 706–32.

¹⁷⁶⁸ Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, passim.

¹⁷⁶⁹ Béla Neufeld, "A fajelmélet és a tudomány" [Racial Theory and Science], *Korunk* 9, no. 6 (June 1934): 429.

¹⁷⁷⁰ For the details about Neufeld's life, I am drawing on his unpublished autobiography. His remarks, such as "Prague remained foreign to me," suggest that Neufeld's stay did not produce durable local networks, unlike in Vienna and Leipzig. This did not change even after Neufeld aligned himself with the Left Front. At the same time, there seems to have been a certain distance between Neufeld and the more populist-inflected Hungarian-speaking socialists, such as those linked to the Sarló movement. National Széchényi Library, Budapest, Manuscript Collection, Béla Neufeld Papers, Fol. Hung. 3430, manuscript Béla Neufeld: A vívódó élet, 28–73, 57.

transnational, as were his publications. The article in question, for instance, was published in Cluj/Kolozsvár, Romania, in the Hungarian-speaking left-wing intellectual journal *Korunk*.

In his critique of racial theories, Neufeld drew upon neo-Lamarckian authors to bolster his argument that “races” were, indeed, malleable. His readings encompassed a broad spectrum of pre-war literature at the intersection of biology, anthropology, and sociology, including the works of Franz Boas, Jean Finot, Franz Oppenheimer, as well as two of the earliest critics of racial theories from Austria-Hungary, namely Hertz and Zollschan.¹⁷⁷¹ However, he ultimately had less inclination to forge a stronger link between this biological theory and socialism. Instead of delving into the contested domains of racial anthropology and genetics, Neufeld proposed that the true realm for socialist theorizing lay elsewhere. As one of the early Hungarian advocates for the fusion of Marxism and Freudian psychoanalysis, he was eager to guide his readers’ focus toward social psychology. He argued that it was within this field that a solution to the surge of Nazi racism could be uncovered. In the key sentence of his essay, Neufeld maintained, paraphrasing Wilhelm Reich: “Racial theory – in its German manifestation – is an expression of sexual repression. This sexual repression is articulated in the sublimation of race as a universality.”¹⁷⁷²

The legal scholar Rusztem Vámbéry similarly aligned himself with earlier neo-Lamarckian critics of racial theories, including Hertz, Zollschan, Finot, and Oppenheimer, even as he wrote in 1931. While he regarded these scientific arguments as reinforcing his left-leaning political stance, he also notably emphasized that his objective was not to “present the results of the author’s original biological research.” Instead, his focus was exclusively on “examining the

¹⁷⁷¹ Even though Neufeld spent several years working in the spa city of Karlsbad, which was also the home of Zollschan, his memoirs make no mention of him. Furthermore, Neufeld only read Zollschan’s prewar writings and was unaware of his more recent efforts against Nazi racial theories. National Széchényi Library, Budapest, Manuscript Collection, Béla Neufeld Papers, Fol. Hung. 3430, manuscript Béla Neufeld: A vívodó élet, 78-98.

¹⁷⁷² Neufeld, “A fajelmélet,” 429.

sociological content of the political slogan” inherent in racial theories.¹⁷⁷³ Vámbéry also stressed the demarcation between the social and the biological, additionally safeguarding his social scientific arguments from a potential critique from the natural sciences.¹⁷⁷⁴

While some Hungarian critics of racial theories adhered to neo-Lamarckism, others gravitated towards genetics. It was particularly significant in this context that the latter group could draw upon a relatively well-established local tradition of associating left-wing politics with hard heredity. Unlike the situation in late imperial Vienna, where eugenicists with left-wing inclinations typically favored neo-Lamarckism (even if the reverse was not always true), Hungary had some left-leaning advocates of eugenics who embraced the concept of hard heredity even before 1914.¹⁷⁷⁵ Subsequently, as racial ideology gained prominence in interwar Hungarian politics, there were several critics, including József Madzsar, who challenged it from a Mendelian or other hard hereditarian perspective, as early as the 1920s.¹⁷⁷⁶ Therefore, the Mendelian arguments presented by Iltis and *The Equivalence* in the following decade had relatively little to offer within the Hungarian context. This was compounded by the fact that even the hard hereditarian critics devoted only cursory attention to recent developments in genetics and primarily employed natural-scientific arguments as a launching point for political theorizing. In effect, not even the seemingly congenial writings of Iltis had any significant echo among these Hungarian-speaking critics of racial theories.

¹⁷⁷³ Vámbéry, *Az élő múlt*, 184.

¹⁷⁷⁴ The arguments of the book are analyzed in more detail in the preceding chapter.

¹⁷⁷⁵ Marius Turda, “‘A New Religion’? Eugenics and Racial Scientism in Pre-First World War Hungary,” *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 3 (September 2006): 303–25.

¹⁷⁷⁶ József Madzsar, “Fajvédelem” [Race Protection], in *Társadalmi Lexikon* [Social Lexicon], ed. József Madzsar (Budapest: Népszava, 1928), 190; Béla Totis, “Rassenreine Sterne,” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 1, no. 5 (May 1934): 75–79.

Conclusion

The preceding chapters of this dissertation have argued that imperial legacies played a significant role in shaping biopolitical practices and eugenic concepts in post-Habsburg contexts, imparting to them a kind of mini-imperial character. Expanding on this argument, this chapter has brought to the forefront another vital imperial legacy, namely the persistence of specific regional networks. Consequently, the chapter has not only examined some of the varied and often ambivalent critiques of Nazi racial theories and ideology presented by eugenicists in post-Habsburg countries during the 1930s but has also revealed that this critique constituted a transnational, interconnected phenomenon. It is not coincidental that in this resulting narrative, many of the same historical actors have once again assumed central roles. In fact, many post-Habsburg eugenicists remained closely linked, and their interactions were facilitated by the networks and shared conceptual vocabularies that had emerged in the late Habsburg Empire. As a result, this chapter reinforces the core argument of this dissertation.

More than a decade and a half after the empire's collapse, the political trajectories of these eugenicists had significantly diverged. The most substantial criticisms of Nazi racial theories were articulated by eugenicists who had faced marginalization in the post-Habsburg countries, often as members of national minorities. Conversely, while some supporters of eugenics who were members of the national majorities in post-Habsburg countries put forth critical arguments against racial theories in Nazi Germany, as well, their critique was more ambiguous. Seeking to defend their mini-imperial projects of nation- and state-building, their critique showed that they had meanwhile gravitated towards more hierarchical and exclusionary models. Their critiques, which used Habsburg tropes to underpin projects of selective assimilation, were “something simultaneously recognizable yet terrifyingly alien.”¹⁷⁷⁷ Yet even

¹⁷⁷⁷ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 452.

darker were the stances adopted by eugenicists and racial anthropologists who chose to mimic Nordacist or *völkisch* racial theories in Germany, localizing them to align with the nationalist agendas in their respective countries. These latter cases represented a clear break with the imperial past and spiraled into radicalizing formulations of biopolitical nation-building.

The networks that connected the post-Habsburg eugenicists examined in this chapter were regional in their scope and informal in their character. Since there was no formal institutional framework for these entanglements – no “International Association of Post-Habsburg Eugenicists” – these networks had to be painstakingly reconstructed using the preserved correspondence among their participants and the mutual referencing in their publications. Methodologically, this chapter advocates for such meticulous research of informal networks, which reveals a reality that is considerably more intricate and characterized by more pronounced continuities than the official cultural stance of post-Habsburg countries at the time, often marked by cultural distancing from the defunct empire, would suggest.

The following chapter, the last of this dissertation, continues to unravel the networks of eugenicists based in post-Habsburg countries. However, the focus shifts from the post-imperial region to a broader, transnational, and even global level. The chapter will continue to argue that the study of informal networks is, at the very least, as enlightening regarding the nature and function of eugenic discourses in post-Habsburg countries as the much-publicized formal affiliations of their proponents. Nevertheless, the chapter also reveals that, unlike the regional networks, the connections of these eugenicists with more distant places in the interwar period often did not and could not rely on robust imperial legacies. Consequently, in the absence of a legacy to draw on, these global networks of post-Habsburg eugenicists do not exhibit a similarly patterned character as their engagement with concepts of human economy, for example. Thus, the following chapter again seeks to reinforce the central argument of this thesis, but this time by providing evidence of absence.

POST-HABSBURG EUGENICISTS GO GLOBAL: TRANSNATIONAL NETWORKS BEYOND THE FORMER EMPIRE

Over 80 scientists from around the world visited Prague, the capital of the newly established Czechoslovakia, in September 1924. The occasion for the visit was the second congress of the *Institut International d'Anthropologie* (IIA), an international scientific association that brought together scholars studying human diversity from biological and cultural perspectives. The congress took place under the patronage of the country's president, while its minister of foreign affairs was among the members of the honorary committee of the congress, testifying to their shared commitment to internationalism, both in politics and science.

While the congress was international, its Czech organizers emphasized that it was not “a mere get-together where scientists lead expert discussions and negotiations,” but also a venue promoting “the importance of our state in the field of cultural and scientific work.”¹⁷⁷⁸ Many speeches and presentations were infused with Czech nationalism. Moreover, the main local organizer of the congress, Jindřich Matiegka, was regarded as one of the principal Czech race scientists, and the concept of “race” was frequently invoked at the congress. It was a theme around which much of the discussion in the section covering physical anthropology revolved. In addition, the congress included sessions dedicated to eugenics, criminology, and anthropogeography. A British participant, the Cambridge archaeologist M. C. Burkitt, observed that the congress showcased a story of “a people at the same time old and yet young: old in tradition, new in having lately become completely free.” Burkitt asserted that this story was “a

¹⁷⁷⁸ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 27, Inv. No. 1333, Circular Letter, Jindřich Matiegka to various officials, May 21., 1924.

lesson for us as anthropologists” and demonstrated “the persistence of race and race ideals.”¹⁷⁷⁹ The congress encapsulates the forceful expansion of the transnational networks of supporters of eugenics in post-Habsburg states such as Czechoslovakia, which this chapter sets out to examine.

Natasha Wheatley argues that when successor states replaced the landed empires in East Central Europe at the end of the First World War, the “post-imperial order” and the “new international order” shaped each other in that part of the world.¹⁷⁸⁰ Together with Peter Becker, she encourages historians to explore internationalism and transnational governance through the lens of Habsburg imperial legacies, looking not only at “formal political structures” but also at “civil society, professional disciplines, and political vocabularies.”¹⁷⁸¹ An analysis of this kind would be incomplete without scrutinizing “how expert and civil society networks were redrawn” during the post-imperial transition, exposing both the continuities and changes in the way these networks interacted with international actors and national governments.¹⁷⁸² This chapter is inspired by Wheatley’s and Becker’s argument, but it complicates it by investigating expert networks that not only supported internationalism but also embraced eugenics. In so doing, the chapter highlights the seemingly paradoxical interplay between internationalism, nationalism, and eugenics that marked the numerous transnational networks that thus came into being.

Internationalism in the interwar period was ambiguous. From the turn of the century onwards, a “distinctively twentieth-century internationalism” emerged hand in hand with new institutional frameworks, patterns of sociability, and idealistic actors, as documented by Glenda

¹⁷⁷⁹ *Ile session de l’Institut International d’Anthropologie, Prague. 14-21 Septembre 1924* (Paris: Librairie E. Nourry, 1926), 21.

¹⁷⁸⁰ Natasha Wheatley, “Central Europe as Ground Zero of the New International Order,” *Slavic Review* 78, no. 4 (2019): 902.

¹⁷⁸¹ Becker and Wheatley, “Introduction,” 4.

¹⁷⁸² Becker and Wheatley, “Introduction,” 8.

Sluga.¹⁷⁸³ While this new internationalism saw itself as a part of a history defined by “political and social evolution in the interests of liberty and peace,” it was also intertwined with nationalism.¹⁷⁸⁴ Indeed, nations and international ties were conceptualized as “entangled ways of thinking about modernity, progress, and politics.”¹⁷⁸⁵ In effect, internationalism often incorporated “the same language of race and civilizational difference” that was germane to nationalism at that time.¹⁷⁸⁶

What is more, Philippa Hetherington and Glenda Sluga challenge the “axiomatic relationship” between liberalism and internationalism.¹⁷⁸⁷ They instead highlight “internationalism’s ideological liminality,” emphasize the points of “intersection of liberal and illiberal politics and policies,” and encourage a scrutiny of their cooperation and co-production in the international arena in the modern period.¹⁷⁸⁸ Often asserting that their arguments were not ideological but borne by positive knowledge, technocrats and scientific experts belonged among the significant actors of this twentieth-century internationalism with all its contradictions.¹⁷⁸⁹

During World War I, the Habsburg Empire increasingly pursued policies, such as stringent food rationing, that intervened in the everyday lives of its citizens and drew on expert knowledge to implement them. Furthermore, technocratic ideas flourished in many post-Habsburg countries, and across interwar East Central Europe. They promised a route to social modernity, economic efficiency, and enhanced state capacity. As the preceding chapters have documented, eugenics was one such discourse, even though its relationship to state-building

¹⁷⁸³ Glenda Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 2.

¹⁷⁸⁴ Sluga, *Internationalism*, 2.

¹⁷⁸⁵ Sluga, *Internationalism*, 3.

¹⁷⁸⁶ Sluga, *Internationalism*, 3.

¹⁷⁸⁷ Philippa Hetherington and Glenda Sluga, “Liberal and Illiberal Internationalisms,” *Journal of World History* 31, no. 1 (March 2020): 1.

¹⁷⁸⁸ Hetherington and Sluga, “Liberal and Illiberal,” 2.

¹⁷⁸⁹ Hetherington and Sluga, “Liberal and Illiberal,” 5.

was complex, and its concrete impact varied during the 1920s. This chapter shows that as its local supporters strove to enter transnational networks, they were sometimes among the pioneers of scientific internationalism and international science in post-Habsburg states.

To substantiate this argument, the larger part of this chapter singles out interwar Czechoslovakia, while its last section locates this particular case within a broader setting of post-Habsburg states. Therefore, the first four subsections of this chapter present a fine-grained analysis of the interactions of Czech race scientists and eugenicists with several transnational scientific networks. They show that shortly after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, both groups embraced the language of scientific internationalism, developed intensive exchanges with their peers in the Allied Powers, and counted among the founders of some of the most influential interwar international associations of race scientists and eugenicists, respectively.

By the end of the first interwar decade, however, significant political and epistemic changes took place, and reshaped these transnational networks. On the political level, dissatisfaction with party politics grew in the post-Habsburg states, and in East Central Europe more broadly, during the first post-war decade, and the notion that seemingly non-ideological but efficient experts should be given more influence on the government, thus decoupling it from political parties, was increasingly accepted.¹⁷⁹⁰ The Great Depression had a profound impact on these countries, and its effects bolstered the argument that experts and the state should take the lead in transforming society. In Czechoslovakia, where many eugenicists and some race scientists had close links to the technocratic movement, the experts were not deliberately preparing the ground for a future authoritarian regime. Nevertheless, they resembled their counterparts in the region by exhibiting “admiration for regimes and governmental measures

¹⁷⁹⁰ Balázs Trencsényi, Michal Kopeček, Luka Lisjak Gabrijelčić, Maria Falina, Mónika Baár, and Maciej Janowski, “A New State for ‘New Men,’” in *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe: Volume II: Negotiating Modernity in the “Short Twentieth Century” and Beyond, Part I: 1918-1968* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 205.

which represented diametrically opposed ideological camps.”¹⁷⁹¹ Some sought templates even in countries such as the Soviet Union or Nazi Germany in the name of reorganizing society along rational lines.¹⁷⁹²

The epistemic shift that largely delegitimized neo-Lamarckian approaches and foregrounded Mendelism occurred at about the same time, affecting the theories and practices of both eugenics and physical anthropology.¹⁷⁹³ This shift was one factor that, as Paul Weindling shows, contributed to the undermining of eugenic strategies legitimized by soft-hereditarian theories and based in social hygiene and public health. Instead, the shift encouraged more radical and coercive approaches.¹⁷⁹⁴ Moreover, it also enabled the separation between the previously enmeshed disciplines of cultural and physical anthropology.¹⁷⁹⁵ Facing these political and epistemic challenges, combined with a growing demand for their expertise and intervention into social processes, Czech race scientists and eugenicists explored various transnational models and practices in the 1930s. While some of these models originated in the metropolitan areas of liberal democracies, European dictatorships and colonies were also seen as relevant, and Czech supporters of eugenics developed more robust networks and intensified exchanges with these contexts in the 1930s.

To describe the connections that “crisscrossed the bounds between democracy and dictatorship” and thus shaped “the transnational dimensions of social engineering,” Kiran Klaus Patel and Sven Reichardt coined the term “the dark side of transnationalism.”¹⁷⁹⁶ Having departed from the earlier “peaceful forms of exchange between similarly structured societies,”

¹⁷⁹¹ Trencsényi et al., “A New State,” 205.

¹⁷⁹² Trencsényi et al., “A New State,” 205.

¹⁷⁹³ For literature on this epistemic shift, please refer to the introduction of the preceding chapter.

¹⁷⁹⁴ Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics*, 441-88.

¹⁷⁹⁵ Maria Kronfeldner, *What’s Left of Human Nature? A Post-Essentialist, Pluralist, and Interactive Account of a Contested Concept* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2018), 64-66.

¹⁷⁹⁶ Kiran Klaus Patel and Sven Reichardt, “The Dark Side of Transnationalism: Social Engineering and Nazism, 1930s–40s,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 51, no. 1 (January 2016): 4-5.

they argue, such dark side of transnationalism facilitated a “mutual perception and radicalization” through “international exchange and contacts.”¹⁷⁹⁷ While scholars recognize that the “international project of imperial liquidation” in East Central Europe made the region into a laboratory of both internationalism and nationalism, with “many unexpected, often troubling, consequences,” the analytical toolkit to understand these consequences is still incomplete.¹⁷⁹⁸ This chapter argues that Patel’s and Reichardt’s notion of the dark side of transnationalism can be a valuable part of this toolkit.

Even as the analysis moves into the 1930s, it closely observes the interactions between scientists without preconceived notions about the allies they would make, boundaries they would cross, or the geographies that would emerge. Examining a broad range of sources produced by the scientists, including their publications, entirely preserved personal correspondence, and administrative records created in their exchanges with state authorities, the chapter demonstrates how Czech race scientists and eugenicists established and maintained connections with a colonial context, the Belgian Congo, as well as two dictatorships, Austria and Nazi Germany. The chapter does not claim that these were the only networks of these scientists at the time, nor does it draw equivalences between these contexts. However, it highlights these exchanges as manifestations of the dark side of transnationalism and argues that they contributed to the scientists’ radicalization during the 1930s.

The last section of the chapter situates the developments in Czechoslovakia within a broader comparative regional perspective and offers several general observations about the transnational interactions among supporters of eugenics in post-Habsburg territories. Firstly, it argues that during the interwar period, these actors made intensive efforts to join transnational networks. Importantly, one of the main motivations behind these attempts was to maintain or

¹⁷⁹⁷ Patel and Reichardt, “The Dark Side,” 6.

¹⁷⁹⁸ Wheatley, “Central Europe,” 902.

reconstruct their networks, which had been affected by the war and the imperial collapse, and to expand them beyond the territory of the former empire. As a result, a dense, complex, and to some extent overlapping web of formal and informal transnational networks involving post-Habsburg eugenicists emerged in the course of the two interwar decades. Secondly, while the post-imperial setting was a crucial motivating factor for this intensive network building, the legacies of the empire did not significantly determine which networks these supporters of eugenics would join or create. Therefore, what distinguishes the networks that emerged is their diversity. It is difficult to identify significant shared patterns determined by imperial legacies. Thirdly, these transnational networks often extended not only beyond the territory of the former empire but also beyond Europe. As implied by the title of this chapter, some supporters of eugenics from post-Habsburg territories went global by establishing connections with non-European contexts, often with disturbing consequences.

Learning to Speak Internationalist: Eugenics and Scientific Internationalism in a Post-Imperial Context

Internationalism was understood as vital in many states that emerged out of the collapsed Austria-Hungary. Sarah Lemmen points out that interwar Czechoslovakia recognized that it was both created and delineated as a result of international interactions, and the state continued to put particular emphasis “on resilient diplomatic and economic networks as well as on international goodwill,” and its international connections were seen as vital for “its security—and even existence—throughout the interwar period.”¹⁷⁹⁹ It was no exception, consequently, from a common pattern in interwar states where the national and the international orders were mutually constitutive.¹⁸⁰⁰ The sociologist and Czechoslovakia’s first president,

¹⁷⁹⁹ Sarah Lemmen, “Beyond the League of Nations: Public Debates on International Relations in Czechoslovakia during the Interwar Period,” in *Remaking Central Europe*, ed. Natasha Wheatley and Peter Becker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 344.

¹⁸⁰⁰ Lemmen, “Beyond the League,” 344.

Tomáš G. Masaryk, put this notion into sharp relief when he noted: “There is no difference between national identity and internationalism, if we understand the point appropriately.”¹⁸⁰¹

There was some ambiguity in Czechoslovakia’s international interactions, which, to some extent, reflected the Czechs’ self-image as a small nation. This discourse of collective identity, which emphasized smallness as a defining feature of the imagined community, had been consolidated and promoted by Masaryk even before Czechoslovakia’s creation. The perception of smallness legitimized internationalist agendas, buttressing political theories that postulated an essential connection between smallness and an inclination towards internationalism.¹⁸⁰² However, some Czechoslovak officials also hoped that the new state, given its relatively large share of the former empire’s territory, population, and resources, would assume leadership in post-Habsburg Europe’ from Vienna and become “a significant economic and political power in Europe.”¹⁸⁰³ As a result, Czechoslovakia’s international interactions also partly mirrored “imperial models.”¹⁸⁰⁴ Linking its self-perception as a small nation with aspirations for regional leadership, interwar Czechoslovakia aspired to play the role of a broker that bridges differences within Europe.¹⁸⁰⁵ It saw this role as a potential source of solutions not only to external but also to many internal political and social challenges.

It may appear counterintuitive that scientific internationalism would reinforce such agenda. Yet, as Brigitte Schroeder-Gudehus notes, there was a tension between an idealized narrative of scientific internationalism as “borne by a community true to its universalist ethos

¹⁸⁰¹ Sluga, *Internationalism*, 43.

¹⁸⁰² Samuël Kruizinga, “Introduction,” in *The Politics of Smallness in Modern Europe: Size, Identity and International Relations since 1800*, ed. Samuël Kruizinga (London: Bloomsbury, 2022), 11.

¹⁸⁰³ Lemmen, “Beyond the League,” 346.

¹⁸⁰⁴ Lemmen, “Beyond the League,” 346.

¹⁸⁰⁵ Rebecka Lettevall, Geert Somsen, and Sven Widmalm, “Introduction,” in *Neutrality in Twentieth-Century Europe: Intersections of Science, Culture, and Politics after the First World War*, ed. Rebecka Lettevall, Geert Somsen, and Sven Widmalm (New York: Routledge, 2012), 11.

and elevated above national boundaries” and the actual practice of international science.¹⁸⁰⁶ Indeed, Paul Forman argues in his classical study that scientific internationalism was an “academic ideology” that presupposed “a substantial measure of national sentiment and organization among scientists” even when it emphasized “the reality and necessity of supranational agreement on scientific doctrine, of transnational social intercourse among scientists, and of international collaboration in scientific work.”¹⁸⁰⁷ It was because science was seen as automatically contributing to national prestige, even if the criteria for determining what constituted such a scientific achievement had to be recognized supranationally.¹⁸⁰⁸ Moreover, scientists utilized their international networks to strengthen their arguments for the recognition of their discipline at the national level and to increase its influence on social, economic, and political decisions.¹⁸⁰⁹ Professional agendas of scientists could coalesce with the agendas of state building.

Czechoslovakia was “a forerunner of technocratic thinking” in East Central Europe.¹⁸¹⁰ The *Masarykova akademie práce* (Masaryk Academy of Labor) was established by law in 1920 as the central coordinating institution for the Czechoslovak technocratic movement. Bringing together engineers, agriculturalists, medical doctors, and some social scientists, the institution also had a special eugenic subsection.¹⁸¹¹ The groups of experts that emerged or were empowered during the first interwar decade embraced scientific internationalism and sought to “gain status and recognition through international meetings and congresses,” often with the

¹⁸⁰⁶ Brigitte Schroeder-Gudehus, “International Science from the Franco-Prussian War to World War Two: An Era of Organization,” in *The Cambridge History of Science*, ed. Hugh Richard Slotten, Ronald L. Numbers, and David N. Livingstone (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 9.

¹⁸⁰⁷ Paul Forman, “Scientific Internationalism and the Weimar Physicists: The Ideology and Its Manipulation in Germany after World War I,” *Isis* 64, no. 2 (1973): 155.

¹⁸⁰⁸ Forman, “Scientific Internationalism,” 154-155.

¹⁸⁰⁹ Forman, “Scientific Internationalism,” 171.

¹⁸¹⁰ Kohlrausch, Steffen, and Wiederkehr, “Introduction,” 17.

¹⁸¹¹ Jan Janko and Emilie Těšínská, eds., *Technokracie v českých zemích (1900-1950)* [Technocracy in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1950] (Prague: Archiv Akademie věd České republiky, 1999).

support of the Masaryk Academy of Labor.¹⁸¹² Transformed from a center of a Habsburg crownland into a capital city, interwar Prague became a site of numerous international conferences of scientists and engineers.

Many disciplines that were influenced by racial discourses featured among the scientific conferences that took place in interwar Prague, or other significant Czechoslovak cities. As we have already seen, Prague hosted an international congress of the IIA in 1924. In the same year, also anthropogeographers and ethnographers from the “Slavic countries” convened in Prague to continue their debates that were often saturated with racial notions. Geneticists and eugenicists gathered already in 1922 at an international meeting in Brno. Prague also became a crucial hub for psychotechnics. The emerging discipline which in Czechoslovakia closely cooperated with eugenics was strongly represented at the First International Congress of Scientific Management in 1924, and again, in 1934 at the Eighth International Psychotechnics Congress. In 1925, Prague hosted an international congress of social policy where eugenics loomed large. The International Penal and Penitentiary Congress in 1930, in turn, was dominated by criminologists who represented crime as a biologically, as well as socially, determined phenomenon.¹⁸¹³ Scientists embracing race science and eugenics thus turned into one of the actors propelling scientific internationalism in interwar Czechoslovakia and many racially oriented scientific disciplines were involved in organizing international scientific congresses.

I will first explore the interplay between internationalism, nationalism, and racial discourses in the interwar period by zooming in on Czech race scientists, personified by the first professor of physical anthropology at the University of Prague, Jindřich Matiegka. In the late imperial setting, Matiegka’s networks were mostly of regional nature, split largely between

¹⁸¹² Kohlrausch, Steffen, and Wiederkehr, “Introduction,” 23.

¹⁸¹³ Janko and Těšínská, *Technokracie*, passim.

imperial Austrian, German, and Czech nationalist connections. Recognized as one of the leading physical anthropologists in Austria-Hungary, the Czech nationalist Matiegka was a longstanding member of scientific associations related to the study of human diversity in the imperial metropolis, including the *Anthropologische Gesellschaft*, *Verein für österreichische Volkskunde*, and cooperated with the *Naturhistorisches Museum*.¹⁸¹⁴ Moreover, Matiegka's interactions with international scientific networks beyond Central Europe were often facilitated by the imperial metropolis, as exemplified by his attendance at the Eighth International Congress Against Alcoholism and the Sixteenth International Congress of Americanists, both of which were held in Vienna. When Matiegka joined the *Société d'anthropologie de Paris* in 1901 as a foreign correspondent, it was a significant exception within his networks.¹⁸¹⁵ Before the First World War, his networks tended to use the Austrian imperial, Central European regional, and Czech national connections almost interchangeably as bridges towards the international level.

After the collapse of the empire, Matiegka briefly believed he could maintain his old networks and renewed his membership in the *Anthropologische Gesellschaft* in Vienna for the year 1919.¹⁸¹⁶ However, as Daniel Kevles explains in his classical paper, the war split international science into two “hostile political camps,” and the tensions between the Allied countries and the former Central Powers persisted deep into the interwar period.¹⁸¹⁷ Consequently, it became clear to Matiegka that to legitimize the new state and gain its support

¹⁸¹⁴ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 1, Inv. No. 24 and 35, Membership cards. See Filip Herza, “Sombre Faces: Race and Nation-Building in the Institutionalization of Czech Physical Anthropology (1890s–1920s),” *History and Anthropology* 31, no. 3 (2019): 371–92; Ranzmaier, “The Anthropological Society,” 1–22.

¹⁸¹⁵ Matiegka had an ally in the United States, the curator of the Smithsonian Institution Aleš Hrdlička. Their exchanges were enabled primarily by their shared Czech nationalism. Mark Brandon, *The Perils of Race-Thinking: A Portrait of Aleš Hrdlička* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2023).

¹⁸¹⁶ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 1, Inv. No. 26, 27, 34 and 35.

¹⁸¹⁷ Daniel Kevles, “‘Into Hostile Political Camps’: The Reorganization of International Science in World War I,” *Isis* 62, no. 1 (1971): 47–60.

for his discipline, he needed to reconfigure his networks. By 1920, Matiegka and many other Czech race scientists had chosen to embrace an international network promoted and dominated by francophone scholars, in line with the diplomatic and cultural orientation of the new Czechoslovakia.

The scientific internationalism of French-speaking physical anthropologists found expression in the IIA, founded in 1920. As Richard McMahon notes, the IIA “had overwhelmingly French origins and institutions, a French state subsidy and 26 French representatives on its 50-member managing council,” and initially exhibited a noticeable “anti-German bitterness.”¹⁸¹⁸ Consequently, participants from Germany, Austria, and Hungary were initially barred from its triennial sessions, and, as Matiegka soon understood, “the use of German language was absolutely disqualified as a matter of course.”¹⁸¹⁹ While these countries were altogether excluded and Anglophone anthropologists remained hesitant, the French founders sought to legitimize the IIA by encouraging the countries of the post-imperial states of Central and Eastern Europe to join. Representatives from most of the states that emerged from the debris of the European landed empires had joined the Institute by the end of the 1920s. In 1927, the IIA reported that its members came from countries including Czechoslovakia, Finland, Greece, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Soviet Russia, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Most of these states had also established a branch office of the IIA by this point or were in the process of establishing one.¹⁸²⁰ While Austrian, German, and Hungarian delegates were also allowed to participate by 1927, their involvement remained limited.¹⁸²¹

¹⁸¹⁸ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 23.

¹⁸¹⁹ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 27, Inv. No. 1326, Letter, Jindřich Matiegka to the General Secretary of the IIA, October 20., 1923.

¹⁸²⁰ *IIIe session de l'Institut international d'anthropologie, Amsterdam. 20-29 Septembre 1927* (Paris: Librairie E. Nourry, 1928), 3-55.

¹⁸²¹ McMahon, *The Races of Europe*, 54.

The scientists from East Central Europe who embraced the IIA most forcefully perceived it as a chance to increase the prestige of their states in front of the Allies, as well as to showcase the political import of their discipline. Czechoslovakia was initially one of its most active affiliates, being its founding member and establishing IIA's second national branch office after Belgium and followed by Poland. The Czechoslovak branch office, presided over by Matiegka, received significant coverage in IIA's journal. At the first official session of IIA, held in Liège, Belgium, in 1921, its French leaders presented the Czechoslovak branch office as the model to follow. Czechoslovakia's delegates attended IIA's early sessions in large numbers, and their presentations on topics ranging from race science to eugenics attracted much attention.¹⁸²² The French connection thus became a cornerstone of these scientists' networks in the 1920s.

Czechoslovak participants secured that the second session of IIA would take place in Prague in 1924. International conferences during the interwar period were not only used as platforms to showcase a nation's scientific advancement and demonstrate its patriotic imagery.¹⁸²³ As science was increasingly perceived as a means to enhance national efficiency, conferences also became a vital tool for cultural foreign policy.¹⁸²⁴ This was particularly true in post-Habsburg Central Europe, where states realized that cultural foreign policy could be a crucial instrument compensating for their perceived vulnerability and a vital link to the former Entente, as argued by Andrea Orzoff.¹⁸²⁵ The 1924 congress of the IIA is an example of Czechoslovakia's adoption of international science, including race science and eugenics, as

¹⁸²² "Institut International d'Anthropologie. Session de Liège (25 juillet - 1er août 1921)," *Revue anthropologique* 31, no. 4 (September 1921): 261–493. A presentation by the psychiatrist Ladislav Haškovec was included in René Sand, Albert Govaerts, Ladislav Haškovec, M. A. van Herwerden, Louis Forest, Lucien March, Maurice Letulle, et al. *L'examen médical en vue du mariage* (Paris: Flammarion, 1927). The psychiatrist Ladislav Haškovec initially cooperated both with the IIA and with the rival Eugenic Committee.

¹⁸²³ Schroeder-Gudehus, "International Science," 8.

¹⁸²⁴ Schroeder-Gudehus, "International Science," 8.

¹⁸²⁵ Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle*, 8.

tools of its cultural foreign policy, and a testament to the extent that scientists integrated these incentives into their strategies and arguments.

Nationalist narratives and images of Europe and whiteness mixed in the cultural foreign policy of Czechoslovakia and post-Habsburg Central Europe more broadly.¹⁸²⁶ When Matiegka proclaimed in his opening speech that “however small they may be,” the Czech nation could be “proud of a civilization dating from the Middle Ages,” and that it had “endeavored to walk hand in hand with the great nations in the way of civilization and science” ever since, these pronouncements were emblematic of how these two motives intertwined at the congress and at many other international conferences that took place in Czechoslovakia.¹⁸²⁷ However, the Prague congress of IIA and similar events also stood out by explicitly defining the imagined national community in biological terms and presenting its alleged essence as ancient and ostensibly unchanging. For instance, the keynote lecture delivered by the anthropologist Lubor Niederle dealt with *The Origins of Czechoslovak People*, and a significant part of the conference program was devoted to the prehistoric archaeology of the Bohemian Lands.¹⁸²⁸ While Czechoslovakia was presented as an expression of a reified national community, it was, in reality, a multi-ethnic state, and its Czech representatives at the IIA privately expressed fears that the members of the state’s minorities would also choose to attend some of the events.¹⁸²⁹

The Margins of Colonialism: Internationalist Turn in Colonialism, Post-Imperial State-Building, and Mobility Control

Bolaji Balogun and Marius Turda call for a critical examination of the “colonial implications” of state-building in East Central Europe and for connecting the histories of

¹⁸²⁶ Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle*, 9.

¹⁸²⁷ *Ile session*, 16.

¹⁸²⁸ *Ile session*, 28.

¹⁸²⁹ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 27, Inv. No. 1326, Letter, Jindřich Matiegka to IIA’s General Secretary, February 12., 1923.

eugenics to “broader intra- and extra-European colonial arrangements.”¹⁸³⁰ Such an analysis must consider the inbetweenness of this part of the world within the production of knowledge by both the colonizers and the colonized.¹⁸³¹ Interestingly, the concept of the “margins of colonialism” coined by Patricia Purtschert and Harald Fischer-Tiné has not yet received attention in this debate. The authors argue that states without formal colonies, positioned at the margins of colonialism, and their subjects were involved in both “colonial core practices” and “the production and reproduction of colonial knowledge, representations and discourses.”¹⁸³² Analyzing these connections requires highlighting how “in order to get access to the imperial project, colonial outsiders developed informal networks, indirect forms of dominance and non-formal politics of governing that they successfully combined with colonial discourses and imaginaries.”¹⁸³³ This approach can shed light on the specific inbetweenness of countries such as interwar Austria or Czechoslovakia.

States such as Czechoslovakia, which extended over several territories of the former empire, were confronted with the challenges of state-building in both their core areas and their borderlands.¹⁸³⁴ In order to inform and legitimize the state-building agenda, scientists sought various models, including in European colonies.¹⁸³⁵ Czech race scientists were not an exception to this pattern. However, even when they joined the IIA, its leading members hesitated to include them more deeply in their research projects and were not ready to facilitate their research in their colonial empires. Consequently, while initially Czech race scientists regarded

¹⁸³⁰ Turda and Balogun, “Colonialism,” 1.

¹⁸³¹ Catherine Baker, *Race and the Yugoslav Region* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018); Anca Parvulescu and Manuela Boatcă, *Creolizing the Modern: Transylvania across Empires* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2022); József Böröcz and Mahua Sarkar, “The Unbearable Whiteness of the Polish Plumber and the Hungarian Peacock Dance around ‘Race,’” *Slavic Review* 76, no. 2 (2017): 307–14.

¹⁸³² Patricia Purtschert and Harald Fischer-Tiné, eds., *Colonial Switzerland* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 8.

¹⁸³³ Purtschert and Fischer-Tiné, *Colonial Switzerland*, 9.

¹⁸³⁴ Schmidt, *The Politics of Disability*, 35–60.

¹⁸³⁵ Ciancia, *On Civilization’s Edge*, passim.

their participation in the IIA as an exemplary success, by the end of the 1920s their behavior increasingly betrayed their disappointment.

The exchanges between the IIA and its Czechoslovak members were less intense in the 1930s. For instance, the number of Czech participants as well as the number of papers presented at IIA's sessions plummeted. When the IIA session took place in Bucharest in 1937, only a small delegation arrived. Even though Romania was an important regional ally prioritized by Czechoslovakia's foreign policy, the individuals who drove the international exchanges with the IIA in the 1920s mostly chose not to attend, and conference participants from other countries "expressed their astonishment that no one came from Prague."¹⁸³⁶ While they deprioritized the internationalism embodied by the IIA, some of the leading Czech race scientists searched for alternative international exchanges that were more bilateral in their form.

By the late 1920s, Matiegka and his students increasingly collaborated with a group of Viennese followers of the ethnologist and priest Wilhelm Schmidt of the *Societas Verbi Divini* missionary congregation. As missionaries, these ethnologists had access to various colonial contexts. It was through these mediators that Czech race scientists gained access to medical experts, as well as material objects from Belgian colonies. The alternative network that thus emerged was international, interdisciplinary, and informal, being held together entirely by personal contacts, and it plugged these individuals from the margins of colonialism directly into the production of colonial knowledge.

Czech race scientists and Austrian ethnologists gained access to the Belgian colonial project, particularly to the Belgian Congo. Even though the Belgian king no longer had private control over Congo after 1908, the colony continued to use coerced labour and the food supplies

¹⁸³⁶ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 7, Inv. No. 100, Letter, Karel Absolon to Jindřich Matiegka, September 17., 1937; *VIIe session de l'Institut international d'anthropologie, Bucarest. 1-8 Septembre 1937* (Bucharest: Imprimerie Socec & Company, 1939), 16.

remained precarious. As a result, Belgian colonial rule faced a persistent crisis of legitimacy both within the colony and on the international level, even during the interwar period. To seek new sources of legitimacy, the colonial administration experimented with various forms of technocratic governmentality in agriculture and public health.¹⁸³⁷ Additionally, as a small state with a large empire, Belgian colonial administrators were keen to involve international experts in producing colonial knowledge.¹⁸³⁸ Thus, they eagerly embraced Austrian and Czechoslovak scholars. The results of their research were not only published in Czechoslovakia and Austria, but also in Brussels. The main outputs of this racial research, including a detailed monograph in three large volumes, were included in a series published by the *Institut royal colonial Belge*.¹⁸³⁹

The central figure of this international network was an Austrian ethnologist and priest Paul Schebesta.¹⁸⁴⁰ During the interwar period, Schebesta conducted extensive fieldwork in the Belgian Congo on two separate occasions: first in 1929-1930, and then again in 1934-1935. Schebesta's research primarily focused on ethnology. However, his "historical and descriptive" approach was challenged by the interpretive approaches of cultural anthropologists.¹⁸⁴¹ To counterbalance this perceived deficit, Schebesta and some of his colleagues started engaging

¹⁸³⁷ Sokhieng Au and Anne Cornet, "Medicine and Colonialism," in *Medical Histories of Belgium*, ed. Joris Vandendriessche and Benoît Majerus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2021), 99–133; Guy Vanthemsche, *Belgium and the Congo, 1885-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 41.

¹⁸³⁸ Florian Wagner, *Colonial Internationalism and the Governmentality of Empire, 1893–1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 8.

¹⁸³⁹ The book appeared in three volumes in book series of the *Section des sciences naturelles et médicales* of the *Institut royal colonial belge*. Paul Schebesta, *Die Bambuti-Pygmäen vom Ituri: Geschichte, Geographie, Umwelt, Demographie und Anthropologie der Ituri-Bambuti (Belgisch Kongo)*. Vol. 1. (Brussels: Librairie Falk fils, 1938).

¹⁸⁴⁰ Schebesta, who spent most of his life in a community of missionaries in Mödling in Austria, originated from a borderland region in German Silesia, where he was born and educated. As such, Schebesta had a hybrid identity and corresponded with Matiegka both in Czech and in German.

¹⁸⁴¹ Suzanne Marchand, "Priests among the Pygmies: Wilhelm Schmidt and the Counter-Reformation in Austrian Ethnology," in *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, ed. Matti Bunzl and H. Glenn Penny (Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2003), 301–304.

with physical anthropology, and they employed an increasingly biologized language.¹⁸⁴² If Schebesta's research produced "much difficult-to-obtain information" that "earned [him] the respect of other professionals," it was partly due to this embrace of positivist methods.¹⁸⁴³

Combining ethnology and physical anthropology, Schebesta studied both the culture as well as the "racial features" of the Bambuti. However, he admitted that he was "no innate expert in [physical] anthropology," and thus had to "familiarize himself" with its methods while often drawing on the assistance of various trained race scientists.¹⁸⁴⁴ Apart from Viktor Lebzelter, the director of the Viennese *Naturhistorisches Museum*, with whom Schebesta initially worked, Czech race scientists occupied an increasingly important place in his research.

Schebesta exchanged numerous letters with Matiegka, who by this time directed an Institute of Anthropology, edited a specialized Czech journal of physical anthropology, and served as the rector of the University of Prague. From the early 1930s onwards, Matiegka provided Schebesta with research guidelines and instructions on how to carry out racial measurements. For instance, in October 1933 Matiegka sent Schebesta a list of anthropometric measurements to be performed on the Bambuti, and in the same letter also invited the ethnologist to visit his institute to familiarize himself "with the ways in which we collect fingerprints, plaster casts, and so on."¹⁸⁴⁵ Furthermore, Matiegka and his students processed and interpreted the anthropometric material that Schebesta had accumulated. In some instances, they even conducted measurements on the human remains that he brought back to Europe. They also co-authored multiple papers that presented the results of these measurements. Lastly, a

¹⁸⁴² The engagement with methods of both ethnology and physical anthropology was enabled by the still relatively permeable boundaries between these disciplines in interwar Austria. See the entries in Gingrich, and Rohrbacher, *Völkerkunde*, 33-204.

¹⁸⁴³ Marchand, "Priests among the Pygmies," 309.

¹⁸⁴⁴ Schebesta, *Die Bambuti-Pygmäen*, X.

¹⁸⁴⁵ Archives of the National Museum, Prague, Fund 246, Jindřich Matiegka Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. 404, Correspondence between Matiegka and Schebesta, 1928-1941, and particularly, Jindřich Matiegka to Paul Schebesta, October 30., 1933.

substantial portion of the funding for Schebesta's field trips and some of his publications came from the Hrdlička Foundation, which was a private funding organization for Czechoslovak physical anthropology.¹⁸⁴⁶ Even though the network of Austrian, Belgian, and Czech researchers was hybrid and informal, there were numerous overlapping dependences that held it together. Despite the much more turbulent international context of the 1930s, this international network producing and circulating colonial knowledge thus ultimately turned out to be more persistent than the Austrian and Czech engagement with the IIA and dissolved only during the Second World War.

Schebesta's field research in the Belgian Congo focused on the nomadic hunter-gatherers. This choice was preordained by the paradigm within which Schebesta operated. As Suzanne Marchand explains, Schebesta's teacher Wilhelm Schmidt was a founder of the Austrian ethnological school embracing a diffusionist-historicist *Kulturkreislehre*. Aiming to discredit cultural evolutionism, Schmidt focused his attention on the human groups that he subsumed under the constructed category of "pygmies."¹⁸⁴⁷ He argued that "the pygmies were the first to break away from the great bloc of original cultures and because of this early break-up they also maintained an archaic condition and preserved it in their isolation."¹⁸⁴⁸ Consequently, he sought to prove that "all pygmies belonged to a single race," and were "the oldest surviving humans" lacking "neither religion nor morals."¹⁸⁴⁹ Schmidt encouraged his students to research various human groups that were included in this category and to produce evidence for his argument. Working within this paradigm, Schebesta thus conducted his

¹⁸⁴⁶ Schebesta, *Die Bambuti-Pygmäen*, IX.

¹⁸⁴⁷ Marchand, "Priests among the Pygmies," 299.

¹⁸⁴⁸ Wilhelm Schmidt, "Die Stellung der Pygmäen in der Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit," *Anthropos* 31, no. 5–6 (December 1936): 934–35.

¹⁸⁴⁹ Marchand, "Priests among the Pygmies," 299.

research in Congo on the groups that Schmidt included into the “pygmy” category, and particularly on the Bambuti in the Ituri Rainforest.¹⁸⁵⁰

The racial anthropologist Lebzelter introduced what became the fundamental assumption of these researchers. Lebzelter and Schebesta drew a dividing line between the sedentary and the nomadic Bambuti, arguing that the nomadic Bambuti preserved their archaic culture as well as their “purity,” defined in racial terms, while the sedentary Bambuti lost both through an increased intermarriage with the other Congolese.¹⁸⁵¹ Lebzelter thus inverted a line of argument that he had originally introduced about the Roma people in Southeastern Europe. As Victoria Schmidt shows, already in the early 1920s Lebzelter claimed that “sedentarized Roma were ‘whiter’ because of the ‘prominent racial influence of Balkan populations.’”¹⁸⁵² Drawing on this distinction, Schebesta emphasized that the particular groups he chose to visit during his second research trip were those who remained nomadic and thus “pure.”¹⁸⁵³ Schmidt’s emphasis on the archaic and unspoiled nature of the Bambuti was thus transformed into frequent invocations of the group’s “racial purity,” as well as of their health. A returning conclusion in the publications that resulted from these research trips was the argument that “one cannot consider the Pygmies as degenerates.”¹⁸⁵⁴ The research by Schebesta and his allies thus translated a large part of Schmidt’s arguments into racial terms.

This was not the main reason why this research appealed to Belgian colonial experts. These experts believed that the arguments of Schebesta, Matiegka, and the others may have important ramifications for their agricultural policy. From the 1930s onwards, Belgian colonial

¹⁸⁵⁰ Marchand, “Priests among the Pygmies,” 304.

¹⁸⁵¹ Paul Schebesta and Viktor Lebzelter, *Anthropology of the Central African Pygmies in the Belgian Congo* (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1933).

¹⁸⁵² Schmidt and Jaworsky, *Historicizing Roma*, 87.

¹⁸⁵³ Schebesta was joined by Martin Gusinde, an Austrian ethnologist, and Jean Jadin, a Belgian physician, on the second research trip. Paul Schebesta, “Meine zweite Forschungsexpedition zu den Ituri-Pygmäen,” *Anthropos* 30, no. 5–6 (December 1935): 826.

¹⁸⁵⁴ Jean Jadin, “Aperçu sur l’état sanitaire des Pygmées de l’Ituri,” *Anthropologie* 16, no. 1–4 (1938): 75.

authorities in Congo launched rural development schemes. As one historian of agriculture recently documented, these schemes aimed “to integrate traditional Congolese agriculture into the modern, western agrosystem,” while further legitimizing the “coercive implementation of Western science with a discourse on the underdevelopment of the Congolese.”¹⁸⁵⁵ The sedentarization of previously nomadic populations and their increased surveillance were central aspects of these schemes.¹⁸⁵⁶ In this context, the research led by Schebesta argued against such sedentarization of the nomadic Bambuti.

The argument these experts developed was racial in its core. “This race does not face extinction,” Schebesta argued in a turn of phrase that was also typical of the arguments made by his scientific allies, “as long as the favorable living conditions of the tropical rainforest are not diminished or stolen from them.”¹⁸⁵⁷ Moreover, the papers published in the Austrian ethnological journal *Anthropos* and by the Czechoslovak anthropological journal *Anthropologie* framed the nomadism of the Bambuti as a crucial precondition of their biological “purity.” Claiming that “nomadism has greatly preserved them [the Bambuti] from miscegenation,”¹⁸⁵⁸ for instance, an article concluded that one could not speak about their “degeneracy” and that

the Pygmies of Ituri constitute a prosperous human group, entirely adapted to the country they occupy. The fragmentation and nomadism are their safeguard against the diseases which affect the sedentary people of the same regions.¹⁸⁵⁹

While Czech race scientists, Austrian ethnologists, and their Belgian allies argued to exempt the Bambuti of Ituri from pressures to become sedentary, they at the same time reinforced a

¹⁸⁵⁵ Yves Segers, “Rural Development and Indigenous Peasantry Schemes in Belgian Congo, 1930–1960,” in *International Conference of the European Rural History Organisation* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2022), 316.

¹⁸⁵⁶ Jeannôt Mokili Danga Kassa, *Politiques agricoles et promotion rurale au Congo-Zaïre (1885-1997)* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1998); Osumaka Likaka, *Rural Society and Cotton in Colonial Zaïre* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997).

¹⁸⁵⁷ Schebesta, *Die Bambuti-Pygmäen*, 401.

¹⁸⁵⁸ Jean Jadin, “Groupes sanguins des Pygmées et des Nègres de l’Ituri (Congo Belge),” *Anthropos* 31, no. 1–2 (April 1936): 179.

¹⁸⁵⁹ Jadin, “Aperçu,” 83.

racialized image of other Congolese as pathological carriers, thus legitimizing their voluntary or forced settlement.

A regime of knowledge circulation thus came into being that connected these racially oriented researchers and facilitated the mobility of objects, practices, and concepts between the colonial context of the Congo, between Belgium, and Central Europe. For instance, Czech race scientists conducted craniological and other anthropometric measurements on six sets of human remains of the Bambuti. These human remains were a part of the collections of the *Musée du Congo* at Tervuren which only after protracted negotiations with Schebesta sent them in boxes through Vienna to Prague.¹⁸⁶⁰ Apart from anthropometric methods which they used in this case, the members of the network also employed serology – collecting more than one thousand blood samples of the Bambuti – and created a large catalogue of fingerprints which were then analyzed from the perspective of Mendelian genetics.¹⁸⁶¹

Czech race scientists who analyzed the colonial data were at the same time increasingly linked to criminology. As Pavel Baloun documents in his landmark book, the gendarmerie and its criminologists became crucial agents in the surveillance of the Roma people and in the production of knowledge about this marginalized group in interwar Czechoslovakia. Gendarmes often complained about the difficulties in identifying individual Roma, and as a result, they ever more relied on dactyloscopy, a technique with colonial roots, as their preferred method of evidence.¹⁸⁶² Although the professionalization of the gendarmerie and its role in the surveillance of the Roma people had a deeper history, and so did the expert discourses racializing this group, Baloun argues that the passing of the Czechoslovak “*Law on Nomadic*

¹⁸⁶⁰ Jiří Malý and Jindřich Matiegka, “Kostry středoafričských pygmejů z porůčí Ituri” [Skeletons of Central African Pygmies from the Ituri Range], *Anthropologie* 16, no. 1–4 (1938): 1–63; Jiří Malý and Jindřich Matiegka, “Étude de quatre squelettes de pygmées centre africains du bassin de Ituri: I. Les crânes des pygmées de l’Afrique centrale,” *L’Anthropologie (Paris)* 48, no. 3–4 (1938): 237–48.

¹⁸⁶¹ Jadin, “Groupes sanguins,” 177–86; Jindřich Valšík, “The Finger-Prints of Central African Pygmies, Negroes and Their Crossbreeds,” *Anthropologie* 16, no. 1/4 (1938): 84–100.

¹⁸⁶² Baloun, “*Metla našeho venkova!*,” 91.

Gypsies” in 1927 was the turning point that amalgamated them. This law introduced a centralized database of fingerprints of the Roma that was run by the gendarmerie, and that in some cases also included other anthropometric data and even family trees.¹⁸⁶³ According to Baloun, the creation and operation of this police database, which eventually covered more than 34,000 individuals, had significant consequences. It propelled “the general racialization of the legislative category” of “nomadic Gypsies,” reframed the criminological representations of this group, and reshaped the “administrative-police label of ‘Gypsiness.’”¹⁸⁶⁴ Working with large amounts of data that they amassed, the gendarmes increasingly sought the expert advice of physical anthropologists.¹⁸⁶⁵

The gendarmes developed a particularly close relationship with the network of physical anthropologists around Matiegka. One of his students, Jindřich Valšík, worked with an early dactyloscopic database created by the gendarmes as early as in the 1920s.¹⁸⁶⁶ In the early 1930s, another student of Matiegka, František Štampach, became a key source for the gendarmes of racial arguments about the Roma people. Similar to Lebzelter, Štampach constructed the Roma people as a racialized group, linked nomadic life with the notion of “racial purity,” and on this alleged basis, advocated their “racial” assimilation and sedentarization.¹⁸⁶⁷ Moreover, Matiegka and his students involved in the research on Congo, such as Jiří Malý or Jindřich Valšík, provided further professional training to the members of Czechoslovak gendarmerie, and served as their expert advisors.¹⁸⁶⁸ This cooperation culminated when an expert criminologist of the

¹⁸⁶³ The centralized database had some local and improvised predecessors. Baloun, “*Metla našeho venkova!*,” 68-69.

¹⁸⁶⁴ Baloun, “*Metla našeho venkova!*,” 102.

¹⁸⁶⁵ Baloun, “*Metla našeho venkova!*,” 114.

¹⁸⁶⁶ Jindřich Valšík, “Případ stluštěných papilárních lišten na otisku středníku české cikánky” [A Case of Thickened Papillary Lines on the Middle Fingerprint of a Gypsy Woman from Bohemia], *Sborník Klubu přírodovědeckého v Praze 1923–1924* (1924): 79–80.

¹⁸⁶⁷ It is not clear whether Štampach was aware of his teacher's research on the Bambuti. Baloun, “*Metla našeho venkova!*,” 115; Shmidt, *The Politics of Disability*, 95-100.

¹⁸⁶⁸ For instance, one of their students, the gendarme officer Rober Váňa, repeatedly supported his claims in an article on dactyloscopy by pointing to the lectures, practical demonstrations, and papers by Matiegka, Malý, as well as Valšík. Robert Váňa, “Vědecký podklad daktyloskopie jako prostředku pro zjišťování totožnosti osob”

gendarmerie, Robert Váňa, obtained a degree in physical anthropology from Matiegka's department.¹⁸⁶⁹ Significantly, the gendarme-turned-anthropologist published both on dactyloscopy and on the Roma people, and eventually rose to the position of deputy commander of the institution responsible for maintaining the central database of Roma fingerprints, among other duties.¹⁸⁷⁰ Matiegka's network thus provided the gendarmes not only with racial theories but also with tacit knowledge of surveillance techniques such as dactyloscopy.

Both directly and by way of a detour through colonial anthropology, these theories and tacit knowledge shaped the language and practices of Czech criminologists. For instance, in a 1938 paper written for a scientific journal by two gendarmes, including Váňa, the authors affirmed the line of argument advanced by Austrian and Czech race scientists in the previous decades:

[O]nly culture judiciously spread among Gypsies can prevent their criminal tendencies [...] also the mixing of the Gypsy race with the surrounding population does not remain without influence on their natural tendencies towards nomadism [...] and the greatest success of our dedicated gendarmerie's hard work is that a certain part of the nomadic gypsies already abandoned its travels and became sedentary.¹⁸⁷¹

While these gendarmes pursued the exact opposite outcomes than the arguments Schebesta, Matiegka and the others made about the Bambuti, their structure was similar. Responding to the challenges posed by the state-building process, Czech race scientists thus returned to regional networks. Through them, they positioned themselves in the margins of colonialism,

[The Scientific Basis of Dactyloscopy as a Means of Establishing the Identity of Persons II], *Bezpečnostní služba: časopis pro úřady, sbory a orgány bezpečnostní v Československé republice* 7, no. 2–3 (1937): 39–44, 67–72.

¹⁸⁶⁹ Archives of the Charles University, Prague, Register of Doctors of Charles University, Inv. No. 10, 1939, folio 4797, Robert Váňa.

¹⁸⁷⁰ Robert Váňa and Josef Mareš, "Cikáni v Československu, jejich historie a počet" [Gypsies in Czechoslovakia, their History and Numbers], *Bezpečnostní služba: časopis pro úřady, sbory a orgány bezpečnostní v Československé republice* 5, no. 12 (December 1, 1935): 364–69; Robert Váňa, "Vědecký podklad daktyloskopie jako prostředku pro zjišťování totožnosti osob I" [The Scientific Basis of Dactyloscopy as a Means of Establishing the Identity of Persons I], *Časopis lékařů českých* 75, no. 50 (December 11, 1936): 1627–30. On the Mendelization of fingerprints, see Amir Teicher, "Kristine Bonnevie's Theories on the Genetics of Fingerprints, and Their Application in Germany," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 92 (April 2022): 162–76.

¹⁸⁷¹ Robert Váňa and Oldřich Pinkas, "Biologie cikánů v republice Česko-Slovenské" [Biology of Gypsies in the Czech-Slovak Republic], *Biologické listy* 23, no. 3–4 (1938): 197.

and started producing knowledge that aimed to inform colonial rule overseas, as well as the practices of surveillance and mobility control closer to home.

Convenient Go-Betweens: The International Eugenics Movement and the Post-Habsburg Countries

By the outset of the interwar period, the international eugenics movement had already existed for over a decade. In 1907, German race hygienists led by Alfred Ploetz had founded an International Society for Race Hygiene, which was primarily joined by representatives from Scandinavia. On the other hand, British eugenicists held significant influence within the *Permanent International Eugenics Committee* [PIEC], which first convened in 1913 in Paris.¹⁸⁷² As Stefan Kühl points out in his foundational work on the international eugenics movement, the two associations differed in their goals. While the former revolved around “the idea of a racist international” based on whiteness, the latter primarily pursued “international cooperation as an instrument for making eugenics into a science.”¹⁸⁷³ After the First World War, the PIEC reconstituted itself in 1919. What followed was an influx of eugenicists from the post-Habsburg countries. By the mid-1930s, eugenicists from all these states had some connection to the *International Federation of Eugenic Organizations* [IFEEO], as the network was known from 1925 onwards.

This influx was a departure from the prewar years when eugenicists based in the Habsburg Empire did not count among the main driving forces of the emerging international eugenics movement.¹⁸⁷⁴ It is true that several of its subjects joined the movement. For instance, the diplomat Géza von Hoffmann became a crucial mediator between the eugenicists in the

¹⁸⁷² Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 14-17 and 22-27.

¹⁸⁷³ Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 27.

¹⁸⁷⁴ Paul Wendling argues that there was an “imperial Austrian [...] component within early German institutions of racial hygiene.” However, it was based on a shared *Grossdeutsch* nationalism and cannot be regarded as an expression of internationalism. Weindling, “A City Regenerated,” 84-85.

United States of America, the German Empire, and the rest of Central Europe.¹⁸⁷⁵ Additionally, several eugenicists from Austria-Hungary were among the contributors to the 1911 Dresden race hygiene exhibition.¹⁸⁷⁶ Finally, when the International Eugenics Congress convened in London in 1912, a few individuals from the Habsburg Empire attended the event.¹⁸⁷⁷ However, these were exceptions rather than the rule. Even after eugenic associations started emerging in Austria-Hungary from 1913 onwards, none of them joined the PIEC. Its relevance for eugenicists from post-Habsburg countries increased only after the empire's collapse.

Although exchanges between advocates of eugenics in Austria-Hungary and the international eugenics movement were limited before 1914, they did participate in broader international initiatives that, to varying degrees, embraced eugenics. International congresses of hygiene and demography, child studies, school hygiene, temperance, moral reform, and several others were attended by numerous eugenicists identifying with various nationalities of Austria-Hungary.¹⁸⁷⁸ Following the destructive war and the imperial collapse, eugenicists based in post-Habsburg states sought to reconnect to such international networks.

As the international eugenics movement embodied by the PIEC rapidly resumed its post-war activity, it became an attractive outlet for eugenicists from post-Habsburg countries seeking to renew their international ties. Not only did the PIEC reactivate itself faster than many other eugenically oriented initiatives, but its influential members were also more explicit in signalling their willingness to integrate Austrian, German, and Hungarian scientists.¹⁸⁷⁹ This

¹⁸⁷⁵ Stefan Kühl, *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 16-18; Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 113-114.

¹⁸⁷⁶ Ernst Rüdin and Max von Gruber, eds., *Fortpflanzung, Vererbung, Rassenhygiene: Illustrierter Führer durch die Gruppe Rassenhygiene der Internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung 1911 in Dresden* (Munich: Lehmann, 1911), 4-6.

¹⁸⁷⁷ *Problems in Eugenics: Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress Held at the University of London, July 24th to 30th, 1912. Vol. 2.* (London: The Eugenics Education Society, 1912); Turda, *Eugenics and Nation*, 88-89.

¹⁸⁷⁸ Marius Turda, *Modernism and Eugenics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

¹⁸⁷⁹ Kühl, *The Nazi Connection*, 18-22.

was crucial for many eugenicists in post-Habsburg countries who, as we will see, wanted to go international without renouncing what remained of their older networks connecting the various centres of knowledge production within the former imperial Austria-Hungary, and which often stretched further into the former German Empire.

Associations from most post-Habsburg countries established ties to the international eugenics movement. The Czechoslovak Eugenics Society was the first to join in 1921, while their Polish counterparts followed in 1925. Although the Austrian and Hungarian eugenic societies officially joined only in 1928 and 1932, respectively, their representatives were allowed to attend its events as early as the early 1920s.¹⁸⁸⁰ During the second interwar decade, also some eugenicists from Yugoslavia and Romania interacted with the IFEO. In 1935, officials of the federation encouraged Božo Škerlj, who was born in Vienna, to establish a small eugenics association in Yugoslavia. Subsequently, Škerlj was nominated as its representative to the IFEO.¹⁸⁸¹ Although Romanian eugenicists aligned themselves with the Latin countries and none of their associations became a member of the IFEO, a former Habsburg military doctor and prominent Romanian eugenicist, Iuliu Moldovan, eventually joined the advisory board of IFEO's official publication, *Eugenical News*. This position was otherwise reserved for its members.¹⁸⁸² By the end of the interwar period, eugenicists in every post-Habsburg country had established some connection to the IFEO.

It was no coincidence that Czechoslovakia became the first post-Habsburg country to be represented in the international eugenics movement. When the movement was revived after the First World War, it became evident that American eugenicists had assumed leadership within it. By joining, Czech eugenicists demonstrated their interest in American models, social

¹⁸⁸⁰ *Bericht der 12. Versammlung der Internationalen Federation Eugenischer Organisationen: Konferenzsitzungen vom 15. bis 20. Juli 1936: Scheveningen - Holland* (Den Haag: Stockum, 1936), 1-3.

¹⁸⁸¹ Cergol Paradiž, *Evgenika na Slovenskem*, 111-113.

¹⁸⁸² "The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting, June 2nd, 1934," *Eugenical News* 20, no. 2 (March 1935): 26.

modernization, and technocratic governance, which were broadly held among Czechoslovakia's elite.¹⁸⁸³ Supported by various governmental and public bodies, several representatives of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society presented their papers at the Second International Congress of Eugenics in New York in 1921. Moreover, Czechoslovakia became a founding member of the Permanent International Eugenics Commission in 1921, as the only member from East Central Europe alongside countries such as France, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and the United States.¹⁸⁸⁴ By the end of the 1920s, a representative of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society had been elected as the vice-president of the IFEO. Joining the international eugenics movement became a central part of Czech eugenicists' strategy to expand their networks after the collapse of the empire.

While the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society embraced the internationalism exemplified by the IFEO, its members also sought to maintain their networks in what was now Austria and Germany. This approach was welcomed at the IFEO, particularly by some of its members from the United States and Scandinavia, including the founder of the American Eugenics Record Office Charles Davenport and the Swedish eugenicist Herman Nilsson-Ehle. Shortly after the end of the First World War, they sought to reintegrate the countries of the former Central Powers into the IFEO. However, these attempts met with resistance from the French and Belgian members of the movement. Although the representatives of German race hygienists, as well as Austrians and Hungarians, only officially joined much later, their supporters sought to maintain at least informal contacts.¹⁸⁸⁵ Consequently, they searched for alternative opportunities and forums. For a brief moment, this made Czech eugenicists into sought-after members of the international eugenics movement.

¹⁸⁸³ Šimůnek, "Eugenics, Social Genetics and Racial Hygiene," passim.

¹⁸⁸⁴ Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 43.

¹⁸⁸⁵ Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 43.

An example of this is an international meeting of geneticists and eugenicists held in September 1922 in the Czechoslovak town of Brno to celebrate the centenary of Gregor Mendel's birth. The chief organizer of the conference was Hugo Iltis, a biologist, Mendel biographer, and supporter of eugenics from Brno. While Iltis was a German-speaking scientist of Jewish origin, both German and Czech eugenicists were involved in organizing this conference. Jaroslav Kříženecký, the secretary of the Czech Eugenics Society, played a direct role in the local committee responsible for organizing the event, while its two other members, Artur Brožek and Vladislav Růžička, provided their “most energetic support” to the main organizer.¹⁸⁸⁶ Among the more than 100 guests who attended the event from abroad, the majority were from Germany and Austria. This intermingling across national boundaries was also evident in the conference's program: some of its official events were bilingual, and the evening program included a night at the local opera house featuring music by Richard Wagner and Bedřich Smetana.¹⁸⁸⁷ Both were widely considered emblematic national romantic composers in their respective contexts. The conference can be seen as a cautious attempt to maintain bridges between the Czech-speaking and German-speaking geneticists and advocates of eugenics from Czechoslovakia and beyond, following the collapse of the empire.

At the same time, the conference clearly aimed at extending the international networks of its organizers. The participants included some of the leading figures of the international eugenics movement, such as Davenport and Nilsson-Ehle. The conference seems to have yielded some results in this regard, as during the meeting of the Permanent International Eugenics Commission in Brussels, which took place less than a month later, Davenport

¹⁸⁸⁶ Hugo Iltis, ed., *Studia Mendeliana ad centesimum diem natalem Gregorii Mendelii a grata patria celebrandum* (Brno: Typos, 1923), 392.

¹⁸⁸⁷ The music was performed by the opera ensembles of the local Czech and German theaters. Moravian Land Archives in Brno, Fund G 654, Hugo Iltis Papers, Box 1, Inv. No. 19, Letter. The Director of the Czech National Theatre in Brno to Hugo Iltis, September 5., 1922; Moravian Land Archives in Brno, Fund G 654, Hugo Iltis Papers, Box 1, Inv. No. 20, Festvorstellung zur Erinnerung an den 100. Geburtstag J. G. Mendels.

proposed that the next eugenics congress be held in Prague in 1924.¹⁸⁸⁸ Another event was planned to be hosted at Nilsson-Ehle's institute at Lund University in Sweden. Significantly, at the same meeting where Davenport's suggestion was accepted, the members also unanimously voted to invite German race hygienists back to the eugenics movement.¹⁸⁸⁹ The attempt of eugenicists in Czechoslovakia to create forums that merged their older regional and newer international networks provided convenient networking opportunities for the supporters of reintegrating German race hygienists into the international eugenics movement.

The forums set up by Czech eugenicists were not limited to events but also assumed a more lasting form through publication projects. It is worthwhile, in this regard, to focus the discussion on Vladislav Růžička, who was the founder and director of the Czechoslovak Institute of National Eugenics, the president of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society, as well as its most active representative within international eugenic associations. In 1925, Růžička launched *Biologia Generalis*, an "International Journal of General Biology." The ambition of the journal was twofold. On the one hand, it sought to integrate the fragmented knowledge produced by various fields of biological research under the umbrella of general biology, "a general discipline having very manifold and close points of contact to various organic and inorganic sciences."¹⁸⁹⁰ On the other hand, the journal was intended to embody scientific internationalism. It appeared in Vienna and published contributions in English, French, German, and Italian.¹⁸⁹¹

The journal's three editors-in-chief were Růžička, the Austrian biologist Leopold Löhner, and the American biologist and eugenicist Raymond Pearl, with whom Růžička

¹⁸⁸⁸ The conference in Prague did not materialize, as the authorities were not ready to fund three racially oriented international gatherings in Prague in one year.

¹⁸⁸⁹ "International Commission of Eugenics," *Eugenical News* 7, no. 11 (November 1922): 117.

¹⁸⁹⁰ Leopold Löhner, Raymond Pearl, and Vladislav Růžička, "Introduction," *Biologia Generalis* 1, no. 1 (1925): I.

¹⁸⁹¹ In the USA, the journal was distributed by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

established ties through the IFEO. On the one hand, the broader advisory board demonstrated the editors' ambition to include prominent biologists from the Allied and neutral countries in their network. Biologists from Anglophone contexts were particularly well represented and included Julian Huxley and F.A.E. Crew from Britain.¹⁸⁹² On the other hand, there were numerous biologists based in post-Habsburg countries on the board. Additionally, the board also featured a notable presence of neo-Lamarckian, and socialist biologists, particularly from Central and Eastern Europe.¹⁸⁹³ Initially, the editors also invited the biologist Paul Kammerer to be included among the names on the journal's title page, an invitation that he enthusiastically accepted.¹⁸⁹⁴ However, the third editor of the journal, Pearl, who had maintained a file on Kammerer's alleged scientific misconduct since the 1910s, blocked Kammerer's inclusion.¹⁸⁹⁵

Simultaneously, the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society published an international *Festschrift* commemorating the centenary of Gregor Mendel's birth, edited by Růžička. In the introduction to the volume, he claimed to have played a pioneering role in promoting scientific internationalism in his national context, stating, "Our attempt – the very first in the history of Czech science – to win international scholars for our celebration was successful."¹⁸⁹⁶ The contributors included the same names as the editorial board of the *Biologia Generalis*, and several other Czech eugenicists. They were joined by Karl Fruwirth, an Austrian agriculturalist, who had contributed to the 1911 race hygiene exhibition in Dresden, and the Canadian-born botanist and eugenicist Reginald Ruggles Gates, who later founded the scientific racist journal

¹⁸⁹² W. M. Bayliss was another British member of the board, while the Americans included Charles M. Child, Ross G. Harrison, Lawrence J. Henderson, and Charles R. Stockard. The board also had Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, French, Greek, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Romanian, Soviet, Swedish, Swiss, and Yugoslav members.

¹⁸⁹³ It included biologists such as Jaroslav Kříženecký from Brno, Alexander Lipschütz from Dorpat/Tartu, Hans Przibram from Vienna, Julius Schaxel from Jena, and two Soviet scholars.

¹⁸⁹⁴ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, File 3465, Letter, Paul Kammerer to Vladislav Růžička, November 30., 1922.

¹⁸⁹⁵ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, File 3469, Letter, Paul Kammerer to Vladislav Růžička, May 25., 1925; Logan, *Hormones, Heredity, and Race*, 40.

¹⁸⁹⁶ Vladislav Růžička, ed., *Memorial-Volume in Honor of the 100th Birthday [sic!] of J. G. Mendel*, Eugenická knihovna 3 (Prague: Borový, 1925), n.pag.

The Mankind Quarterly.¹⁸⁹⁷ Czech eugenicists thus became convenient go-betweens that linked Anglophone eugenicists and the race hygienists who worked in German-speaking contexts.

Genetics and Radical Politics: The Dark Side of Transnationalism in the 1930s

Race hygienists from Weimar Germany restarted their official participation in the IFEO in 1927, and Austria officially joined in 1928.¹⁸⁹⁸ As both German and Austrian eugenicists now pursued unmediated contacts with their British and American counterparts, eugenicists from East Central Europe lost some of their leverage within the international eugenics movement. Magdalena Gawin documents that the engagement of Polish eugenicists in the IFEO peaked exactly in 1927.¹⁸⁹⁹ Similarly, Czech eugenicists experienced several setbacks within the international eugenics movement in the second half of the 1920s.

In March 1927, the eugenicist Růžička and his allies were ousted from the editorial board of the *Biologia Generalis*. While the new editors claimed that centralizing the editorship in Vienna was a practical decision, it effectively handed control of the periodical to nationalist biologists. The new editorial board was led by the archaeologist Othenio Abel, and his ally Jan Versluys took charge of editing the zoology section.¹⁹⁰⁰ Both scholars had strong connections to Vienna's nationalist academic networks and embraced Nazi ideology at some point during the interwar period.¹⁹⁰¹ The removal of Růžička and Löhner was encouraged by the journal's third editor, Raymond Pearl. Löhner wryly observed that the decision to include Pearl among

¹⁸⁹⁷ Růžička, *Memorial-Volume*, n.pag.

¹⁸⁹⁸ Weindling, "A City Regenerated," 96; Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 45.

¹⁸⁹⁹ Gawin, *Race and Modernity*, 167.

¹⁹⁰⁰ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, File 1521, Letter, Othenio Abel et al. to Vladislav Růžička, March 26., 1927.

¹⁹⁰¹ Klaus Taschwer, "Geheimsache Bärenhöhle: Wie eine antisemitische Professorenclique nach 1918 an der Universität Wien jüdische Forscherinnen und Forscher vertrieb," in *Alma Mater Antisemitica: Akademisches Milieu, Juden und Antisemitismus an den Universitäten Europas zwischen 1918 und 1939*, ed. Regina Fritz, Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe, and Jana Starek (Vienna: New Academic Press, 2016), 221–42.

the editors was “probably the most unfortunate move we could have made because, from what I can gather, we not only owe him for the previous difficulties but also our forced exit now.”¹⁹⁰² What is more, other attempts at international networking yielded some disappointment as well, including the involvement in the IFEO. Although Růžička, as a representative of the CES, held a vice-presidential position in the IFEO, the federation's secretary later acknowledged that “he was rarely able to be present at our meetings.”¹⁹⁰³ In effect, by the end of the 1920s, eugenicists like Růžička began to perceive their international engagement as a partial failure.

This sense of failure was compounded by the challenges posed by an epistemic shift in the theory of heredity and eventually by political changes. Růžička and some other Czech eugenicists continued to embrace the inheritance of acquired characteristics well into the 1920s. In a publication intended for an international audience, he went as far as to make the provocative claim that “Mendelism had been exhausted both ideologically and methodologically.”¹⁹⁰⁴ This view was not broadly shared within the IFEO. Employing internationalism to legitimize the claimed status of eugenics as an independent scientific discipline, the leading members of the federation emphasized its allegedly rigorous scientific foundations. Crucially, the federation embraced genetics as the main symbol of its scientific aspirations, reinforcing an already strong commitment to Mendelism among its American, British, and German members, and eventually marginalizing its internal critics.¹⁹⁰⁵ This created a double bind for eugenicists such as Růžička, who clung to the inheritance of acquired characteristics while simultaneously networking primarily with Anglophone and German-speaking members of the IFEO. This tension was ultimately resolved when Růžička and some of his allies in the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society

¹⁹⁰² Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Vladislav Růžička Papers, File 1521, Letter, Leopold Löhner to Vladislav Růžička, March 1., 1927.

¹⁹⁰³ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 7898, Report of the Honorary Secretary of the IFEO, 1934.

¹⁹⁰⁴ Růžička, *Memorial-Volume*, 49.

¹⁹⁰⁵ Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 40.

opted out of the inheritance of acquired characteristics and embraced Mendelian genetics. Concurrently, Czech eugenicists increasingly sought alternatives to welfare-oriented approaches, particularly in the wake of the Great Depression.

Stefan Kühl argues that after 1933, the IFEO became one of the “channels that the National Socialists used for propagating their race policies abroad,” and it “increasingly took on the role of a willing instrument of legitimization of National Socialist race policy.”¹⁹⁰⁶ Those eugenicists from East Central Europe who continued to participate in the IFEO, or who joined it during the 1930s, increasingly faced choices regarding the Nazi influence within the federation. The 1934 IFEO conference in Zurich illustrates this trend. All the representatives from East Central Europe who attended the conference hailed from post-Habsburg countries: Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland.¹⁹⁰⁷ They joined the other participants – including a delegation of Nazi Germany – and voted for a resolution stating that

despite all differences in their political and social outlook, they have nevertheless been united by the deep conviction that eugenic research and practice is of the highest and most urgent importance for the existence of all civilized countries.¹⁹⁰⁸

While the resolution did not specifically mention the recently introduced Nazi racial policies, it was widely regarded as their clear scientific endorsement.¹⁹⁰⁹

The Czechoslovak representative at the IFEO conference, a young geneticist Bohumil Sekla, summed up his observations in letter written shortly afterwards: “There were no really serious objections to German race hygiene.”¹⁹¹⁰ Sekla, who was one of the defining members

¹⁹⁰⁶ Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 80 and 91.

¹⁹⁰⁷ Kühl, *The Nazi Connection*, 97.

¹⁹⁰⁸ *Bericht über die 11. Versammlung der Internationalen Föderation Eugenischer Organisationen, Konferenzsitzungen vom 18. bis 21. Juli 1934 im Waldhaus Dolder, Zürich, Schweiz* (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1934), 79.

¹⁹⁰⁹ Kühl, *The Nazi Connection*, 27-28.

¹⁹¹⁰ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 8781, Letter, Bohumil Sekla to [Egon von Niederhöffer], November 2, 1934.

of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society in the 1930s, himself contributed to the discussion at the conference by stating that “the realization of eugenic principles is also possible under a democratic state regime” and that

while the eugenics movement is greatly encouraged by the powerful example of Germany, we cannot conceal some difficulties which arise from the fact that eugenicists in different countries have to dispel prejudices which are based on the fact that it is precisely the new Germany where race hygiene is carried out most energetically.¹⁹¹¹

While the IFEO was increasingly controlled by supporters of Nazi race policies, there was also disagreement. A coalition of mainly American and British “reform eugenicists” sought to establish human genetics as an independent discipline, while simultaneously embracing some form of socialist politics. Motivated by both agendas, this generationally defined coalition positioned itself critically towards the eugenic ideas which dominated the IFEO.¹⁹¹² In this conflict, Sekla assumed a position of strategic ambiguity, and interacted with both of these increasingly adversarial groups.

On the one hand, Sekla maintained contact with the British and American geneticists that culminated during his research stay at the Institute of Animal Genetics in Edinburgh. Between October 1937 and February 1938, Sekla worked closely with F. A. E. Crew and Hermann J. Muller, the latter of whom has just returned from the Soviet Union. In his curriculum vitae from 1938, Sekla proudly pointed out that his cooperation with the American socialist geneticist Muller continued even after his return to Prague.¹⁹¹³

On the other hand, Sekla used multiple occasions to interact with race hygienists in Nazi Germany. In 1934, he attended an “international” course on *Konstitutions- und Erbbiologie in*

¹⁹¹¹ National Archives, Prague, Fund 622, Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education, Box 169, Inv. No. XV-C-2-4, Sekla’s report, October 23., 1934.

¹⁹¹² Daniel Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (New York: Knopf, 1985), 164-75.

¹⁹¹³ National Archives, Prague, Fund 371, Ministry of Education, Box 204, Bohumil Sekla’s File, Inv. No. 98.719/38, Curriculum vitae.

der Praxis der Medizin (The Biology of Constitution and Heredity in Medical Practice) in Berlin, led by the physician Walther Jaensch, and visited the *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* [Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics].¹⁹¹⁴ Sekla also participated in two scientific events that were invoked by Nazi propaganda as their most salient successes in promoting their racial policies. In addition to his participation at the IFEO conference of 1934, discussed above, Sekla presented his research at the World Population Congress in Berlin in 1935.¹⁹¹⁵ Even on his way to Edinburgh in 1937, Sekla travelled through Berlin and used the opportunity to visit the *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Hirnforschung* (KWI for Brain Research), another center of racial research.¹⁹¹⁶ Sekla thus networked with reform eugenicists, but also interacted with race hygienists in Nazi Germany.

In Czechoslovakia, Sekla accumulated considerable symbolic capital. He gained it partly thanks to his access to the human geneticists abroad and partly due to his public profile. At the time, Sekla was a vocal member of Czech militant atheist and socialist intellectual circles. He used this symbolic capital to promote eugenic sterilizations, particularly after the introduction of the Sterilization Law of 1933 in Nazi Germany.¹⁹¹⁷ Such a position was shared by several other Czech eugenicists in the early 1930s, including the former neo-Lamarckian Růžička, who claimed that sterilizations as a technology could be separated from the Nazi race ideology.

¹⁹¹⁴ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 8778, Letter of Application, [1934]. On the organizer of the course, Walther Jaensch, see Michael Hau, “Constitutional Therapy and Clinical Racial Hygiene in Weimar and Nazi Germany,” *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 71, no. 2 (April 2016): 115–43.

¹⁹¹⁵ Bohumil Sekla, “Differentielle Fortpflanzung in der Tschechoslowakei,” in *Bevölkerungsfragen: Bericht des Internationalen Kongresses für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Berlin, 26. August-1. September 1935*, ed. Hans Harmsen and Franz Lohse (Munich: Lehmann, 1936), 530–34; Mackensen, Rainer, ed. *Bevölkerungslehre und Bevölkerungspolitik im ‘Dritten Reich’* (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2004).

¹⁹¹⁶ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 8776, Letter, Nikolay Timofeev-Ressovsky to Bohumil Sekla, September 25., 1937.

¹⁹¹⁷ Gisela Bock, *Zwangssterilisation im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Geschlechterpolitik* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1986); Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*.

Yet, Sekla went one step further and asserted that the policy was already ideologically neutral in the way it was applied in Nazi Germany. Discussing the Sterilization Law in a Czech medical journal in 1934, Sekla claimed that it was largely separated from politics: “The connection of this law to Germany’s current political regime [...] is merely accidental.”¹⁹¹⁸ Contending that it is “hardly possible to raise any substantial objections” against the wording of the law, that it “defends the entire population” against “the proliferation of the inferior,” and that the law involved “experts in eugenics” at various stages, Sekla alleged that it is “hard to imagine how this law could ever be abused.”¹⁹¹⁹ He concluded his analysis by declaring that

it would not be in the interest of eugenics in general, nor in the interest of our own nation’s health if the German eugenic law failed or if it withered away such as the American Prohibition law.¹⁹²⁰

Throughout the 1930s, Sekla repeatedly argued in support of eugenic sterilizations. He was even a member of a three-member committee that was convened by the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society to draft a Czechoslovak sterilization law.¹⁹²¹ Sekla thus used his authority to advocate for the implementation of eugenic sterilizations in Czechoslovakia without clearly distancing himself from the practice in Nazi Germany.

During the 1930s, Nazi propaganda sought various signs of international support for its racial policies. They were to be used to legitimize these policies domestically, as well as abroad.¹⁹²² Sekla’s statements attracted some of that attention. One of the leading medical journals in Germany, the *Münchener Medizinische Wochenschrift*, reviewed Sekla’s arguments in a 1934 article. The journal presented them as an endorsement, pointing particularly to Sekla’s

¹⁹¹⁸ Bohumil Sekla, “Eugenické sterilizační zákony” [Eugenic Sterilisation Laws], *Praktický lékař* 14, no. 2 (January 20, 1934): 48.

¹⁹¹⁹ Sekla, “Eugenické sterilizační zákony,” 48.

¹⁹²⁰ Sekla, “Eugenické sterilizační zákony,” 48.

¹⁹²¹ While the committee produced a memorandum endorsing the measure, it did not proceed to prepare a detailed draft of the law, likely due to a lack of political support. Michal Šimůnek, “Pro et contra. Debáty o zavedení eugenické sterilizace v Československu, 1933–1938” [Pro et Contra: Debates on the Introduction of Eugenic Sterilization in Czechoslovakia, 1933–1938], *Speciální pedagogika* 22, no. 3 (2012): 232–40.

¹⁹²² Kühl, *For the Betterment*, 95.

formulations that the Sterilization Law was “formally very perfect,” that it “complied with the current state of eugenics and the science of human heredity,” “protected against the inferior,” and that it was drafted by “experts.”¹⁹²³ Such use of Sekla’s arguments cannot be interpreted as a product of misunderstanding or as a misinterpretation. Indeed, drawing on the networks he developed within the IFEO, Sekla was in contact with several Nazi race hygienists at the time.

For instance, in March 1935, Sekla reached out to the prominent race hygienist and one of the authors of the Sterilization Law, Ernst Rüdin. Invoking their contacts at the IFEO, Sekla sought to obtain up-to-date statistics about the number of sterilized individuals in Germany, imploring Rüdin to realize that “it may be in your interest, too, to spread accurate information about the impact and function of this very important institution.”¹⁹²⁴ A few months earlier, Sekla also contacted a German medical doctor, asking him to intervene with Walter Gross, the head of the *Rassenpolitisches Amt* of the NSDAP, and to obtain confidential information concerning the outcomes of the Nazi sterilization policies. While instructing his go-between, Sekla again appealed to the IFEO:

You can tell him [Gross] my name without any hesitation, as it is possible that he remembers me from this year’s IFEO congress in Zurich. Of course, I must ask you not to use this inquiry of mine for public purposes. [...] As I stated in my remarks in Zurich, which Dr Gross will perhaps remember, it is still the case that there are infinitely many prejudices against sterilization that are based in politics. I can assure you that I am making this request in the best of my intentions and will not misuse the clarification, if you can provide me with one; at most I will use it to correct some misleading reports.¹⁹²⁵

To support his case, Sekla attached copies of two articles about the Sterilization Law that had recently appeared under his name in Czechoslovakia in German- and Hungarian-language

¹⁹²³ “Das deutsche Sterilisationsgesetz im Spiegel ausländischer medizinischer Kritik,” *Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift* 81, no. 8 (March 2, 1934): 308.

¹⁹²⁴ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 8778, Letter, Bohumil Sekla to Ernst Rüdin, March 21., 1935.

¹⁹²⁵ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 8781, Letter, Bohumil Sekla to [Egon von Niederhöffer], November 2, 1934.

periodicals.¹⁹²⁶ Although Sekla's go-between eventually provided him with the requested information from a less prominent source within the Nazi hierarchy than Gross, he still praised Sekla for his personal attitude: "We Germans are currently so misunderstood abroad that it feels great when we encounter such understanding as you have exhibited towards us in these matters."¹⁹²⁷

Sekla used go-betweens to interact with race hygienists in Nazi Germany, even as the 1930s progressed. For instance, when Sekla wrote a favorable review of a book by a German race hygienist Karl Valentin Müller in 1937, he chose to publish it in the eugenic journal *Evgenika* based in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia. Sekla made it clear to the editor of the journal, eugenicist Božo Škerlj, that publishing the review in Yugoslavia would be more appropriate than in Czechoslovakia, "given that Germany has better relations with your country than with ours."¹⁹²⁸

While Sekla is sometimes presented by Czech historians as someone who "sharply and repeatedly criticized scientific racism," this assessment may be difficult to maintain in light of these sources.¹⁹²⁹ Indeed, his networks from the 1930s are a typical example of the dark side of transnationalism.¹⁹³⁰ They exemplify the shift among the members of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society from the internationalism of the early 1920s towards an embrace of more discreet, bilateral exchanges. These ties remained international but oscillated between liberal

¹⁹²⁶ Bohumil Sekla, "Die eugenische Sterilisation in der Gesetzgebung," *Grenzbote: Deutsches Tagblatt für die Karpathenländer* 64, no. 158 (June 13, 1934): 5; Bohumil Sekla, "Az eugenikus sterilizációs törvények I" [The Eugenic Sterilisation Laws I], *Therapia* 13, no. 8 (April 11, 1934): 177–81; Bohumil Sekla, "Az eugenikus sterilizációs törvények II" [The Eugenic Sterilisation Laws II], *Therapia* 13, no. 9 (May 1, 1934): 199–204.

¹⁹²⁷ Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum, Brno, Bohumil Sekla Papers, File 8778, Letter, Egon von Niederhöffer to Bohumil Sekla, November 22., 1934.

¹⁹²⁸ Archives of the Group of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Božo Škerlj papers, Letter, Bohumil Sekla to Božo Škerlj, April 12., 1937; Bohumil Sekla, Review of *Der Aufstieg des Arbeiters durch Rasse und Meisterschaft*, by Karl Valentin Müller, *Evgenika* 3, no. 2 (May 1937): 31.

¹⁹²⁹ Michal Šimůnek, "Bohumil Sekla," in *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, ed. Marius Turda (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 174.

¹⁹³⁰ Sekla played a crucial role in reproducing the discourse of eugenics in the state-socialist context. Schmidt, "Race Science," 7-9.

democracies and dictatorships, providing potential templates and justifications for the calls for more radical biopolitical blueprints that marked the 1930s.

Conclusion: Transnational Networks of Eugenicians in Post-Habsburg Countries in Comparative Perspective

The collapse of the Habsburg Empire spurred the quest for fresh transnational networks, even among local eugenicists and racial anthropologists. This chapter provides evidence to support this assertion by examining the formal and informal networks of these scientists in Czechoslovakia. This conclusion now takes a step back and situates this particular case within the broader context of post-Habsburg territories.

A comparative examination of the varied transnational networks involving racial anthropologists and eugenicists in this region reveals that their participation in such networks became a common trend in the interwar period. The networks they became part of often espoused the principles of scientific internationalism, and the scientists who chose to engage in them adopted a language that blended internationalism, nationalism, and biological concepts to varying extents. Significantly, these networks did not limit themselves to the territory of the dissolved Habsburg Empire; instead, they extended beyond it. Furthermore, these networks increasingly expanded beyond the borders of Europe. In essence, many post-Habsburg eugenicists went global in the interwar period.

Even though the collapse of the Austria-Hungary provided an incentive for an intensification of transnational exchanges, and the post-imperial situation was of significance in this regard, there were few surviving imperial legacies for these eugenicists to rely on. Even if they had international networks before the war, which was not always the case, the institutions and trust that facilitated them had been disrupted during the war and the violent disintegration of the empires in East Central Europe. In many cases, they could not be restored afterward.

Additionally, some of the key intermediaries between eugenicists in the Habsburg context and the international eugenics movement died or retired in the early postwar period, including Géza von Hoffmann, arguably the most influential among these mediators.¹⁹³¹

While the previous chapters of this dissertation have exemplified the prominent and recurring patterns that marked the practices, concepts, and regional networks in eugenics in post-Habsburg countries, the networks that extended beyond the post-Habsburg context do not exhibit such consistent patterns.

By engaging in transnational networks, post-Habsburg eugenicists pursued varied objectives. Their strategies within these networks also exhibited significant variations. Importantly, these differences were not only evident between countries but also within individual national contexts and even within specific local or disciplinary settings. While the imperial legacies played a negligible role in determining which transnational networks these advocates of eugenics would enter, the presumed distinctiveness of national cultures had little influence, either, particularly on informal exchanges.

To begin with, the *League of Nations Health Organisation* [LNHO] played a pivotal role in facilitating and shaping the transnational networking of certain proponents of public health from post-Habsburg territories and East Central Europe more broadly. The international organization was officially established in 1924 after operating provisionally for a few years and was led by Ludwik Rajchman, a physician who obtained his degree from the University of Cracow.¹⁹³² According to Paul Weindling, the agenda of the LNHO gradually expanded to encompass “expert-led scientific initiatives to advance medical science, and improve health and

¹⁹³¹ Kühl, *The Nazi Connection*, 36.

¹⁹³² Paul Weindling, “The League of Nations Health Organization and the Rise of Latin American Participation, 1920–40,” *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos* 13, no. 3 (2006): 1; Martin David Dubin, “The League of Nations Health Organisation,” in *International Health Organisations and Movements, 1918–1939*, by Paul J. Weindling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 56–80.

living conditions, and thereby to secure social cohesion, and to promote ‘health in the widest sense of the word.’”¹⁹³³

The internationalism of the LNHO played a key role in assisting post-Habsburg public health experts, many of whom advocated some form of eugenics, to integrate themselves into transnational networks following the collapse of the empire.¹⁹³⁴ Firstly, the LNHO facilitated exchanges within East Central Europe. For instance, in 1930, the LNHO organized what it called a “Balkans Medical Interchange.” Over several weeks, selected participants traveled through Romania and Yugoslavia, visiting numerous public health institutions, including rural health demonstration areas. Importantly, the selection of participants and the routes they traveled did not adhere to the old imperial borders. Instead, participants were recruited from various parts of East Central Europe, and the itinerary covered the entirety of both states evenly, disregarding the differing imperial legacies of the territories that composed them. This approach reflected the LNHO administrators’ mental map, which recognized the distinctiveness of meso-regions like the Balkans and considered nation-states as their constitutive components.¹⁹³⁵ Therefore, the LNHO not only incorporated post-Habsburg public health experts but also had a significant impact on reshaping and expanding their networks and mental maps, transitioning them from an imperial framework to a meso-regional perspective.

However, the LNHO also played a vital role in connecting public health experts from East Central Europe with their counterparts from outside the region. For instance, the list of

¹⁹³³ Weindling, “The League of Nations Health Organization,” 1.

¹⁹³⁴ The ambiguity of their attitude towards eugenics is encapsulated in the historian Iris Borowy’s observation that there were “eugenic undertones to which LNHO members, despite their general rejection of eugenics, were not immune,” Iris Borowy, *Coming to Terms with World Health: The League of Nations Health Organisation 1921-1946* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009), 326.

¹⁹³⁵ United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section, Registry files (1928-1932), Health - International Liaison, International Liaison, 1928 - Balkan Medical Interchange, 1930, Inv. No. R5947/8B/21603/15763, Exchange by the Balkans, 1930 - Reports of the best participants; National Archives of Romania, Bucharest, Fund 614, Sabin Manuilă Papers, Box 8, Inv. No. IV 38, Report, Frank G. Boudreau to Iuliu Moldovan, March 11., 1930.

invitees to an LNHO-organized international conference, which accompanied the opening of the School of Public Health in Zagreb in 1927, featured high-ranking guests from France, Germany, and other European countries. Moreover, the LNHO extended invitations to global participants from countries like Brazil and the United States. These global experts, then, were joined by various participants from East Central Europe. Among them were numerous public health officials from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania, including the advocates of eugenics such as Witold Chodźko, Béla Johan, Iuliu Moldovan, and Hynek Pelc. Participants from Austria, Bulgaria, and Greece were also included.¹⁹³⁶ Therefore, the LNHO assisted these post-imperial physicians in expanding their networks on a more global scale.

In turn, public health experts from East Central Europe and their agendas transformed the LNHO, as Sara Silverstein points out. Initially, the management of epidemics in Europe's eastern borderlands, and later on, public health within rural areas, became key issues on the international organization's agenda. Experts from post-imperial states in East Central Europe played a significant role in shaping these initiatives. By addressing issues related to the state-building process in post-imperial parts of Europe and involving regional experts, the LNHO increasingly adopted strategies that enhanced health by strengthening state capacity. By linking health promotion to post-imperial state-building, the LNHO gradually expanded its focus from "limited humanitarian relief concerns" to "expanding health services."¹⁹³⁷

The rural initiatives sought to create a public health infrastructure in rural areas, with a particular emphasis on preventive medicine. Iris Borowy describes them as "the largest and also most important project" of the LNHO, and "the one that most determined its emerging profile."¹⁹³⁸ These initiatives commenced in the late 1920s, with East Central Europe as one of

¹⁹³⁶ Croatian State Archives, Zagreb, Fund 517, Higijenski zavod sa školom narodnog zdravlja [Hygienic Institute and School of Public Health], Box 2, September 1927, A report by Andrija Štampar to the king Alexander I.

¹⁹³⁷ Silverstein, "Reinventing International Health," 72.

¹⁹³⁸ Borowy, *Coming to Terms*, 325.

their main global sites.¹⁹³⁹ As a result, the locations that were regarded as the most remarkable public health achievements in East Central Europe, particularly the rural public health institutions in Yugoslavia, attracted visits from public health officials from various parts of the globe. These visits were organized as part of their professional training and study trips, supported by the LNHO, and included individuals from non-European contexts.¹⁹⁴⁰ Equally importantly, women were increasingly present among the international visitors to these institutions.¹⁹⁴¹ Their often extensive narrative reports not only filled the dossiers at the LNHO's and Rockefeller Foundation's offices but also became a sought-after part of the content published in professional and popular medical journals. These study trips, therefore, facilitated the circulation of knowledge generated by post-Habsburg eugenicists associated with the LNHO, both within the region and globally. In the case of the circulation of this knowledge across different parts of the world, the impact of these study trips was further enhanced by the global mobility of some experts from post-Habsburg contexts.

From the early 1920s onward, the LNHO embarked on an ambitious program to establish health systems in Greece, Bolivia, the Republic of China, and beyond.¹⁹⁴² It was the last case, where LNHO's involvement in the creation of the national health system started in second half of the 1920s, that offered significant opportunities for several post-Habsburg physicians, including Andrija Štampar, Berislav Borčić, and their mentor Julius Tandler, to seek refuge from the authoritarian political regimes of their respective home countries.¹⁹⁴³ Their

¹⁹³⁹ Murard, "Designs within Disorder," passim.

¹⁹⁴⁰ See, for instance United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section, Registry files (1933-1946), Health – General, Inv. No. R6143/8A/30918/30918, Mission of Dr. Wakil, 1937.

¹⁹⁴¹ Ruth Ingram, "Nursing in Yugoslavia: Glimpses of the Preparation and Work of Health Nurses in Yugoslavia," *The American Journal of Nursing* 30, no. 2 (February 1930): 139; United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section, Registry files (1928-1932), Health - International Liaison, International Liaison, 1928 - Individual Missions: Individual Cases, Inv. No. R5943/8B/36730/1218, Individual Missions - Dr. Johanovska, 1932.

¹⁹⁴² Borowy, *Coming to Terms*, 301.

¹⁹⁴³ Željko Dugac, "Cooperation in the Field of Public Health and Medicine: Instances of Expert and Knowledge Mobility between Vienna, Zagreb and the Far East," *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Medicinske znanosti* 540, no. 48–49 (2019): 78–85.

impact was strengthened by the experiences of several Chinese public health experts during their research trips to Yugoslavia, where they studied the local rural health institutions. C. C. Chen, a public health expert who directed a rural hygiene center in Ding Xian, China, later recalled that what he saw in Yugoslavia “most impressed” him during a study trip that also took him to the Soviet Union, India, and Sri Lanka.¹⁹⁴⁴

This experience helped some post-Habsburg eugenicists reframe their arguments along more global lines. Andrija Štampar, the leading Yugoslav expert within the LNHO, serves as a prime example. During his Cutter Lecture at Harvard University in 1938, Štampar pointed out that he drew on professional experiences from diverse parts of the world. He stressed that besides working in rural settings in Yugoslavia and China, he had also visited numerous other countries and conducted a series of studies, particularly focusing on the problems of rural health, which formed the central theme of the lecture.¹⁹⁴⁵ While he did not entirely break with the political and epistemic values that he promoted in his Habsburg and post-imperial local context, he now scaled them up into a global vision of rural modernization.

There were many instances in Štampar’s lecture that revealed his persisting commitment to the ideology of agrarian populism, and particularly to its left-wing interpretation that shaped Croatian politics in Yugoslavia. Yet, while agrarian populists in East Central Europe tended to claim that rural spaces were repositories of ethnic purity, Štampar, in a remark that was both scathing and significant, rejected this notion: “people have not bothered much about the peasant, as he is always looked upon as a permanent source of new life and reinvigoration in every nation.”¹⁹⁴⁶ In other words, this romanticized and racialized image actually contributed

¹⁹⁴⁴ Chen, C. C., *Medicine in Rural China: A Personal Account* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 99-106; Ka-che Yip, *Health and National Reconstruction in Nationalist China: The Development of Modern Health Services, 1928-1937* (Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1995), 40.

¹⁹⁴⁵ Andrija Štampar, “Observations of a Rural Health Worker,” *New England Journal of Medicine* 218, no. 24 (June 16, 1938): 991.

¹⁹⁴⁶ Štampar, “Observations,” 996.

to the suffering of peasants, as it allowed politics to negate their lives. By purposefully stripping his argument of the tropes that reduced peasants to mere resources for the biological rejuvenation of a nation, Štampar globalized his agrarian populism.

This argument also cleared the path for a globalized approach to biopolitics in rural areas. Ultimately, the goal was to create an organic rural modernity that would reshape both the peasants and the countryside. The way to achieve this was to enlist the support of the peasants for an expert-driven attempt to reshape the rural environment, through engineering, medical prevention, and popular education. The strategy rested on robust assumptions about the nature of the rural population, and about its capacity to modernize, in particular. “It is usually assumed that the peasant is primitive and conservative,” Štampar noted, yet he rejected this notion by stressing that “peasant life nevertheless contains all the elements required for every form of progress.”¹⁹⁴⁷ To those who were aware of the strategy that Štampar pursued in rural Yugoslavia, these ideas likely sounded familiar. Yet, his observation that there were still “enormous rural areas in the world without any proper medical aid, and without any preventive work” was a forceful reminder that the challenges that Štampar now thought through were global, and so was also the scale of his proposed solutions.¹⁹⁴⁸ Equally important was that his vision of rural modernization and empowerment now cut across the global color-line. Consequently, the doctor asserted that “the tillers of the soil made their own history” in the past, and that there was also “a strong movement among the peasants all over the world” in the present.¹⁹⁴⁹

Another important international network of physicians had been built around a shared commitment to socialist ideology. The *International Federation of Socialist Physicians*, as the

¹⁹⁴⁷ Štampar, “Observations,” 996.

¹⁹⁴⁸ Štampar, “Observations,” 991.

¹⁹⁴⁹ Štampar, “Observations,” 992 and 997.

network was called, was established at a meeting in Karlsbad/Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia, in 1931. Among the physicians who formed the Federation, socialist doctors from Germany and certain groups of doctors from post-Habsburg countries played a decisive role, despite the initial hesitation of Austrian socialist physicians to join.¹⁹⁵⁰ In a programmatic text published in its flagship journal, the *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* (International Medical Bulletin), the Federation defined its main goals as follows: “to make and to keep the proletariat both physically and mentally capable of fighting for its liberation,” and to hinder fascism across borders.¹⁹⁵¹ This declaration was one of the many texts published by this organization, which demonstrated their increasingly anti-fascist orientation alongside their dedication to socialism.

Multiple members of the association defended eugenics, even if they were critical of its uses in Nazi Germany. This included a Hungarian doctor, Béla Totis, as well as German-speaking physicians from Czechoslovakia such as Theodor Gruschka and Arnold Holitscher. A Czech biologist, Jan Bělehrádek, was another advocate of eugenics within the Federation. As Germany and Austria descended into dictatorship, the Federation’s members were increasingly scattered in exile. Significantly, their periodical first appeared in Prague in 1934, with Holitscher serving as one of its local editors there, before the journal moved to another exile in Paris in 1938. Despite the prevalence of German-speaking doctors within the Federation, the political and epistemic community that gathered around the Federation transcended Central Europe. Manifesting the socialist internationalism that was at its core, it notably included socialist British and French physicians, as well as doctors from Republican Spain and Scandinavia. Moreover, the Federation was not limited to Europe but had a more global,

¹⁹⁵⁰ Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*, passim; Franz Walter, “Der Verein sozialistischer Ärzte,” in *Sozialistische Akademiker- und Intellektuellen-Organisationen in der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Peter Lösche and Franz Walter (Bonn: Dietz, 1990), 131–201.

¹⁹⁵¹ “Was wir wollen!” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (January 1934): 2–3.

transatlantic element, with some members located in the Americas.¹⁹⁵² While the connections of the socialist network to South America remained rather marginal, they were more central for another network that placed Latin identity at the forefront.

Indeed, the tropes of civilizational and cultural commonality between some nations, which infused what Alexander Maxwell calls “pan-nationalist” discourses became a core around which some networks of eugenicists were organized.¹⁹⁵³ The *Fédération Internationale Latine des Sociétés d'Eugénique* (Latin International Federation of Eugenic Societies) was established in 1935 in Mexico and revolved around a concept of Latin identity that its participants claimed to share. As Aaron Gillette and Marius Turda document, the international network that came into being brought together eugenicists from South and Central America, as well as from several countries of Europe, forming a “formalized international Latin eugenics movement” that did not draw on the same categories as the race hygiene promoted by the IFEO.¹⁹⁵⁴ Within post-imperial East Central Europe, it was Romania in particular that espoused a discourse of Latin identity and, accordingly, its eugenicists joined this network.¹⁹⁵⁵ Even though the network’s contacts with eugenicists in Romania’s capital appear to be more intensive than with their counterparts in Cluj, several eugenicists from post-Habsburg parts of Romania were also involved in the network.¹⁹⁵⁶ Based on the pan-nationalist notion of Latin identity, these eugenicists formed a network with a global scope.

While the notion of pan-Slavism guided or legitimized some transnational contacts even before the collapse of the empire, such exchanges were revived and reframed during the

¹⁹⁵² Gregorio Bermann, “Ärztliches aus Latein-Amerika,” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 3, no. 9–10 (1936): 122–23; “Offene Antwort auf den Offenen Brief des Herrn Geheimrat Prof. Dr. E. F. Sauerbruch,” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (January 1934): 4–8.

¹⁹⁵³ Alexander Maxwell, “Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice,” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 28, no. 1 (January 2022): 1–19.

¹⁹⁵⁴ Turda and Gillette, *Latin Eugenics*, 183.

¹⁹⁵⁵ Turda and Gillette, *Latin Eugenics*, 9.

¹⁹⁵⁶ Fédération Internationale Latine des Sociétés d’eugénique, *1er Congrès Latin d’eugénique : Rapport, Paris, 1er-3 Août 1937* (Paris: Masson, 1937).

interwar period. Between the late 1920s and 1936, five pan-Slav congresses of physicians took place. While the scope of these congresses was very broad, the programs of the last two congresses, organized in Poznań, Poland, and in Bulgaria's capital, Sofia, respectively, make it clear that the issues of eugenics and race anthropology were becoming increasingly prominent in these exchanges.¹⁹⁵⁷

Eugenics played an even more central role at the two “Slav Congresses for Child Research,” which brought together physicians, psychologists, educators, and biologists. However, the actual scope of these congresses, which took place in Brno, Czechoslovakia, and Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, in 1933 and 1937, respectively, was narrower than their name suggested. Their organizers, as well as their participants, were largely recruited from the territories of the former imperial Austria or were educated at its universities.¹⁹⁵⁸ Even though they were also based on a pan-nationalist concept, the medical networks that placed pan-Slavism at their center were regional in their scope, narrowly limited to post-imperial East Central Europe, and lacked a global dimension.

Quite characteristic of post-imperial East Central Europe, Francophone networks were also indicative of the cultural and foreign policy orientations of some of its states, even though they did not adopt a discourse of Latin identity as Romania did. The French *Société de biologie*, for example, established branches in several post-Habsburg countries. Besides Romania, active branches emerged in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia by the mid-1920s. While not all biologists who interacted with the Société embraced eugenics, its sessions and proceedings

¹⁹⁵⁷ *IV Zjazd Lekarzy Słowiańskich w Poznaniu, 11-15 IX 1933 w ramach XIV Zjazdu Lekarzy i Przyrodników Polskich: pamiętnik zjazdu* [Fourth Congress of Slavic Physicians in Poznań, September 11-15, 1933, as part of the Fourteenth Congress of Polish Physicians and Naturalists: A Memoir of the Congress] (Warsaw: Drukarnia Bankowa, 1933); Kristina Popova, “Combating Infant Mortality in Bulgaria: Welfare Activities, National Propaganda, and the Establishment of Pediatrics, 1900–1940,” in *Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, ed. Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta, and Marius Turda (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011), 161.

¹⁹⁵⁸ Uher, *Pátý sjezd*, passim; Samec, *Program in navodila*, passim.

provided publication opportunities for advocates of eugenics to reach an international audience, often through technical communications.¹⁹⁵⁹

While the emerging field of biotypology, in which France played a significant role, initially appears to replicate a similar pattern. Mobilizing a range of anthropometric, physiological, psychological, and sexological measurements, and employing statistical methods to analyze them, the biotypologists associated with the *Société de biotypologie* founded in 1932 claimed to develop “a classification of human types” by collecting “all the documents, observations, and measurements that it is possible to gather on a subject.”¹⁹⁶⁰ Professing a holistic view of the human body and making eugenics a constitutive concern of their investigations, these biotypologists, led by Henri Laugier, aimed to generate applied knowledge, particularly for industrial uses.¹⁹⁶¹ On the one hand, Romanian eugenicists increasingly engaged in exchanges with proponents of biotypology in France, Italy, and other countries, aligning with their emphasis on Latin identity and facilitated by the strengthening networks within these contexts.¹⁹⁶²

On the other hand, some doctors in Czechoslovakia were also quick to embrace biotypology and established a local *Československá společnost biotypologická* (Czechoslovak Society of Biotypology) in 1936. Some Yugoslav researchers, including Božo Škerlj, also became familiar with biotypology and plugged themselves into this network.¹⁹⁶³ While the medical concepts of “constitution” and “biological types” were discussed across several contexts, including Germany and Italy, the Society chose to affiliate itself with its French

¹⁹⁵⁹ Some of these texts are cited in the previous chapters.

¹⁹⁶⁰ Henri Laugier, Édouard Toulouse, and Dagmar Weinberg, “La Biotypologie et l’orientation professionnelle,” *Biotypologie: Bulletin de la Société de Biotypologie* 1, no. 1 (December 1932): 28.

¹⁹⁶¹ William H. Schneider, “Henri Laugier, the Science of Work and the Workings of Science in France, 1920–1940,” *Cahiers pour l’histoire du CNRS* 5 (1989): 7–34.

¹⁹⁶² Turda and Gillette, *Latin Eugenics*, passim.

¹⁹⁶³ Božo Škerlj, “Československá společnost biotypologická ve Zlíně” [Czechoslovak Society of Biotypology in Zlín], *Zdravniški vestnik* 10, no. 1 (January 1938): 38.

model.¹⁹⁶⁴ Henri Laugier, the secretary of the latter, an architect and the first director of the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, as well as a professor at the Sorbonne visited Czechoslovakia twice to deliver lectures. The first visit took place during the *International Congress on Psychotechnics* in 1935, while the second visit was upon the invitation of the newly established local biotypology society.¹⁹⁶⁵ The shared focus on industrial applications of biotypological knowledge played an equally significant role in this case, perhaps even more so than the cultural orientation towards France.

During the interwar period, advocates of eugenics from several countries in East-Central Europe also integrated themselves into a transnational network of Catholic physicians. The network, consisting of national chapters known as the Guilds of Saint Luke, had been in existence for several decades. However, the Austrian, Hungarian, and Polish chapters emerged only in the early 1930s, as documented by the historian Monika Löscher. The doctors involved in the association strongly criticized Nazi race hygiene. For instance, the Austrian chapter, founded in 1932, specifically stated its objective as “defense against the further spread of immoral principles, the increasing prevalence of godless and misguided eugenics, and non-Catholic thinking in medical-ethical matters.”¹⁹⁶⁶ However, they were not entirely opposed to eugenics, particularly if it proposed interventions that were within the bounds indicated in the 1930 papal encyclical *Casti connubii*. In practice, this meant that various types of eugenically influenced population policies and social hygiene measures that did not violate human bodily integrity were deemed acceptable, or even welcomed, by these physicians.¹⁹⁶⁷

¹⁹⁶⁴ “Fondation de la Société Tchecoslovaque de biotypologie, affiliée a la Société Française de Biotypologie,” *Biotypologie: Bulletin de la Société de Biotypologie* 4, no. 4 (1936): 177–78.

¹⁹⁶⁵ Bohumil Krajník, “Prof. Dr. Henri Laugier hostem Čsl. společnosti biotypologické” [Prof. Dr. Henri Laugier as a Guest of the Czechoslovak Society of Biotypology], *Časopis lékařů českých* 76, no. 20 (May 21, 1937): 633–34.

¹⁹⁶⁶ Carla Zawisch, “Was wir sein, was wir tun wollen,” *St. Lukas: Mitteilungen der österreichischen St.-Lukas-Gilde* 1, no. 1 (January 1933): 2–4.

¹⁹⁶⁷ Etienne Lepicard, “Eugenics and Roman Catholicism An Encyclical Letter in Context: *Casti Connubii*, December 31, 1930,” *Science in Context* 11, no. 3–4 (1998): 527–44.

The members of the Guilds of Saint Luke from various countries met at regular conferences, the second of which took place in Vienna in 1936, as already mentioned in the previous chapter.¹⁹⁶⁸ The two main themes of the conference were “Eugenics and Sterilization” and “Missionary Medical Welfare.”¹⁹⁶⁹ While the former session, which issued a stark condemnation of eugenic sterilizations, was indicative of the grappling of Catholic physicians with eugenics, the latter highlighted their global connections. The conference linked participants from East Central Europe, primarily Austrian, Hungarian, and Polish physicians, with Belgian, French, and Portuguese medical doctors, among others, who were working as missionaries.¹⁹⁷⁰ Similar to the transnational initiatives discussed above, this network thus facilitated global exchanges, in this case by familiarizing the participants with or plugging them into the production of colonial knowledge.

There was also an attempt to create a network of racial nationalists in Europe’s Southeast which was macro-regional, rather than post-imperial, in its scope. The initiative was led by Hungarian physician and physical anthropologist János Gáspár, who had previously worked as an assistant to the zoologist Lajos Méhely and shared his teacher’s virulent anti-Semitic views.¹⁹⁷¹ In the mid-1930s, Gáspár launched a journal called *Rassen im Donauraum* (Races in the Danubian Space).¹⁹⁷² The journal’s name not only reflected the influence that race-hygienic and geopolitical discourses from Nazi Germany had on Gáspár, but also indicates how these categories reconfigured the mental maps held by some Hungarian race hygienists. Gáspár’s project now aimed to cover “a Danubian space” that was no longer contiguous with

¹⁹⁶⁸ Löscher, *der gesunden Vernunft*, passim.

¹⁹⁶⁹ “II. Internationaler Kongress katholischer Ärzte: Pfingsten 1936 in Wien,” *St. Lukas: Mitteilungen der österreichischen St.-Lukas-Gilde* 4, no. 2 (February 1936): 26–27.

¹⁹⁷⁰ Jenő Leskó, “A bécsi nemzetközi katolikus orvoskongresszus” [The International Catholic Medical Congress in Vienna], *Szent Lukács* 2, no. 3 (July 1936): 53–57.

¹⁹⁷¹ On Méhely, see János Gyurgyák, *Magyar fajvédők: Eszmetörténeti tanulmány* [Hungarian Race Protectionists: A Study in the History of Ideas] (Budapest: Osiris, 2012); Kund, Attila. “Méhely Lajos és a magyar fajbiológiai kísérlete (1920–1931)” [Lajos Méhely and the Hungarian Experiment in Racial Biology, 1920–1931], *Múltunk* 57, no. 4 (2012): 239–89.

¹⁹⁷² Turda, “Introduction,” xvii.

the old imperial borders. It encompassed Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania, and Bulgaria, likely selected due to their foreign policy that increasingly veered towards Nazi Germany.¹⁹⁷³ Conversely, the same political rationale may have also led to the omission of Austria and Czechoslovakia.

In his introductory essay, Gáspár dismissed “the milieu philosophy of the previous century,” condemned the tendency to “blur the distinctive characteristics of individual nations,” and criticized the belief in the “equalizing power of general education” as untenable for a new scientific generation to which he felt he belonged.¹⁹⁷⁴ Instead, he invoked the history and present of the “Danubian space” as allegedly unmatched evidence for his dark claim that “the innate physical and mental characteristics of individuals and of a nation [Volkstum] can, under certain circumstances, be eradicated [ausgerottet] through state power or by the economic position of specific classes within the state, but they can never be changed.”¹⁹⁷⁵ However, very little in terms of the proposed cooperation among racial nationalists in this region materialized, and only one issue of the new periodical ever saw the light of day. This can be attributed, in part, to the conflicting political agendas and epistemic frameworks of the nationalist scientists involved in the project. Additionally, the fact that an existing and powerful network, the Nazi-influenced IFEO, already facilitated contacts between some of these promoters of racial nationalism, could have also played a role.

To sum up, there was a plethora of transnational networks that post-Habsburg eugenicists in post-Habsburg countries joined following the collapse of the empire. Therefore, the networks discussed here cannot be considered an exhaustive list of these connections. The objective was rather to demonstrate the multiplicity of agendas that these networks

¹⁹⁷³ János Gáspár, “Zum Geleit,” *Rassen im Donauraum: Beiträge zur Rassenkunde, Erbbiologie, und Eugenik der Donauvölker* 1, no. 1 (October 1935): 1–2.

¹⁹⁷⁴ Gáspár, “Zum Geleit,” 1–2.

¹⁹⁷⁵ Gáspár, “Zum Geleit,” 1–2.

encompassed, the varied roles that post-Habsburg eugenicists assumed within them, and the distinct geographies (and mental maps) that these networks delineated.

It is evident, therefore, that numerous post-Habsburg eugenicists significantly expanded their networks during the interwar period. For these eugenicists, engaging in local state-building increasingly involved the dissemination of knowledge within transnational networks that extended beyond the former empire. Some of these networks had a distinct regional dimension, connecting the former Habsburg territories with neighboring areas of former empires. The exchanges and movement within these networks significantly shaped the eugenicists' perceptions, leaving a lasting imprint of East Central Europe on their mental map. In considerable number of cases, however, the eugenicists' networks now extended beyond Europe, enabling certain post-Habsburg eugenicists to establish a global reach during the interwar period. The effects of these global connections oscillated between two ideal-typical poles.

On the one hand, some post-Habsburg eugenicists utilized these networks to address the challenges they faced by the end of the 1920s. The Great Depression heightened public demand for state intervention and expert-led solutions to economic and social issues, while simultaneously reducing the budget for welfare policies, as explained in greater detail in the introduction to this chapter. Additionally, the eugenicists grappled with the declining credibility of the neo-Lamarckian notion of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, although this decline did not always result in immediate changes in eugenic practices on the ground. Mobilizing their transnational networks, these eugenicists sought models that would enable them to confront these challenges more forcefully. Frequently, the concepts and practices they thus circulated facilitated enhanced control and surveillance of local populations, as demonstrated by the aforementioned cases of Czech race scientists and eugenicists. Paradoxically, these transnational exchanges often bolstered the power of these eugenicists

within their nation-states and intensified the demand for their expert advice from central authorities. The concept of the “dark side of transnationalism” aptly captures these instances.

Conversely, the developing global connections challenged other eugenicists in post-Habsburg Central Europe to reframe and globalize their arguments. Strikingly, many of these eugenicists were forcefully disconnected from their national contexts through voluntary or de facto exile. This was particularly the case for many experts from the region associated with the LNHO, such as Ludwik Rajchman or Andrija Štampar. Connecting Habsburg legacies with their experience in post-imperial nation-building, these experts now moved across the globe, primarily to East and Southeast Asia, which was the site of several ambitious public health projects spearheaded by the LNHO and the Rockefeller Foundation. After integrating themselves into the public health expert network in this area, these post-Habsburg scientists aligned their expertise with an anti-colonial political stance.¹⁹⁷⁶

¹⁹⁷⁶ Tomoko Akami, “Imperial Politics, Intercolonialism, and the Shaping of Global Governing Norms: Public Health Expert Networks in Asia and the League of Nations Health Organization, 1908–37,” *Journal of Global History* 12, no. 1 (2017): 14 and 20.

CONCLUSION

Paul Weindling once observed that eugenics in Vienna “has yet to find its position within an appropriate sociopolitical or cultural frame.”¹⁹⁷⁷ This observation, by extension, holds true for eugenics in the entire polity of which Vienna was the metropolis, as well as in the multiethnic states that replaced it after 1918. This dissertation proposes one such analytical framework.

Interpreting eugenics in Austria-Hungary against the backdrop of its Habsburg imperial setting, the dissertation argues that this ambiguous body of knowledge was adapted as a tool for the cognitive management of imperial diversity. Moreover, it highlights the significant role of imperial legacies in shaping eugenics in post-Habsburg countries, or “miniature empires,” well into the late 1920s. In effect, the dissertation bridges two bodies of scholarship that have rarely interacted before: Habsburg Studies and the history of eugenics. Transnational in scope and focused on entanglements, it develops an analytical framework that is comprehensible to both fields.

Empirically, the dissertation uncovers the shared genealogies of eugenic discourses and networks in the late imperial context, as well as their post-imperial trajectories, which, while increasingly divergent, remained interconnected. In doing so, it challenges the existing scholarship on eugenics in East Central Europe. This scholarship posits that the nation has always been the primary – or even exclusive – point of reference for eugenic discourses in this area. What is more, it suggests that the networks of eugenics advocates in this region have always been primarily national in character as well. In contrast, this dissertation reveals the pivotal links between these actors, concepts, and networks and their imperial setting, as well as

¹⁹⁷⁷ Weindling, “A City Regenerated,” 81.

their remarkable resilience after the dissolution of Austria-Hungary. After 1918, I argue, they were repurposed in the new political context, often for the objectives of post-imperial state-building. It was only by the early 1930s that they collapsed across most of these contexts, allowing overtly racist, radical nationalist, and authoritarian biopolitical blueprints to dominate.

To put it more systematically, this dissertation suggests that eugenics in Austria-Hungary and in the post-Habsburg countries went through three successive phases over the course of approximately four decades. The first phase, the imperial, involved attempts to develop eugenics into a modern conceptual toolkit for describing and managing the empire's diverse populations and their complex entanglements. On the one hand, this led to experimentation with biological narratives that emphasized cooperation and extended beyond national boundaries. On the other hand, nationalist activists inimical to imperial diversity sought to harness eugenics as a resource for biopolitical projects aimed at violent ethnic disentangling or at delineating an imperial society in which groups were segregated according to purportedly natural criteria.

In the second, mini-imperial phase, the concepts, networks, and practices that had been experimented with in the late imperial context were adopted and adapted for diverging epistemic and political agendas in the post-Habsburg countries of the 1920s. The fact that these polities, in practice, constituted small empires rather than homogeneous nation-states provided a crucial backdrop for these varied attempts. In effect, eugenics reflected and informed a differentiated form of rule in these states, with biopolitical strategies varying across locations. While modernist biopolitics thrived primarily in large, multiethnic metropolises, the contested, multiethnic borderlands became a testing ground for a biopolitics that aggressively targeted both ethnocultural diversity and what it perceived as the harmful effects of modernity.

The striking persistence of imperial concepts, networks, and practices across various post-imperial contexts, well into the interwar period, suggests that there are new, fruitful avenues for studying scientific experts, their networks, and the circulation of their knowledge in East Central Europe more broadly. Rather than focusing on national case studies, future scholarship may benefit from taking the imperial and post-imperial entanglements of these actors as its point of departure.

While the year 1918 and the collapse of the Habsburg Empire represented a point of continuity in many aspects of the history of eugenic discourses in this area, a deep rupture occurred by the end of the first decade after World War I. At this moment, in the wake of the Great Depression, an impending sense of crisis and a greatly amplified demand within state administrations for technocratic solutions to manifold social challenges intersected with the forceful rise of a radical new generation of eugenicists. Their radicalism, coupled with the slower radicalization of some older proponents, was driven by a perceived sense of failure of the post-imperial state-building attempts that had marked the first interwar decade. If earlier eugenicists had claimed to be molding the subjects for the post-imperial state, often by emphasizing the active role of the environment in their remaking, they now increasingly came to see a new wave of radical state building as a precondition for constructing the New Man. In this endeavor, where the word “new” often implied “purified,” Habsburg imperial legacies were perceived as the key obstacle to both. One could describe the phase of eugenics inaugurated by this shift as de-imperial.

The historical trajectory of eugenics in Austria-Hungary and the post-Habsburg states sheds new light on the history of biopolitics in this part of the world. Of course, this is not to suggest that the sphere of biopolitics – in which the lives of individuals and populations become objects of political concern – can be reduced to eugenics, even during its apogee in the first half of the 20th century. Nevertheless, the discourse of eugenics is symptomatic of modern

biopolitics, and its contradictions and transformations reveal much about the fundamental features of biopolitics at the time. Indeed, the very existence and increasing prominence of eugenics in the Habsburg Empire indicate that historians of this imperial formation can no longer remain indifferent to the histories of biopolitics and “race.”

The shift from imperial management of diversity to eugenic visions of purification, traced in this dissertation, also highlights a fundamental reconfiguration of biopolitics in the region during this period. To use the terminology suggested by Roberto Esposito, the modernizing Habsburg Empire in its final decades provided fertile ground for a striking experiment with a modern form of affirmative biopolitics. Emphasizing the interrelatedness of diverse humans with one another and with their environment, this form of biopolitics supported efforts not only to describe and manage but also to legitimize and sustain the empire’s ethnocultural diversity. Only gradually did this form of biopolitics lose its power, ultimately giving way to an immunitarian form marked by growing hostility towards all internal and external alterities. Even though the latter became dominant after the end of the first interwar decade and ultimately plunged into a fatal vortex of destruction and self-destruction, this non-linear trajectory suggests that the relationship between modernity and an immunitarian inflection of biopolitics may not be as logical and straightforward as Esposito assumes.

This dissertation also offers a new perspective on the complex relationship between expertise, the state, and voluntary associations in Austria-Hungary and the post-Habsburg countries. It highlights how a new understanding of the state and its expanding role in the late imperial period went hand in hand with a growing demand for scientific expertise. While experts who thus established increasingly numerous and dense links to the state were many, covering even some areas of biopolitics, eugenicists were not initially among them in significant numbers. With the central state administration hesitant to trust their claims to authoritative knowledge, eugenicists and their ideas were primarily linked to a section of the empire’s large

and varied sphere of voluntary associations. It was during moments of crisis that central state authorities turned to the often-dark advice of these actors claiming expertise. The Leviathan first sought their expertise transiently during World War I and then, more enduringly, embraced eugenics forcefully from the Great Depression onward. Thus, a perceived sense of crisis played a critical role in the history of expert knowledge in the region.

Regarding biopolitics in particular, this dissertation complicates a certain Foucauldian narrative, which positions the state as the primary driver of biopolitics in East Central Europe. Moreover, this received narrative assumes a rather linear relationship between state-building and biopolitical radicalization. The historical, comparative, and entangled analysis undertaken in this dissertation reveals, instead, the ambiguous role of voluntary associations. Rather than resisting biopolitics as part of civil society's defense against state encroachment, these voluntary associations experimented with eugenics, transforming into laboratories where even repressive and exclusionary forms of biopolitics were tested and later supplied to the state.

Despite its scale and scope, this dissertation is necessarily incomplete. It neither claims nor aims to provide the definitive account of the history of eugenics in Austria-Hungary and the post-Habsburg territories. Rather, it offers an initial analytical framework and empirical foundation upon which future historical research can build, paving the way for new lines of inquiry. At least four such promising avenues should be highlighted here.

First, future studies should more systematically follow the core principles of the history of science and Science and Technology Studies by examining the materiality of eugenics during this period and in the region under study. While this dissertation touches on these issues in several instances, further research should seize the opportunity to engage more deeply with physical artifacts and instruments, laboratory practices, research organisms, and other facets of material culture that shaped eugenics in these areas. Detailed, source-rich local studies that

remain attuned to broader imperial and global trends could thus yield novel and exciting findings.

Second, building on the findings of this dissertation, future research should more closely examine the use of eugenic tropes in popular culture within Habsburg and post-Habsburg contexts, as well as the various media through which they were disseminated. Images – whether drawings, photographs, or early film – will be central to this inquiry, as some pioneering studies have already indicated. This research is likely to complicate the findings of this dissertation by showing that visual languages have different genealogies and historical dynamics compared to the technical languages employed by actors claiming scientific expertise, such as those ambiguous figures studied in this volume. Equally important will be discerning how different audiences, both rural and urban, engaged with these visual representations. In stark contrast to the extensive literature devoted to popular reactions (and indifference) to nationalism in this region during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, popular reactions to racial discourses such as eugenics have received surprisingly little attention so far, despite the importance and gravity of the matter.

Third, much of the existing scholarship on eugenics in East Central Europe tends to foreground, perhaps counterintuitively, its earliest stages and interwar growth. In revisiting some of its key arguments, this dissertation was inevitably focused on the same time frame. However, it is urgent to extend this granular attention – across all contexts of East Central Europe – to the period when eugenics underwent its darkest and most violent spasm during World War II. Furthermore, greater attention should be paid to the trajectories of eugenics under the state-socialist regimes that emerged across this region in the aftermath of this global conflict. While “race” was not the central term around which the ideology of these socialist dictatorships revolved, this does not mean that it entirely disappeared from the lexicon, that

they did not pursue biopolitical agendas, or that eugenics and racial anthropology did not partially persist in some contexts.

Fourth, and crucially, future research must move beyond the exclusive focus on the perpetrators – the eugenicists – and recover the experiences of those affected by eugenics in this region: its victims. The voices of inmates in special schools, patients in psychiatric clinics, prisoners of war, disabled veterans, the urban and rural poor, victims of forced sterilizations, women deprived of reproductive choices, and persecuted groups – such as Jews and Roma – should not only be more frequently represented in scholarship on eugenics in East Central Europe but must be brought to the very forefront. Such a shift will lead scholars to discover new historical sources that reveal these voices and may ultimately result in a new narrative: imperial (and post-imperial) eugenics from below.¹⁹⁷⁸ Thus, to use a well-known metaphor, this dissertation can best be described as a ladder: one that should be discarded once the ascent is complete.

¹⁹⁷⁸ I am grateful to Tatjana Buklijaš for suggesting this term.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Newspapers and Periodicals

A Gyermek - Dieťa - Das Kind

A Gyermek [The Child]

A Társadalmi Múzeum Értesítője [Bulletin of the Social Museum]

Acta neerlandica morphologiae, normalis et pathologicae

Adevărul [The Truth]

Akadémiai Értesítő [Academy Gazette]

American Journal of Physical Anthropology

Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien

Anthropologie [Physical Anthropology]

L'Anthropologie

Arbeiterwille

Arbeiterzeitung

Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen

Archiv für Gynäkologie

Archiv für Hygiene

Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie

Archiv für soziale Hygiene und Demographie

Aufwärts: Blätter für alkoholfreie Lebensgestaltung

Az Alkoholizmus: A magyarországi abstinens egyesületek központi közlönye [Alcoholism: The Central bulletin of Hungary's Abstinence Associations]

Az Alkoholkérdés: Alkoholelleses folyóirat [The Alcohol Question: Anti-Alcohol Magazine]

Az Est [The Evening]

Bezpečnostní služba: Časopis pro úřady, sbory a orgány bezpečnostní v Československé republice [Security Service: Journal for Authorities, Corps and Security Bodies in the Czechoslovak Republic]

Biologia Generalis

Biologické listy [Biological Journal]

Biotypologie: Bulletin de la Société de Biotypologie

Blätter für das Wohlfahrtswesen der Stadt Wien

Boabe de Grâu [Wheat Grains]

Boj o zdravie: ľudový zdravotnícky časopis Masarykovej ligy proti tuberkulóze na Slovensku
[Struggle for Health: Popular Health Journal of the Masaryk League Against Tuberculosis in Slovakia]

Brassói Lapok [Braşov Newspapers]

Brünner Zeitung

Budapesti Orvosi Újság [Budapest Medical Journal]

Budoucno: Revue českého socialismu [Future: Journal of Czech Socialism]

Buletin eugenic și biopolitic [Eugenic and Biopolitical Bulletin]

Burgenländische Lehrerzeitung

Čas [Time]

Časopis lékařů českých [Journal of Czech Physicians]

Česká mysl [Czech Thought]

Česká revue [Czech Review]

Československá nemocnice [Czechoslovak Hospital]

Dan: nezavisni informativni dnevnik [Day: Independent Information Daily]

Darwin

Das monistische Jahrhundert

Das Österreichische Sanitätswesen

Das Wiener Jugendhilfswerk

Dav [The Crowd]

Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus

Der Alkoholgegner

Der Freie Burgenländer: Unabhängige deutsche Zeitung für das Burgenland

Der Kampf: Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift

Der Morgen: Monatsschrift der Juden in Deutschland

Deutsche Arbeit

Deutsche Landpost: Tagblatt der deutschen Landpartei Bund der Landwirte

Deutsche soziale Rundschau

Deutsche Zeitung Bohemia

Die Gesellschaft: Internationale Revue für Sozialismus und Politik

Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben

Die Südmark: Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken

E Brno: List etického hnutí československého studentstva [E Brno: Letter of the Ethical Movement of Czechoslovak Students]

Életreform [Life Reform]

Endocrinology

Eos: Vierteljahrsschrift für die Erkenntnis und Behandlung jugendlicher Abnormer

Erdélyi Fiatalok [Transylvanian Youth]

Eugenical News

Evgenika [Eugenics]

Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.

Félegyházi Közlöny [Félegyház Gazette]

Foreign Affairs

Gazeta Oficială [Official Gazette]

Gazeta Transilvaniei [Transylvanian Gazette]

Geografski vestnik [Geographical Bulletin]

Gerechtigkeit

Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja [Bulletin of the Ministry of Public Health]

Grenzbote: Deutsches Tagblatt für die Karpathenländer

Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung: Herausgegeben vom österreichischen Vereine Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische

Hrvatska njiva [Croatian Field]

Hrvatski Sokol: Časopis hrvatskog sokolskog saveza [Croatian Falcon: Journal of the Croatian Sokol Association]

Huszadik Század [Twentieth Century]

Ideea Națională [National Idea]

Internationale Monatsschrift zur Bekämpfung der Trinksitten

Internationale Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Lebensform [Sic!]

Internationales ärztliches Bulletin

Jövő [Future]

Jugoslavenska njiva [Yugoslav Field]

Jutro [Tomorrow]

Kirchliche Blätter aus der ev. Landeskirche A.B.

Korunk [Our Epoch]

Kriegszeitung des A.T.V. Graz

Kwartalnik Psychologiczny [Psychological Quarterly]

Landesamtsblatt für das Burgenland

League of Red Cross Societies: Monthly Bulletin

Lékařské rozhledy [Medical Review]

Licht ins Volk

Liječnički vjesnik [Physicians' Journal]

Lípa [Linden Tree]

Magyar Gyógypedagógia [Hungarian Special Education]

Magyar Közigazgatás [Hungarian Public Administration]

Magyarország [Hungary]

Magyarság [Hungariandom]

Le Matin

Medicul nostru [Our Doctor]

Mișcarea medicală [Medical Movement]

Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien

Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus

Mitteilungen der Grossloge Ungarns des Internationalen Guttemplerordens (I.O.G.T.) und des Alkohol Enthaltensamkeits-Vereins (A.E.V.)

Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik

Mitteilungen der Unterabteilung Gesundheitswesen im Ministerium für innere und kulturelle Angelegenheiten

Mitteilungen der Wirtschaftlichen Organisationen der Aerzte Wiens, Niederösterreichs, Salzburgs und Vorarlbergs, der Aerztekammern von Niederösterreich, Salzburg und Tirol

Mitteilungen des Vereines Südmark

Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung

Mittheilungen der kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft

Mjesečnik Pravničkoga društva u Zagrebu [Monthly Journal of the Lawyer's Society in Zagreb]

Monatsschrift für Kultur und Politik

Morava [Moravia]

Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift

Národ [Nation]

Národní listy [National Journal]

Národopisný věstník českoslovanský [Czechoslavonic Ethnographic Gazette]

Náš život: Časopis Matice slovenskej v Juhoslávii [Our Life: Journal of the Slovak Cultural and Artistic Association in Yugoslavia]

Naše doba [Our Epoch]

Naturwissenschaften

Nemzetvédelem [National Defense]

Népegészségügy [People's Health]

Népszava [Voice of the People]

Neue Freie Presse

Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich

Neues Wiener Tagblatt

New England Journal of Medicine

Nova Evropa [New Europe]

Nová práce [New Labor]

Nové Atheneum [New Athenaeum]

Novi život [New Life]

Ochrana mládeže: Časopis pro veřejnou i soukromou péči o mládež v Království českém [Child Protection: Journal for Public and Private Care of Youth in the Kingdom of Bohemia]

Orvosi Hetilap [Medical Journal]

Orvosképzés [Medical Education]

Österreichische botanische Zeitschrift

Österreichische Frauen-Rundschau

Panoráma: képes hetilap [Panorama: Illustrated Weekly Magazine]

Pécsi Napló [Pécs Journal]

Pester Lloyd

Podkarpatské hlasy: Neodvislý týdeník, hájící zájmy českého živlu na Podk. Rusi a Vých. Slovensku [Subcarpathian Voices: An Independent Weekly Advocating the Interests of the Czech Element in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and Eastern Slovakia]

Politika [Politics]

Politisch-anthropologische Revue

Prágai Magyar Hírlap [Prague Hungarian Newspaper]

Prager Presse

Prager Tagblatt

Praktický lékař [General Practitioner]

Pregled [Review]

Priroda [Nature]

Přítomnost [The Present]

Przegląd Antropologiczny [Anthropological Review]

Przegląd Fizjologii Ruchu [Review of Physiology of Movement]

Przegląd Sportowo-Lekarski [Sports and Medical Review]

Przewodnik Gimnastyczny Sokół: Organ Związku Polskich Gimnastycznych Tow. Sokolich w Austrii [Sokół Gymnastic Guide: Organ of the Union of Polish Gymnastic Associations Sokół in Austria]

Psychotechnika [Psychotechnics]

Rassen im Donauraum: Beiträge zur Rassenkunde, Erbbiologie, und Eugenik der Donauvölker Reichspost

Revista Sănătății: Organ de profilaxie sanitară [Health Magazine: Journal of Sanitary Prevention]

Revue anthropologique

Revue internationale de sociologie

Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicina, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika [Review: Neuropsychopathology, Therapy, Physical Medicine, Public Hygiene, Social Medicine, Heredity, and Eugenics]

Rozpravy České akademie věd a umění [Proceedings of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts]

Sănătatea publică [Public Health]

Sborník Klubu přírodovědeckého v Praze [Proceedings of the Natural Science Club in Prague]

Seljanka: list za prosvećivanje žena na selu [Peasant Woman: Magazine for the Enlightenment of Women in the Village]

Sestrinska riječ [Nursing Word]

Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt

Slovenski pravnik [Slovenian Lawyer]

Sociální péče [Social Welfare]

Societatea de Mâine [Tomorrow's Society]

Socijalni arhiv [Social Archive]

Sociologie Românească [Romanian Sociology]

Șoimii Carpaților [Carpathian Falcons]

Soko: List prednjaštva Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije [Falcon: Journal of the Instructors of the Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia]

Sokol: Časopis Saveza hrvatskih sokolskih društava [Sokol: Journal of the Union of Croatian Sokol Societies]

Sokolski glasnik [Sokol Courier]

Sokolski vestnik: Glasilo žup Ljubljana I, Idrijske in Novomeške [Sokol Herald: Bulletin of the Districts Ljubljana I, Idrija, and Novo Mesto]

Sozialistische Bildung

Srpsko kolo [Serb Circle]

St. Lukas: Mitteilungen der österreichischen St.-Lukas-Gilde

Staleški glasnik: Prilog Liječničkog vjesnika [Professional Gazette: Supplement to the Medical Herald]

Streffleurs militärische Zeitschrift

Styk: Časopis věnovaný společným zájmům lékařů, veterinářů, lékárníků a přírodovědců [Contact: Journal Dedicated to the Common interests of Physicians, Veterinarians, Pharmacists and Natural Scientists]

Svoboda [Freedom]

Századunk [Our Century]

Szent Lukács [Saint Luke]

Szocializmus [Socialism]

Tagesbote aus Mähren und Schlesien

The American Journal of Nursing

The Eugenics Review

Therapia [Therapy]

Tribuna [Tribune]

Turán

Turnzeitung des Deutschen Turnverbandes

Uj Közlöny [New Gazette]

Új Magyar Szemle [New Hungarian Review]

Új világ [New World]

Ukrainskii medichnyi vistnyk [Ukrainian Medical Herald]

Urania

Verhandlungen des naturforschenden Vereines in Brünn

Věstník českých lékařů [Bulletin of Czech Physicians]

Věstník Masarykovy Akademie Práce [Bulletin of the Masaryk Academy of Labor]

Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy [Bulletin of the Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education]

Věstník věnovaný zájmům porodních asistentek [Bulletin Dedicated to the Interests of Midwives]

Vetés: A csehszlovákiai magyar egyetemi hallgatóság röpirata [Vetés: Pamphlet of the Hungarian University Students in Czechoslovakia]

Világ [World]

Volksaufartung, Erbkunde und Eheberatung

Volksfreund

Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik

Volksgesundheit: Zeitschrift für soziale Hygiene

Wiener klinische Wochenschrift

Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift

Wychowanie Fizyczne [Physical Education]

Wyzwolenie [Liberation]

Zagadnienia rasy [Race Issues]

Zdravniški vestnik [Medical Journal]

Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského [Medical Rubric of the Sokol Bulletin]

Zdravotnická revue [Medical Review]

Zdravotnická ročenka československá [Czechoslovakia's Medical Yearbook]

Zeitschrift für angewandte Anatomie und Konstitutionslehre

Zeitschrift für biologische Technik und Methodik

Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft

Zeitschrift für Konstitutionslehre

Zeitschrift für Krankenpflege und Fürsorge

Ženský svět [Women's World]

Zlín: Pondělník zlínského kraje [Zlín: Monday Newspaper of the Zlín Region]

Zlín: Sdělení zaměstnanců firmy Baťa [Zlín: Notice to the Employees of the Baťa Company]

Zpravodaj Anthropologické společnosti [Newsletter of the Anthropological Society]

Zprávy Československého Červeného kříže [Reports of the Czechoslovak Red Cross]

Archival Sources

Benešov, State Regional Archives

Czech Heart, Benešov branch

Brno, Archives of the Department of the History of Biological Sciences in the Moravian Museum

Jaroslav Kříženecký Papers

Vladislav Růžička Papers

Bohumil Sekla Papers

Brno, Moravian Land Archives

Hugo Iltis Papers

Bucharest, Library of the Institute of Hygiene

Râmneanțu, Petru. Mss. *Iuliu Moldovan (1882-1966): Viața, realizările și epoca sa*

Bucharest, National Archives of Romania

Sabin Manuilă Papers

Budapest, National Széchényi Library, Manuscript Collection

Béla Neufeld Papers

István Apáthy Papers

Cluj, National Archives of Romania, Cluj-Napoca Branch

Iuliu Moldovan Papers

Debrecen, Déri Museum, Literary Collection

Csáder, Mihály, Johanna Dávid, Jenő Freiberg, and Miksa Német. *Népegészségügyi kérdések*

Geneva, United Nations Library & Archives

League of Nations Secretariat, Health and Social Questions Section

Kraków, The Jagiellonian University Archives, New Records Department

Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University 1849-1945, Department of Anthropology

Ljubljana, Archives of the Group of Anthropology, Department of Biology, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana

Božo Škerlj papers

Mělník, State Regional Archives

Czech Heart, Kralupy nad Vltavou Branch

Munich, Max Planck Institute of Psychiatry

Alfred Ploetz Papers

Novi Sad, Archives of Vojvodina

The Danube Banovina Committee of the Red Cross Society
Health Department of the Ministry of Public Health for Banat, Bačka, and Baranja
National Administration for Banat, Bačka, and Baranja
Provincial Institute for Health Protection
Royal Administration of the Danube Banovina

Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society Digital Library, Manuscripts Department

Franz Boas Papers

Pilsen, City Archives

Czech Heart, Pilsen Branch

Prague, Archives of the Charles University

Register of Doctors of the Charles University
Register of Doctors of the German Karl-Ferdinand University

Prague, Archives of the National Museum

Jindřich Matiegka Papers

Prague, Library of the Masaryk Institute of the CAS, T. G. Masaryk Library

Vomela, Stanislav. Mss. *Pamětní spis o sanaci Valašska*

Prague, National Archives

Ministry of Education
Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education

Vienna, Archive of the Austrian Academy of Sciences

Biologische Versuchsanstalt

Vienna, Austrian State Archives

Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Inneres, Ministerium des Innern, Sanitätsakten
Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Unterricht und Kultus, Unterrichtsministerium
Archiv der Republik, Arbeit und Soziales, Bundesministerium für soziale Verwaltung
Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Armeeoberkommando, Evidenzbüro
Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Neue Feldakten

Vienna, Historical collections of the Medical University - Josephinum

Julius Tandler Papers

Zagreb, Croatian State Archives

Andrija Štampar Papers
Hygienic Institute and School of Public Health

Edited Primary Sources

Anhang zu den stenographischen Protokollen des Hauses der Abgeordneten des österreichischen Reichsrates. Vienna: Staatsdruckerei, 1907.

Iltis, Hugo. *Race, Genetics, and Science: Resisting Racism in the 1930s.* Brno: Masaryk University Press, 2017.

Kárpáti, Endre. *Madzsar József válogatott írásai* [Selected Writings of József Madzsar]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967.

Kautsky, Karl, and Luise Kautsky. *Briefwechsel mit der Tschechoslowakei 1879-1939.* Edited by Zdeněk Šolle. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1993.

Moldovan, Iuliu. *Amintiri și reflexiuni* [Memories and Reflections]. Edited by Gheorghe Brătescu and Dan Enăchescu. Bucharest: Editura Universitară Carol Davila, 1996.

Petrák, Katalin, and György Milei, eds. *A Magyar Tanácsköztársaság szociálpolitikája: Válogatott rendeletek, dokumentumok, cikkek* [Social Policy of the Hungarian Soviet Republic: Selected Decrees, Documents, Articles]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1959.

Příloha k těsnopisecké zprávě o 91. schůzi poslanecké sněmovny Národního shromáždění republiky Československé v Praze ve středu dne 16. listopadu 1921 [Attachment to the Minutes of the 91st Meeting of the Chamber of Deputies of the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia in Prague on Wednesday, November 16th, 1921]. Prague: Národní shromáždění, 1921.

Redlich, Josef. *Schicksalsjahre Österreichs, 1908-1919. Das politische Tagebuch Josef Redlichs.* Edited by Fritz Fellner. Vol. 2. Vienna: Böhlau, 1954.

- Špiritová, Alexandra, ed. *Sborník dokumentů k vnitřnímu vývoji v českých zemích za 1. světové války 1914-1918: Rok 1917* [Collection of Documents on the Internal Development in the Bohemian Lands during World War I 1914-1918: Year 1917]. Vol. 4. Prague: Státní ústřední archiv, 1996.
- Srbik, Heinrich von. "Austria in the Holy Roman Empire and in the German Confederation." In *Anti-Modernism: Radical Revisions of Collective Identity*, edited by Diana Mishkova, Marius Turda, and Balázs Trencsényi, 263–65. New York: Central European University Press, 2014.
- Tisky k těsnopiseckým zprávám o schůzích Národního shromáždění československého* [Prints of Stenographic Reports on Sessions of the Czechoslovak National Assembly]. Prague: Národní shromáždění, 1918-1920.
- Vrbata, Jaroslav, and Eva Drašarová, eds. *Sborník dokumentů k vnitřnímu vývoji v českých zemích za 1. světové války 1914-1918: Rok 1918* [Collection of Documents on the Internal Development in the Bohemian Lands during World War I 1914-1918: Year 1918]. Vol. 5. Prague: Státní ústřední archiv, 1997.
- Źródła do dziejów Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu: Organizacja i rozwój uczelni od listopada 1918 roku do inauguracji w maju 1919 roku [Sources for the History of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań: Organization and Development of the University from November 1918 to the Inauguration in May 1919], edited by Antoni Czubiński and Maria Kujawska, Vol. 1. Dzieje UAM 10. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza, 1973.

Primary Sources

- "II Polski Zjazd Naukowej Organizacji" [Second Polish Congress of Scientific Management]. *Psychotechnika* 2, no. 6 (April 1, 1928): 61–63.
- "II. Internationaler Kongress katholischer Ärzte: Pfingsten 1936 in Wien." *St. Lukas: Mitteilungen der österreichischen St.-Lukas-Gilde* 4, no. 2 (February 1936): 26–27.
- "IV. austrijski protualkoholni kongres" [Fourth Austrian Anti-Alcohol Congress]. *Novi život* 2, no. 7 (June 1914): 109–10.
- "IV. rakouský sjezd protialkoholní v Brně" [Fourth Austrian Anti-Alcohol Congress in Brno]. *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 6, no. 13 (1914): 78–79.
- "A második hadsereg orvosai szakértekezlete" [The Medical Congress of the Second Army]. *Budapesti Orvosi Újság* 15, no. 4 (January 25, 1917): 31.
- "A Társadalomtudományi Társaság jubiláris ülése" [The Jubilee Session of the Society for Social Sciences]. *Huszadik Század* 13, no. 8 (1912): 866–71.
- "A telepítés alapelvei fajegészségügyi szempontból" [Principles of Settlement from a Racial Hygiene Perspective]. *Nemzetvédelem* 1, no. 1–2 (1918): 60–64.

- “Alkoholelles Egyesületek Országos Ligája” [Statewide League of Temperance Associations]. *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 5 (May 1914): 53–55.
- “Alkohoverbot in Ungarn.” *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 27.
- “Alkohoverbot in Ungarn.” *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 27.
- “Anthropologische Aufnahme der Bevölkerung des Burgenlandes.” *Landesamtsblatt für das Burgenland* 15, no. 27 (April 7, 1935): 307.
- “Antialkoholisták ünnepe — A magyar Good Templar-rend tízéves jubileuma” [Celebration of the Anti-Alcoholists - The Ten-Year Jubilee of the Hungarian Good Templar Order]. *Világ* 2, no. 107 (May 7, 1911): 15–16.
- “Arzt und Wirtschaft.” *Volksfreund* 52, no. 82 (April 6, 1932): 8.
- “Aus der Volksheimwoche: Neue Kurzurse.” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 123 (January 9, 1936): 12.
- “Ausstellung einer Mischrasse.” *Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus* 2, no. 3–4 (April 1937): 8.
- “Az osztrák alkoholelles nap” [The Austrian Anti-Alcohol Day]. *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 7 (July 1914): 77–78.
- “Beförderungen und Auszeichnungen.” *Kriegszeitung des A.T.V. Graz*, no. 173 (December 22, 1917): 1100.
- “Bericht über die Tätigkeit der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik im Jahre 1917.” *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 2–4.
- “Bericht über die Tätigkeit in den ersten Monaten des Jahres 1918.” *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 4–7.
- “Bolševický reflex na zdravotnictví v Podkarpatské Rusi” [Bolshevik Impact on Healthcare in Subcarpathian Ruthenia]. *Věstník českých lékařů* 37, no. 32 (August 8, 1925): 423–24.
- “Činnost polského ministerstva zdravotnictví” [Activities of the Polish Ministry of Health]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 6 (August 20, 1919): 164–65.
- “Czy alkohol wzmacnia siły i sprawność?” [Does Alcohol Enhance Strength and Fitness?]. *Przewodnik Gimnastyczny Sokół: organ Związku Polskich Gimnastycznych Tow. Sokolich w Austrii* 33, no. 6 and 7 (1913): 43–46, 52–55.
- “Das deutsche Sterilisationsgesetz im Spiegel ausländischer medizinischer Kritik.” *Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift* 81, no. 8 (March 2, 1934): 308.
- “Das Herbstprogramm der Brünner Masarykvolkshochschule.” *Volksfreund* 55, no. 202 (August 30, 1935): 6.

- “Das Maß ist voll.” *Mitteilungen der Wirtschaftlichen Organisationen der Aerzte Wiens, Niederösterreichs, Salzburgs und Vorarlbergs, der Aerztekammern von Niederösterreich, Salzburg und Tirol*, no. 12 (September 1, 1920): 1561–66.
- “Das neue Ehegesetz in der Tschechoslowakei.” *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 228 and 390.
- “Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse.” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 143 (May 28, 1936): 5.
- “Der sechste österreichische Alkoholgegnertag.” *Die Südmark: Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken* 4, no. 7 (July 1923): 329–30.
- “Die Abstinenzbewegung in Österreich.” *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 1902): 3.
- “Die Fürsorgerinnenschule Ilse Arlts.” *Zeitschrift für Krankenpflege und Fürsorge* 1, no. 4–5 (1937): 37.
- “Die Geldgebarung der Volkshochschule.” *Licht ins Volk* 1, no. 1 (1928): 15–16.
- “Die Hilfsaktion für Nordböhmen: Unterredung mit dem Präsidenten des gemeinsamen Ernährungsausschuss GM Landwehr von Pragenau und mit dem Dr. Freiherrn von Hussarek.” *Prager Tagblatt* 43, no. 69 (March 23, 1918): 1.
- “Die Kaiser-Karl-Aktion für unterernährte Kinder.” *Neue Freie Presse*, no. 19252 (March 31, 1918): 17.
- “Die Österreichisch-ungarische Tagung über die Fragen der Kinderaufzucht.” *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 38–39.
- “Die Thronrede Kaiser Karls.” *Reichspost* 24, no. 248 (May 31, 1917): 1–2.
- “Diskussion zum Vortrag J. Tandler: Krieg und Bevölkerung.” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 29, no. 15 (April 13, 1916): 470–72.
- “Djelokrug drž. ureda za nar. zdravlje u Njem. Austrii” [Scope of the State Office of People’s Health in German Austria]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 1–2 (September 1919): 36–37.
- “Dr. Gustav Rösler.” *Volksgesundheit* 5, no. 8 (1907): 127–28.
- “Dr. Ödön Tuszkai, lékařská praxe v Mariánských Lázních” [Dr. Ödön Tuszkai, Medical Practice in Marienbad]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 5, no. 12 (December 20, 1923): 359.
- “Dr. Paul Kammerer.” *Volksfreund* 39, no. 275 (December 12, 1919): 5.
- “Egészségügyi tisztek kinevezése” [Appointment of Health Officers]. *Pécsi Napló* 26, no. 136 (June 20, 1917): 5.
- “Eheprobleme des Volkes.” *Volksaufartung, Erbkunde und Eheberatung* 4, no. 6 (June 15, 1929): 143–44.

- “Ein Neudeutscher Kulturverein.” *Volksgesundheit* 6, no. 8 (1907): 117–18.
- “Ein Volk rückt ab vom Rassenwahn.” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 173 (December 24, 1936): 3.
- “Eingelangt am 16. Juli 1915.” *Kriegszeitung des A.T.V. Graz*, no. 37 (July 24, 1915): 372.
- “Elhalasztott kongresszusok” [Postponed Congresses]. *Magyarország* 21, no. 185 (August 1, 1914): 2.
- “Expedition zur Bekämpfung des Fleckfiebers in Polen.” *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 1 (1919): 465.
- “Feldärztliche Tagung bei der k. u. k. 2. Armee: Abgehalten in Lemberg, 20.-22. Februar 1917.” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 67, no. 13 (March 24, 1917): 619–24.
- “Fondation de la Société Tchecoslovaque de biotypologie, affiliée a la Société Française de Biotypologie.” *Biotypologie: Bulletin de la Société de Biotypologie* 4, no. 4 (1936): 177–78.
- “Gemeinschaftliche Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen von Deutschland, Ungarn und Österreich.” *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift* 67, no. 39 (September 22, 1917): 1733–34.
- “Goethe über die Raucher und Trinker.” *Volksgesundheit* 6, no. 9 (1907): 128–29.
- “Gründung einer deutschösterreichischen Beratungsstelle für Volkswohlfahrt.” *Mitteilungen des Vereines Südmark* 9, no. 1–2 (January 3, 1914): 9–11.
- “Gustav Rösler - Über die nationale Bedeutung unserer Enthaltensamkeitsbewegung.” *Volksgesundheit* 5, no. 9 (1907): 143–44.
- “Haeckel jubilál: A Társadalomtudományi Társaság ünnepe” [Haeckel’s Jubilee: The Celebration of the Society for Social Sciences]. *Világ* 5, no. 40 (February 15, 1914): 14.
- “Hugo Iltis in Wien.” *Arbeiterzeitung* 45, no. 29 (January 29, 1932): 4.
- “Institut International d’Anthropologie. Session de Liège (25 juillet - 1er août 1921).” *Revue anthropologique* 31, no. 4 (September 1921): 261–493.
- “International Commission of Eugenics.” *Eugenical News* 7, no. 11 (November 1922): 117.
- “Iz Ugarske” [From Hungary]. *Novi život* 2, no. 6 (June 1914): 94–95.
- “Jogi szakosztály” [Legal Department]. *A Gyermek* 10, no. 9–10 (1916): 594–99.
- “Jüdische Schulkinder: blond und blauäugig.” *Gerechtigkeit* 2, no. 65 (November 29, 1934): 3.
- “Kölcsönös segítség mint természettörvény: Irta Kropotkin Péter, fordította dr. Madzsar József” [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution: Written by Peter Kropotkin, Translated by Dr. József Madzsar]. *Szocializmus* 15, no. 1 (January 1925): 35–37.
- “Komise eugenicko demografická” [Eugenic and Demographic Commission]. In *Zpráva o činnosti Masarykovy akademie práce podaná k oslavě X. výročí trvání Československé*

republiky [Report on the Activities of the Masaryk Academy of Labour Submitted to Celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Czechoslovak Republic], 215–19. Prague: Masarykova akademie práce, 1929.

“Koppányi Tivadar laboratóriumában” [In the Laboratory of Tivadar Koppány.]. *Jövő* 1, no. 266 (December 25, 1921): 4.

“Kriminalpädagogisches Institut in Budapest Erzsébetfalva (Elisabethdorf).” *Eos* 12, no. 2 (1916): 233–36.

“Kropotkin Péter: Kölcsönös segítség, mint természettörvény” [Peter Kropotkin: Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution]. *Magyarság* 6, no. 37 (February 15, 1925): 12.

“Land und Luft für die Kinder: Die Aktion unter dem Schutze des Kaisers.” *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 52, no. 86 (March 31, 1918): 11.

“Landeskongress der Alkoholgegner.” *Kirchliche Blätter aus der ev. Landeskirche A.B.* 6, no. 17 (April 25, 1914): 198.

“Lékařský sjezd c. a k. 2. armády” [Medical Congress of the Imperial and Royal 2nd Army]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 56, no. 25 (June 23, 1917): 778–80.

“Masarykův ideál sociální péče: Zabezpečovat národu tělesně zdatný a bezúhonný dorost” [Masaryk’s Ideal of Social Welfare: To Provide the Nation with Physically Fit and Morally Upright Youth]. *Zlín: Pondělník zlínského kraje* 8, no. 11 (March 14, 1938): 2.

“Masaryk-Volkshochschule: Vorträge über das ‘Rassenproblem.’” *Tagesbote aus Mähren und Schlesien* 85, no. 499 (October 30, 1935): 8.

“Merkblatt über Geschlechtskrankheiten: Herausgegeben vom k.u.k. Kriegsministerium.” *Das Österreichische Sanitätswesen* 27, no. 31–32 (August 1915): 1567–68.

“Militärärztliche Auszeichnungen und Ernennungen.” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 67, no. 17 (April 21, 1917): 798.

“Militärärztliche Auszeichnungen und Ernennungen.” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 68, no. 9 (March 2, 1918): 399.

“Militärärztliche Auszeichnungen und Ernennungen.” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 68, no. 44 (November 2, 1918): 1956.

“Ministarstvo za javne radnje i opću pomoć u Ugarskoj” [Ministry for Public Works and Social Welfare in Hungary]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 10 (June 1920): 418–21.

“Ministerium für Gesundheitswesen und körperliche Erziehung in Prag.” *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 2 (1920): 840.

“Mitgliederverzeichnis.” *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 9–13.

“Mjesto uvoda” [Introduction]. *Sestrinska riječ* 1, no. 1–2 (February 1, 1933): 1.

- “Náray-Szabó Sándor, 1861–1914” [Sándor Náray-Szabó, 1861–1914]. *A Gyermek* 8, no. 7–10 (1914): 497–98.
- “Natečaj za prijem slušača u školu za telesno vaspitanje” [Competition for Admission to the School for Physical Education]. *Sokolski glasnik* 6, no. 36 (September 27, 1935): 2–3.
- “Naturwissenschaftliche-medizinische Abteilung.” *Licht ins Volk* 5, no. 1 (September 1932): 30.
- “Neues Leben.” *Volksgesundheits* 6, no. 11 (1907): 166–67.
- “O zadaniach skautingu dla dziewcząt” [On the Tasks of Girl Scouting]. *Przewodnik Gimnastyczny Sokół: organ Związku Polskich Gimnastycznych Tow. Sokolich w Austrii* 34, no. 6 (June 1914): 42–43.
- “Offene Antwort auf den Offenen Brief des Herrn Geheimrat Prof. Dr. E. F. Sauerbruch.” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (January 1934): 4–8.
- “Országos alkoholelleanes értekezlet” [Statewide Anti-Alcohol Congress]. *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 1 (January 1914): 9.
- “Paul Kammerer gestorben.” *Volksfreund* 46, no. 225 (September 25, 1926): 3.
- “Poljsko ministarstvo zdravlja” [Polish Ministry of Health]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 7 (March 1920): 291–92.
- “Postavljenja, premeštaji i penzionisanja u resoru Ministarstva socijalne politike i narodnog zdravlja u mesecima junu-novembru 1935 godine” [Appointments, Transfers, and Retirements in the Ministry of Social Policy and Public Health in the Months of June–November 1935]. *Socijalni arhiv* 1, no. 9–10 (September 1935): 165.
- “Přípis o základních potřebách eugenických” [A Note on the Basic Needs of Eugenics]. *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicina, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 14, no. 11–12 (December 25, 1917): 434–37.
- “Prof. Dr. Hugo Iltis, Leiter der Masaryk-Volkshochschule, 1921–1938.” *Licht ins Volk* 11, no. 1 (1938): 1–3.
- “Prof. Finger: Sociální důležitost pohlavních chorob a jich potírání” [Prof. Finger: The Social Importance of Venereal Diseases and Their Suppression]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 8 (October 20, 1919): 232.
- “Proiect de organizare a Ministerului Sănătății Publice și a Serviciilor Sanitare” [Project for the Organization of the Ministry of Public Health and Sanitary Services]. *Sănătatea publică* 1, no. 7–8 (July–August 1921): 17–32.
- “Protualkoholna izložba u Zagrebu” [Anti-Alcohol Exhibition in Zagreb]. *Novi život* 2, no. 5 (May 1914): 72–75.
- “Redacția și colaboratorii Ideii Naționale” [Editors and Collaborators of the Ideea Națională]. *Ideea Națională* 3, no. 1–2 (April 5, 1935): 7.

- “Rozhovor s panem docentem RN et MUDr Krajníkem” [Interview with Associate Professor RN et MUDr Krajník]. *Zlín* 17, no. 31 (August 10, 1934): 6.
- “Schůze komise eugenické” [Session of the Eugenics Committee]. *Věstník Masarykovy Akademie Práce* 2, no. 8 (December 1922): 152.
- “Sekcija za antropologijo, genealogijo in evgeniko” [Section for Anthropology, Genealogy, and Eugenics]. *Evgenika* 3, no. 2 (May 1937): 28–29.
- “Sektion Mähren-Schlesien.” *Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus* 2, no. 1 (January 1937): 8.
- “Sjednocení eugenických poraden: Výnos ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví ze dne 29. července 1932 č. 14488/32 jako dodatek k výnosu ze dne 9. ledna 1930 č. 33.319/29” [Unification of Eugenic Counseling: Decree of the Ministry of Public Health dated July 29, 1932, No. 14488/32 as an amendment to the decree of January 9, 1930, No. 33.319/29]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 14, no. 9 (September 20, 1932): 294.
- “Sociálně-lékařský sjezd, pořádaný Podkarpatskou župou Ú.J.Č.L. v Mukačevě (Podkarpatská Rus)” [Social-Medical Congress organized by the Subcarpathian County of the Central Union of Czechoslovak Doctors in Mukachevo, Subcarpathian Ruthenia]. *Česká mysl* 18, no. 3 (1922): 188–189.
- “Sozialismus und Naturwissenschaft.” *Arbeiterwille* 42, no. 50 (February 19, 1929): 6.
- “Státní úřad pro zdraví lidu ve Vídni” [State Office for Public Health in Vienna]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 10 (December 20, 1919): 289.
- “Střízlivé slovo” [Sober Word]. *Podkarpatské hlasy: neodvislý týdeník, hájící zájmy českého živlu na Podk. Rusi a Vých. Slovensku* 3, no. 83 (April 9, 1927): 2.
- “Származástan” [Theory of Evolution]. In *Társadalmi Lexikon* [Social Lexicon], edited by József Madzsar, 632–33. Budapest: Népszava, 1928.
- “Társulati ügyek: Társadalomtudományi Társaság” [Association’s Affairs: Society for Social Sciences]. *Huszadik Század* 14, no. 1 (1913): 136–37.
- “The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting, June 2nd, 1934.” *Eugenical News* 20, no. 2 (March 1935): 26–27.
- “Tudományosan racionális alapon akarja újjászervezni életünket az eubiótikai társaság” [The Eubiotic Society Wants to Scientifically Reorganise Our Lives on a Rational Basis]. *Brassói Lapok* 39, no. 236 (October 15, 1933): 111.
- “Turnfachausschusssitzung des Deutschen Turnverbandes.” *Turnzeitung des Deutschen Turnverbandes* 1, no. 3 (March 15, 1920): 17–19.
- “Tuszkai Ödön: A socialis hygiéne újabb problémái (A Szegedi Egyetem barátok Egyesülete orvosi szakosztályának február 19-i ülése)” [Ödön Tuszkai: New Issues in Social

Hygiene: Meeting of the Medical Section of the Friends Association of the University of Szeged on February 19]. *Orvosi Hetilap* 71, no. 11 (March 13, 1927): 303.

“Une conversation avec le docteur F. Spina, ministre d’origine allemand dans le nouveau gouvernement tchéco-slovaque.” *Le matin* 43, no. 15621 (December 26, 1926): 3.

“Unser Brünnener Mitarbeiter.” *Mitteilungen der Čsl. Liga gegen den Antisemitismus* 2, no. 3–4 (April 1937): 8.

“Verzeichnis der in den letzten vier Jahren an der Deutschen Volkshochschule in Brünn abgehaltenen Vortragsreihen.” *Licht ins Volk* 1, no. 1 (1928): 7–11.

“Vierter österreichischer Alkoholgegnertag in Brünn.” *Brünnener Zeitung* 49, no. 123 (May 30, 1914): 4.

“Vita Madzsar József A jövő nemzedék védelme és a háború c. előadása felett” [Discussion on József Madzsar's Lecture on The Protection of Future Generations and War]. *Huszadik Század* 33, no. 2 (February 1916): 165.

“Vliv přehnané tělovýchovy na ženské tělo” [The Effect of Excessive Physical Exercise on Female Body]. *Zlín* 9, no. 7 (February 13, 1939): 5.

“Volkshochschule: Julius Tandler: Rasse und Konstitution.” *Tagesbote aus Mähren und Schlesien* 83, no. 72 (February 12, 1933): 8.

“Vznik a vývoj československého ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy: K jubileu 1918-1928” [Formation and Development of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Public Health and Physical Education: On the Jubilee 1918-1928]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 10, no. 11 (November 20, 1928): 584–95.

“Vzpomínky k sedmdesátinám odborového přednosty MUDr. Františka Kulhavého” [Memories for the Seventieth Birthday of the Head of the Department MUDr. František Kulhavý]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 15, no. 1 (January 15, 1933): 7–8.

“Walka z alkoholem u Słowenów: Wykład księdza Dra Leopolda Lénarda z Lublany w Krakowie 14 października 1906” [The Struggle Against Alcoholism among the Slovenes: Lecture by Father Dr. Leopold Lénard from Ljubljana in Krakow on October 14, 1906]. *Wyzwolenie* 1, no. 12 (December 1906): 5–7.

“Was wir wollen!” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (January 1934): 2–3.

“Wissenschaftliche Vorträge.” *Volksfreund* 41, no. 4 (January 8, 1921): 3.

“Wohlfahrtsministerium in Ungarn.” *Mitteilungen des Volksgesundheitsamtes im Bundesministerium für Soziale Verwaltung* 2 (1920): 191.

“Z polského ministerstva zdravotnictví” [From the Polish Ministry of Health]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 1, no. 10 (December 20, 1919): 290.

“Zdravotnická poradna sňatková” [Medical Marriage Counseling]. *Věstník věnovaný zájmům porodních asistentek* 14, no. 4 (April 1926): 3.

“Zehnjähriger Bestand des Vereines Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische.” *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung: Herausgegeben vom österreichischen Vereine Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische* 4, no. 2 (February 1913): 34–39.

“Zweite Wiener Führerschule der Wiener Kreisorganisation der Sozialistischen Arbeiterjugend.” *Arbeiterzeitung* 44, no. 314 (November 14, 1931): 5.

10 Jahre Burgenland: Seine politische, kulturelle und wirtschaftliche Entwicklung in den Jahren 1921–1931. Vienna: Wirtschafts-Zeitungs-Verlag, 1931.

II. Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 15. u. 16. April 1917: Vorträge. Vienna: Deuticke, 1917.

IIe session de l’Institut International d’Anthropologie, Prague. 14-21 Septembre 1924. Paris: Librairie E. Nourry, 1926.

IIIe session de l’Institut international d’anthropologie, Amsterdam. 20-29 Septembre 1927. Paris: Librairie E. Nourry, 1928.

IV Zjazd Lekarzy Słowiańskich w Poznaniu, 11-15 IX 1933 w ramach XIV Zjazdu Lekarzy i Przyrodników Polskich: pamiętnik zjazdu [Fourth Congress of Slavic Physicians in Poznań, September 11-15, 1933, as part of the Fourteenth Congress of Polish Physicians and Naturalists: A Memoir of the Congress]. Warsaw: Drukarnia Bankowa, 1933.

VIIe session de l’Institut international d’anthropologie, Bucarest. 1-8 Septembre 1937. Bucharest: Imprimerie Socec & Company, 1939.

A Sarló jegyében: az újarcú magyaroktól a magyar szocialistákig: a Sarló 1931-iki pozsonyi kongresszusának vitaanyaga [In the Sign of the Sick: From New Hungarians to Hungarian Socialists: Proceedings of the 1931 Congress of The Sarló in Bratislava]. Pozsony: A Sarló országos vezetősége, 1932.

Aderca, Felix. “Gaz otrăvitor” [Poison Gas]. *Adevărul* 49, no. 15827 (August 23, 1935): 1–2.

Adler, Viktor. “Alkohol und Befreiungskampf.” *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 3, no. 5 (May 1, 1904): 1.

Adorján, Andor. “Magyar legény a kórházban: Gözfürdő, mosoda, téglamelegítő a fronton” [Hungarian Lad in the Hospital: Steam Bath, Laundry, Brick Heater at the Front]. *Az Est* 6, no. 100 (April 11, 1915): 13.

Agârbiceanu, Ion. “Înalta încurajare” [High Encouragement]. *Tribuna* 2, no. 191 (August 23, 1939): 1.

Albert, Bohuslav. “Čs. Červený kříž v Podkarpatské Rusi” [Czechoslovak Red Cross in Subcarpathian Ruthenia]. *Zprávy Československého Červeného kříže* 1, no. 2 (December 1, 1920): 17–19.

- Alföldy, Zoltán. “Johan Béla (1889-1983)” [Béla Johan, 1889-1983]. *Orvosi Hetilap* 124, no. 28 (July 10, 1983): 1699–1700.
- Amerling, Karel. “Idioten-Albums mit Casus Complexen – Einige interessante Idioten-Familien als Beispiele ihres Sinkens.” In *Die Idiotenanstalt des Sct. Anna-Frauen-Vereines in Prag nach ihrem zwölfjährigen Bestande vom J. 1871-1883*, 119–32. Prague: Bellmann, 1883.
- Amerling, Karel, Marcel Aymonin, Karel Eisler, Bohumil Krajník, Stanislav Mentl, Josef Saidl, Jan Sotona, et al. *O lidské konstituci = La constitution humaine* [On the Human Constitution = La constitution humaine]. Prague: Mladá generace čsl. lékařů, 1939.
- Apáthy, István. “A társas erkölcsről” [On Social Ethics]. *Világ* 4, no. 304 (December 25, 1913): 65–66.
- Balk, Theodor. “A fajelmélet két évezrede” [Two Millennia of Race Theory]. *Korunk* 10, no. 5 (May 1935): 229–337.
- Balk, Theodor. *Sumrak nauke: knjiga o rasi* [The Twilight of Science: A Book on Race]. Beograd: Medicinska biblioteka Lekar, 1935.
- Ballai, Károly, and Dániel Répay. *Az első magyar országos gyermektanulmányi kongresszus naplója s a vele kapcsolatos kiállítás leírása* [The Diary of the First Hungarian National Congress on Child Study and Description of the Associated Exhibition]. Budapest: Armin Fritz, 1913.
- Balogh, Edgár. “A regösjárástól a szociografiai intézetig” [From the Regösjárás to the Sociographic Institute]. *Erdélyi Fiatalok* 1, no. 6 (June 1930): 82–85.
- Balogh, Edgár. “Nová maďarská generácia” [The New Hungarian Generation]. *E Brno: List etického hnutí československého studentstva* 2, no. 5 (February 1930): 44–47.
- Balogh, Edgár. “Tíz nap Szegényországban I: Beszámoló a sarlósok ruszinszkói vándorlásáról” [Ten Days in a Land of Poverty I: An Account of the Sarló’s Wandering in Ruthenia]. *Prágai Magyar Hírlap* 9, no. 218 (September 24, 1930): 4–5.
- Balogh, Edgár. “Niekoľko slov o sociografickej práci Sarló” [A Few Words about the Sociographic Work of Sarló]. *Dav* 4, no. 9–10 (September 1931): 14–15.
- Bányai, Imre. “A bioszociológia világképe” [The World View of Biosociology]. *Korunk* 11, no. 4 (April 1, 1936): 292–97.
- Bartucz, Lajos. “Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. IX In Ungarn.” *Prager Presse* 15, no. 12 (January 13, 1935): 4.
- Báthory, Nándorné. *A fóthi példa: Fóth község népjóléti intézményei* [The Fót Model: Welfare Institutions of the Fót Municipality]. Budapest: Posner, 1916.
- Batthyány, Tivadar. *Népjóléti Minisztérium* [Ministry of Welfare]. Budapest: Franklin Nyomda, 1918.

- Bauer, Julius. "Individual Constitution and Endocrine Glands." *Endocrinology* 8, no. 3 (May 1, 1924): 297–322.
- Bauer, Julius. *Praktische Folgerungen aus der Vererbungslehre*. Vienna: Urban und Schwarzenberg, 1925.
- Bauer, Julius. *Innere Sekretion*. Berlin: Springer, 1927.
- Bauer, Julius. "Erbpathologie und ihre praktischen Konsequenzen." *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 84, no. 49–51 (1934): 1352–53.
- Bauer, Julius. "Importanța glandelor endocrine" [The Importance of Endocrine Glands]. *Medicul nostru* 1, no. 2 (February 18, 1937): 4.
- Bauer, Julius. "Konstitutionspathologie einst und jetzt." *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 87, no. 15 (April 10, 1937): 401–5.
- Bauer, Julius. *Medizinische Kulturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts im Rahmen einer Autobiographie*. Vienna: Maudrich, 1964.
- Bělehrádek, Jan. "Die Tschechische Akademie über die Rassenfrage." *Gerechtigkeit* 3, no. 87 (May 2, 1935): 2.
- Beneš, Edvard. *Problém alkoholové výroby a abstinence* [The Problem of Alcohol Production and Abstinence]. Prague: Československý abstinentní svaz, 1915.
- Berczeller, László. "Theorie und Praxis der Wassermannschen Reaktion." *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 27–28 (November 10, 1917): 11–18.
- Bericht der vierten österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Wien am 21. und 22. März 1910*. Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung 2. Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1910.
- Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*. Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung 3. Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912.
- Bericht über die 11. Versammlung der Internationalen Föderation Eugenischer Organisationen, Konferenzsitzungen vom 18. bis 21. Juli 1934 im Waldhaus Dolder, Zürich, Schweiz*. Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1934.
- Bericht der 12. Versammlung der Internationalen Federation Eugenischer Organisationen: Konferenzsitzungen vom 15. bis 20. Juli 1936: Scheveningen - Holland*. Den Haag: Stockum, 1936.
- Berkovits, René. "Újabb tanulmányok a szociálbiológia köréből" [New Studies in the Field of Sociobiology]. *Huszadik Század* 14, no. 12 (1913): 610–21.
- Bermann, Gregorio. "Ärztliches aus Latein-Amerika." *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 3, no. 9–10 (12 1936): 122–23.

- Berzeviczy, Albert, and Albert Apponyi. *Ungarische Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung = Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség*. Budapest: Pester Buchdruckerei, 1916.
- Bihar vármegye tisztiorvosi kara [Faculty of Medical Officers of Bihar County]. *Egészségtan a leventék részére: Kérdésekben és feleletekben* [Health Education for the Levente: In Questions and Answers]. Budapest: Pesti Könyvnyomda Részvénytársaság, 1928.
- Brdlík, Jiří. “Úvodem - Einleitung - Bevezető.” *A Gyermek - Dieťa - Das Kind* 1, no. 1 (January 15, 1926): 1–6.
- Brdlík, Jiří. *Dětské lékařství v minulosti a jak jsem je prožíval* [Pediatrics in the Past and How I Experienced It]. Prague: Státní zdravotnické nakladatelství, 1957.
- Brdlík, Jiří. *Padesát let dětským lékařem* [Fifty Years as a Pediatrician]. Prague: Státní zdravotnické nakladatelství, 1961.
- Breazu, Ion. “Șoimii Carpaților la serbările Sokolilor dela Praga” [Carpathian Falcons at the Celebrations of the Sokols in Prague]. *Șoimii Carpaților* 1, no. 2–3 (1938): 10–19.
- Brezina, Ernst, and Viktor Lebzelter. “Über Körperbeschaffenheit von Lokomotivführern: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des Zusammenhanges zwischen Rasse und Beruf.” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 65, no. 1–2 (1935): 51–57.
- Brožek, Artur. “Biologický význam rodokmenu I: Předneseno ve schůzi Ústavu psychotechnického 17. března 1921” [The Biological Significance of Pedigree I: Presented at a meeting of the Institute of Psychotechnics, March 17, 1921]. *Nová práce* 3, no. 7 (June 25, 1921): 18–19.
- Brožek, Artur. “Biologický pojem rasy” [The Biological Concept of Race]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 19–31. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Buday, Dezső. “Törvényjavaslat a házasságkötés kötelező orvosi vizsgálatáról” [Draft Law on the Mandatory Prenuptial Medical Examination]. *Nemzetvédelem* 1, no. 1–2 (1918): 47–53.
- Čáda, František. “Moderní péče o slabomyslné a důležitost našich sjezdů” [Modern Care for the Mentally Disabled and the Importance of Our Congresses]. In *Druhý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 29. a 30. září 1911 v Brně*, 11–21. Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1912.
- Čáda, František. “Úkoly a význam České společnosti eugenické” [Tasks and Significance of the Czech Eugenics Society]. *Revue neuropsychopathologie* 12, no. 5–6 (June 25, 1915): 177–185.
- Čajak, Ján. “Dr. Laza Marković.” *Náš život: Časopis Matice slovenskej v Juhoslávii* 3, no. 2 (August 1935): 90.
- Chen, C. C. *Medicine in Rural China: A Personal Account*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

- Chrapko, Mykola, and Adolf Bartoš. *Obsleduvannya shkôl'nych detej v Sevljushskom okruzi na Pôdkarpats'kôj Rusi* [Examination of School Children in the Syvlyush District in Subcarpathian Rus]. Syvlyush: [sine], 1934.
- Cieszyński, Antoni. *Stan lekarski w czasach obecnych pod względem liczbowym i ekonomicznym: Przyszłość stanu lekarskiego w Polsce* [Medical Profession in Present Times in Terms of Numbers and Economics: The Future of the Medical Profession in Poland]. Lwów: Nakład własny autora, 1928.
- Csáder, Mihály. “A szociális gyermekgondozás reformja” [The Reform of Social Child Care]. *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1926): 122–24.
- Csáder, Mihály. “A pozsonyi orvosi szeminárium első szemesztere” [First Semester at the Bratislava Medical Seminary]. *Vetés: A csehszlovákiai magyar egyetemi hallgatóság röpirata* 1 (April 1929): 11.
- Csáder, Mihály. “Az új orvosnemzedék feladata” [The Task of the New Generation of Doctors]. *Vetés: A csehszlovákiai magyar egyetemi hallgatóság röpirata* 1 (April 1929): 11.
- Csáder, Mihály, Johanna Dávid, Emerich Fischer, Julius Frank, Jenő Freiberg, Max Németh, and Jakub Tuscherer. *Otázky ľudového zdravotníctva: Sociografický sošit socialistických lekárov* [Issues of People's Health: The Sociographic Workbook of Socialist Doctors]. Bratislava: Dr. Tuscherer, 1930.
- Csallner, Robert. “Die deutschen Siedlungen im Norden Siebenbürgens mit Rücksicht auf die Ursachen ihres Blühens und Welkens.” *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 8, no. 8 (1910): 122–26.
- Cuvaj, Antun. “Povjesne crtice o obuci gluhoonijeme djece u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji” [Historical Notes on the Education of Deaf-Mute Children in Croatia and Slavonia]. In *Grada za povijest školstva kraljevina Hrvatske i Slavonije od najstarijih vremena do danas* [Materials for the History of Education in the Kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia from the Earliest Times to the Present Day], 77–131. Zagreb: Kr. zemaljska tiskara, 1913.
- Czech, Ludwig. “Im Dienste der Volksgesundheit.” *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 3, no. 9–10 (December 1936): 123–28.
- Darwin, Leonard. “Das Wesen der Eugenic Education.” *Eos* 9, no. 2 (1913): 81–93.
- Das Wohlfahrtsamt der Stadt Wien und seine Einrichtungen, 1921-1931*. Vienna: Magistrat der Stadt Wien, 1931.
- Daszyńska-Golińska, Zofia. “Alkoholismus und soziale Verhältnisse in einigen galizischen Bezirken: Vortrag gehalten am VIII. internationalen Kongresse gegen den Alkoholismus in Wien.” *Internationale Monatsschrift zur Bekämpfung der Trinksitten* 11, no. 4–5 (April 1901): 110–26.
- Daum, Adolf. *Bericht über den 1. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Wien, 12.-14. Oktober 1908*. Leipzig: Deuticke, 1909.
- Der Karl-Marx-Hof: Die Wohnhausanlage der Gemeinde Wien auf der Hagenwiese in Heiligenstadt*. Vienna: Die Gemeinde Wien, 1930.

- Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 12. und 13. März 1916: Vorträge und Wechselreden.* Vienna: Deuticke, 1916.
- Die Erhaltung und Mehrung der deutschen Volkskraft: Verhandlungen der 8. Konferenz der Zentralstelle für Volkswohlfahrt in Berlin vom 26. - 28. Oktober 1915.* Berlin: Heymann, 1916.
- Dlouhý, Jaroslav. “Dům lidového zdraví v Užhorodě” [House of Public Health in Uzhhorod]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 15, no. 1 (January 15, 1933): 5–7.
- Dóczi, Imre. “A magyar alkoholelles mozgalom” [The Hungarian Anti-Alcohol Movement]. *Félegyházi Közlöny* 13, no. 19 (May 10, 1914): 4.
- Doerr, Robert. “Demobilisierungsfragen.” In *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, edited by Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner, 468–76. Jena: Fischer, 1918.
- Dokládál, Milan, and Edmund Piasecki. “Profesor Dr Jan Mydlarski (1892-1956).” *Zpravodaj Anthropologické společnosti* 8, no. 3 (November 30, 1956): 5–6.
- Donáth, Gyula. “Die Alkoholfrage in der österreichisch-ungarischen gemeinsamen und Honvédarmee und in den ungarischen Sportvereinen.” *Der Alkoholgegner* 4, no. 6 (March 15, 1907): 1–6.
- Dr. B. “Praktische Dietwartarbeit.” *Turnzeitung des Deutschen Turnverbandes* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1920): 46–47.
- Dratva, Alfred. “Ústředí poraden pro volbu povolání v Praze” [The Central of Vocational Guidance Offices in Prague]. *Nová práce* 6, no. 12 (June 15, 1924): 183–85.
- Druhý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 29. a 30. září 1911 v Brně* [The Second Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on September 29 and 30, 1911, in Brno]. Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1912.
- Eisenberg, Filip. “Wrażenia z I. austriackiego Zjazdu przeciwalkoholowego we Wiedniu d. 12-14 października 1908 r.” [Impressions from the 1st Austrian Anti-Alcohol Congress in Vienna on October 12-14, 1908]. *Wyzwolenie* 3, no. 9–11 (November 1908): 1–4.
- Éltes, Mátyás. “Lehrplan für staatliche Hilfsschulen in Ungarn.” *Eos* 3, no. 2 (April 1907): 127–40.
- Éltes, Mátyás. “A Binet-Simon féle intelligencia vizsgálat eredménye magyar gyermekeken” [Results of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test on Hungarian Children]. *A Gyermekek* 8, no. 4 (1914): 257–66.
- Éltes, Mátyás. “Levana: Internationale wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur gesamten Heilpädagogik.” *Magyar Gyógypedagógia* 18, no. 3–4 (1930): 52.

- Făcăoaru, Iordache. “Criteriile pentru diagnoza rasială” [Criteria for Racial Diagnosis]. *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 6, no. 10–11–12 (1935): 341–62.
- Făcăoaru, Iordache. “Rasa și rasismul, o punere la punct a unei probleme de actualitate” [Race and Racism: An Analysis of a Topical Issue]. *Ideea Națională* 4, no. 1–9 (June–September, 1936).
- Făcăoaru, Iordache. “Reviste streine în schimb cu Buletinul eugenic și biopolitic” [Foreign Journals in Exchange with the Buletin eugenic și biopolitic]. *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 8, no. 10–12 (December 1937): 381–82.
- Fédération Internationale Latine des Sociétés d’eugénique. *1er Congrès Latin d’eugénique : Rapport, Paris, 1er-3 Août 1937*. Paris: Masson, 1937.
- Fetter, Vojtěch. “Vliv tělocviku na tělo” [The Effect of Gymnastics on the Body]. *Anthropologie* 15, no. 1–4 (1937): 122–24.
- Fetter, Vojtěch. “Ocenění vědecké práce prof. Božo Škerlja” [Assessment of Božo Škerlj’s Scientific Work]. *Anthropologie* 1, no. 1 (1962): 52–53.
- Finger, Ernst. “Die Verbreitung der Geschlechtskrankheiten durch den Krieg und deren Bekämpfung: Referat, erstattet über Aufforderung des k. k. Ministeriums des Innern, Juli 1915.” *Das Österreichische Sanitätswesen* 27, no. 43–46 (October 1915): 1447–52.
- Foustka, Břetislav. *Slabí v lidské společnosti: Ideály humanitní a degenerace národů* [The Weak in a Human Society: Humanitarian Ideals and the Degeneration of Nations]. Prague: Laichter, 1904.
- Foustka, Břetislav. “O významu alkoholu pro život národa” [On the Significance of Alcohol for the Life of the Nation]. *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 6, no. 13 (1914): 79–80.
- Fülöp, Zsigmond. “A kísérleti biológia újabb diadala” [The New Triumph of Experimental Biology]. *Darwin* 3, no. 10 (May 15, 1914): 151–52.
- Gajda, Radola. *Stavovská demokracie národního státu: úvahy o mravní a hmotné stavbě státu* [Corporatist Democracy in a National State: Reflections on the Moral and Material Structure of the State]. Prague: Národní obec fašistická, 1933.
- Galton, Francis. “Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope and Aims.” In *Essays in Eugenics*, 35–44. London: The Eugenics Education Society, 1909.
- Gáspár, János. “Zum Geleit.” *Rassen im Donaauraum: Beiträge zur Rassenkunde, Erbbiologie, und Eugenik der Donauvölker* 1, no. 1 (October 1935): 1–2.
- Gasser, Paul. Review of *Die Maske heruntergerissen*, by Hugo Iltis. *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 144 (June 4, 1936): 2–3.
- Gavrilović, Đorđe. “Srpska gimnastičko-higijenska bibliografija” [Serb Gymnastic-Hygienic Bibliography]. *Sokol: Časopis za promicanje tjelovježbe* 4, no. 2–12 (1905): 24–26, 40–41, 92, 109–10, 155–56, 175–76.

- Geyer, Eberhard. "Grundsätzliches zur Rassenhygiene." *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 55 (1925): 286–88.
- Gheorghiu, Constantin C. "Asistența medicală rurală în România" [Rural Healthcare in Romania]. *Sociologie Românească* 2, no. 2 (February 1937): 80–87.
- Giddings, Franklin Henry. *Základy sociologie: rozbor jevů, týkajících se asociace a společenské organizace* [The Principles of Sociology: An Analysis of the Phenomena of Association and of Social Organization]. Translated by Břetislav Foustka. Prague: Laichter, 1900.
- Glicsman, Iosif. "Eugenia și ereditatea patologică" [Eugenics and Pathological Heredity]. *Sănătatea Publică* 1, no. 4 (July 1927): 4–5.
- Glicsman, Iosif. "Capitalul uman: O concepție biopolitică" [Human Capital: A Biopolitical Concept]. *Adevărul* 42, no. 13855 (February 21, 1929): 1.
- Glicsman, Iosif. "Arianomania" [Aryan Mania]. *Adevărul* 49, no. 15817 (August 11, 1935): 3.
- Glicsman, Iosif. *Rasa și rasismul: Cea mai mare escrocherie științifică a secolului* [Race and Racism: The Biggest Scientific Fraud of the Century]. Bucharest: Adam, [1935].
- Glicsman, Iosif. "Șlagvorturi" [Slogans]. *Adevărul* 50, no. 15936 (January 2, 1936): 1.
- Glicsman, Iosif. "Ereditatea" [Heredity]. In *Medicul nostru: Dicționar enciclopedic medical* [Our Physician: Encyclopedic Medical Dictionary], 197–200. Bucharest: Adevărul, 1937.
- Glicsman, Iosif, and J. R. Stoicescu. *Album statistic al igienei preventive, asistenței medicale și al asistenței sociale* [Statistical Album of Preventive Hygiene, Medical Care, and Social Assistance]. Bucharest: Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co, 1927.
- Glingar, Alois. "Die Bekämpfung der Geschlechtskrankheiten in Zloczow während eines Zeitraumes von sieben Monaten." *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 22–23 (February 20, 1917): 25–28.
- Glingar, Alois. "Richtlinien für die Untersuchung auf Geschlechtskrankheiten." *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 24 (May 6, 1917): 9–11.
- Goddard, Henry H. "Die Konferenz der Nationalvereinigung für das Studium der Schwachsinnigen und der Epileptiker vom 3. bis 5. Juni 1912 in Vineland, N. J." *Eos* 9, no. 1 (1913): 78–80.
- Goddard, Henry H. "Sterilisation und Segregation." *Eos* 10, no. 1 (1914): 11–18.
- Goddard, Henry H. "Wie sollen wir die geistig Schwachen erziehen?" *Eos* 11, no. 3 (1915): 213–24.
- Goddard, Henry H. "Die Formentafel als Maßstab der intellektuellen Entwicklung der Kinder." *Eos* 12, no. 1 (1916): 72–75.

- Goldscheid, Rudolf. *Höherentwicklung und Menschenökonomie: Grundlegung der Sozialbiologie*. Leipzig: Klinkhardt, 1911.
- Goldscheid, Rudolf. *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie*. Berlin: Friedenswarte, 1912.
- Goldscheid, Rudolf. *Monismus und Politik*. Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1912.
- Goldscheid, Rudolf. “Kultúrperspektívák” [Cultural Perspectives]. *Huszadik Század* 14, no. 9 (September 1913): 177–99.
- Goldscheid, Rudolf. *Frauenfrage und Menschenökonomie*. Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1913.
- Goldscheid, Rudolf. “Embergazdaság” [Human Economy]. *Századunk* 1, no. 4 (1926): 276–82.
- Goldscheid, Rudolf. “A szaporodás forradalma” [The Reproductive Revolution]. *Korunk* 5, no. 3 (March 1930): 175–79.
- Gruber, Max von. “Das Schreiben Hofrats Prof. Max Gruber an die Redaktion des Abstinenten über Prof. Hueppes Vortrag am österreichischen Brauertag.” *Der Abstinente* 3, no. Extra-Ausgabe (June 6, 1904): 1–2.
- Gruber, Max von. “Professor Max Gruber über Hueppes Vortrag am österreichischen Brauertag.” *Der Abstinente* 3, no. 7 (July 1, 1904): 1–2.
- Gruber, Max von. “An unsere studierende Jugend.” *Der Abstinente* 7, no. 6 (June 1, 1908): 2–4.
- Gruber, Max von. *Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene: Vortrag, gehalten anläßig der generalversammlung des Verbandes zur Hebung hauswirtschaftlicher Frauenbildung am 4. Juli 1910 im alten Rathaussaale in München*. Munich: Reinhardt, 1910.
- Gruber, Max von, F Grützner, and Emil Kraepelin. “Wissenschaft und Geschäft.” *Der Abstinente* 7, no. 4 (April 1, 1908): 1–2.
- Gschwendtner, Leopold. “Wirkt der moderne Sport rassenerhaltend und -ertüchtigend?” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 17, no. 2 (1925): 170–80.
- Gundrum, Fran Srećko. “Alkohol i sokolstvo” [Alcohol and Sokol Movement]. *Sokol: Časopis Saveza hrvatskih sokolskih društava* 5, no. 8 (August 1906): 118–21.
- Gundrum, Fran Srećko. *Tjelovježba i športovi za ženskinje sa zdravstvenog stajališta* [Physical Exercise and Sports for Women from a Health Perspective]. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1909.
- Gyulai, Aladár. Review of *Iskola-egészségi könyvtár* [Library of School Medicine], by Ödön Tuszkai. *A Gyermekek* 7, no. 05 (1913): 354–55.
- Hadži, Jovan. “Vorversuche zur Biologie von Hydra.” *Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen* 22, no. 1–2 (1906): 38–47.
- Hadži, Jovan. “Pojavi udruživanja u životinjstvu” [Phenomena of Association in Animal Life]. *Priroda* 17, no. 6 (June 1927): 109–17.

- Hadži, Jovan. "Pojavi udruživanja u životinjstvu: II. Životinjske države" [Phenomena of Association in Animal Life: II. Animal Societies" or "Instances of Cooperation in the Animal Kingdom: II. Animal States]. *Priroda* 17, no. 7–8 (July 1927): 145–49.
- Hainisch, Michael. *Einige neue Zahlen zur Statistik der Deutschösterreicher*. Leipzig: Deuticke, 1909.
- Hainisch, Michael. "Ein Ausflug nach St. Egydi." *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* 1, no. 20 (May 1, 1912): 686–89.
- Hainisch, Michael. *Die Landflucht: ihr Wesen und ihre Bekämpfung im Rahmen einer Agrarreform*. Jena: Fischer, 1924.
- Hanuš, Josip. "O potrebi ženskog tjelesnog odgoja" [On the Need for Female Physical Education]. *Hrvatski Sokol: Časopis hrvatskog sokolskog saveza* 9, no. 8–9–10 (1910): 100–102, 116–17, 132–33.
- Haškovec, Ladislav. *Snahy veřejného zdravotnictví v otázce smlouvy manželské* [Efforts of Public Health in the Matter of Marriage Contracts]. Prague: Otto, 1902.
- Haškovec, Ladislav. "Contrat matrimonial et l'hygiène publique." In *XV Congrès international de médecine, Lisbonne, 19-26 avril 1906*, 600–624. Section 7: Neurologie, Psychiatrie et Anthropologie Criminelle. Lisbon: Mendonça, 1906.
- Haškovec, Ladislav. *Lékařské vysvědčení před sňatkem: Sbirka dokumentů doby* [Prenuptial Medical Certificate: Collection of Documents of the Period]. Prague: Borový, 1928.
- Hațieganu, Iuliu. "Über das Blutbild bei Struma und Morbus Basedowi." *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 25, no. 39 (September 26, 1912): 1449–52.
- Hațieganu, Iuliu. "Die klinische Bedeutung der Winkler-Schulze-Oxydase-Reaktion." *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 26, no. 13 (April 3, 1913): 537–38.
- Hațieganu, Iuliu. *Șoimii Carpaților* [Carpathian Falcons]. Biblioteca poporală a asociațiunii ASTRA 226–227. Sibiu: Editura Asociațiunii ASTRA, 1935.
- Hațieganu, Iuliu, and Béla Döri. "Über die klinische Vergleichung des Ewald-Boas und des Mintzschen Probefrühstückes." *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 25, no. 52 (Dezember 1912): 2044–46.
- Havelka, F. J. "Egy prágai egyetemi tanár a ruszinszkói zsidókérdésről" [A Prague University Professor on the Jewish Question in Ruthenia]. *Uj Közlöny* 48, no. 58 (March 12, 1926): 1.
- Hecht, Hugo. "Das Gesundheitszeugnis der Eheandidaten." *Deutsche Zeitung Bohemia* 92, no. 112 (August 8, 1919): 3.
- Hecke, Wilhelm. *Die Verschiedenheit der deutschen und slawischen Volksvermehrung in Österreich*. Stuttgart: Enke, 1916.

- Hecke, Wilhelm. "Bericht über die Tätigkeit der Gesellschaft in den Jahren 1918 bis 1920." *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 2, no. 2 (April 1921): 1–12.
- Heinz, Wilhelm. "Der deutsch-wirtschaftliche Schutzverein Südmark." In *Sächsisches Wehr- und Mehrbuch: Ein Volksbuch*, by Heinrich Siegmund, Michael Englisch, and Rudolf Schuster, 147–54. Mediasch: Selbstverlag, 1914.
- Helbich, Karel, ed. *Věstník I. lékařského sjezdu zdravotnicko-sociálního v Praze 1919* [Bulletin of the 1st Medical Congress of Health and Social Care in Prague 1919]. Prague: Ústřední jednota československých lékařů, 1919.
- Henlein, Konrad. "Beispiel eines Vortrages: Rassenreinheit." In *Führer-Lehrgänge im deutschen Turnen: Der Vorturner*, 2nd ed., 2:13–17. Teplitz-Schönau: Deutscher Turnverband, 1931.
- Henlein, Konrad. "Leibesübung und ihre volkspolitische Bedeutung." In *Reden und Aufsätze zur völkischen Turnbewegung 1928-1933*, edited by Willi Brandner, 59–68. Karlsbad: K. H. Frank, 1934.
- Henlein, Konrad. "Worte Konrad Henleins." In *Reden und Aufsätze zur völkischen Turnbewegung 1928-1933*, edited by Willi Brandner, 105–17. Karlsbad: K. H. Frank, 1934.
- Henlein, Konrad. *Die völkische Turnbewegung*. 4th ed. Gablonz an der Neise: Deutscher Turnverband, 1937.
- Herfort, Karel. "Die pathologische Anatomie der Idiotie." *Eos* 4, no. 4 (October 1908): 233–42.
- Herfort, Karel. "Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der Biologie." *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* 1, no. 4 (April 1910): 17.
- Herfort, Karel, ed. "Geschichtlicher Rückblick." In *Festbericht des St. Anna-Frauen-Vereines für das Jahr 1911. Ernestinum; Festbericht 1871-1911; Zur Feier des 14 jähr. Bestehens der Anstalt zur Erziehung u. Pflege von Schwachsinnigen "Ernestinum,"* 9–13. Prague: St. Anna-Frauen-Verein, 1912.
- Herfort, Karel. "Eugenický význam vrozené slabomyslnosti a první výsledky prací v tom směru vykonaných eugenickou stanicí při Ernestinu" [The Eugenic Significance of Congenital Feeble-mindedness and the First Results of Research in that Direction Carried Out by the Central Eugenic Station at the Ernestinum]. *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 12, no. 11–12 (1915): 447–60.
- Herfort, Karel, and Artur Brožek. "Die eugenische Zentrale des Ernestinums." *Eos* 10, no. 3 (1914): 161–73.
- Hertz, Friedrich. *Moderne Rassentheorien: Kritische Essays*. Vienna: C. W. Stern, 1904.

- Hoffmann, Géza von. “Die Rechtsgiltigkeit der Sterilisierungsgesetze und der einschränkenden Ehegesetze in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika.” *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 34, no. 1 (1913): 900–905.
- Hoffmann, Géza von. *Die Rassenhygiene in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika*. Munich: Lehmann, 1913.
- Hoffmann, Géza von. “Gyermektanulmány és fajegészségtani (eugenikai) adatok gyűjtése” [Child Study and Data Collection on Racial Hygiene (Eugenics)]. *A Gyermek* 8, no. 2 (1914): 86–91.
- Hoffmann, Géza von. “A svéd házassági törvény fajegészségügyi követelményei” [The Racial Hygienic Requirements of the Swedish Marriage Law]. *Nemzetvédelem* 1, no. 1–2 (1918): 90–91.
- Hoffmann, Géza von. “Fajegészségügy és népesedéspolitika a közigazgatásban” [Racial Hygiene and Population Policy in Public Administration]. *Magyar Közigazgatás* 36, no. 12 (March 24, 1918): 1–2.
- Hoffmann, Géza von. *Egészséges magyar családnak soha magva ne szakadjon!* [May the Seed of a Healthy Hungarian Family Never Break!]. Budapest: Magyar társadalmi muzeum, 1918.
- Hofstetter, Gustav. “Es graut ihnen von sich selber...” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 142 (May 21, 1936): 5.
- Holitscher, Arnold. “Abstinenz und Bourgeoisie.” *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 4, no. 4 (April 1, 1905): 4.
- Holitscher, Arnold. “Weshalb jeder deutsche Arzt am Kampfe gegen den Alkoholismus sich beteiligen müsste.” *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 2, no. 2 (July 1, 1907): 15.
- Holitscher, Arnold. “Alkohol und Infektionskrankheiten.” *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 9, no. 12 (1911): 188–89.
- Holitscher, Arnold. “Alkoholsitte-Opiumsitté.” *Az Alkoholkérdés: Alkoholelles folyóirat* 2, no. 2 (February 1, 1911): 7.
- Holitscher, Arnold. “Az állam jelenlegi feladatai az alkoholelles küzdelemben” [The Current Tasks of the State in the Fight Against Alcohol]. *A Társadalmi Múzeum Értesítője* 3, no. 3 (May 1, 1911): 177–95.
- Holitscher, Arnold. “Schäden der Volksernährung.” In *II. Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 15. u. 16. April 1917: Vorträge*, 18–41. Vienna: Deuticke, 1917.
- Hora, Karel. “Promjene na kostima i zglobovima gornjeg ekstremiteta promatrane kod vježbača na spravama (Sokola)” [Changes in the Bones and Joints of the Upper Extremities Observed in Sokol Gymnasts Exercising on Devices]. *Liječnički vjesnik* 54, no. 11 (November 1932): 547–61.

- Hora, Karel. “Změny na kostech a v kloubech horní končetiny, pozorované u sokolek” [Changes in the Bones and Joints of the Upper Limb Observed in Female Sokol Gymnasts]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 72, no. 46–7 (1933): 1397–1405.
- Hueppe, Ferdinand. *Die hygienische Bedeutung der erziehenden Knabenhandarbeit*. Leipzig: Frankenstein & Wagner, 1899.
- Hueppe, Ferdinand. “Einleitung.” In *System Proschek: Übungssystem koordinierter Muskelgruppen*, by Josef Proschek, 4th ed. Vienna: Perles, 1907.
- Hueppe, Ferdinand. *Hygiene der Körperübungen*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1910.
- Husáková, Julie, Otokar Chlup, Petr Růžek, Karel Herfort, Jan Mauer, and Cyril Stejskal. *O významu poradnictví při volbě povolání (Odbor pro vybudování poraden pro volbu povolání)* [On the Importance of Vocational Guidance: Department for the Establishment of Vocational Guidance Centres]. [Prague]: Psychotechnický ústav Masarykovy akademie práce, 1920.
- Iacobovici, Iacob. “Fațada și realitate” [Façade and Reality]. *Revista Sănătății* 1, no. 2 (May 1921): 36–39.
- Iltis, Hugo, ed. *Studia Mendeliana ad centesimum diem natalem Gregorii Mendelii a grata patria celebrandum*. Brno: Typos, 1923.
- Iltis, Hugo. *Gregor Johann Mendel: Leben, Werk und Wirkung*. Berlin: Springer, 1924.
- Iltis, Hugo. *Kampf und Gemeinschaft in Natur und Gesellschaft*. [Bodenbach]: Deutsche sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei in der Tschechoslowakischen Republik, 1926.
- Iltis, Hugo. “Rassenwissenschaft und Rassenwahn.” *Die Gesellschaft: Internationale Revue für Sozialismus und Politik* 4, no. 2 (1927): 97–114.
- Iltis, Hugo. “Rassenforschung und Rassenfrage II.” *Sozialistische Bildung*, no. 2 (February 1929): 45–52.
- Iltis, Hugo. “Zur Rassenfrage.” *Prager Presse* 9, no. 64 (March 5, 1929): 3.
- Iltis, Hugo. *Volkstümliche Rassenkunde*. Jena: Urania-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1930.
- Iltis, Hugo. “Rassenforschung und Rassenfrage.” *Der Kampf: Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift* 24, no. 5 (May 1931): 220–25.
- Iltis, Hugo. *Rasa ve vědě a v politice* [Race in Science and Politics]. Prague: Svaz národního osvobození, 1935.
- Iltis, Hugo, ed. *Het rassenprobleem in politiek en wetenschap* [The Race Problem in Politics and Science]. Translated by Maurice Bernard Coelho. The Hague: Confidentia, 1936.
- Iltis, Hugo. “Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse.” *Gerechtigkeit* 4, no. 141 (May 14, 1936): 2.
- Iltis, Hugo. *Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse*. Vienna: Rudolf Harand, 1936.

- Ingram, Ruth. "Nursing in Yugoslavia: Glimpses of the Preparation and Work of Health Nurses in Yugoslavia." *The American Journal of Nursing* 30, no. 2 (February 1930): 139.
- Ivanić, Stevo. *Epidemiologija* [Epidemiology]. Zagreb: Higijenski zavod sa školom narodnog zdravlja, 1926.
- Jadin, Jean. "Groupes sanguins des Pygmées et des Nègres de l'Ituri (Congo Belge)." *Anthropos* 31, no. 1–2 (April 1936): 177–86.
- Jadin, Jean. "Aperçu sur l'état sanitaire des Pygmées de l'Ituri." *Anthropologie* 16, no. 1–4 (1938): 69–83.
- Janiszewski, Tomasz Wiktor. *Polskie Ministerstwo Zdrowia Publicznego : (zadania, zasady organizacyi i zakres działania zarządu spraw zdrowotnych w państwie polskiem)* [Polish Ministry of Public Health: Tasks, Principles of Organization, and Scope of the Health Administration in the Polish State]. Kraków: nakł. własny, 1917.
- Janiszewski, Tomasz Wiktor. *The Plan of Campaign against the Epidemie [sic!] of Typhus in Poland*. Warsaw: Drukarnia Państwowa, 1919.
- Janiszewski, Tomasz Wiktor. *Do czego dążyć powinien ruch ludowy?: Próba ideologii ruchu ludowego* [What Should the Populist Movement Strive For?: An Attempt at the Ideology of the Peasant Movement]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Obywatelskiego Komitetu odbudowy wsi i miast, 1923.
- Janiszewski, Tomasz Wiktor. "L'importance sociale de la santé." *Revue internationale de sociologie* 34 (1926): 262–85.
- Janiszewski, Tomasz Wiktor. *Sprawy zdrowia publicznego wobec reformy administracji* [Public Health Issues in the Face of Administrative Reform]. Warsaw: s.n., 1926.
- Janiszewski, Tomasz Wiktor. "Społeczne obowiązki stanu lekarskiego" [Social Responsibilities of the Medical Profession]. In *Sprawozdanie z Kursu Doksztalcającego dla lekarzy w Ciechocinku* [Report on the Continuing Education Course for Doctors in Ciechocinek], by Julian Drac, 1–37. Warsaw: skł. gł. Biblioteka Szkoły Podchorążych Sanitarnych i Główna Księg. Wojskowa, 1929.
- Jászi, Oszkár. *Mi a szociológia?* [What is Sociology?]. Budapest: Huszadik század, 1908.
- Jászi, Oszkár. "Népegészségi országos nagygyűlés" [Countrywide Public Health Assembly]. *Világ* 8, no. 255 (October 14, 1917): 1–2.
- Jászi, Oszkár. *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Jaxa-Bykowski, Ludwik. "Właściwości antropologiczne a psychotechnika" [Anthropological Characteristics and Psychotechnics]. *Psychotechnika* 2, no. 5 (January 1, 1928): 8–10.
- Jelentés a Stefánia-Szövetség működéséről. 1915. jún. 13–1917. jún. 15.* [Report on the Operation of the Stefánia Association. June 13, 1915 – June 15, 1917]. Budapest: Pfeifer, 1917.

- Jelentés a társadalomtudományok szabad iskolájának 1906-1907-ik évi működéséről* [Report on the Activities of the Free School of Social Sciences for the Academic Year 1906-1907]. Budapest: Az iskola igazgatósága, 1907.
- Jesser, Franz. “Ländliche Kriegerheimstätten.” In *Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 12. und 13. März 1916: Vorträge und Wechselreden*, 132–48. Vienna: Deuticke, 1916.
- Jickeli, Karl. “Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene.” *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 5, no. 14 (April 15, 1911): 424–29.
- Johan, Béla. “Az orvos és a modern közegészségügy: Jugoszlávia egészségügyi szervezete” [The Doctor and Modern Public Health: The Healthcare Organization of Yugoslavia]. *Orvosi Hetilap* 69, no. 11 (March 15, 1925): 224–28.
- Johan, Béla. “A modern közegészségügy célja, eszközei, eredményei” [The Purpose, Means, and Results of Modern Public Health]. *Népegészségügy* 9, no. 10 (May 15, 1928): 603–15.
- Jojkić, Vladan. *Nacionalizacija Bačke i Banata: Etno-politička studija* [Nationalization of Bačka and Banat: Ethno-Political Study]. Novi Sad: Jovanović i Bogdanov, 1931.
- Jojkić, Vladan. “Higijenske prilike i zdravstveni budžet Dunavske Banovine” [Hygienic Conditions and Health Budget of the Danube Banovina]. *Dan: nezavisni informativni dnevnik* 5, no. 1 (January 1, 1939): 2–3.
- Kączkowska, Janina. “Rola instynktu w wyborze zawodu: Z prac Dr. W. Lista i Dr. C. Coerpera” [The Role of Instinct in Career Choice: From the Work of Dr. W. List and Dr. C. Coerper]. *Psychotechnika* 3, no. 9 (Autumn 1929): 1–17.
- Kammerer, Paul. “Symbiose zwischen Libellenlarve und Fadenalge.” *Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen* 25, no. 1 (1907): 52–81.
- Kammerer, Paul. “Ausnützung dütenförmig gedrehter junger Blätter von Canna, Musa und Aspidistra durch kleinere Tiere.” *Österreichische botanische Zeitschrift* 58, no. 1 (January 1908): 19–27.
- Kammerer, Paul. “Allgemeine Symbiose und Kampf ums Dasein als gleichberechtigte Triebkräfte der Evolution.” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 6, no. 5 (1909): 585–608.
- Kammerer, Paul. “Mendelsche Regeln und Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften.” *Verhandlungen des naturforschenden Vereines in Brünn* 49 (1910): 72–110.
- Kammerer, Paul. “A szerzett tulajdonságok átöröklése és annak szociológiai jelentősége” [The Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics and Its Sociological Significance]. *Husadik Század* 14, no. 3 (1913): 305–24.
- Kammerer, Paul. “Gegenseitige Hilfe und erbliche Entlastung.” *Pester Lloyd* 60, no. 27 (January 31, 1913): 1–2.

- Kammerer, Paul. "Pansymbiose." *Naturwissenschaften* 1, no. 50 (December 1, 1913): 1222–25.
- Kammerer, Paul. *Genossenschaften von Lebewesen auf Grund gegenseitiger Vorteile (Symbiose)*. Bern: R. Dech & Co., 1913.
- Kammerer, Paul. "Ernst Haeckel." *Huszadik Század* 15, no. 2 (1914): 137–50.
- Kammerer, Paul. "Nacionalizmus és biológia" [Nationalism and Biology]. *Huszadik Század* 15, no. 5 (1914): 625–31.
- Kammerer, Paul. "Nationalismus und Biologie." *Das monistische Jahrhundert* 2, no. 42 (January 17, 1914): 1177–85.
- Kammerer, Paul. *Menschheitswende: Wanderungen im Grenzgebiet von Politik und Wissenschaft*. Vienna: Der Friede, 1919.
- Kammerer, Paul. *Das biologische Zeitalter: Fortschritte der organischen Technik*. Vienna: Verlag der Gruppen Währing-Döbling und Hernals des Vereins Freie Schule, 1920.
- Kammerer, Paul. *Sind wir Sklaven der Vergangenheit oder Werkmeister der Zukunft?: Anpassung, Vererbung, Rassenhygiene in dualistischer und monistischer Betrachtungsweise*. 2nd ed. Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1921.
- Kammerer, Paul. "Schmelztiegel Amerika." *Urania* 1, no. 2 (November 1924): 36–39.
- Kammerer, Paul. "Ist die Rasse veränderlich?" *Der Morgen: Monatsschrift der Juden in Deutschland* 2, no. 4 (October 1926): 323–338.
- Kápar, Josef, ed. *Svoboda: její vznik a budování: k desátému výročí osídlení legionářů na Podkarpatské Rusi* [Freedom: Its Origins and Development: On the Tenth Anniversary of the Settlement of Legionaries in Subcarpathian Ruthenia]. Prague: Obecně prospěšné stavební a bytové družstvo pro výstavbu kolonií, 1933.
- Kelus, Aleksander. *Centralny Instytut Wychowania Fizycznego w Warszawie: Przewodnik, Informator* [Central Institute of Physical Education in Warsaw: Guide, Handbook]. Warsaw: Drukarnia Gospodarcza, 1933.
- Kirchner, Martin, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner, eds. *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*. Jena: Fischer, 1918.
- Klausberger, Maria Leopoldine. "Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene: Zum Vortrag des Prof. Max von Gruber, München." *Österreichische Frauen-Rundschau* 8, no. 78 (October 1, 1910): 5–7.
- Kontra, László, and Tibor Bielek. *A falu egészségvédelme* [Health Protection in the Village]. Pécs: Dunántúl, 1934.

- Kőröspataki Kiss, Károly. *Szép életünk: Eubiotikus-vegetárius erdélyi kis szakácskönyve* [Our Beautiful Life: A Small Eubiotic Vegetarian Transylvanian Cookbook]. [Budapest]: Iránytű, 1932.
- Kovács, Alajos. *Magyarország néperejének újjászületése* [Rebirth of the Strength of the Hungarian Nation]. Szeged: Szegedi Városi Nyomda, 1922.
- Krajník, Bohumil. “Výzkum konstitute a její význam pro lékařství” [Research on Constitution and its Relevance to Medicine]. *Biologické listy* 19, no. 3 (1934): 117–28.
- Krajník, Bohumil. “Genetické základy preventivní péče o biologickou zdatnost národa” [Genetic Foundations of Preventive Care for the Biological Fitness of the Nation]. In *Prevence a brannost: Soubor prací 6. konference preventivního lékařství v Janských Lázních ve dnech 31. ledna a 1.-3. února 1936* [Prevention and Military Ability: Proceedings of the 6th Conference of Preventive Medicine in Janské Lázně on 31 January and 1-3 February 1936], 11–20. Prague: Státní zdravotní ústav, 1936.
- Krajník, Bohumil. “Prof. Dr. Henri Laugier hostem Čsl. společnosti biotypologické” [Prof. Dr. Henri Laugier as a Guest of the Czechoslovak Society of Biotypology]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 76, no. 20 (May 21, 1937): 633–34.
- Krajník, Bohumil. *L'étude des types humains et son importance pour la défense nationale*. Prague: Vojenský ústav vědecký, 1938.
- Král, Jiří. “Vědecká práce na sletišti” [Scientific Work at the Sokol Rally]. *Věstník československých lékařů* 50, no. 25–27 (June 30, 1938): 1030–32.
- Krasney, Ernst. “7. österreichischer Alkoholgegnertag vom 21. bis 23. November 1931 in Wien.” *Aufwärts: Blätter für alkoholfreie Lebensgestaltung* 6, no. 1 (January 1932): 1–2.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Otázka dědičnosti získaných vlastností, její význam pro praxi eugenickou a úkoly politiky sociální” [The Question of the Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics, Its Significance for Eugenic Practice, and the Tasks of Social Policy]. *Česká revue* 8, no. 12 (September 1915): 719–39.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Eugenika a ženské hnutí: Několik kritických a polemických poznámek” [Eugenics and the Women's Movement: Several Critical and Polemical Remarks]. *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 14, no. 1–2 (February 25, 1917): 86–94.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “K organizaci ministerstva lidového zdravotnictví” [On the Organization of the Ministry of Public Health]. *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fysikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 15, no. 1–3 (March 25, 1918): 39–41.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. *O smrti hladem a porušování organismu nedostatečnou výživou* [On Death by Starvation and the Harm to the Organism by Undernutrition]. Prague: Otto, 1918.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Studium kolektivního života, sociologie a biologie” [The Study of Collective Life, Sociology, and Biology]. *Lékařské rozhledy* 7, no. 4–5 (1919): 116–21.

- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Eugenika a socialismus [Eugenics and Socialism].” *Budoucnost: Revue českého socialismu* 2, no. 10 (1920): 513–532.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Organisace vědy: česká eugenika” [Organization of Science: Czech Eugenics]. *Nové Atheneum* 1, no. 3 (1920): 209–15.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Proč nejsem komunistou? [Why I am not a Communist?].” *Přítomnost* 1, no. 52 (January 8, 1925): 819–20.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Rok činnosti Českého srdce” [One Year of Activity of the Czech Heart]. *Revue: neuropsychopathologie, therapie, fyzikální medicína, veřejná hygiena, lékařství sociální, dědičnost a eugenika* 15, no. 7–9 (October 28, 1918): 234–36.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Život a individualita II” [Life and Individualism]. *Přítomnost* 2, no. 6 (February 19, 1925): 91–92.
- Kříženecký, Jaroslav. “Biologie a sociální etika [Biology and Social Ethics].” *Morava* 2, no. 1 (January 1926): 7–11.
- Kronika Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego za Rok Szkolny 1916/17: Za Rektoratu Radcy Dworu Prof. Dra Władysława Szajnochy i Otwarcie Roku Szkolnego w dniu 27. października 1917* [Chronicle of the Jagiellonian University for the Academic Year 1916/17: Under the Rectorate of Court Counselor Prof. Dr. Władysław Szajnoch and the Opening of the Academic Year on October 27, 1917]. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1918.
- Kropotkin, Pyotr Alexeyevich. *A kölcsönös segítség mint természettörvény* [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution]. Translated by József Madzsar. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1908.
- Kropotkin, Pyotr Alexeyevich. *A kölcsönös segítség mint természettörvény* [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution]. Translated by József Madzsar. 2nd ed. Budapest: Népszava, 1924.
- Krulj, Uroš. “Nacionalna rasna higijena” [National Racial Hygiene]. *Pregled* 1, no. 5 (September 15, 1910): 262–74.
- Krulj, Uroš. “Moderni patriotizam” [Modern Patriotism]. *Pregled* 3, no. 3 (August 15, 1912): 121–24.
- Krulj, Uroš. *Politika i rasa: rasni nacionalizam* [Politics and Race: Racial Nationalism]. Sarajevo: Državna štamparija, 1925.
- Krulj, Uroš, Risto Radulović, Svetozar Ćorović, Vladimir Gaćinović, Šćepan Grdić, Vojislav Besarović, and Đoka Perin. *Spomenica o proslavi desetogodišnjice Prosvjete: pregled prosvjetnog i kulturnog rada Srba Bosne i Hercegovine od 1902 do 1912* [Memorial about the Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of the Prosvjeta Association: Overview of Educational and Cultural Activities of Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1902 to 1912]. Sarajevo: Prosvjeta, 1912.
- Kulhavý, František. “Stát a eugenika” [State and Eugenics]. *Ochrana mládeže: Časopis pro veřejnou i soukromou péči o mládež v Království českém* 6, no. 4–5 (May 1916): 99–104.

- Kupec, Bohuslav. “Dr B. Albert - zdravotnícký a sociální administrátor. Vzpomínky na naši spolupráci na Podkarpatské Rusi a ve Zlíně” [Dr. B. Albert – Public Health and Social Administrator. Memories of Our Cooperation in Subcarpathian Rus and Zlín]. *Československá nemocnice* 18, no. 2 (February 1950): 53–54.
- Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. “Ekonomija života i eugenetika” [Economy of Life and Eugenics]. *Jugoslavenska njiva* 5, no. 40–41 (October 1921): 634–36.
- Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. *Problemi biološke sociologije* [Problems of Biological Sociology]. Zagreb: Štamparija “Gaj,” 1924.
- Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. “Docent dela reklamo” [An Assistant Professor Promotes Himself]. *Svoboda* 6, no. 12 (1934): 345–47.
- Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. “Kaj je z rasami?” [What About the Races?]. *Svoboda* 6, no. 11 (1934): 281–84.
- Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. *Laž rasizma* [The Lie of Racism]. Zagreb: Naš front, 1934.
- Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. *Antisemitizam bez maske* [Anti-Semitism Unmasked]. Zagreb: Naš front, 1935.
- Lacković, Darinka. “Smrt Dr. Laze Markovića” [Death of Dr. Laza Marković]. *Seljanka: list za prosvjećivanje žena na selu* 3, no. 9 (January 9, 1935): 1–2.
- Lancová, Juliana. “Česká eugenika a její hlasatel” [Czech Eugenics and Its Advocate]. *Ženský svět* 20, no. 11 (May 24, 1916): 246–47.
- Lancová, Juliana. “Poradny pro volbu povolání” [Vocational Guidance Centres]. *Sociální péče* 2, no. 3–4 (May 1921): 26–27.
- Langer, William L. Review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit der europäischen Rassen*, by Karel Weigner. *Foreign Affairs* 14, no. 3 (April 1936): 536.
- Lašek, František. *Zušlechtění lidstva: Eugenika* [Breeding Humanity: Eugenics]. Prague: Vilímek, 1916.
- László, Dénes. “Eugénia, fajbiológia és sterilizálás” [Eugenics, Racial Biology and Sterilisation]. *Korunk* 8, no. 12 (December 1933): 917–20.
- Laugier, Henri, Édouard Toulouse, and Dagmar Weinberg. “La Biotypologie et l’orientation professionnelle.” *Biotypologie: Bulletin de la Société de Biotypologie* 1, no. 1 (December 1932): 27–34.
- Lazar, Erwin. “Die Intelligenzprüfung bei Kindern und ihre Verwertbarkeit zur Beurteilung krankhafter Geisteszustände.” In *Bericht der vierten österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Wien am 21. und 22. März 1910*, 84–90. Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung 2. Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1910.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. “Anthropologie und Konstitutionsforschung: Diskussion.” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 51 (1921): 4.

- Lebzelter, Viktor. "Konstitution und Kondition in der allgemeinen Biologie." *Zeitschrift für Konstitutionslehre* 8 (1921): 184–90.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. Review of *Physical Anthropology, its scope and aims*, by Aleš Hrdlička. *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 52 (1922): 280–81.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. "Grundsätzliches zur Rassenhygiene." *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 55 (1925): 361–62.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. Review of *Grundzüge der Rassenhygiene, zugleich Einführung in die Vererbungslehre*, by Hermann Werner Siemens. *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 55 (1925): 48–49.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. "Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. II. In Österreich." *Prager Presse* 14, no. 323 (November 25, 1934): 4.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. "Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. IV. In Rumänien." *Prager Presse* 14, no. 336 (December 8, 1934): 4.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. Review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit der europäischen Rassen und die Wege zu ihrer Vervollkommenung*, by Karel Weigner. *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 65 (1935): 243–44.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. Review of *Herkunft und Rassengeschichte der Germanen*, by Hans Günther. *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 65 (1935): 244.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. "Kleine Rassenkunde Österreichs." *Monatsschrift für Kultur und Politik* 1, no. 8 (August 1936): 708–16.
- Lebzelter, Viktor. "Unsere rassenhygienische Aufgabe." *Monatsschrift für Kultur und Politik* 2, no. 1 (1937): 19–24.
- Lebzelter, Viktor, and Ernst Brezina. "Über die Dimensionen der Hand bei verschiedenen Berufen." *Archiv für Hygiene* 92, no. 1 (1923): 53–59.
- Lebzelter, Viktor, and Ernst Brezina. "Der Einfluß des Berufes und Wachstums auf die Dimensionen der Hand." *Zeitschrift für Konstitutionslehre* 10 (1924): 581–85.
- Lenhossék, Mihály. "A finn-ugor nyelvcsaládhoz tartozó orosz hadifoglyokon végzett anthropologiai vizsgálatok" [Anthropological Studies on Russian Prisoners of War Belonging to the Finno-Ugric Language Family]. *Akadémiai Értesítő* 27, no. 12 (December 15, 1916): 685–701.
- Lenhossék, Mihály. "Anthropologische Untersuchungen an russischen Kriegsgefangenen finnisch-ugrischer Nationalität." *Turán* 2, no. 3 (March 1917): 136–51.
- Leskó, Jenő. "A bécsi nemzetközi katolikus orvoskongresszus" [The International Catholic Medical Congress in Vienna]. *Szent Lukács* 2, no. 3 (July 1936): 53–57.
- Literatura Sokolská: Seznam spisů odborné tělocvičné literatury české, chorvatské, polské, ruské, slovinské i jinojazyčné* [Sokol Literature: A List of Works of Specialized

Literature on Gymnastics in Czech, Croatian, Polish, Russian, Slovenian, and Other Languages]. 2nd ed. Prague: Springer, 1911.

Löhner, Leopold, Raymond Pearl, and Vladislav Růžička. "Introduction." *Biologia Generalis* 1, no. 1 (1925): I.

Macewicz, Piotr. "Zarys powstania i działalności pierwszej pracowni psychotechnicznej w Polsce" [Outline of the Establishment and Activities of the First Laboratory of Psychotechnics in Poland]. *Psychotechnika* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 1927): 45–49.

Madzsar, József. "Lamarck és Darwin" [Lamarck and Darwin]. In *Jelentés a társadalomtudományok szabad iskolájának 1908-1909-ik évi működéséről* [Report on the Activities of the Free School of Social Sciences for the Academic Year 1908-1909], 3–11. Budapest: Az iskola igazgatósága, 1909.

Madzsar, József. *Az anya- és csecsemővédelem országos szervezése: Mellékelve a Stefánia-Szövetség alapszabályainak tervezete* [Countrywide Organization of Maternal and Infant Care: With an Attached Draft of the Stefánia Association's By-Laws]. Budapest: Stefánia Szövetség, 1915.

Madzsar, József. "Fajvédelem" [Race Protection]. In *Társadalmi Lexikon* [Social Lexicon], edited by József Madzsar, 190. Budapest: Népszava, 1928.

Madzsar, József, and Béla Fenyvessy, eds. *A Népegészségügyi országos nagygyűlés munkálatai: Budapest 1917. évi október hó 25-28.* [Proceedings of the Countrywide Public Health Assembly: Budapest, October 25-28, 1917]. Budapest: Eggenberger, 1918.

Magyarországi Bajtársi Szövetség [Hungarian Fraternal Military Association]. *Jelentés a német, osztrák, török és magyar bajtársi szövetségek orvosi szakosztályainak és a bolgár kiküldötteknek Budapesten, 1918 szept. 21-23. án tartott együttes üléséről = Bericht über die in Budapest am 21-23. September 1918 stattgefundenen gemeinsamen Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Deutschlands, Österreichs, Türkei, Ungarn und Bulgarien.* Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1918.

Malý, Jiří. "Rovnocennost evropských plemen po stránce tělesné" [The Physical Equivalence of European Races]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 47–59. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.

Malý, Jiří, and Jindřich Matiegka. "Étude de quatre squelettes de pygmées centre africains du bassin de Ituri: I. Les crânes des pygmées de l'Afrique centrale." *L'Anthropologie* 48, no. 3–4 (1938): 237–48.

Malý, Jiří, and Jindřich Matiegka. "Kostry středoafričských pygmejů z poříčí Ituri" [Skeletons of Central African Pygmies from the Ituri Range]. *Anthropologie* 16, no. 1–4 (1938): 1–63.

Manolescu, Al. "Comemorarea D-rului I. Glicsman-Ygrec" [Commemoration of Dr. I. Glicsman-Ygrec]. *Mișcarea medicală* 12, no. 3–4 (1939): 235–37.

- Manuilă, Sabin. “Specializarea în Sănătatea publică și Fondatiunea Rockefeller” [Specialization in Public Health and the Rockefeller Foundation]. *Adevărul* 45, no. 14773 (February 29, 1932): 1–2.
- Marković, Laza. *Ženidba i udadba ili kako će narod doći do dobrog podmlatka* [Marriage or How the Nation Will Get Good Offspring]. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1913.
- Marković, Laza. *Zašto Srbi pre vremena umiru?* [Why do Serbs Die Prematurely?]. Zagreb: Privrednik, 1914.
- Marković, Laza. “Rasna higijena: Nacrt zakona o braku” [Racial Hygiene: Draft Law on Marriage]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 4 (December 1919): 126–30.
- Marković, Laza. *Zadaci narodne uprave za unapređenje rasne higijene i evgenike* [Tasks of Public Administration for the Improvement of Racial Hygiene and Eugenics]. Novi Sad: Štamparija Supeka i Jovanović, 1919.
- Marković, Laza. “Agrarna reforma i rasna higijena” [Agrarian Reform and Racial Hygiene]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 7 (March 1920): 294–99.
- Marković, Laza. *Postanak i zadaci Državne škole za zdravstveno prosvjećivanje* [Establishment and tasks of the State School for Health Education]. Biblijoteka Državne škole za zdravstveno prosvjećivanje 1. Novi Sad: Državna škola za zdravstveno prosvjećivanje, 1920.
- Marković, Laza. “Zdravstveni Odsek za Banat, Bačku i Baranju, Inspektorat Ministarstva Narodnog Zdravlja za Beogradsku, Bačku i Sremsku Oblast i Dom Narodnog Zdravlja u Novom Sadu” [Health Section for Banat, Bačka, and Baranya, Inspectorate of the Ministry of Public Health for the Belgrade, Bačka, and Srem Region, and the People's Health Home in Novi Sad]. In *Mati: Komad u jednom činu* [Mother: A Play in One Act], 107–11. Novi Sad: Dom narodnog zdravlja, 1928.
- Masaryk, Tomáš G. “Rukověť sociologie” [The Basics of Sociology]. *Naše doba* 8, no. 1 (1900): 1–12.
- Masaryk, Tomáš G. *Ideály humanitní* [Humanitarian Ideals]. Prague: Čas, 1901.
- Masaryk, Tomáš G. “Sociologische Bemerkungen zur socialen Frage des Alkoholismus.” In *Bericht über den VIII. Internationalen Congress gegen den Alkoholismus*, by Rudolf Wlassak, 231–35. Leipzig: Deuticke, 1902.
- [Masaryk, Tomáš G.] “Ethik und Alkoholismus.” *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 1, no. 1 (May 27, 1906): 7–8.
- Masaryk, Tomáš G. “Úvod” [Introduction]. In *K otázce alkoholu: Přednáška: Slovo k dělníkům* [On the Question of Alcohol: Lecture: A Word to Workers], by Gustav von Bunge. Translated by Alice Masaryková. Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag, 1906.
- Masaryk, Tomáš G. *Etika i alkoholizam* [Ethics and Alcoholism]. Translated by Dragan Šašel. Knjižnica proti alkoholu 6. Karlovac: Knjižara St. Jelača, 1912.

- Masaryk, Tomáš G. “Ethika és alkoholizmus” [Ethics and Alcoholism]. *Az Alkoholizmus* 10, no. 1 (January 1914): 2–4.
- Masaryková, Alice. “Alkohol, Abstinenz und die Frauenbewegung.” *Der Abstinenz: Blätter zur Bekämpfung des Alkoholismus* 5, no. 4 (April 1, 1906): 1–3.
- Matiegka, Jindřich. “Die physische Beschaffenheit und die Kriegstüchtigkeit des böhmischen Volkes.” In *Das böhmische Volk: Wohngebiete: Körperliche Tüchtigkeit: Geistige und materielle Kultur*, edited by Zdeněk Václav Tobolka, 9–16. Prague: Pražská akciová tiskárna, 1916.
- Matiegka, Jindřich. “Fysická anthropologie obyvatelstva v Československu” [Physical Anthropology of the Population in Czechoslovakia]. In *Československá vlastivěda. Díl 2: Člověk* [Czechoslovak Patrimony. Volume 2: Man], edited by Václav Dědina, 115–254. Prague: Sfinx, 1933.
- Matiegka, Jindřich. “Němci v Československu” [Germans in Czechoslovakia]. In *Československá vlastivěda. Díl 2: Člověk* [Czechoslovak Patrimony. Volume 2: Man], edited by Václav Dědina, 270–76. Prague: Sfinx, 1933.
- Matiegka, Jindřich. “Dějiny problému o nerovnocennosti nebo rovnocennosti evropských plemen” [History of the Problem of Inequality or Equivalence of European Races]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 7–17. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Matiegka, Jindřich. “Dnešní stav znalosti evropských plemen” [Today’s State of Knowledge of European Races]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 33–45. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Matiegka, Jindřich. “Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. X. In Deutschland.” *Prager Presse* 15, no. 19 (January 20, 1935): 4–5.
- Matiushenko, Borys. “Yevhenichna sterilizatsiya” [Eugenic Sterilization]. *Ukrainskii medichnyi vistnyk*, no. 3–4 (December 1924): 96–107.
- Medved, Josip. “Zdravstveno-pedagoške ustanove u Jugoslaviji” [Health-Pedagogical Institutions in Yugoslavia]. *Liječnički vjesnik* 48, no. 10 (October 1926): 623–34.
- Mehl, Erwin. “Fortbildungslehrgang für Turnkursleiter in Wien.” *Die Südmark: Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken* 4, no. 8 (August 1923): 364–68.
- Migray, József. “Kölcsönös segítség, mint természettörvény (Kropotkin Péter könyve. Fordította dr. Madzsar József)” [Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution. Book by Peter Kropotkin. Translated by Dr. József Madzsar]. *Népszava* 52, no. 263 (November 23, 1924): 5–6.
- Mikułowski-Pomorski, Józef. *O zawodzie rolnika: odczyt z cyklu wykładów “O wyborze zawodu” urządzanych dla maturzystów szkół średnich przez Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne* [On the Profession of a Farmer: A Lecture from the Series ‘On the Choice

of Profession,' Arranged for High School Graduates by the Polish Eugenics Society]. Biblioteka Eugeniczna Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego 13. Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne, 1927.

Miler, Ernest. "Anarkista Kropotkin o medjusobnoj pomoći kao glavnom zakonu ljudskog društva" [Anarchist Kropotkin on Mutual Aid as the Main Law of Human Society]. *Mjesečnik Pravničkoga društva u Zagrebu* 38 (1912): 106–13, 193–99.

Milicerowa, Halina. "W sprawie w. f. kobiet (Ocena wyników pracy w C. I. W. F. a typy konstytucjonalne)" [On Physical Education of Women: Evaluation of Work at C.I.W.F. and Constitutional Types]. *Wychowanie Fizyczne* 20, no. 9 (May 1939): 303–12.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Zur Prophylaxe der venerischen Erkrankungen." *Streffleurs militärische Zeitschrift* 87, no. 11 (November 1910): 1763–70.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Ergebnisse der Salvarsantherapie luetischer Erkrankungen im österreichisch-ungarischen Heere." In *Militärmedizin und ärztliche Kriegswissenschaft: Vorträge, gehalten in der Abteilung XXX "Militärsanitätswesen" auf der 85. Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte in Wien in der Zeit vom 21. bis 28. September 1913*, by Zdzisław Hordyński-Juchnowicz and Erhard Glaser, 541–44. Vienna: Šafář, 1914.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Hygiene in der Front." *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 1 (December 6, 1915): 2–4.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Vorschriften zur Bekämpfung der Läuseplage bei der Truppe: Entlausungs- und Desinfektionsanstalten für die Truppen." In *Die Erkennung und Verhütung des Flecktyphus und Rückfallfiebers*, by Ludolf Brauer, 14–17. Würzburg: Kabitzsch, 1915.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "22. Juni 1915. Hygienische Betrachtungen." *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.*, no. 13–14 (July 22, 1916): 2–4.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Die Bekämpfung der Geschlechtskrankheiten bei der Armee im Felde." *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 24 (May 6, 1917): 1–4.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Instrucțiuni regulamentare pentru combaterea boalelor contagioase" [Regulatory Instructions for the Control of Contagious Diseases]. *Gazeta Oficială*, no. 81 (January 20, 1920): 1–6.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Tabelă comperativă a medicilor din Transilvania (1917-1920)" [A Comparative Chart of Physicians in Transylvania, 1917-1920]. *Buletinul Direcțiunei generale a serviciului sanitar* 32, no. 6 (June 1920): 190.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Documente din trecut" [Documents from the Past]. *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 9, no. 11–12 (October 1938 [1921]): 321–339.

Moldovan, Iuliu. "Motive pentru înființarea Ministerului Sănătății Publice" [Reasons for Establishing the Ministry of Public Health]. *Sănătatea publică* 1, no. 1 (January 1921): 10–11.

- Moldovan, Iuliu. “Rolul societății în igiena socială” [The Role of Society in Social Hygiene]. *Revista Sănătății: Organ de profilaxie sanitară* 1, no. 1 (April 1921): 7–10.
- Moldovan, Iuliu. “Un program biopolitic” [A Biopolitical Programme]. *Societatea de Mâine* 1, no. 3 (April 27, 1924): 69–70.
- Moldovan, Iuliu. *Igiena Națiunii: (Eugenia)* [Hygiene of the Nation: (Eugenics)]. Cluj: Institutul de Igienă și Igienă Socială, 1925.
- Moldovan, Iuliu, and Otto Zuckerkandl, eds. *Verhandlungen der Feldärztlichen Tagung bei der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Lemberg 20. -22. Februar 1917*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1917.
- Munda, Avgust. “Problem sterilizacije in kazensko pravo” [The Problem of Sterilisation and Criminal Law]. *Slovenski pravnik* 48, no. 10–12 (1934): 244–69.
- Mundprecht, Maria. “Mustergesundheitsfürsorge im Burgenlande.” *Der Freie Burgenländer: Unabhängige deutsche Zeitung für das Burgenland* 10, no. 468 (June 22, 1930): 3.
- Mydlarski, Jan. “Podstawowe zagadnienia eugeniki” [Fundamental Questions of Eugenics]. *Zagadnienia rasy* 11, no. 6 (June 1929): 113–31.
- Mydlarski, Jan. “Z zagadnień konstytucjonalizmu” [On Questions of Constitutionalism]. *Zagadnienia rasy* 11, no. 7–8 (August 1929): 323–45.
- Mydlarski, Jan. “Charakterystyka antropologiczna uczestników Międzynarodowych Zawodów Narciarskich w Zakopanem 1929 r.” [Anthropological Characteristics of Participants in the 1929 International Ski Competition in Zakopane]. *Przegląd Sportowo-Lekarski* 3, no. 2–3 (April 1931): 107–80.
- Mydlarski, Jan. “Sprawność fizyczna młodzieży w Polsce. Część II. Dziewczęta” [Physical Fitness of Youth in Poland. Part II. Girls]. *Przegląd Fizjologii Ruchu* 6, no. 4 (1934): 403–86.
- Neufeld, Béla. “A fajelmélet és a tudomány” [Racial Theory and Science]. *Korunk* 9, no. 6 (June 1934): 424–30.
- Neumann, Friedrich I. *Bericht über den 2. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Graz am 8. und 9. October 1911*. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1912.
- Neumann, Friedrich I., ed. *Bericht über den 3. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Salzburg am 22. und 23. September 1912*. Beiheft der Wochenschrift Das österreichische Sanitätswesen 41/1914. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1914.
- Niedermeyer, Albert. *Wahn, Wissenschaft und Wahrheit: Lebensbekenntnisse eines Arztes*. Salzburg: Pustet, 1934.
- Nindl, Geiza Artur. “Volksgesundheit und öffentliche Gesundheitsfürsorge im Burgenland.” *Volksgesundheit: Zeitschrift für soziale Hygiene* 5, no. 11–12 (1931): 161–68.
- Nobel, Edmund. “Ärztliche Erfahrungen über die große Erholungsaktion für Schulkinder im Sommer 1918: Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk I.” *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 69, no. 1 (January 1, 1919): 33–38.

- Österreichische Waffenbrüderliche Vereinigung: Gründende Versammlung: Wien, 26. Jan. 1917.* Vienna: Fromme, 1917.
- Pach, Henrik. “Das Ministerium für Volkswohlfahrt.” *Pester Lloyd* 64, no. 251 (October 10, 1917): 2.
- Panýrek, Duchoslav. “Tělocvik či sport: S hlediska lékařského uvažuje Zdrav. odbor ČOS” [Gymnastics or Sport: From a Medical Perspective, Consideration by the Health Department of the Czech Sokol Organization]. *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 2, no. 1 (1910): 3–8.
- Panýrek, Duchoslav. “Některé novější vědecké poznatky o vlivu lihovin na člověka” [Some Recent Scientific Findings on the Impact of Spirits on Humans]. *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 6, no. 18 (1914): 101–3.
- Paulovits, Sándor, ed. *Harmincas honvédek élete a halálmezőkön* [The Lives of the Soldiers of the Thirtieth Honvéd Regiment on the Fields of Death]. Kecskemét: sine, 1939.
- Pelc, Hynek. “Jugoslávie nás předhání” [Yugoslavia is Outpacing Us]. *Praktický lékař* 7, no. 23 (December 5, 1927): 858–63.
- Pelc, Hynek. “Otevření zdravotních ústavů a školní hygieny v Budapešti a Záhřebě” [Opening of Health Institutions and School Hygiene in Budapest and Zagreb]. *Praktický lékař* 7, no. 21 (May 11, 1927): 792–95.
- Pelc, Hynek. *Zdravotní a sociální přehled XIII. okresu velké Prahy : za účelem organisování vzorové práce zdravotní a sociální v tomto okresu* [Health and Social Overview of the 13th District of Greater Prague: For the Purpose of Organizing Exemplary Health and Social Work in this District]. Prague: Nákladem vlastním, 1927.
- Pelc, Hynek. “O možnostech zdokonaliti lidský rod úpravou životního prostředí cestou sociálního lékařství” [On the Possibilities of Improving the Human Race through Environmental Modification via Social Medicine]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 89–101. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Pelc, Hynek. *Sociální lékařství* [Social Medicine]. Prague: Melantrich, 1937.
- Pestotnik, Pavel. “Telesna vzgoja žen - društvena organizacija za ženstvo” [Women’s Physical Education - Social Organization for Women]. *Sokolski vestnik: Glasilo žup Ljubljana I, Idrijske in Novomeške* 3, no. 3 (October 1912): 81–89, 133–137.
- Pět let Českého srdce, 1917-1922* [Five Years of the Czech Heart, 1917-1922]. Prague: České srdce, 1922.
- Piasecki, Eugeniusz Witold. *O zawodzie wychowawcy fizycznego : odczyt z cyklu wykładów “O wyborze zawodu”, urządzanych dla maturzystów szkół średnich przez Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne* [On the Profession of a Physical Educator: A Lecture from the Series ‘On the Choice of Profession,’ Arranged for High School Graduates by the Polish Eugenics Society]. Biblioteka Eugeniczna Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego 16. Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne, 1927.

- Piasecki, Eugeniusz Witold. "Lekarze w sokolstwie polskiem (1867-1932)" [Doctors in the Polish Sokół, 1867-1932]. *Věstník českých lékařů* 44, no. 27–28 (July 1, 1932): 709–14.
- Pirc, Ivo. *Asanacija Lukovice: Spomenica ob otvoritvi zdravstvenskega doma v Lukovici* [Sanitation of Lukovica: Commemoration of the Opening of the Health Center in Lukovica]. Ljubljana: Državni higijenski zavod, 1926.
- Pirquet, Clemens Freiherr von. "Richtlinien der Volksernährung." In *II. Deutsch-Österreichische Tagung für Volkswohlfahrt am 15. u. 16. April 1917*, 8–17. Vienna: Deuticke, 1917.
- Pirquet, Clemens Freiherr von. *System der Ernährung*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Springer, 1917.
- Pirquet, Clemens Freiherr von. "Ergebnisse der Ernährung nach einem neuen System." In *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, edited by Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner, 128-138. Jena: Fischer, 1918.
- Pirquet, Clemens Freiherr von. "Ernährungszustand der Kinder in Österreich während des Krieges und der Nachkriegszeit." In *Volksgesundheit im Krieg*, edited by Clemens Freiherr von Pirquet, 1:151–79. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1926.
- Ploetz, Alfred. "Darwinismus und Rassenhygiene." *Der Abtinent* 8, no. 3 (March 1, 1909): 1–4.
- Pöch, Georg. "Mustergesundheitsfürsorge in der Freistadt und im Bezirk Eisenstadt." *Volksgesundheit: Zeitschrift für soziale Hygiene* 5, no. 11–12 (1931): 171–173.
- Pöch, Georg. "Volksgesundheit I." *Burgenländische Lehrerzeitung* 12, no. 9 (September 1933): 38–39.
- Pöch, Georg. "Gesundheitsdienst im Lande." *Mitteilungen der Unterabteilung Gesundheitswesen im Ministerium für innere und kulturelle Angelegenheiten* 1, no. 4 (April 1939): 28–32.
- Pöch, Rudolf. "Die Pest." In *Handbuch der Tropenkrankheiten*, by Carl Mense, 391–433. Leipzig: Barth, 1905.
- Pöch, Rudolf. "Rassenhygienische und ärztliche Beobachtungen aus Neu-Guinea." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 5, no. 1 (1908): 46–66.
- Pöch, Rudolf. "I. Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k. u. k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien." *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 45 (1915): 219–35.
- Pöch, Rudolf. "IV. Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k. u. k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien." *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 48 (June 1, 1918): 146–61.
- Pöch, Rudolf. "Neue anthropologische Fragestellungen." *Mittheilungen der kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft* 62, no. 5 (1919): 193–210.

Popa, Atanasie. “Șoimii Carpaților” [Carpathian Falcons]. *Boabe de Grâu* 1, no. 6 (1930): 339–46.

Problems in Eugenics: Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress Held at the University of London, July 24th to 30th, 1912. Vol. 2. London: The Eugenics Education Society, 1912.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop. *Zdravotnictví velké Prahy: Popis, úkoly a návrh organisace* [Healthcare in Greater Prague: Description, Tasks, and Proposal for Organization]. Prague: Rockefellerova nadace, 1922.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop. “Zrušíme-li ministerstvo zdravotnictví, nezapomínejme na jeho úkoly!” [If We Abolish the Ministry of Health, Let Us not Forget its Tasks!]. *Přítomnost* 2, no. 50 (December 24, 1925): 786–87.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop. “Otcové a děti a pražské problémy” [Fathers and Children and Prague’s Issues]. *Přítomnost* 3, no. 4 (February 4, 1926): 59–60.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop. “Právo na život” [Right to Life]. *Přítomnost* 3, no. 24 (June 24, 1926): 377–79.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop, ed. *Zpráva o zdravotních poměrech hlavního města Prahy v letech 1910-1925* [Report on the Health Conditions of the Capital City of Prague in the Years 1910-1925]. Prague: Nákladem Obce hlavního města Prahy, 1928.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop. *Cestou za zdravím* [On the Way to Health]. Prague: Lékařské knihkupectví a nakladatelství Mladé generace lékařů, 1931.

Procházka, Ladislav Prokop. “Zdravotnictví a sociální politika” [Healthcare and Social Policy]. In *Zdravotnictví a sociální politika* [Healthcare and Social Policy], 5–10. Prague: Sociální ústav ČSR, 1934.

Proschek, Josef. *Proškův systém: cvičný systém koordinovaných skupin svalových, S úvodem c. k. vrchního zdravotního rady Prof. Dr. Ferdinanda Hueppa* [Prošek’s System: An Exercise System of Coordinated Muscle Groups. With an introduction by the k. und k. Supreme Health Counsellor Prof. Dr. Ferdinand Hueppe]. Prague: Kočí, 1907.

Prvý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 27., 28. a 29. června 1909 v Praze [The First Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on June 27, 28, and 29, 1909, in Prague]. Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1909.

Przibram, Hans. “Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt in Wien: Zweck, Einrichtung und Tätigkeit während der ersten fünf Jahre ihres Bestandes (1902-1907), Bericht der zoologischen, botanischen und physikalisch-chemischen Abteilung.” *Zeitschrift für biologische Technik und Methodik* 1 (September 1908): 1–34, 234–64, 329–62, 409–33.

Przibram, Hans. “Die Biologische Versuchsanstalt in Wien: Ausgestaltung und Tätigkeit während des zweiten Quinquenniums (1908-1912), Bericht der zoologischen, botanischen und physikalisch-chemischen Abteilung.” *Zeitschrift für biologische Technik und Methodik* 3 (1913): 163–245.

Ranschburg, Pál. “Leicht Schwachsinnige als Zeugen.” *Eos* 3, no. 2 (April 1907): 81–101.

- Ranschburg, Pál. *Az emberi elme* [The Human Mind]. Budapest: A Pantheon irodalmi intézet, 1923.
- Rasuhin, Josip. “Da li liječnički stalež može danas snositi odgovornost za narodno zdravlje” [Can Today’s Medical Profession Bear Responsibility for Public Health?]. *Liječnički vjesnik* 58, no. 10 (October 1936): 444–46.
- Rasuhin, Josip. “Selo Visoko: Socijalno-medicinska anketa” [Village Visoko: Social-Medical Survey]. *Liječnički vjesnik* 1, no. 6 (June 1939): 70–79.
- Reibmayr, Albert. “Über den Einfluss der Inzucht und Vermischung auf den politischen Charakter einer Bevölkerung.” *Politisch-anthropologische Revue* 1, no. 1 (1902): 21–37.
- Reibmayr, Albert. “Die wichtigsten biologischen Ursachen der heutigen Landflucht.” *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 8, no. 3 (1911): 349–76.
- Reiner, Ernő. “Egészséges utódokat” [Healthy Offspring]. *A Gyermek - Diéta - Das Kind* 1, no. 3 (March 15, 1926): 74–75.
- Révész, Margit. “Az erkölcsi fogyatékosok orvosi védelme” [Medical Protection for People with Moral Disabilities]. *Magyar Gyógypedagógia* 15, no. 1–3 (1927): 44–55.
- Riedl, Franz. “Wann und wieso wird Schwachsinn zur erblichen Abartung? Besserungsaussichten hiefür.” In *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Band 3: Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*, 160–78. Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912.
- Rogers, A. C. Review of *The Kallikak Family*, by Henry H. Goddard. *Eos* 9, no. 3 (1913): 231–32.
- Römer-Teubner, Meta. “Frauenbewegung und Rassenhygiene: Eine Antwort und Rechenschaft.” *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 5, no. 16 (May 15, 1911): 507–11.
- Rösler, Gustav. *Über die nationale Bedeutung unserer Enthaltensamkeits-Bewegung: ein Vortrag*. Reichenberg: Selbstverlag, 1905.
- Rösler, Gustav. Review of *Mädchenerziehung und Rassenhygiene*, by Max von Gruber. *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 5, no. 3 (September 1, 1910): 47.
- Rösler, Gustav. *Zur Organisation der Deutschgesinnten in Österreich: ein Vortrag*. Reichenberg: Neudeutscher Kulturverlag, 1911.
- Rottenstein, Eugen. “Die Frage der Vermehrung und das Ein-Kind-System.” *A Gyermek - Diéta - Das Kind* 1, no. 1 (January 15, 1926): 18–19.
- Rüdin, Ernst, and Max von Gruber, eds. *Fortpflanzung, Vererbung, Rassenhygiene: Illustrierter Führer durch die Gruppe Rassenhygiene der Internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung 1911 in Dresden*. Munich: Lehmann, 1911.

- Růžička, Vladislav. “O konstituci, dědičnosti u člověka a významu mendelismu pro eugeniku” [On Constitution, Human Heredity, and the Importance of Mendelism for Eugenics]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 54, no. 17 (May 24, 1915): 525–27.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “Ministerstvo pro lidové zdravotnictví a sociální péči” [Ministry for Public Health and Social Care]. *Národ* 1, no. 13 (1917): 276–77.
- Růžička, Vladislav. *Dědičnost u člověka ve zdraví a nemoci* [Human Heredity in Health and Disease]. Prague: Otto, 1917.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “O národní konstituci” [On the National Constitution]. *Národní listy* 58, no. 100 (May 3, 1918): 1.
- Růžička, Vladislav. *Hlad: jeho vliv na organismus a děje životní* [Starvation: Its influence on the Organism and Life Processes]. Prague: Vilímek, 1918.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “Ústav pro národní eugeniku” [Institute for National Eugenics]. *Národ* 3, no. 2 (January 10, 1919): 17–18.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “Eugenické výzkumnictví” [Eugenic Experimentation]. *Budoucnost: Revue českého socialismu* 1, no. 6 (February 1919): 391–95.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “Československý ústav pro národní eugeniku” [Czechoslovak Institute for National Eugenics]. *Čas* 32, no. 305 (December 31, 1922): 1–2.
- Růžička, Vladislav. *Biologické základy eugeniky* [Biological Foundations of Eugenics]. Prague: Borový, 1923.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “Histerheza protoplazmy ta ii znachennia dlia zahalnoi biolohii” [Hysteresis of Protoplasm and Its Significance for General Biology]. *Ukrainskii medichnyi vistnyk*, no. 3–4 (December 1924): 11–34.
- Růžička, Vladislav, ed. *Memorial-Volume in Honor of the 100th Birthday [sic!] of J. G. Mendel*. Eugenická knihovna 3. Prague: Borový, 1925.
- Růžička, Vladislav. “Zlepšení stavu národa plemennou hygienou či eugenikou” [Improving the State of the Nation through Race Hygiene or through Eugenics?]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 75–88. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Saleeby, Caleb W. “The Methods of Eugenics.” *The Sociological Review* a3, no. 4 (October 1910): 277–86.
- Samec, Maks. *Program in navodila: II. vseslovanski pedološki kongres Ljubljana* [Program and Instructions: II. All-Slavic Pedological Congress in Ljubljana]. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna, 1937.
- Sand, René. “Health Centres in Europe.” *League of Red Cross Societies Monthly Bulletin* 16, no. 12 (December 1935): 219–21.

Sand, René, Albert Govaerts, Ladislav Haškovec, M. A. van Herwerden, Louis Forest, Lucien March, Maurice Letulle, et al. *L'examen médical en vue du mariage*. Paris: Flammarion, 1927.

Satzungen des Vereines Wiener Kinder aufs Land. Vienna: Karl Gorischek, 1917.

Schebesta, Paul, and Viktor Lebzelter. *Anthropology of the Central African Pygmies in the Belgian Congo*. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1933.

Schebesta, Paul. "Meine zweite Forschungsexpedition zu den Ituri-Pygmäen." *Anthropos* 30, no. 5–6 (December 1935): 825–29.

Schebesta, Paul. *Die Bambuti-Pygmäen vom Ituri: Geschichte, Geographie, Umwelt, Demographie und Anthropologie der Ituri-Bambuti (Belgisch Kongo)*. Vol. 1. Brussels: Librairie Falk fils, 1938.

Scheyer, Moriz. "Das Zweimonateparadies." *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 50, no. 180 (July 1, 1916): 3–4.

Schiner, Hans. "Der Stand der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Österreich." In *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Band 3: Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*, 28–32. Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912.

Schmidt, Wilhelm. "Die Stellung der Pygmäen in der Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit." *Anthropos* 31, no. 5–6 (December 1936): 934–35.

Schneider, Jan, and Josef Groh, eds. *Dvacet let Českého srdce 1917-1937: jubilejní památník jeho národní a humanní činnosti* [Twenty Years of the Czech Heart, 1917-1937: Jubilee Memorial of Its National and Humane Activities]. Prague: České srdce, 1937.

Schneiderová, Marie. "Lékař a inženýr asanují vesnici v Jugoslávii" [Doctor and Engineer Sanitize a Village in Yugoslavia]. *Věstník českých lékařů* 45, no. 21 (May 26, 1933): 609–11.

Schuler, Dezső. *Hatósági és társadalmi embervédelem Budapesten* [Official and Social Human Protection in Budapest]. Vol. 1-2. Budapest: Budapest Székesfőváros Statisztikai Hivatala, 1937.

Schwarzwald, Eugenie. "Mehr Luft!" *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 50, no. 202 (July 23, 1916): 13.

Schwarzwald, Eugenie. "Wiener Kinder aufs Land!" *Die Zeit* 15, no. 4978 (August 3, 1916): 5.

Sedláček, František. "Das Hilfeschulwesen in Prag." *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* 2, no. 1 (January 1911): 16–20.

Sekla, Bohumil. "Az eugenikus sterilizációs törvények I" [The Eugenic Sterilisation Laws I]. *Therapia* 13, no. 8 (April 11, 1934): 177–81.

Sekla, Bohumil. "Az eugenikus sterilizációs törvények II" [The Eugenic Sterilisation Laws II]. *Therapia* 13, no. 9 (May 1, 1934): 199–204.

- Sekla, Bohumil. "Die eugenische Sterilisation in der Gesetzgebung." *Grenzbote: Deutsches Tagblatt für die Karpathenländer* 64, no. 158 (June 13, 1934): 5.
- Sekla, Bohumil. "Eugenické sterilizační zákony" [Eugenic Sterilisation Laws]. *Praktický lékař* 14, no. 2 (January 20, 1934): 5–9, 46–49.
- Sekla, Bohumil. "Differentielle Fortpflanzung in der Tschechoslowakei." In *Bevölkerungsfragen: Bericht des Internationalen Kongresses für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Berlin, 26. August-1. September 1935*, edited by Hans Harmsen and Franz Lohse, 530–34. Munich: Lehmann, 1936.
- Sekla, Bohumil. "Funkce eugenického poradenství" [Functions of Eugenic Counseling]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 76, no. 22 (June 22, 1937): 919–20.
- Sekla, Bohumil. Review of *Der Aufstieg des Arbeiters durch Rasse und Meisterschaft*, by Karl Valentin Müller. *Evgenika* 3, no. 2 (May 1937): 31.
- Sellner, Konrad. "Benennung und Einteilung von Schwachsinnigen unter Anwendung der Binet'schen Tests." In *Das schwachsinnige Kind im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Band 3: Bericht der fünften österreichischen Konferenz der Schwachsinnigenfürsorge in Brünn am 1. und 2. April 1912*, 66–73. Vienna: Verein Fürsorge für Schwachsinnige und Epileptische, 1912.
- Semerád, Jan. "Organizacija zdravstvene službe u čehoslov. republici/Nacrt djelokruga čehoslov. ministarstva zdravlja" [Organization of Health Services in Czechoslovak Republic/Draft Scope of Czechoslovak Ministry of Health]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 1–2 (September 1919): 33–35.
- Šeracký, František. *Comptes rendus, publiés par le Comité national d'organisation: VIIIe conférence internationale de psychotechnique*. Prague: Orbis, 1935.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Zur sächsischen Hygiene IV." *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt* 28, no. 8274 (March 3, 1901): 1.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Zur sächsischen Hygiene V." *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt* 28, no. 8276 (March 8, 1901): 1.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Dr. Gustav Rösler: Neue Wege deutscher Volkspolitik." *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 6, no. 1 (1907): 15–16.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Der Rückkehr zur Scholle." *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 5, no. 7 (1907): 97–101.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Der sächsische Lebensraum und die Bedingungen seiner Ausgestaltung." *Volksgesundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 7, no. 3 (March 1908): 33–37.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Der Kampf gegen den Alkoholismus als Mittel der Volkserhaltung." *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt* 35, no. 10473 (June 12, 1908): 4–5.

- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Grundbesitzwechsel der Jahre 1907, 08 und 09 in 27 sächsischen Orten." *Volksgeundheit: Gemeinverständliche Monatsschrift für deutsch-ungarische Kulturpolitik* 8, no. 3 (1910): 32–38.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Vernichtung und Verdrängung im Lebenskampf des sächsischen Volkes." *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 6, no. 6 (December 15, 1912): 167–82.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Ist die alkoholfreie Zukunft des sächsischen Volkes möglich?" *Mitteilungen der Grossloge Ungarns des Internationalen Guttemplerordens (I.O.G.T.) und des Alkohol Enthaltensamkeits-Vereins (A.E.V.)* 2, no. 1 (January 20, 1913): 1–2.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Sächsische Volksvermehrung und Frauenbewegung." *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 7, no. 17 (September 1, 1913): 731–35.
- Siegmund, Heinrich. "Über Rassenreinheit und Wert einer guten Abstammung." In *Sächsisches Wehr- und Mehrbuch: Ein Volksbuch*, by Heinrich Siegmund, Michael Englisch, and Rudolf Schuster, 74–78. Mediasch: Selbstverlag, 1914.
- Silberstein, Desider. "Zdravotné pomery detí v Petržalke" [Health Conditions of Children in Petržalka]. *A Gyermek - Diéta - Das Kind* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1926): 105–8.
- Šimsa, Jan. "Alkoholismus a jeho vliv na slabomyslnost mládeže" [Alcoholism and its Influence on the Feeble-mindedness of Youth]. In *Prvý český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné dne 27., 28. a 29. června 1909 v Praze* [The First Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on June 27, 28, and 29, 1909, in Prague], 113–17. Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1909.
- Sittenberger, Anna, Josef Wastl, and Viktor Lebzelter. "Rassenkundliche Untersuchungen an Deutschen und Tschechen im südlichsten Böhmerwald (Quellgebiet der Moldau)." *Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien* 52 (1941): 397–457.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Kako naj razumemo dinarsko raso?" [How Should We Understand the Dinaric Race?]. *Geografski vestnik* 4, no. 1–4 (1928): 34–55.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Sredstva negativne evgenike" [The Means of Negative Eugenics]. *Zdravniški vestnik* 9, no. 6 (September 30, 1934): 497–504.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Laž rasizma?" [The Lie of Racism?]. *Jutro* 15, no. 234 (October 11, 1934): 7–8.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Die Rassen Zentraleuropas: Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Forschung. III. In Jugoslavien." *Prager Presse* 14, no. 330 (December 2, 1934): 4.
- Škerlj, Božo. "In vendar demagogija!" [And yet it is Demagogy!]. *Jutro* 15, no. 280 (December 6, 1934): 3–4.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Prof. Růžička in Weigner o evgeniki" [Prof. Růžička and Weigner on Eugenics]. *Zdravniški vestnik* 6, no. 12 (December 31, 1934): 650–53.
- Škerlj, Božo. *Človek* [The Human]. Ljubljana: Merkur, 1934.

- Škerlj, Božo. "O enakovrednosti evropskih ras" [On the Equivalence of European Races]. *Jutro* 16, no. 1 (January 1, 1935): 12.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Čemu telesni uzgoj?" [What is Physical Education For]. *Soko: List prednjaštva Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije* 6, no. 3 (March 15, 1935): 69–70.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Telovadba in človeško telo: Prinos k problemu III" [Gymnastics and the Human Body: A Contribution to the Problem III]. *Zdravniški vestnik* 7, no. 5 (May 31, 1935): 209–14.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Rasni tipi Slovencev" [Racial Types of Slovenians]. *Evgenika* 1, no. 3 (August 1935): 33–37.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Moj studijski boravak u C.I.W.F." [My Study Stay at the C.I.W.F.]. *Soko: List prednjaštva Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije* 6, no. 11 (November 15, 1935): 327–29.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Menstruationszyklen und Leibesübungen." *Archiv für Gynäkologie* 162 (1936): 516–37.
- Škerlj, Božo. *Menschlicher Körper und Leibesübungen*. Prace Antropologiczne Instytutu Nauk Antropologicznych i Etnologicznych Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego 2. Warsaw: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie, 1936.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Československá společnost biotypologická ve Zlíně" [Czechoslovak Society of Biotypology in Zlín]. *Zdravniški vestnik* 10, no. 1 (January 1938): 38.
- Škerlj, Božo. "Die Körperformtypen des Weibes." *Acta neerlandica morphologiae, normalis et pathologicae* 2, no. 1 (1938): 20–46.
- Škerlj, Božo. *O človeških rasah in o rasizmu* [On Human Races and Racism]. Ljubljana: Slovenski knjižni zavod, 1949.
- Skiz. "Méhely, a kormány fajbiológusa" [Méhely, The Government's Racial Biologist]. *Panoráma: képes hetilap* 2, no. 25 (1922): 10–11.
- Škrach, Vasil. "Abstinenzbewegung an den tschechischen Hochschulen und über die Teilnahme der Mittelschulen an der Antialkoholbewegung." In *Bericht über den 2. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Graz am 8. und 9. October 1911*, by Friedrich I. Neumann, 72–74. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1912.
- Sociálně-lékařský sjezd, pořádaný Podkarpatskou župou Ú.J.Č.L. v Mukačevě [Podkarpatská Rus] ve dnech 4.-7. června 1922 pod protektorátem guvernéra Podkarpatské Rusi dle usnes. valné hromady lékař. župy Ú. J.Č.L. pro Podkarpatskou Rus, dne 2. února 1922* [Social-Medical Congress, organized by the Subcarpathian County of the Central Union of Czechoslovak Physicians District in Mukachevo, Subcarpathian Ruthenia, from June 4 to June 7, 1922, under the Protectorate of the Governor of Subcarpathian Ruthenia According to the Resolution of the General Assembly of the Medical County on February 2, 1922]. [Mukachevo]: Ú.J.Č.L. Župa podkarpatská, 1922.
- Sociálně-lékařský sjezd pořádaný Podkarpatskou (XXXIII) župou Ú.J.Čs.L. ve dnech 4. až 7. června 1922 v Mukačevě* [Social-Medical Congress organized by the Subcarpathian

(XXXIII) County of the Czechoslovak Red Cross on June 4-7, 1922, in Mukachevo]. Mukachevo: vlastním nákladem, 1923.

Spina, Franz. “Über deutsch-tschechische Kulturbeziehungen.” *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* 1, no. 3 (September 1, 1911): 65–70.

Spina, Franz. “Aus der Welt der Slawen III: Das tschechische Problem.” *Deutsche Arbeit* 17, no. 2 (1917): 61–66.

Štampar, Andrija. “Kako ćemo očuvati narodno zdravlje?” [How Will we Preserve Public Health?]. *Hrvatska njiva* 2, no. 28 (July 15, 1918): 481–83.

Štampar, Andrija. “Primjetbe k osnovi zakona o čuvanju narodnog zdravlja” [Remarks on the Draft Law on Public Health]. *Liječnički vjesnik* 41, no. 8 (August 15, 1919): 424–29.

Štampar, Andrija. “Ministarstvo narodnog zdravlja” [Ministry of Public Health]. In *Srpsko kolo: kalendar za prestupnu godinu 1920* [Serb Circle: Calendar for the Leap Year 1920], 72–75. Zagreb: Ign. Granic, 1919.

Štampar, Andrija. “O socijalnoj medicini” [On Social Medicine]. *Glasnik Ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 4, no. 1 (1923): 1–12.

Štampar, Andrija. “Naša ideologija” [Our Ideology]. *Nova Evropa* 18, no. 8 (October 1928): 229–31.

Štampar, Andrija. “Rokfelerova fondacija” [Rockefeller Foundation]. *Politika* 25, no. 7365 (October 31, 1928): 8.

Štampar, Andrija. “Soziale Medizin und die Gemeindeärzte.” *Orvosképzés* 23, no. 1 (January 1933): 195–210.

Štampar, Andrija. “Sociální lékařství a praktičtí lékaři” [Social Medicine and General Practitioners]. *Věstník českých lékařů* 45, no. 6 (February 10, 1933): 153–54.

Štampar, Andrija. “Jugoslavie a zdravotnické zvelebení venkova” [Yugoslavia and Rural Health Improvement]. *Věstník českých lékařů* 45, no. 8 (February 24, 1933): 207–8.

Štampar, Andrija. “Socijalna medicina i praktični liječnici” [Social Medicine and General Practitioners]. *Staleški glasnik: prilog Liječničkog vjesnika* 55, no. 3 (March 1933): 72–73.

Štampar, Andrija. “Observations of a Rural Health Worker.” *New England Journal of Medicine* 218, no. 24 (June 16, 1938): 991–97.

Štampar, Andrija. *Public Health in Yugoslavia*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1938.

Statut Towarzystwa Zupelnej Wstrzemięźliwości od Napojów Alkoholowych “Eleuterya”: zatwierdzony reskryptem c.k. Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnętrznych z dnia 13 stycznia 1906 r. L. 58475/05 [By-Laws of the Eleuterya, Society of Complete Abstinence from Alcoholic Beverages: Approved by the Rescript of the Imperial and Royal Ministry of

Internal Affairs from January 13, 1906, L. 58475/05]. Kraków: Towarzystwo Zupełnej Wstrzemięźliwości od Napojów Alkoholowych “Eleuterya,” 1906.

Stein, Fülöp. *Dixième Congrès international contre l'alcoolisme, tenu à Budapest du 11 au 16 septembre 1905*. Budapest: Frédéric Kilián successeur, 1906.

Stodola, Ivan. “Dojmy z cesty po Juhoslávii” [Impressions from a Trip to Yugoslavia]. *Boj o zdravie: ľudový zdravotnícky časopis Masarykovej ligy proti tuberkulóze na Slovensku* 5, no. 9–10 (1930): 130–36.

Stojanowski, Karol. “Typy sprawności fizycznej a typy rasowe” [Types of Physical Fitness and Racial Types]. *Wychowanie Fizyczne* 8, no. 11 (November 1927): 265–66.

Stojanowski, Karol. “Skład rasowy studentek i studentów Studium W. F. Uniw. Pozn.” [Racial Composition of Female and Male Students of Physical Education at the University of Poznań]. *Wychowanie Fizyczne* 12, no. 2 (February 1931): 49–56.

Stransky, Erwin. “Krieg und Bevölkerung: Erweiterte Diskussionsbemerkungen zum gleichnamigen Vortrage des Herrn Prof. Dr. J. Tandler.” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 29, no. 18 (May 4, 1916): 555–58.

Studencki, Stanisław Mateusz. “O typie psycho-fizycznym Polaka: przyczynek do charakterystyki psychologicznej typów antropologicznych wśród młodzieży polskiej” [On the Pole and His Psycho-Physical Type: A Contribution to the Psychological Characteristics of Anthropological Types among Polish Youth]. *Kwartalnik Psychologiczny* 2, no. 1–2 (1931): 55–91.

Studencki, Stanisław Mateusz. “Praca psychologiczna w szkolnictwie zawodowym” [Psychological Work in Vocational Education]. *Psychotechnika* 2, no. 8 (October 1, 1928): 1–19.

Suk, Vojtěch. “Chrup školní mládeže pražské s hlediska antropologického” [The Dentition of School Youth in Prague from an Anthropological Perspective]. *Lékařské rozhledy* 5, no. 3 (1916): 97–112.

Suk, Vojtěch. “Eruption and Decay of Permanent Teeth in Whites and Negroes, with Comparative Remarks on Other Races.” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 2, no. 4 (October 1919): 351–88.

Suk, Vojtěch. “Příspěvky k anthropologii podkarpatských Huculů” [Contributions to the Anthropology of Subcarpathian Hutsuls]. *Národopisný věstník československý* 15, no. 1 (1922): 32–43.

Suk, Vojtěch. “Příspěvky ke studiu skupin krevních v Československu” [Contributions to the Study of Blood Groups in Czechoslovakia]. *Biologické listy* 17, no. 1 (1932): 13–20.

Suk, Vojtěch. *Anthropologie Podkarpatské Rusi s některými poznámkami o lidských plemelech vůbec a metodách anthropologických* [Anthropology of Subcarpathian Ruthenia with Some Notes on Human Races in General and Anthropological Methods]. Brno: Přírodovědecká fakulta, 1932.

Svobodová, Růžena. “Nedejme zahynouti” [Let us Not Perish]. *Lípa* 1, no. 2 (1917): 29–30.

- Swoboda, Frank. "Hygiene hilft der Landwirtschaft in Jugoslawien." *Deutsche Landpost: Tagblatt der deutschen Landpartei "Bund der Landwirte,"* 1932.
- Sz., N. "Evolúció-revolúció" [Evolution-Revolution]. *Új világ* 1, no. 2 (1920): 15–16.
- Szekeres, János. *A szellemi és a fizikai munka válsága Magyarországon* [The Crisis of Intellectual and Physical Labor in Hungary]. Budapest: Pesti Nyomda, 1921.
- Szende, István. "Szexuális kongresszusok" [Sexual Congresses]. *Korunk* 5, no. 11 (November 1930): 810–14.
- Szende, Pál. "Rudolf Goldscheid (1870—1931)." *Századunk* 7, no. 1 (1932): 18–20.
- Szondi, Lipót. "A konstitúciós elmélet fontossága a speciális oktatás tanárképzésében" [The Importance of Constitutional Theory in the Training of Special Educators]. *Magyar Gyógypedagógia* 18, no. 9–10 (1930): 134–40.
- Szterényi, József. *Egy szociális mintaintézmény: A fóti Népjóléti központ* [A Social Model Institution: The Welfare Center of Fót]. Budapest: Pfeifer, 1918.
- T., review of *Die Gleichwertigkeit*, *The Eugenics Review* 27, no. 2 (July 1935): 161.
- Tandler, Julius. "Konstitution und Rassenhygiene." *Zeitschrift für angewandte Anatomie und Konstitutionslehre* 1, no. 1 (1914): 11–26.
- Tandler, Julius. "Krieg und Bevölkerung." *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* 29, no. 15 (April 13, 1916): 445–52.
- Tandler, Julius. "Volksgesundheit und Volkswohlfahrt." *Arbeiterzeitung* 29, no. 152 (June 5, 1917): 1–2.
- Tandler, Julius. "Bevölkerungspolitische Probleme und Ziele." In *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, edited by Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner, 95–110. Jena: Fischer, 1918.
- Tandler, Julius. "Probleme der Bevölkerungspolitik." *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungspolitik* 1, no. 1 (July 1918): 15–18.
- Tandler, Julius. "Ehe und Bevölkerungspolitik III." *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 74, no. 6 (February 2, 1924): 305–9.
- Tandler, Julius. *Ehe und Bevölkerungspolitik*. Vienna: Perles, 1924.
- Tandler, Julius. "Gefahren der Minderwertigkeit." *Das Wiener Jugendhilfswerk* 5 (1928): 3–22.
- Tansegédlet leventék egészségügyi kiképzéséhez* [Study Guide for the Health Training of Levente]. Homok: Csernai Nyomda, 1937.

- Tauffer, Vilmos. "Die Säuglingssterblichkeit und ihre Bekämpfung in Ungarn." In *Der Wiederaufbau der Volkskraft nach dem Kriege: Sitzungsbericht über die gemeinsame Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Österreichs, Ungarns und Deutschlands in Berlin 23. bis 26. Januar 1918*, edited by Martin Kirchner, Curt Adam, and Adam Kirchner, 111–19. Jena: Fischer, 1918.
- Teleki, Pál. *Szociálpolitika és hadigondozás* [Social Policy and Military Welfare]. Budapest: Országos Hadigondozó Hivatal, 1918.
- Teutsch, Grete. "Dr. H. Siegmund und die Frauenbewegung." *Die Karpathen: Halbmonatsschrift für Kultur und Leben* 7, no. 20 (October 15, 1913): 40–42.
- Thenen, Josef. "Organisation der Kur- und Bäderfürsorge für Kriegsinvalide in Österreich." In *Verhandlungen der Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Deutschlands, Ungarns und Österreichs. Baden bei Wien vom 11. bis 13. Oktober 1917*, 45–50. Vienna: Perles, 1918.
- Thurnwald, Richard. "Reiseeindrücke aus Norwegen." *Der Abstinenz* 2, no. 1 (January 1, 1903): 3–4.
- Tichý, František. "Tělesná cvičení žen" [Physical Exercises for Women]. *Zdravotní hlídka Věstníku sokolského* 3, no. 2 (1911): 9–10.
- Tietze, Felix. "Eugenics in Austria." *The Eugenics Review* 26, no. 4 (1935): 260–61.
- Tolar, Vojtěch. "O významu konstituce pro posouzení biologického zdraví populace" [On the Importance of Constitution in Assessing the Biological Health of the Population]. *Styk: Časopis věnovaný společným zájmům lékařů, veterinářů, lékárníků a přírodovědců* 1, no. 11–12 (May 1935): 14–15.
- Tolar, Vojtěch. "Posuzování zdravotního stavu a tělesné konstituce ve zjišťovací a vyšetřovací akci Baťovy nemocnice ve Zlíně" [Assessment of Health Status and Physical Constitution in the Detection and Examination Action of the Baťa Hospital in Zlín]. *Zdravotnická ročenka československá* 7 (1935): 258–61.
- Tolar, Vojtěch. "Lékařské prohlídky zdravých" [Medical Examinations of Healthy People]. *Zdravotnická revue* 18, no. 10 (October 1936): 166–67.
- Tolar, Vojtěch. "Základy zdravotní péče o zaměstnance" [Basics of Employee Health Care]. *Zlín* 20, no. 35 (September 10, 1937): 4.
- Toman, Prokop. "Die Schwachsinnigen vom Standpunkte des Zivilrechts." *Heilpädagogische Schul- und Elternzeitung* 2, no. 10 (October 1911): 181–86.
- Totis, Béla. "Rassenreine Sterne." *Internationales ärztliches Bulletin* 1, no. 5 (May 1934): 75–79.
- Tramer, Ervín. "Die Vererbung." *A Gyermek - Diet'a - Das Kind* 1, no. 5 (May 15, 1926): 108–11.
- Trbojević, Mane. "Statistika lekara u Jugoslaviji" [Statistics of Doctors in Yugoslavia]. *Glasnik ministarstva narodnog zdravlja* 1, no. 4 (December 1919): 142–45.

- Třetí český sjezd pro péči o slabomyslné a školství pomocné 5. a 6. října 1913 v Polské Ostravě* [The Third Czech Congress for the Care of the Mentally Disabled and Special Education on October 5 and 6, 1913, in Polská Ostrava]. Prague: Sjezdový výbor, 1914.
- Tuma, von Waldkampf Marianne. “Regeneration und Frauenbewegung.” *Neues Leben: Organ des Neudeutschen Kulturbundes in Österreich* 5, no. 3 (September 1, 1910): 38–39.
- Tuma, von Waldkampf Marianne. “Die nationale Bedeutung des Mutterschutzes.” *Deutsche soziale Rundschau* 1, no. 19 (April 15, 1912): 650–53.
- Tuscherer, Jakub. *Die kranke Medizin: Ausweg aus der heutigen Krise*. Bratislava: Bleier, 1931.
- Tuszkai, Ödön. “Embergazdaság” [Human Economy]. *Új Magyar Szemle* 2, no. 3 (1921): 305–13.
- Tuszkai, Ödön. “A pályaválasztási vizsgálatok szociálhigiénés fontossága” [The Social Hygienic Importance of Career Choice Tests]. In *A pályaválasztás: Tanulmányok* [Choosing a Career: Studies], edited by László Nagy, 8–13. Budapest: Magyar Gyermektanulmányi Társaság, 1924.
- Tuszkai, Ödön. “Menschenökonomie: Die öffentliche Hygiene auf volkswirtschaftlicher Grundlage.” *Archiv für soziale Hygiene und Demographie* 15 (1924): 1–12.
- Tuszkai, Ödön. “Helytelen nevelés orvosi szempontból” [Incorrect Upbringing from a Medical Point of View]. *A Gyermek* 19, no. 01–04 (1926): 37–47.
- Tuszkai, Ödön. “Testalkotás és jellem” [Constitution and Character]. *A Gyermek* 20, no. 04–07 (1927): 65–80.
- Ude, Johannes. “Der katholische Priester und das Problem der Aufklärung der Jugend über die Antialkoholbewegung.” In *Bericht über den 2. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Graz am 8. und 9. October 1911*, by Friedrich I. Neumann, 92–97. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1912.
- Ude, Johannes. “Über Trinkerfürsorge vom katholische Standpunkte aus.” In *Bericht über den 3. österreichischen Alkoholgegnertag abgehalten in Salzburg am 22. und 23. September 1912*, by Friedrich I. Neumann, 48–53. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1914.
- Ude, Johannes. “Akarsz egészséges lenni?” [Do You Want to be Healthy?]. *Életreform* 1, no. 2 (June 1932): 11–13.
- Ude, Johannes, Stanislav Růžička, and Hugo E. Feix. “Unsere Organisation.” *Internationale Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Lebensform* [sic!] 21, no. 5–6 (May 1930): 65–66.
- Uher, Jan, ed. *Pátý sjezd (první slovanský) pro výzkum dítěte v Brně 28.-31. října 1933* [The Fifth Congress (First Slavic) for Child Research in Brno, October 28-31, 1933]. Prague: Stálý výbor pro pořádání sjezdů pro výzkum dítěte, 1934.
- Ullmann, Hermann. “Ein vorbildliches Volksbuch aus dem nationalen Kampf.” *Deutsche Arbeit* 13, no. 12 (September 1914): 766.

- Vaida-Voevod, Alexandru. “Politica națională și capitalul biologic național” [National Politics and National Biological Capital]. *Gazeta Transilvaniei* 90, no. 51 (May 13, 1927): 1–2.
- Valný sjezd České obce sokolské pořádaný ve dnech 27. - 28. listopadu 1910* [General Assembly of the Czech Sokol Association held on November 27-28, 1910]. Prague: Česká obec sokolská, 1910.
- Valšík, Jindřich. “Případ stluštěných papilárních lišten na otisku středníku české cikánky” [A Case of Thickened Papillary Lines on the Middle Fingerprint of a Gypsy Woman from Bohemia]. *Sborník Klubu přírodovědeckého v Praze 1923–1924* (1924): 79–80.
- Valšík, Jindřich. “The Finger-Prints of Central African Pygmies, Negroes and Their Crossbreeds.” *Anthropologie* 16, no. 1–4 (1938): 84–100.
- Vámbéry, Rusztem. *Az élő múlt: Politikai téveszmék - társadalmi babonák* [The Living Past: Political Delusions - Social Superstitions]. Budapest: Pantheon, 1931.
- Vámbéry, Rusztem. “Töltsétek be a földet” [Fill the Earth]. In *Születésszabályozás* [Birth Control], edited by Totis Béla, 3–7. [Budapest]: Szociáldemokrata Párt, 1932.
- Váňa, Robert. “Vědecký podklad daktyloskopie jako prostředku pro zjišťování totožnosti osob I” [The Scientific Basis of Dactyloscopy as a Means of Establishing the Identity of Persons II]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 75, no. 50 (December 11, 1936): 1627–30.
- Váňa, Robert. “Vědecký podklad daktyloskopie jako prostředku pro zjišťování totožnosti osob II” [The Scientific Basis of Dactyloscopy as a Means of Establishing the Identity of Persons II] *Bezpečnostní služba: časopis pro úřady, sbory a orgány bezpečnostní v Československé republice* 7, no. 2–3 (1937): 39–44.
- Váňa, Robert, and Josef Mareš. “Cikáni v Československu, jejich historie a počet” [Gypsies in Czechoslovakia, their History and Numbers]. *Bezpečnostní služba: časopis pro úřady, sbory a orgány bezpečnostní v Československé republice* 5, no. 12 (December 1, 1935): 364–69.
- Váňa, Robert, and Oldřich Pinkas. “Biologie cikánů v republice Česko-Slovenské” [Biology of Gypsies in the Czech-Slovak Republic]. *Biologické listy* 23, no. 3–4 (1938): 184–98.
- Verhandlungen der Tagung der ärztlichen Abteilungen der Waffenbrüderlichen Vereinigungen Deutschlands, Ungarns und Österreichs. Baden bei Wien vom 11. bis 13. Oktober 1917.* Vienna: Perles, 1918.
- Vomela, Stanislav. *V srdci Makedonie* [In the Heart of Macedonia]. Holešov: nákladem vlastním, 1931.
- Vomela, Stanislav. “Karpatský masiv po stránce zdravotnické” [Carpathian Massif from the Medical Perspective]. *Věstník československých lékařů* 46, no. 31–32 (August 10, 1934): 868–70.
- Vraný, Václav. “Státní epidemická autokolona” [State Epidemic Motorized Dispensary]. *Věstník ministerstva veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy* 2, no. 11 (November 20, 1920): 265–67.

- Weigner, Karel. “Cíle a prostředky tělesné výchovy: Úvodní přednáška v 20. sekci pro tělesnou výchovu” [Goals and Means of Physical Education: Introductory Lecture in the 20th Section for Physical Education]. In *Otázka tělesné výchovy na V. sjezdu českých přírodopýtců a lékařů v Praze roku 1914* [The Question of Physical Education at the V. Congress of Czech Naturalists and Physicians in Prague in 1914], 5–17. Prague: Grégr, 1914.
- Weigner, Karel. *Tělesná výchova: Její význam a cesty* [Physical Education: Its Significance and Paths]. Prague: Vilímek, 1916.
- Weigner, Karel. “Tělesná výchova se zřením ke konstituci a pohlaví” [Physical Education with a Focus on Constitution and Sex]. *Rozpravy České akademie věd a umění* 38, no. 28 (1928): 1–10.
- Weigner, Karel. “Tělesná výchova a její národní význam” [Physical Education and Its National Importance]. In *Zdravím k síle národa: Výběr statí uveřejněných v letech 1911–1929* [Through Health to the Strength of the Nation: A Selection of Essays Published Between 1911 and 1929], 4–38. Prague: Česká obec sokolská, 1930.
- Weigner, Karel. “Tyrševa baština lékařima” [The Legacy of Tyrš to Physicians]. *Sokolski glasnik* 3, no. 44 (November 3, 1932): 1–2.
- Weigner, Karel, ed. *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement]. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Weigner, Karel. “Význam tělesné výchovy pro zlepšení rasy” [The Importance of Physical Education for the Improvement of Race]. In *Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování* [The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement], edited by Karel Weigner, 103–12. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1934.
- Weigner, Karel, ed. *Die Gleichwertigkeit der europäischen Rassen und die Wege zu ihrer Vervollkommnung*. Prague: Tschechische Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste, 1935.
- Weigner, Karel, ed. *L'Égalité des races européennes et les moyens de les améliorer*. Maastricht: Editions A.A.M. Stols, 1935.
- Weil, Edmund, and Arthur Felix. “Serologische Fleckfieberdiagnose.” *Feldärztliche Blätter der k.u.k. 2. Armee. Herausgegeben von der Salubritätskommission des 2. A. E. K.* 1, no. 5 (February 5, 1916): 1–2.
- Wiener, Josef. “Prohlídky před sňatkem a sňatková poradna čsl. eugenické společnosti” [Prenuptial Medical Examinations and Marriage Counseling of the Czechoslovak Eugenic Society]. *Časopis lékařů českých* 67, no. 39 (September 21, 1928): 1352–54.
- Willerowa, Olga. “Spostrzeżenia nad barwą oczów i skóry u Tatarów, Ormian, Gruzinów, Mołdawjan, Serbów i Macedończyków” [Observations on the Color of Eyes and Skin among Tatars, Armenians, Georgians, Moldovans, Serbs, and Macedonians]. *Przegląd Antropologiczny* 1, no. 1 (1926): 84–91.

- Wlassak, Rudolf, ed. *Bericht über den VIII. Internationalen Congress gegen den Alkoholismus abgehalten in Wien, 9.-14. April 1901*. Leipzig: Deuticke, 1902.
- Wroczyński, Czesław. *O zawodzie lekarza : z cyklu odczytów pod protektoratem Ministerstwa Oświecenia i Wyznań Religijnych 'O wyborze zawodu'* [On the Profession of a Physician: From a Series of Lectures Under the Protectorate of the Ministry of Education and Religious Denominations, 'On the Choice of Profession']. Biblioteka Eugeniczna Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego 9. Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Eugeniczne, 1928.
- Wrzosek, Adam, and Adolf Maciesza. "Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die Vererbung der durch Ischiadicusverletzung hervorgerufenen Brown-Séquardschen Meerschweinchen-Epilepsie: Erster Teil der experimentellen Untersuchungen über die Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 8, no. 1 (1911): 1–24.
- Wrzosek, Adam, and Adolf Maciesza. "Über die Entstehung, den Verlauf und die Vererbung der durch Rückenmarksverletzung hervorgerufenen Meerschweinchen- Epilepsie: Dritter Teil der experimentellen Untersuchungen über die Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 11, no. 3 (1914): 290–98.
- Zawirska, Jadwiga. "Poradnictwo Zawodowe i Psychotechnika w Wiedniu" [Vocational Guidance and Psychotechnics in Vienna]. *Psychotechnika* 3, no. 12 (1929): 9–21.
- Zawisch, Carla. "Was wir sein, was wir tun wollen." *St. Lukas: Mitteilungen der österreichischen St.-Lukas-Gilde* 1, no. 1 (January 1933): 2–4.
- Zelený, Dr B. Review of *Biologické základy eugeniky* [Biological Foundations of Eugenics], by Vladislav Růžička. *Národní listy* 63, no. 180 (July 3, 1923): 4.
- Zeman, Josef. "Die Fürsorge für abnorme Kinder in Böhmen." *Eos* 3, no. 3 (July 1907): 214–23.
- Zenkl, Petr. "Über die soziale Fürsorge der Stadt Prag: Ein Vortrag." *Blätter für das Wohlfahrtswesen der Stadt Wien* 29, no. 279 (June 1930): 105–18.
- Zenkl, Petr. "Městská sociální péče" [Municipal Social Welfare]. In *Praha v obnoveném státě československém* [Prague in the Restored Czechoslovak State], edited by Václav Vojtíšek, 421–54. Prague: Rada města, 1936.
- Zollschan, Ignaz. *Das Rassenproblem: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der theoretischen Grundlagen der jüdischen Rassenfrage*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1910.
- Zollschan, Ignaz. "Wissenschaft und Rassenfrage." *Prager Presse* 15, no. 26 (January 27, 1935): 3.
- Zolog, Mihai, Ioan Cosma, and Ioan Prodan. "Activitatea Plasei sanitare model Gilău pe anii 1931-1933" [Activity of the Gilău Model Sanitary District for the Years 1931-1933]. *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 5, no. 1–6 (January 1934): 1–128.

Zolog, Mihai, and Ioan Prodan. “Plasa sanitară model Gilău. Raport de activitate pe anii 1931-1936” [Gilău Model Sanitary District. Activity Report for the Years 1931-1936]. *Buletin eugenic și biopolitic* 8, no. 1–3 (January 1937): 3–42.

Secondary Sources

Ablonczy, Balázs. *A miniszterelnök élete és halála: Teleki Pál (1879-1941)* [The Life and Death of the Prime Minister: Pál Teleki, 1879-1941]. Budapest: Jaffa Kiadó, 2018.

Adams, Mark B. “Towards a Comparative History of Eugenics.” In *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil, and Russia*, edited by Mark B. Adams, 217–31. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Akami, Tomoko. “Imperial Politics, Intercolonialism, and the Shaping of Global Governing Norms: Public Health Expert Networks in Asia and the League of Nations Health Organization, 1908–37.” *Journal of Global History* 12, no. 1 (2017): 4–25.

Armitage, David. “What’s the Big Idea? Intellectual History and the *Longue Durée*.” *History of European Ideas* 38, no. 4 (2012): 493–507.

Ash, Mitchell G. “Wissenschaft und Politik als Ressourcen für einander.” In *Wissenschaften und Wissenschaftspolitik: Bestandaufnahmen zu Formationen, Brüchen und Kontinuitäten im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch and Brigitte Kaderas, 32–51. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002.

Au, Sokhieng, and Anne Cornet. “Medicine and Colonialism.” In *Medical Histories of Belgium*, edited by Joris Vandendriessche and Benoît Majerus, 99–133. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2021.

Avritzer, Leonardo. “Civil Society in Latin America: Uncivil, Liberal and Participatory Models.” In *Exploring Civil Society*, edited by Marlies Glasius, 53–60. London: Routledge, 2004.

Baader, Gerhard, Veronika Hofer, and Thomas Mayer, eds. *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900-1945*. Vienna: Czernin, 2007.

Baader, Gerhard. “Eugenische Programme in der sozialistischen Parteienlandschaft in Deutschland und Österreich im Vergleich.” In *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900-1945*, edited by Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer, and Thomas Mayer, 66–139. Vienna: Czernin, 2007.

Bajcsi, Ildikó. *Kisebbségi magyar küldetés Csehszlovákiában: A sarlós nemzedék közösségi szerepvállalása Trianon után* [The Hungarian Minority Mission in Czechoslovakia: The Community Engagement of the *Sarló* Generation after Trianon]. Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2021.

Bajohr, Frank. “Nationalist Mobilization: Foreign Diplomats’ Views on the Third Reich, 1933–1945.” In *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, edited by Devin Pendas,

- Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell, 362–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Baker, Catherine. *Race and the Yugoslav Region*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018.
- Balcarová, Jitka. “MUDr. Gustav Rösler a Neudeutscher Kulturbund in Österreich: ‘Pionýři’ rasové hygieny v českých zemích” [Dr. Gustav Rösler and the Neudeutscher Kulturbund in Austria: ‘Pioneers’ of Racial Hygiene in the Bohemian Lands]. *Historica* 7, no. 2 (2016): 142–55.
- Baldwin, Peter. *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Balikić, Lucija, and Vojtěch Pojar. “‘Politics of Plastic Nationhood’: Sokol Mass Gymnastics and Eugenics Between Empire and Nation-States.” *East Central Europe* 50, no. 2–3 (2023): 155–79.
- Baloun, Pavel. “Československá civilizační mise: asimilační praktiky vůči ‘cikánským’ dětem v letech 1918–1942” [Czechoslovak Civilizing Mission: Assimilation Practices Toward ‘Gypsy’ Children in the Years 1918–1942]. *Dějiny – teorie – kritika*, no. 2 (2018): 175–202.
- Baloun, Pavel. “*Metla našeho venkova!*”: *Kriminalizace Romů od první republiky až po prvotní fázi protektorátu, 1918-1941* [“The Scourge of the Countryside”: Criminalization of Roma between the First Republic and the first Phase of the German Protectorate, 1918-1941]. Dolní Břežany: Scriptorium, 2022.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.
- Baynton, Douglas. *Defectives in the Land: Disability and Immigration in the Age of Eugenics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- Becker, Peter, and Natasha Wheatley. “Introduction: Central Europe and the New International Order.” In *Remaking Central Europe: The League of Nations and the Former Habsburg Lands*, edited by Peter Becker and Natasha Wheatley, 1–15. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Becker, Peter. “The Administrative Apparatus under Reconstruction.” In *The Habsburg Civil Service and Beyond: Bureaucracy and Civil Servants from the Vormärz to the Inter-War Years*, edited by Franz Adlgasser and Fredrik Lindström, 233–58. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2019.
- Becker, Peter, Therese Garstenauer, Veronika Helfert, Karl Megner, Thomas Stockinger, and Guenther Steiner, eds. *Hofratsdämmerung? Verwaltung und ihr Personal in den Nachfolgestaaten der Habsburgermonarchie 1918 bis 1920*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2020.
- Berend, Iván T. *Decades of Crisis: Central and Eastern Europe before World War II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

- Berger, Stefan, and Alexei Miller. "Building Nations In and With Empires: A Reassessment." In *Nationalizing Empires*, edited by Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, 1–30. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015.
- Bernasconi, Robert. "Racism." In *Key Concepts in the Study of Antisemitism*, edited by Sol Goldberg, Scott Ury, and Kalman Weiser, 245–56. Cham: Springer, 2021.
- Bernasconi, Robert. "A Most Dangerous Error: The Boasian Myth of a Knock-Down Argument against Racism." In *Critical Philosophy of Race: Essays*, by Robert Bernasconi, 220–34. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023.
- Berner, Margit. "Die rassenkundlichen Untersuchungen der Wiener Anthropologen in Kriegsgefangenenlagern 1915-1918." *Zeitgeschichte* 30, no. 3 (2003): 124–36.
- Berner, Margit. "Forschungs-"Material" Kriegsgefangene: Die Massenuntersuchungen der Wiener Anthropologen an gefangenen Soldaten 1915-1918." In *Vorreiter der Vernichtung: Eugenik, Rassenhygiene und Euthanasie in der österreichischen Diskussion vor 1938*, edited by Wolfgang Neugebauer and H. E. Gabriel, 167–98. Vienna: Böhlau, 2005.
- Berner, Margit. "Die Bedeutung der biometrischen Erfassungsmethode in der österreichischen Anthropologie in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts." In *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900-1945*, edited by Gerhard Baader, Hans-Georg Hofer, and Thomas Mayer, 239–56. Vienna: Czernin, 2007.
- Berner, Margit. "Large-Scale Anthropological Surveys in Austria-Hungary, 1871-1918." In *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, edited by Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer, 233–54. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010.
- Bihari, Péter. *Lövészárkok a hátszágban: középosztály, zsidókérdés, antiszemitizmus az első világháború Magyarországon* [Trenches in the Hinterland: Middle Class, Jewish Question, and Anti-Semitism in World War I Hungary]. Budapest: Napvilág, 2008.
- Blum, Mark E., and William Smaldone, eds. *Austro-Marxism: The Ideology of Unity*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Bock, Gisela. *Zwangsterilisation im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Geschlechterpolitik*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1986.
- Bognár, Iván. "A Népjóléti Minisztérium és a Népjóléti Népbiztosság szervezete, 1917–1919" [Organization of the Ministry of Welfare and the People's Welfare Commissariat, 1917–1919]. *Levéltári Közlemények* 37, no. 2 (1966): 293–343.
- Bokor, Zsuzsa. *Testtörténetek: a nemzet és a nemi betegségek medikalizálása a két világháború közötti Kolozsváron* [Body Histories: The Medicalization of the Nation and Venereal Diseases in Kolozsvár between the Two World Wars]. Kolozsvár: Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2013.
- Bokor, Zsuzsa. "Girls, Doctors and Institutions. Eugenics and Medical Institutionalisation in Interwar Cluj." *Revista de Antropologie Urbană* 3, no. 5 (2015): 21–26.

- Böröcz, József, and Mahua Sarkar. "The Unbearable Whiteness of the Polish Plumber and the Hungarian Peacock Dance around 'Race.'" *Slavic Review* 76, no. 2 (2017): 307–14.
- Borodziej, Włodzimierz, Sabina Ferhabdžević, and Joachim von Puttkamer, eds. *The Routledge History Handbook of Central and Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century. Volume 2: Statehood*. Routledge Twentieth Century History Handbooks. London: Routledge, 2020.
- Borowy, Iris. *Coming to Terms with World Health: The League of Nations Health Organisation 1921-1946*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Brandon, Mark. *The Perils of Race-Thinking: A Portrait of Aleš Hrdlička*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2023.
- Breslau, Daniel. "The American Spencerians: Theorizing a New Science." In *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 39–62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Brett, Daniel. "What Was the National Peasant Party?: Internal Division and Organizational Conflict 1900-1947." In *Politics and Peasants in Interwar Romania: Perceptions, Mentalities, Propaganda*, edited by Sorin Radu and Oliver Schmitt, 187–214. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Press, 2017.
- Broklová, Eva. *Politická kultura německých aktivistických stran v Československu 1918-1938* [Political Culture of German Activist Political Parties in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1938]. Prague: Karolinum, 1999.
- Brown, Geoffrey. "'The Spirit of Dictators': Rusyn Accusations of Corruption and Imperialism against František Svojsé and Officials in Czechoslovak Ruthenia." *Bohemia* 57, no. 2 (2017): 346–66.
- Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. "Beyond 'Identity.'" *Theory and Society* 29, no. 1 (2000): 1–47.
- Brykczynski, Paul. "Reconsidering 'Piłsudskiite Nationalism.'" *Nationalities Papers* 42, no. 5 (September 2014): 771–90.
- Bucur, Maria. "Awakening or Constructing Biological Consciousness?: 'Astra' and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania." *Colloquia: Journal of Central European History* 2, no. 1–2 (1995): 172–85.
- Bucur, Maria. *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002.
- Bucur, Maria. "Fallen Women and Necessary Evils: Eugenic Representations of Prostitution in Interwar Romania." In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900- 1940*, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 335–50. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Bucur, Maria. "Eugenics in Eastern Europe, 1870s–1945." In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, edited by Philippa Levine and Alison Bashford, 398–410. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

- Budkiewicz, Janina, and Janina Kączkowska. *Z dziejów psychologii stosowanej w Polsce do roku 1957, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem poradnictwa zawodowego* [From the History of Applied Psychology in Poland until 1957, with Special Emphasis on Vocational Guidance]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1987.
- Buklijaš, Tatjana. “The Politics of Fin-de-Siècle Anatomy.” In *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918*, edited by Jan Surman and Mitchell G. Ash, 209–44. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Buklijaš, Tatjana, and Emese Lafferton. “Science, Medicine and Nationalism in the Habsburg Empire from the 1840s to 1918.” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 38, no. 4 (2007): 679–86.
- Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. “Empires and the Politics of Difference: Pathways of Incorporation and Exclusion.” In *The Oxford World History of Empire: Volume One: The Imperial Experience*, edited by Peter Fibiger Bang, Christopher A. Bayly, and Walter Scheidel, 375–415. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Burri, Michael. “Clemens Pirquet: Early Twentieth-Century Scientific Networks, the Austrian Hunger Crisis, and the Making of the International Food Expert.” In *Remaking Central Europe*, edited by Natasha Wheatley and Peter Becker, 39–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Byer, Doris. *Rassenhygiene und Wohlfahrtspflege: Zur Entstehung eines Sozialdemokratischen Machtdispositivs in Österreich bis 1934*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1988.
- Bynum, William F. “Alcoholism and Degeneration in 19th Century European Medicine and Psychiatry.” *British Journal of Addiction* 79 (1984): 59–70.
- Callon, Michel. “Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay.” In *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by John Law, 196–233. London: Routledge, 1986.
- Campbell, Timothy. “Bíos, Immunity, Life: The Thought of Roberto Esposito.” In *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, by Roberto Esposito, vii–xlii. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Cassata, Francesco. *Building the New Man: Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth Century Italy*. New York: Central European University Press, 2011.
- Cergol Paradiž, Ana. “Evgenika na Slovenskem v perspektivi spola” [Eugenics in Slovenia from a Gender Perspective]. *Zgodovinski časopis* 63, no. 3–4 (2009): 408–25.
- Cergol Paradiž, Ana. “Yugoslavia I: (Slovenia).” In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 364–75. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Cergol Paradiž, Ana. *Evgenika na Slovenskem* [Eugenics in Slovenia]. Ljubljana: Sophia, 2016.
- Ciancia, Kathryn. *On Civilization’s Edge: A Polish Borderland in the Interwar World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.

- Coen, Deborah R. "Living Precisely in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna." *Journal of the History of Biology* 39, no. 3 (2006): 493–523.
- Coen, Deborah R. "The Storm Lab: Meteorology in the Austrian Alps." *Science in Context* 22, no. 3 (2009): 463–86.
- Coen, Deborah R. "Climate and Circulation in Imperial Austria." *The Journal of Modern History* 82, no. 4 (2010): 839–75.
- Coen, Deborah R. "Imperial Climatographies from Tyrol to Turkestan." *Osiris* 26, no. 1 (2011): 45–65.
- Coen, Deborah R. *Climate in Motion: Science, Empire, and the Problem of Scale*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2018.
- Cohen, Gary B. "Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1867-1914." *Central European History* 40, no. 2 (2007): 241–78.
- Cohen, Gary B. "The Austrian Bureaucracy at the Nexus of State and Society." In *The Habsburg Civil Service and Beyond: Bureaucracy and Civil Servants from the Vormärz to the Inter-War Years*, edited by Franz Adlgasser and Fredrik Lindström, 49–66. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2019.
- Cole, Laurence. *Military Culture and Popular Patriotism in Late Imperial Austria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Conklin, Alice. *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France, 1850-1950*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- Connelly, John. *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1933-1965*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Cooter, Roger. *Surgery and Society in Peace and War: Orthopaedics and the Organization of Modern Medicine, 1880-1948*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993.
- Cornelius, Deborah. *In Search of the Nation: The New Generation of Hungarian Youth in Czechoslovakia 1925-1934*. Boulder, CO: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Cornwall, Mark. *The Devil's Wall: The Nationalist Youth Mission of Heinz Rutha*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Cremonesi, Laura, Orazio Irrera, Daniele Lorenzini, and Martina Tazzioli, eds. *Foucault and the Making of Subjects*. London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.
- Croissant, Aurel. "Historical Legacies." In *The Handbook of Political, Social, and Economic Transformation*, edited by Wolfgang Merkel, Raj Kollmorgen, and Hans-Jürgen Wager, 515–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Cvetnić, Željko, and Željko Dugac. *Selo Mraclin i Andrija Štampar – susret lokalnog i globalnog* [The Village of Mraclin and Andrija Štampar – the Meeting of Local and Global]. Mraclin: HAZU, 2018.

- Czech, Herwig. "Regenerating the Nation: Eugenics and Racial Hygiene in Early Twentieth-Century Austria." In *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Fearing for the Nation*, edited by Barbara Klich-Kluczevska, Joachim Puttkamer, and Immo Rebitschek, 23–42. London: Routledge, 2022.
- Daston, Lorraine, and Fernando Vidal. "Introduction: Doing What Comes Naturally." In *The Moral Authority of Nature*, edited by Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal, 1–20. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Deak, John. "The Great War and the Forgotten Realm: The Habsburg Monarchy and the First World War." *The Journal of Modern History* 86, no. 2 (June 2014): 336–80.
- Deak, John. *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Deak, John, and Jonathan E. Gumz. "How to Break a State: The Habsburg Monarchy's Internal War, 1914–1918." *The American Historical Review* 122, no. 4 (October 2017): 1105–36.
- Dean, Mitchell, and Kaspar Villadsen. *State Phobia and Civil Society: The Political Legacy of Michel Foucault*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016.
- Decker, Philipp. "Varieties of Nationalism in the Political Discourses of Habsburg Austria." *Nations and Nationalism* 29, no. 3 (2023): 888–905.
- Doleshal, Zachary Austin. *In the Kingdom of Shoes: Bata, Zlín, Globalization, 1894–1945*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2021.
- Donia, Robert. "Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Proximate Colony in the Twilight of Empire." *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja* 42 (2014): 197–202.
- Donia, Robert. "Bosnia-Herzegovina under Austria-Hungary: From Occupation to Assassination, 1878–1914." In *The Routledge Handbook of Balkan and Southeast European History*, edited by John R. Lampe and Ulf Brunnbauer, 135–43. New York: Routledge, 2021.
- Donzelot, Jacques. *The Policing of Families*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.
- Dósa, Rudolfné, Ervinné Liptai, and Mihály Ruff. *A Magyar Tanácsköztársaság egészségügyi politikája* [Healthcare Policy of the Hungarian Soviet Republic]. Budapest: Medicina, 1959.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Edited by Brent Hayes Edwards. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Duančić, Vedran. *Geography and Nationalist Visions of Interwar Yugoslavia*. Cham: Springer, 2020.
- Dubin, Martin David. "The League of Nations Health Organisation." In *International Health Organisations and Movements, 1918–1939*, edited by Paul J. Weindling, 56–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

- Ducháček, Milan, and Michaela Lenčesová. “Sborník Rovnocennost evropských plemen a cesty k jejich ušlechťování jako křížovátka československé meziválečné antropologie i kulturní propagandy” [The Volume ‘The Equivalence of European Races and the Paths to Their Improvement’ as an Intersection of Czechoslovak Interwar Anthropology and Cultural Propaganda]. In *Za rovnocennost evropských plemen: Československá antropologie tváří v tvář rasismu a nacismu* [For the Equivalence of European Races: Czechoslovak Anthropology in the Face of Racism and Nazism], edited by Milan Ducháček, 6–41. Prague: NLN, 2023.
- Dugac, Željko. *Protiv bolesti i neznanja: Rockefellerova fondacija u međuratnoj Jugoslaviji* [Against Disease and Ignorance: The Rockefeller Foundation in Interwar Yugoslavia]. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2005.
- Dugac, Željko. *Kako biti čist i zdrav : zdravstveno prosvjećivanje u međuratnoj Hrvatskoj* [How to be Clean and Healthy: Health Education in Interwar Croatia]. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2010.
- Dugac, Željko. “‘Like Yeast in Fermentation’: Public Health in Interwar Yugoslavia.” In *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Marius Turda, Christian Promitzer, and Sevasti Trubeta, 193–232. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011.
- Dugac, Željko. “Cooperation in the Field of Public Health and Medicine: Instances of Expert and Knowledge Mobility between Vienna, Zagreb and the Far East.” *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Medicinske znanosti* 540, no. 48–49 (2019): 78–85.
- Duraković, Indira. *Serbien und das Modernisierungsproblem. Die Entwicklung der Gesundheitspolitik und sozialen Kontrolle bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Egry, Gábor. “Unholy Alliances? Language Exams, Loyalty, and Identification in Interwar Romania.” *Slavic Review* 76, no. 4 (2017): 959–82.
- Egry, Gábor. “Negotiating Post-Imperial Transitions: Local Societies and Nationalizing States in East Central Europe.” In *Embers of Empire: Continuity and Rupture in the Habsburg Successor States after 1918*, edited by Claire Morelon and Paul Miller, 15–42. Oxford: Berghahn, 2019.
- Egry, Gábor. “Fallen between Two Stools? Imperial Legacies, State-Society Relationships, and the Limits of Building a Nation-State in Romania after the First World War.” *Südostforschungen* 79, no. 1 (2020): 4–31.
- Egry, Gábor. “Unruly Borderlands: Border-Making, Peripheralization and Layered Regionalism in Post-First World War Maramureș and the Banat.” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d’histoire* 27, no. 6 (2020): 709–31.
- Egry, Gábor. *The Empire’s New Clothes: How Austria-Hungary’s Legacy Kept the Successor States Running*. Leiden: Foundation for Austrian Studies, 2020.
- Egry, Gábor. “The Leftover Empire? Imperial Legacies and Statehood in the Successor States of Austria-Hungary.” In *Postwar Continuity and New Challenges in Central Europe*,

- 1918–1923: *The War That Never Ended*, edited by Tomasz Pudłocki and Kamil Ruszała, 81–102. New York: Routledge, 2021.
- Egry, Gábor. “The Numerus Clausus: A Transitory Act between Liberal and Ethnic Nationalisms.” *Hungarian Studies Review* 48, no. 1 (June 2021): 86–91.
- Elvert, Jürgen. *Mitteleuropa!: Deutsche Pläne zur europäischen Neuordnung (1918-1945)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.
- Emed, Alexander. “A magyar orvostudomány sokoldalú, színes alakja: Tuszka Ödön (1863-?)” [The Versatile, Colorful Figure of Hungarian Medicine: Ödön Tuszka, 1863-?]. *Ezredvég* 14, no. 8–9 (2004): 121–22.
- Ernst, Waltraud, and Thomas Müller. “Introduction: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives on Alcohol, Psychiatry and Society, c. 1500–1991.” In *Alcohol, Psychiatry and Society: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives, c. 1700-1990s*, edited by Waltraud Ernst and Thomas Müller, 1–35. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022.
- Esposito, Roberto. *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Esposito, Roberto. *Immunitas: The Protection and Negation of Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011.
- Esposito, Roberto. “Community, Immunity, Biopolitics.” *Angelaki* 18, no. 3 (2013): 83–90.
- Evans, Andrew D. *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Exner, Gudrun. *Die “Soziologische Gesellschaft in Wien” (1907-1934) und die Bedeutung Rudolf Goldscheids für ihre Vereinstätigkeit*. Vienna: New AcadPress, 2013.
- Exner, Gudrun. “Rudolf Goldscheids »Menschenökonomie« im Kontext von Julius Tandler's Wohlfahrtskonzepten, lamarckistisch motivierter Reformeugenik, Soziologie, Monismus, Pazifismus und der Frauenfrage.” In *Strukturen und Netzwerke: Medizin und Wissenschaft in Wien 1848–1955*, edited by Daniela Angetter, Birgit Nemec, Herbert Posch, Christiane Druml, and Paul J. Weindling, 393–408. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2018.
- Exner, Gudrun, Josef Kytir, and Alexander Pinwinkler. *Bevölkerungswissenschaft in Österreich in der Zwischenkriegszeit (1918-1938): Personen, Institutionen, Diskurse*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2004.
- Eyal, Gil. “Plugging into the Body of the Leviathan: Proposal for a New Sociology of Public Interventions.” *Middle East – Topics & Arguments* 2, no. 1 (2013): 13–24.
- Eyal, Gil. “Spaces between Fields.” In *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*, edited by Philip S. Gorski, 158–82. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.
- Eyal, Gil. *The Crisis of Expertise*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019.

- Farkas, Reinhard. "Turnen und Sport in der Steiermark: Von der Subkultur zum Staatsmonopol (1862-1938)." *Blätter für Heimatkunde* 74 (2000): 139–53.
- Farkas, Reinhard. "Die Anfänge der steirischen Abstinenzbewegung." *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereines für Steiermark* 26 (2010): 546–61.
- Fatović-Ferenčić, Stella, and Martin Kuhar. "'Imagine All the People': Andrija Štampar's Ideology in The Context of Contemporary Public Health Initiatives." *Acta Medico-Historica Adriatica* 17, no. 2 (2020): 269–84.
- Fejzić, Elvis. "Political Thought in Bosnia and Herzegovina During Austro-Hungarian Rule, 1878–1918." *East Central Europe* 39, no. 2–3 (2012): 204–36.
- Felder, Björn M., and Paul J. Weindling, eds. *Baltic Eugenics: Bio-Politics, Race and Nation in Interwar Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania 1918-1940*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013.
- Ferenc, Gergely. "Leventeintézmény, cserkészmozgalom, militarizáció (1919-1939)" [Levente Institution, Scout Movement, Militarization, 1919-1939]. *Pedagógiai Szemle* 23, no. 12 (December 1, 1973): 1152–64.
- Fillafer, Franz Leander. "Böhmen interimperial. Die böhmische Jurisprudenz als Drehscheibe der zentraleuropäischen Wissenszirkulation." *Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte Österreichs* 1 (2022): 163–80.
- Fillafer, Franz Leander. "Imperial Diversity, Fractured Sovereignty, and Legal Universals: Hans Kelsen and Eugen Ehrlich in Their Habsburg Context." *Modern Intellectual History* 19, no. 2 (2022): 421–43.
- Flamm, Heinz. *Die Geschichte der Staatsarzneikunde, Hygiene, Medizinischen Mikrobiologie, Sozialmedizin und Tierseuchenlehre in Österreich und ihrer Vertreter*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2012.
- Forman, Paul. "Scientific Internationalism and the Weimar Physicists: The Ideology and Its Manipulation in Germany after World War I." *Isis* 64, no. 2 (1973): 150–80.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality 1: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. New York: Picador, 2003.
- Frankl, Michal, and Miloslav Szabó. *Budování státu bez antisemitismu? Násilí, diskurz loajality a vznik Československa* [Building a State Without Antisemitism? Violence, Discourse of Loyalty, and the Formation of Czechoslovakia]. Prague: NLN, 2015.
- Freund, Florian. "Der polizeilich-administrative Zigeunerbegriff: Ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Begriffes 'Zigeuner.'" *Zeitgeschichte* 30, no. 2 (2003): 76–90.
- Friedmann, Ina. "Die Heilpädagogische Abteilung der Wiener Universitätskinderklinik zwischen 1911 und 1977." *Monatsschrift Kinderheilkunde* 168, no. Supplement 3 (September 2020): 154–62.

- Fuchs, Brigitte. *Rasse, Volk, Geschlecht: Anthropologische Diskurse in Österreich 1850-1960*. Frankfurt: Campus, 2003.
- Galambos, Ferenc. *A bécsi magyar emigráció újságjai és folyóiratai* [The Newspapers and Periodicals of the Hungarian Emigration in Vienna]. Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 1967.
- Gantar Godina, Irena. “Slovensko dijaštvo, alkohol, burševstvo in ženske” [Slovenian Students, Alcohol, Fraternities, and Women]. *Zgodovina za vse* 15, no. 2 (2008): 37–44.
- Gantner, Doris. “‘Sozialpolitik des Roten Wien 1919 – 1934. Kommunale Leuchtturmprojekte in den Bereichen Architektur und Gesundheit unter dem Aspekt des Social Engineering.’” M.A. Thesis, University of Vienna, 2017.
- Gantner, Eszter, Heidi Hein-Kircher, and Oliver Hochadel. “Introduction: Searching for Best Practices in Interurban Networks.” In *Interurban Knowledge Exchange in Southern and Eastern Europe, 1870–1950*, edited by Eszter Gantner, Heidi Hein-Kircher, and Oliver Hochadel, 1–22. New York: Routledge, 2021.
- Garstenauer, Therese, and Veronika Helfert. “Von der Residenzstadt zum Roten Wien: Die Veränderungen in der Gemeindeverwaltung, 1918-1920.” In *Das Rote Wien 1919–1934: Ideen, Debatten, Praxis*, edited by Werner Michael Schwarz, Georg Spitaler, and Elke Wikidal, 38–41. Vienna: Birkhäuser, 2019.
- Gawin, Magdalena. “Niechciana pamięć - polski ruch eugeniczny w latach międzywojennych: Na marginesie artykułu Krzysztofa Kawalca” [Unwanted Memory - Polish Eugenics Movement in the Interwar Years: A Side Note to Krzysztof Kawalec’s Article]. *Medycyna Nowożytna* 8, no. 2 (2001): 75–89.
- Gawin, Magdalena. “Progressivism and Eugenic Thinking in Poland, 1905–1939.” In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 167–83. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Gawin, Magdalena. *Race and Modernity: A History of the Polish Eugenics Movement*. Warsaw: IH PAN, 2018.
- Gebel, Ralf. *Heim ins Reich!: Konrad Henlein und der Reichsgau Sudetenland, 1938-1945*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999.
- George, Lucian. “Greedy Farmers versus Workshy Workers: Urban-Rural Moral Competition and the Shadow of WWI in the Politics of Interwar Czechoslovakia.” In *International Conference of the European Rural History Organisation*, 60. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2022.
- Georgescu, Tudor. “The Eugenic Fortress: Alfred Csallner and the Saxon Eugenic Discourse in Interwar Romania.” In *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta, and Marius Turda, 351–84. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011.

- Georgescu, Tudor. "Saxon Eugenics in Transylvania." In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 549–94. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Georgescu, Tudor. *The Eugenic Fortress: The Transylvanian Saxon Experiment in Interwar Romania*. New York: Central European University Press, 2016.
- Gerasimov, Ilya, Sergey Glebov, and Marina Mogilner. "Hybridity: Marrism and the Problems of Language of the Imperial Situation." *Ab Imperio* 2016, no. 1 (2016): 27–68.
- Gerwarth, Robert. "The Central European Counter-Revolution: Paramilitary Violence in Germany, Austria and Hungary after the Great War." *Past & Present* 200, no. 1 (2008): 175–209.
- Gieryn, Thomas. "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists." *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 6 (December 1983): 781–95.
- Gilman, Sander L. *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Ginderachter, Maarten van. "Possibilities and Pitfalls of the Concept of National Indifference." *Nations and Nationalism* 29, no. 3 (2023): 831–36.
- Gingrich, Andre, and Peter Rohrbacher, eds. *Völkerkunde zur NS-Zeit aus Wien (1938-1945): Institutionen, Biographien und Praktiken in Netzwerken*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2021.
- Gingrich, Andre. "Liberalism in Imperial Anthropology: Notes on an Implicit Paradigm in Continental European Anthropology before World War I." *Ab Imperio* 2007, no. 1 (2007): 224–39.
- Gingrich, Andre. "Science, Race, and Empire: Ethnography in Vienna before 1918." *East Central Europe* 43, no. 1–2 (2016): 41–63.
- Giomi, Fabio, and Stefano Petrunaro. "Voluntary Associations, State and Gender in Interwar Yugoslavia. An Introduction." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire* 26, no. 1 (2019): 1–18.
- Gissis, Snait. "Late Nineteenth Century Lamarckism and French Sociology." *Perspectives on Science* 10, no. 1 (March 2002): 69–122.
- Glasius, Marlies. "Uncivil Society." In *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*, edited by Helmut K. Anheier and Stefan Toepler, 1583–88. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Gliboff, Sander. "'Protoplasm...is Soft Wax in Our Hands': Paul Kammerer and the Art of Biological Transformation." *Endeavour* 29, no. 4 (December 2005): 162–67.
- Gliboff, Sander. "The Case of Paul Kammerer: Evolution and Experimentation in the Early 20th Century." *Journal of the History of Biology* 39, no. 3 (2006): 525–63.
- Godinek, Ibolya. "Fajvédő eszme A Cél című folyóiratban" [The Ideology of Race Protection in the Journal *A Cél*]. *Valóság* 57, no. 2 (February 2014): 40–58.

- Górny, Maciej. "Bone & Soul: Physical Anthropology, the Great War and Nationalism in Eastern Europe." *Cuadernos de Historia Contemporánea* 36 (2014): 239–58.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1981.
- Gradmann, Christoph. "Invisible Enemies: Bacteriology and the Language of Politics in Imperial Germany." *Science in Context* 13, no. 1 (2000): 9–30.
- Graham, Loren R. "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s." *The American Historical Review* 82, no. 5 (December 1977): 1133–64.
- Grandits, Hannes, Pieter M. Judson, and Malte Rolf. "Towards a New Quality of Statehood: Bureaucratization and State-Building in Empires and Nation States before 1914." In *The Routledge History Handbook of Central and Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century. Volume 2: Statehood*, edited by Włodzimierz Borodziej, Sabina Ferhadbegović, and Joachim von Puttkamer, 41–116. London: Routledge, 2020.
- Grata, Paweł. "Krucjata antyalkoholowa w Sejmie Ustawodawczym i jej efekty (1919–1922)" [Anti-Alcohol Crusade in the Legislative Sejm and Its Effects, 1919–1922]. *UR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 8, no. 3 (2018): 5–25.
- Grift, Liesbeth van de, and Amalia Ribi Forclaz. "Preface." In *Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe*, edited by Liesbeth van de Grift and Amalia Ribi Forclaz, xi–xviii. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Grosse, Judith, Francesco Spöring, and Jana Tschurennev, eds. *Biopolitik und Sittlichkeitsreform: Kampagnen gegen Alkohol, Drogen und Prostitution 1880-1950*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2014.
- Grubački, Isidora. "Emancipating Rural Women in Interwar Yugoslavia: Analysis of Discourses on Rural Women in Two 1930s Women's Periodicals." M.A. Thesis, Central European University, 2017.
- Gruber, Helmut. "Sexuality in 'Red Vienna': Socialist Party Conceptions and Programs and Working-Class Life, 1920-34." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 31, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 37–68.
- Gruber, Helmut. *Red Vienna: Experiment in Working-Class Culture, 1919-1934*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Gugitscher, Karin. "Das Berufsberatungsamt der Stadt Wien und der Arbeiterkammer in Wien: Eine sozialhistorische Studie zur Bildungs- und Berufsberatung in Wien 1918-1933/34." M.A. Thesis, Alpen-Adria Universität, 2013.
- Gumz, Jonathan E. *The Resurrection and Collapse of Empire in Habsburg Serbia, 1914-1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Gyurgyák, János. *Magyar fajvédők: Eszmetörténeti tanulmány* [Hungarian Race Protectionists: A Study in the History of Ideas]. Budapest: Osiris, 2012.
- Hale, Piers J. *Political Descent: Malthus, Mutualism, and the Politics of Evolution in Victorian England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

- Hart, Mitchell B. "Racial Science, Social Science, and the Politics of Jewish Assimilation." *Isis* 90, no. 2 (June 1999): 268–97.
- Hau, Michael. "Sports in the Human Economy: 'Leibesübungen,' Medicine, Psychology, and Performance Enhancement during the Weimar Republic." *Central European History* 41, no. 3 (2008): 381–412.
- Hau, Michael. "Constitutional Therapy and Clinical Racial Hygiene in Weimar and Nazi Germany." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 71, no. 2 (April 2016): 115–43.
- Hau, Michael. *Performance Anxiety: Sport and Work in Germany from the Empire to Nazism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.
- Havlin, Michael. "Eine Begriffsgeschichte der deutsch-tschechischen Symbiose nach Franz Spina." In *Franz Spina (1868-1938)*, edited by Steffen Höhne and Ludger Udolph, 261–280. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2011.
- Healy, Maureen. *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Heggie, Vanessa. "Sport (and Exercise) Medicine in Britain: Healthy Citizens and Abnormal Athletes." *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 28, no. 2 (2011): 249–69.
- Hellbling, Ernst C. "Die Landesverwaltung in Cisleithanien." In *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918: Verwaltung und Rechtswesen*, edited by Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, 190–269. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003.
- Herza, Filip. "Sombre Faces: Race and Nation-Building in the Institutionalization of Czech Physical Anthropology (1890s–1920s)." *History and Anthropology* 31, no. 3 (2019): 371–92.
- Herza, Filip. "Colonial Czechoslovakia? Overseas and Internal Colonization in The Interwar Czechoslovak Republic." *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 2022.
- Hetherington, Philippa, and Glenda Sluga. "Liberal and Illiberal Internationalisms." *Journal of World History* 31, no. 1 (March 2020): 1–9.
- Hirschhausen, Ulrike von, and Jörn Leonhard. "Beyond Rise, Decline and Fall. Comparing Multi-Ethnic Empires in the Long Nineteenth Century." In *Comparing Empires: Encounters and Transfers in the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Ulrike von Hirschhausen and Jörn Leonhard, 9–36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*. London: Abacus, 1994.
- Hofer, Veronika. "Rudolf Goldscheid, Paul Kammerer und die Biologen des Prater-Vivariums in der liberalen Volksbildung der Wiener Moderne." In *Wissenschaft, Politik und Öffentlichkeit*, edited by Mitchell G. Ash and Christian H. Stifter, 149–84. Vienna: WUV, 2002.

- Hofer, Veronika. "Positionen und Posen eines Experten: Der Konstitutionsforscher Julius Bauer (1887-1973) und die Eugenik in der Wiener Zwischenkriegszeit." In *Eugenik in Österreich: Biopolitische Methoden und Strukturen von 1900-1945*, edited by Thomas Mayer, Veronika Hofer, and Gerhard Baader, 31–66. Vienna: Czernin, 2007.
- Hofer, Hans-Georg. "Ernährungskrise, Krankheit, Hungertod: Wien (und Österreich-Ungarn) im Ersten Weltkrieg." *Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte* 31 (2013): 33–66.
- Hoffmannová, Eva. *Karel Slavoj Amerling*. Prague: Melantrich, 1982.
- Hofinger, Johannes. "Georg Pösch: Ein Schreibtischtäter der NS-Euthanasie." In *Nationalsozialismus in Salzburg*, 286–88. Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2016.
- Holmes, Deborah. *Langeweile ist Gift: Das Leben der Eugenie Schwarzwald*. St. Pölten: Residenz-Verlag, 2012.
- Holubec, Stanislav. "Silní milují život. Utopie, ideologie a biopolitika baťovského Zlína" [The Strong Love Life: Utopia, Ideology, and Biopolitics of Bata's Zlín]. *Kuděj* 11, no. 2 (2009): 30–55.
- Hoßfeld, Uwe, Elizabeth Watts, and Georgy S. Levit. "Valentin Haecker (1864–1927) as a Pioneer of Phenogenetics: Building the Bridge between Genotype and Phenotype." *Epigenetics* 12, no. 4 (April 2017): 247–53.
- Hsia, Ke-chin. "Who Provided Care for Wounded and Disabled Soldiers? Conceptualizing State–Civil Society Relationship in First World War Austria." In *Other Fronts, Other Wars? First World War Studies on the Eve of the Centennial*, edited by Joachim Bürgschwentner, Matthias Egger, Gunda Barth-Scalmani, 303–30. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Hsia, Ke-chin. *Victims' State: War and Welfare in Austria, 1868-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Hudek, Adam, Michal Kopeček, and Jan Mervart. *Czechoslovakism*. London: Routledge, 2021.
- Hund, Wulf D. "Die Befreiung der unterdrückten Rassen kann nur das Werk der unterdrückten Rassen selbst sein: Marginalie zur Kritik des Rassismus durch Hugo Iltis." *Das Argument* 57, no. 4–5 (2015): 493–502.
- Hutton, Christopher. *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk*. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.
- Ignácz, Károly. "The Emergence of the 'Outskirts of Budapest' as a New Administrative District through Food Supply, 1917–1919." *Südostforschungen* 79, no. 1 (2020): 71–95.
- Irinyi, Károly. *Mitteleuropa-tervek és az osztrák-magyar politikai közgondolkodás* [Central European Plans and Austro-Hungarian Political Public Opinion]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973.
- Jacoby, Sanford M. *Employing Bureaucracy: Managers, Unions, and the Transformation of Work in the 20th Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004.

- Jakobyová, Barbora. “Budete se ženit? Budete se vdávat?: Snahy o eugenickou profylaxii v 1. ČSR” [Will you Marry? Attempts at Eugenic Prophylaxis in the First Czechoslovak Republic]. *Historické rozhledy* 38 (2021): 197–209.
- Jančík, Drahomír. “Pít či nepít – to jest, oč tu běží: Střety příznivců a odpůrců abstinence v meziválečném Československu” [To Drink or Not to Drink – That is the Question: Clashes between Supporters and Opponents of Abstinence in Interwar Czechoslovakia]. *Historická sociologie* 2014, no. 1 (June 2014): 47–69.
- Janko, Jan. *Vznik experimentální biologie v Čechách, 1882-1918* [The Emergence of Experimental Biology in Bohemia, 1882-1918]. Prague: Academia, 1982.
- Janko, Jan. *Vědy o životě v českých zemích, 1750-1950* [Life Sciences in the Bohemian Lands, 1750-1950]. Prague: Archiv Akademie věd České republiky, 1997.
- Janko, Jan, and Emilie Těšínská, eds. *Technokracie v českých zemích (1900-1950)* [Technocracy in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1950]. Prague: Archiv Akademie věd České republiky, 1999.
- Judson, Pieter M. “‘Not Another Square Foot!’ German Liberalism and the Rhetoric of National Ownership in Nineteenth-Century Austria.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 26 (January 1995): 83–97.
- Judson, Pieter M. *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Judson, Pieter M. *The Habsburg Empire: A New History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016.
- Judson, Pieter M. “‘Where Our Commonality Is Necessary...’: Rethinking the End of the Habsburg Monarchy.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 48 (2017): 1–21.
- Kapronczay, Károly. *Fejezetek 125 év magyar egészségügyének történetéből* [Chapters from the 125-Year History of Hungarian Healthcare]. Budapest: Semmelweis Orvostörténeti Múzeum, Könyvtár és Levéltár, 2001.
- Karady, Victor, and Lucian Nastasă. *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and the Students of the Medical Faculty: (1872-1918)*. Budapest: Central European University, 2004.
- Karasek, Nicola Thadea. “Seuchen und Militär 1914-1918.” M.A. Thesis, University of Vienna, 2012.
- Kárpáti, Endre. “Madzsar József egészségpolitikai tevékenysége a magyarországi polgári demokratikus forradalom és a Tanácsköztársaság idején” [The Health Policy Activities of József Madzsar during the Civil Democratic Revolution and the Hungarian Soviet Republic]. *Az Országos Orvostörténeti Könyvtár közleményei* 28, no. 5 (1963): 55–75.
- Kassa, Jeannôt Mokili Danga. *Politiques agricoles et promotion rurale au Congo-Zaïre (1885-1997)*. Paris: L’Harmattan, 1998.
- Kenyeres, Ágnes. “Szekeres Sándor” [Sándor Szekeres]. In *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon* [Hungarian Biographical Lexicon], 3:744. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981.

- Kevles, Daniel. “‘Into Hostile Political Camps’: The Reorganization of International Science in World War I.” *Isis* 62, no. 1 (1971): 47–60.
- Kevles, Daniel. *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*. New York: Knopf, 1985.
- Kind-Kovács, Friederike. “The ‘Other’ Child Transports: World War I and the Temporary Displacement of Needy Children from Central Europe.” *Revue d’histoire de l’enfance « irrégulière »*, no. 15 (2013): 75–109.
- Kind-Kovács, Friederike. *Budapest’s Children: Humanitarian Relief in the Aftermath of the Great War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2022.
- King, Jeremy. *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Kiss László. “Egészség és politika – az egészségügyi prevenció Magyarországon a 20. század első felében” [Health and Politics – Healthcare Prevention in Hungary in the First Half of the 20th Century.]. *Korall* 4, no. 17 (2004): 107–37.
- Klabouch, Jiří. *Manželství a rodina v minulosti* [Marriage and Family in the Past]. Prague: Orbis, 1962.
- Klabouch, Jiří. *Die Gemeindeselbstverwaltung in Österreich 1848-1918*. Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1968.
- Klich-Kluczewska, Barbara. “Is Biopower Something to Be Afraid Of? Biopolitics as a Research Category in Historiography.” In *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Fearing for the Nation*, edited by Barbara Klich-Kluczewska, Joachim Puttkamer, and Immo Rebitschek, 8–20. London: Routledge, 2022.
- Klösch, Christian, Kurt Scharr, and Erika Weinzierl. *Gegen Rassenhass und Menschennot: Irene Harand - Leben und Werk einer ungewöhnlichen Widerstandskämpferin*. Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2004.
- Kohlrausch, Martin, Katrin Steffen, and Stefan Wiederkehr. “Introduction.” In *Expert Cultures in Central Eastern Europe. The Internationalization of Knowledge and the Transformation of Nation States since World War I*, edited by Martin Kohlrausch, Katrin Steffen, and Stefan Wiederkehr, 9–30. Osnabrück: Fibre Verlag, 2010.
- Koller, Christian. “Nationalism and Racism in Franco-German Controversies about Colonial Soldiers.” In *Nations, Identities and the First World War. Shifting Loyalties to the Fatherland*, edited by Nico Wouters and Laurence van Ypersele, 213–32. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- Komlosy, Andrea. “Imperial Cohesion, Nation-Building and Regional Integration in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1804–1918.” In *Nationalizing Empires*, edited by Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, 369–428. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015.
- Kořalka, Jiří. *Tschechen und Deutschland im langen 19. Jahrhundert: Studien zum gegenseitigen Verhältnis, 1800-1918*. Dresden: Thelem, 2018.

- Koselleck, Reinhart. "Zur historisch-politischen Semantik der asymmetrischen Gegenbegriffe." In *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*, by Reinhart Koselleck, 211–59. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1979.
- Kosi, Jernej, and Elisabeth Haid. "State-Building and Democratisation on the Fringes of Interwar Poland and Yugoslavia. Prekmurje and Eastern Galicia from Empire to Nation State." *Südostforschungen* 79, no. 1 (2020): 29–67.
- Kostović, Tomislav. "Škola narodnog zdravlja u borbi protiv alkoholizma u međuratnoj Hrvatskoj" [School of Public Health in the Fight against Alcoholism in Interwar Croatia"]. M.A. Thesis, University of Zagreb, 2018.
- Kovács, Mária. *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Kovács, Mária. *Törvénytől sújtva: A numerus clausus Magyarországon, 1920-1945* [The Beginnings of Anti-Jewish Legislation: The 1920 Numerus Clausus Law in Hungary]. Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó, 2012.
- Kronfeldner, Maria. "'If There Is Nothing beyond the Organic...': Heredity and Culture at the Boundaries of Anthropology in the Work of Alfred L. Kroeber." *NTM Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin* 17, no. 2 (May 2009): 107–133.
- Kronfeldner, Maria. *What's Left of Human Nature? A Post-Essentialist, Pluralist, and Interactive Account of a Contested Concept*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2018.
- Kruizinga, Samuël. "Introduction." In *The Politics of Smallness in Modern Europe: Size, Identity and International Relations since 1800*, edited by Samuël Kruizinga, 1–14. London: Bloomsbury, 2022.
- Kučera, Rudolf. "Exploiting Victory, Sinking into Defeat: Uniformed Violence in the Creation of the New Order in Czechoslovakia and Austria, 1918–1922." *The Journal of Modern History* 88, no. 4 (December 2016): 827–55.
- Kučera, Rudolf. *Rationed Life: Science, Everyday Life, and Working-Class Politics in the Bohemian Lands, 1914-1918*. Oxford: Berghahn, 2016.
- Kuhar, Martin. "Eugenika u hrvatskoj medicini i njezin utjecaj na javnost u razdoblju od 1859. do 1945" [Eugenics in Croatian Medicine and Its Influence on the Public in the Period from 1859 to 1945]. PhD Thesis, University of Zagreb, 2015.
- Kuhar, Martin. "'From an Impure Source, All Is Impure': The Rise and Fall of Andrija Štampar's Public Health Eugenics in Yugoslavia." *Social History of Medicine* 30, no. 1 (February 2017): 92–113.
- Kuhar, Martin, and Stella Fatović-Ferenčić. "Antropologija jedinke, spolnosti i rase u djelima Frana Gundruma Oriovčanina (1856.–1919.)" [Anthropology of the Individual, Society, and Race in the Works of Fran Gundrum Oriovčanin (1856–1919)]. *Acta medico-historica Adriatica* 13, no. Suppl. 1 (2015): 79–96.
- Kühl, Stefan. *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Kühl, Stefan. *For the Betterment of the Race: The Rise and Fall of the International Movement for Eugenics and Racial Hygiene*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Kund, Attila. “Méhely Lajos és a magyar fajbiológiai kísérlete (1920–1931)” [Lajos Méhely and the Hungarian Experiment in Racial Biology, 1920–1931]. *Múltunk* 57, no. 4 (2012): 239–89.
- Kuzmany, Börries. “Habsburg Austria: Experiments in Non-Territorial Autonomy.” *Ethnopolitics* 15, no. 1 (2016): 43–65.
- Kwaschik, Anne. “Die Verwissenschaftlichung des Kolonialen als kultureller Code und internationale Praxis um 1900.” *Historische Anthropologie* 28, no. 3 (2020): 399–423.
- Lafferton, Emese. “The Magyar Moustache: The Faces of Hungarian State Formation, 1867–1918.” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 38, no. 4 (2007): 706–32.
- Lampland, Martha. *The Value of Labor: The Science of Commodification in Hungary, 1920–1956*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Ledebur, Sophie. “Die österreichische Irrenrechts- und Strafrechtsreformbewegung und die Anfänge eines eugenischen Diskurses in der Psychiatrie um 1900.” In *Eugenik in Österreich: biopolitische Strukturen von 1900–1945*, edited by Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer, and Thomas Mayer, 208–35. Vienna: Czernin, 2007.
- Ledebur, Sophie. *Das Wissen der Anstaltspsychiatrie in der Moderne: Zur Geschichte der Heil- und Pflegeanstalten Am Steinhof in Wien*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2015.
- Lemmen, Sarah. “Beyond the League of Nations: Public Debates on International Relations in Czechoslovakia during the Interwar Period.” In *Remaking Central Europe*, edited by Natasha Wheatley and Peter Becker, 343–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Lenderová, Milena. *Chytila patrola, aneb, Prostituce za Rakouska i republiky* [Caught by the Patrol, or Prostitution under Austria and the Republic]. Prague: Karolinum, 2002.
- Lepicard, Etienne. “Eugenics and Roman Catholicism An Encyclical Letter in Context: *Casti Connubii*, December 31, 1930.” *Science in Context* 11, no. 3–4 (1998): 527–44.
- Lettevall, Rebecka, Geert Somsen, and Sven Widmalm. “Introduction.” In *Neutrality in Twentieth-Century Europe: Intersections of Science, Culture, and Politics after the First World War*, edited by Rebecka Lettevall, Geert Somsen, and Sven Widmalm, 1–15. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Leustean, Lucian N. “Eastern Orthodoxy and National Indifference in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774–1873.” *Nations and Nationalism* 24, no. 4 (2018): 1117–41.
- Levine, Philippa, and Alison Bashford. “Introduction: Eugenics and the Modern World.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, edited by Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine, 1:3–20. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

- Levine, Philippa. *Eugenics: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Lichtej, Igor. “Český lékař Bohuslav Albert a jeho priekopnícka činnosť na Podkarpatskej Rusi v rokoch 1919–1927” [Czech Doctor Bohuslav Albert and His Pioneering Activity in Subcarpathian Rus in the Years 1919–1927], *Česko-slovenská historická ročenka* 23, no. 2 (2021): 83–96.
- Likaka, Osumaka. *Rural Society and Cotton in Colonial Zaire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.
- Linkiewicz, Olga. “Applied Modern Science and the Self-Politicization of Racial Anthropology in Interwar Poland.” *Ab Imperio* 2016, no. 2 (2016): 153–81.
- Lipphardt, Veronika. *Biologie der Juden: Jüdische Wissenschaftler über “Rasse” und Vererbung, 1900-1935*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Litván, György. *A Twentieth-Century Prophet: Oscar Jászi 1875-1957*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006.
- Livezeanu, Irina. *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Lloyd, Catherine. *Discourses of Antiracism in France*. New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Logan, Cheryl A. “Cases and Prototypes: Constitutionalism and Photographic Portrayal of the Person in Freud’s Vienna.” *Visual Resources* 23, no. 1–2 (March 2007): 65–83.
- Logan, Cheryl A. *Hormones, Heredity, and Race: Spectacular Failure in Interwar Vienna*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2013.
- Löhnig, Martin, ed. *Kulturkampf um die Ehe: Reform des europäischen Eherechts nach dem Großen Krieg*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.
- López, Rosario. “The Quest for the Global: Remapping Intellectual History.” *History of European Ideas* 42, no. 1 (2016): 155–60.
- Lorimer, Jamie. “Probiotic Environmentalities: Rewilding with Wolves and Worms.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 34, no. 4 (July 2017): 27–48.
- Löscher, Monika. “... der gesunden Vernunft nicht zuwider ...”?: *katholische Eugenik in Österreich vor 1938*. Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2009.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair C. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.
- Mackensen, Rainer, ed. *Bevölkerungslehre und Bevölkerungspolitik im ‘Dritten Reich’*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2004.
- Maier, Charles S. “Between Taylorism and Technocracy: European Ideologies and the Vision of Industrial Productivity in the 1920s.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 5, no. 2 (April 1970): 27–61.

- Marchand, Suzanne. "Priests among the Pygmies: Wilhelm Schmidt and the Counter-Reformation in Austrian Ethnology." In *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, edited by Matti Bunzl and H. Glenn Penny, 283–316. Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2003.
- Mášová, Hana. "Účelnost pro vyšší humanitu: Lékař a organizátor Bohuslav Albert" [Purpose for Higher Humanity: Doctor and Organizer Bohuslav Albert]. *Dějiny věd a techniky* 31, no. 1 (1998): 1–23.
- Mášová, Hana. "Bojovník s byrokracií: Lékař a úředník Ladislav Prokop Procházka" [Fighter against Bureaucracy: Doctor and Official Ladislav Prokop Procházka]. In *Historia - medicina - cultura: Sborník k dějinám medicíny* [History - Medicine - Culture: Collection on the History of Medicine], 31:189–203. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 2006.
- Mášová, Hana. "Social Hygiene and Social Medicine in Interwar Czechoslovakia with the 13th District of the City of Prague as Its Laboratory." *Hygiea Internationalis* 6, no. 2 (2007): 53–68.
- Massin, Benoit. "From Virchow to Fischer: Physical Anthropology and Modern Race Theories." In *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, edited by George Stocking, 79–154. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.
- Matz, Bernhard Wilhelm. "Die Konstitutionstypologie von Ernst Kretschmer: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte von Psychiatrie und Psychologie des Zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts." PhD Thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, 2002.
- Maxwell, Alexander. "Pan-Nationalism as a Category in Theory and Practice." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 28, no. 1 (January 2022): 1–19.
- Mayer, Thomas. "Akademische Netzwerke um die „Wiener Gesellschaft für Rassenpflege (Rassenhygiene)“ von 1924 bis 1948." M.A. Thesis, University of Vienna, 2004.
- Mayer, Thomas. "Eugenische Initiativen und Netzwerke in Österreich von 1918 bis 1945." *VIRUS – Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte der Medizin* 5, no. 1 (2005): 43–80.
- Mayer, Thomas. "Gesunde Gene im gesunden Körper? Die Kooperation von Eugenik und Turnreform am Beispiel des österreichischen Reformers des Turnunterrichts Karl Gaulhofer (1885-1941)." In „mens sana in corpore sano“ *Gymnastik, Turnen, Spiel und Sport als Gegenstand der Bildungspolitik vom 18. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert. Jahrestagung der dvs-Sektion Sportgeschichte vom 7.-8. Juni 2007 in Frankfurt am Main*, edited by Michael Krüger, 115–26. Hamburg: Deutsche Vereinigung für Sportwissenschaft, 2008.
- Mayer, Thomas. "Wie kommt die Eugenik in die Eugenik? Sampling und Auswahlverfahren von prozess-produzierten Daten am Beispiel eugenischer Netzwerke in Österreich." *Historical Social Research* 34, no. 1 (2009): 159–171.
- Mayer, Thomas. "Albert Niedermeyer." In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 53–54. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

- Mayer, Thomas. "Austria." In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 4–18. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- McEwen, Britta. "Welfare and Eugenics: Julius Tandler's Rassenhygienische Vision for Interwar Vienna." *Austrian History Yearbook* 41 (2010): 170–190.
- McEwen, Britta. *Sexual Knowledge: Feeling, Fact, and Social Reform in Vienna, 1900-1934*. New York: Berghahn, 2012.
- McMahon, Richard. *The Races of Europe: Construction of National Identities in the Social Sciences, 1839-1939*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- McMahon, Richard, ed. *National Races: Transnational Power Struggles in the Sciences and Politics of Human Diversity, 1840-1945*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019.
- McMillan, Daniel A. "Nothing Wrong with My Bodily Fluids: Gymnastics, Biology, and Nationalism in the Germanies before 1871." In *Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe*, edited by Pieter M. Judson and Marsha L. Rozenblit, 50–60. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.
- Meloni, Maurizio. *Political Biology: Science and Social Values in Human Heredity from Eugenics to Epigenetics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Meloni, Maurizio. *Impressionable Biologies: From the Archaeology of Plasticity to the Sociology of Epigenetics*. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Meloni, Maurizio. "Porous Bodies: Environmental Biopower and the Politics of Life in Ancient Rome." *Theory, Culture & Society* 38, no. 3 (2021): 91–115.
- Meloni, Maurizio. "The Politics of Environments before the Environment: Biopolitics in the Longue Durée." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 88 (2021): 334–44.
- Mesner, Maria. *Geburten/Kontrolle: Reproduktionspolitik im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2010.
- Metzger, Nadine. „Auf strengster wissenschaftlicher Grundlage": Die Etablierungsphase der modernen Konstitutionslehre 1911 bis 1921." *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 51, no. 3 (2016): 209–45.
- Mezger, Caroline. *Forging Germans: Youth, Nation, and the National Socialist Mobilization of Ethnic Germans in Yugoslavia, 1918-1944*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Mieszkowski, Łukasz. "Disinfection Trains: Fighting Lice on Polish Railways, 1918–1920." In *Biopolitics in Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Fearing for the Nation*, edited by Immo Rebitschek, Barbara Klich-Kluczevska, and Joachim Puttkamer, 160–74. London: Routledge, 2022.
- Mogilner, Marina. "Russian Physical Anthropology in Search of 'Imperial Race': Liberalism and Modern Scientific Imagination in the Imperial Situation." *Ab Imperio* 2007, no. 1 (2007): 191–223.

- Mogilner, Marina. *Homo Imperii: A History of Physical Anthropology in Russia*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013.
- Mogilner, Marina. “When Race Is a Language and Empire Is a Context.” *Slavic Review* 80, no. 2 (2021): 207–15.
- Morovicsová, Eva. “Právne normy a činnosť Československého abstinentného zväzu v boji proti alkoholizmu v prvej Československej republike” [Legal Norms and Activities of the Czechoslovak Abstinent Union in the Fight against Alcoholism in the First Czechoslovak Republic]. *Alkoholizmus a drogové závislosti* 49, no. 2 (2014): 65–80.
- Morris-Reich, Amos. *The Quest for Jewish Assimilation in Modern Social Science*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Mottier, Véronique. “Eugenics and the State: Policy-Making in Comparative Perspective.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, edited by Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine, 134–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Moyn, Samuel. “Imaginary Intellectual History.” In *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Samuel Moyn and Darrin M. McMahon, 112–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Mulej, Oskar. “National Liberals and Their Progeny. Approaching the Peculiar Developments in Central European Liberal Party Traditions, 1867–1918.” *Acta Poloniae Historica* 111 (2015): 57–81.
- Mulej, Oskar. “Interwar Perspectives on Liberalism in Central Europe : The Czech, Austrian and Slovene National Liberal Heirs, 1918-1934.” PhD Thesis, Central European University, 2018.
- Murard, Lion. “Designs within Disorder: International Conferences on Rural Health Care and the Art of the Local, 1931–39.” In *Shifting Boundaries of Public Health: Europe in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Susan Gross Solomon, Lion Murard, and Patrick Zylberman, 141–74. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, University of Rochester Press, 2008.
- Murber Ibolya. “A burgenlandi impériumváltás 1918–1924: Kikényszerített identitásképzés és politikai erőszak” [The Imperial Transition in Burgenland, 1918–1924: Coerced Identity Formation and Political Violence]. *Múltunk*, no. 2 (2019): 181–214.
- Muşat, Raluca. “‘To Cure, Uplift and Ennoble the Village’: Militant Sociology in the Romanian Countryside, 1934–1938.” *East European Politics and Societies* 27, no. 3 (August 2013): 353–75.
- Musil, Jan. “Měření Čechoslováků: Česká společnost biotypologická a konstituční medicína v ČSR mezi lety 1937–1959” [Measuring the Czechoslovaks: The Czech Society of Biotypology and Constitutional Medicine in Czechoslovakia, 1937-1959]. PhD Thesis, Charles University, 2018.
- Nagy, Sándor. “One Empire, Two States, Many Laws: Matrimonial Law and Divorce in the Austro—Hungarian Monarchy.” *The Hungarian Historical Review* 3, no. 1 (2014): 190–221.

- Nastasă, Lucian. "Antisemitismul universitar în România (1919–1939)" [University anti-Semitism in Romania (1919–1939)]. In *Antisemitismul universitar în România (1919–1939): mărturii documentare* [University anti-Semitism in Romania (1919–1939): documentary evidence], edited by Lucian Nastasă, 13–98. Cluj-Napoca: Kriterion, 2011.
- Newman, John Paul. "Post-Imperial and Post-War Violence in the South Slav Lands, 1917–1923." *Contemporary European History* 19, no. 3 (August 2010): 249–65.
- Newman, John Paul. *Yugoslavia in the Shadow of War: Veterans and the Limits of State Building, 1903–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Nolte, Claire Elaine. "Voluntary Associations and Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Prague." In *Different Paths to the Nation*, edited by Laurence Cole, 82–99. London: Palgrave, 2007.
- Orel, Vítězslav, and Anna Matalová. "Kříženeckého chápání Mendelova objevu pod vlivem teorie dědičnosti získaných vlastností [The Understanding of Mendel's Discovery by Kříženecký Under the Influence of the Theory of Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics]." *Dějiny věd a techniky* 23, no. 2 (1990): 79–91.
- Orzoff, Andrea. *Battle for the Castle: The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe, 1914–1948*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Osterkamp, Jana. "Cooperative Empires: Provincial Initiatives in Imperial Austria." *Austrian History Yearbook* 47 (April 2016): 128–46.
- Parvulescu, Anca, and Manuela Boatcă. *Creolizing the Modern: Transylvania across Empires*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2022.
- Patel, Kiran Klaus. "The Green Heart of Governance: Rural Europe during the Interwar Years in a Global Perspective." In *Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe*, edited by Liesbeth van de Grift and Amalia Ribi Forclaz, 1–23. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Patel, Kiran Klaus, and Sven Reichardt. "The Dark Side of Transnationalism: Social Engineering and Nazism, 1930s–40s." *Journal of Contemporary History* 51, no. 1 (January 2016): 3–21.
- Pawlowsky, Verena. "Quelle aus vielen Stücken: Die Korrespondenz der Anthropologischen Abteilung des Wiener Naturhistorischen Museums bis 1938." In *Vorreiter der Vernichtung: Eugenik, Rassenhygiene und Euthanasie in der österreichischen Diskussion vor 1938*, edited by Wolfgang Neugebauer and Heinz Eberhard Gabriel, 139–65. Vienna: Böhlau, 2005.
- Pendas, Devin, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell. "Introduction." In *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, edited by Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell, 1–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Pendas, Devin. "Racial States in Comparative Perspective." In *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, edited by Devin Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard Wetzell, 116–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

- Pešek, Jiří. *Od aglomerace k velkoměstu: Praha a středoevropské metropole, 1850-1920* [From Agglomeration to Metropolis: Prague and Central European Metropolises, 1850-1920]. Prague: Scriptorium, 1999.
- Petrescu, Dragoș, and Daniela Petrescu. “Organizația ‘Șoimii Carpaților’ în perioada interbelică” [The Organization Carpathian Falcons During the Interwar Period]. *Carpica* 32 (2003): 187–96.
- Petrungaro, Stefano. “The Medical Debate about Prostitution and Venereal Diseases in Yugoslavia (1918–1941).” *Social History of Medicine* 32, no. 1 (February, 2019): 121–42.
- Phillips, Mark Salber, and Gordon Schochet. “Preface.” In *Questions of Tradition*, edited by Mark Salber Phillips and Gordon Schochet, ix–xv. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Pifferi, Michele. *The Limits of Criminological Positivism: The Movement for Criminal Law Reform in the West, 1870–1940*. London: Routledge, 2021.
- Piskorski, Jan. “Polish Myśl Zachodnia and German Ostforschung: An Attempt at a Comparison.” In *German Scholars and Ethnic Cleansing, 1919-1945*, edited by Ingo Haar and Michael Fahlbusch, 260–71. New York: Berghahn, 2005.
- Plaschka, Richard Georg, ed. *Mitteleuropa-Konzeptionen in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995.
- Pojar, Vojtěch. “Nedostatek potravin za první světové války a legitimita komunálních elit v Praze” [Food Shortages during World War I and the Legitimacy of Municipal Elites in Prague]. *Hospodářské dějiny* 28, no. 2 (2013): 177–225.
- Pojar, Vojtěch. “Quality over Quantity: Expert Knowledge and the Politics of Food in Prague, 1914-1918.” M.A. Thesis, Central European University, 2017.
- Pommer, Annette. “(Wiener) Kinder aufs Land: Die Kinderverschickung im Ersten Weltkrieg.” M.A. Thesis, University of Salzburg, 2019.
- Pommer, Annette. “Das Kaiser Kaiser-Karl-Wohlfahrtswerk: Die staatliche Kinderverschickungsaktion im Ersten Weltkrieg.” *historioPLUS* 7 (2020): 113–48.
- Popova, Kristina. “Combating Infant Mortality in Bulgaria: Welfare Activities, National Propaganda, and the Establishment of Pediatrics, 1900–1940.” In *Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta, and Marius Turda, 143–64. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011.
- Porter, Theodore M. *Genetics in the Madhouse: The Unknown History of Human Heredity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Porter, Theodore M. “Revenge of the Humdrum: Bureaucracy as Profession and as a Site of Science.” *Journal for the History of Knowledge* 1, no. 1 (2020): 1–5.

- Prendergast, Thomas R. "The Sociological Idea of the State: Legal Education, Austrian Multinationalism, and the Future of Continental Empire, 1880–1914." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 62, no. 2 (2020): 327–58.
- Presner, Todd Samuel. *Muscular Judaism: The Jewish Body and the Politics of Regeneration*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Proctor, Robert. *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Promitzer, Christian. "'Betwixt and Between'. Physical Anthropology in Bulgaria and Serbia until the End of the First World War." In *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, edited by Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer, 141–68. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010.
- Promitzer, Christian, Marius Turda, and Sevasti Trubeta, eds. *Health, Hygiene, and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011.
- Pudłocki, Tomasz, and Kamil Ruszała. "The War That Never Ended: East-Central Europe After 1918." In *Postwar Continuity and New Challenges in Central Europe, 1918–1923: The War That Never Ended*, edited by Tomasz Pudłocki and Kamil Ruszała, 1–6. New York: Routledge, 2021.
- Purtschert, Patricia, and Harald Fischer-Tiné, eds. *Colonial Switzerland*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Pyrah, Robert. "Heinrich von Srbik." In *Anti-Modernism: Radical Revisions of Collective Identity*, edited by Diana Mishkova, Marius Turda, and Balázs Trencsényi, 259–65. New York: Central European University Press, 2014.
- Rabinbach, Anson. *The Human Motor: Energy, Fatigue, and the Origins of Modernity*. New York: Basic Books, 1990.
- Rabinbach, Anson. *The Eclipse of the Utopias of Labor*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2018.
- Rabinow, Paul, and Nikolas Rose. "Biopower Today." *BioSocieties* 1, no. 2 (2006): 195–217.
- Radick, Gregory. "Mendel the Fraud? A Social History of Truth in Genetics." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 93 (June 2022): 39–46.
- Raj, Kapil. "Beyond Postcolonialism ... and Postpositivism: Circulation and the Global History of Science." *Isis* 104, no. 2 (2013): 337–47.
- Rákosník, Jakub, and Radka Šustrová. *Rodina v zájmu státu: Populační růst a instituce manželství v českých zemích 1918-1989* [Family in the Interest of the State: Population Growth and the Institution of Marriage in the Czech Lands 1918-1989]. Prague: NLN, 2016.
- Ranzmaier, Irene. "The Anthropological Society in Vienna and the Academic Establishment of Anthropology in Austria, 1870-1930." *Histories of Anthropology Annual* 7, no. 1 (2011): 1–22.

- Ranzmaier, Irene. *Die Anthropologische Gesellschaft in Wien und die akademische Etablierung anthropologischer Disziplinen an der Universität Wien 1870-1930*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2013.
- Rathkolb, Oliver, ed. *Der lange Schatten des Antisemitismus: Kritische Auseinandersetzungen mit der Geschichte der Universität Wien im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vienna University Press, 2013.
- Reill, Dominique Kirchner. *The Fiume Crisis: Life in the Wake of the Habsburg Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020.
- Reiß, Christian. "The Biologische Versuchsanstalt as a Techno-Natural Assemblage: Artificial Environments, Animal Husbandry and the Challenges of Experimental Biology." In *Vivarium: Experimental, Quantitative, and Theoretical Biology at Vienna's Biologische Versuchsanstalt*, edited by Gerd B. Müller, 115–32. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 2017.
- Rhode, Maria. "A Matter of Place, Space, and People." In *National Races: Transnational Power Struggles in the Sciences and Politics of Human Diversity, 1840-1945*, edited by Richard McMahon, 105–40. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019.
- Richards, Robert J. *The Tragic Sense of Life: Ernst Haeckel and the Struggle over Evolutionary Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Robionek, Bernd. "Contested Cooperation: The Ethnic-German Welfare Cooperatives in the Vojvodina (1930s)." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire* 26, no. 1 (January 2019): 104–120.
- Rogahn, Sabrina. *Rassismus popularisieren: Hans F. K. Günthers »Rassenkunden« in der Rezensionenliteratur 1922–1942*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2022.
- Rohde, Martin. *Nationale Wissenschaft zwischen zwei Imperien: Die Ševčenko-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1892–1918*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2021.
- Roseman, Mark. "Racial Discourse, Nazi Violence, and the Limits of the Racial State Model." In *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, edited by Devin O. Pendas, Mark Roseman, and Richard F. Wetzell, 31–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Rudnicki, Szymon. "Anti-Jewish Legislation in Interwar Poland 148." In *Antisemitism and Its Opponents in Modern Poland*, edited by Robert Blobaum, 148–70. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Rybak, Jan. "Racialization of Disease: The Typhus-Epidemic, Antisemitism and Closed Borders in German-Occupied Poland, 1915–1918." *European History Quarterly* 52, 'no. 3 (July 2022): 461–84.
- Ryšavá Alvarezová, Elizabeth. "Dětství mimo svět a rozum: Institucionalizace mentálních chorob a psychopatologie dětí v 1. polovině 20. století" [Childhood Outside the World and Reason: Institutionalization of Mental Disorders and Psychopathology of Children in the First Half of the 20th Century]. M.A. Thesis, University of Pardubice, 2018.

- Sablik, Karl. "Julius Tandler und die Medizinische Fakultät in Budapest (I. Weltkrieg)." In *Acta Congressus Internationalis XXIV Historiae Artis Medicinae : 25-31 Augusti 1974 Budapestini*, edited by József Antall, Géza Buzinkay, Ferenc Némethy, Emil Schultheisz, Endre Réti, Dénes Karasszon, Győző Birtalan, and Károly Zalai, 631–35. Budapest: Museum, Bibliotheca et Archivum Historiae Artis Medicinae Semmelweis Nominata, 1976.
- Sablik, Karl. *Julius Tandler: Mediziner und Sozialreformer: Eine Biographie*. Vienna: Schendl, 1983.
- Sapp, Jan. *Evolution by Association: A History of Symbiosis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Schmuhl, Hans-Walter. *The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics, 1927–1945: Crossing Boundaries*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2008.
- Schneider, William H. "Henri Laugier, the Science of Work and the Workings of Science in France, 1920-1940." *Cahiers pour l'histoire du CNRS* 5 (1989): 7–34.
- Schorske, Carl E. "Politics in a New Key: An Austrian Trio." In *Fin-de-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture*, 116–80. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.
- Schrad, Mark Lawrence. *Smashing the Liquor Machine: A Global History of Prohibition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Schroeder-Gudehus, Brigitte. "International Science from the Franco-Prussian War to World War Two: An Era of Organization." In *The Cambridge History of Science*, edited by Hugh Richard Slotten, Ronald L. Numbers, and David N. Livingstone, 43–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Schultz, Helga, and Angela Harre, eds. *Bauerngesellschaften auf dem Weg in die Moderne: Agrarismus in Ostmitteleuropa 1880 bis 1960*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010.
- Schwarz, Peter. *Julius Tandler: zwischen Humanismus und Eugenik*. Vienna: Steinbauer, 2017.
- Scott, James C. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Šedivý, Ivan. *Češi, české země a Velká válka: 1914-1918* [Czechs, Bohemian Lands, and the Great War: 1914-1918]. Prague: NLN, 2003.
- Seelig, Marie Louise. *Heinz Potthoff (1875-1945): Arbeitsrecht als volkswirtschaftliches und sozialpolitisches Gestaltungsinstrument*. Berlin: BWV Verlag, 2008.
- Segers, Yves. "Rural Development and Indigenous Peasantry Schemes in Belgian Congo, 1930–1960." In *International Conference of the European Rural History Organisation*, 316. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2022.
- Ševeček, Ondřej, and Martin Jemelka, eds. *Company Towns of the Baťa Concern: History - Cases - Architecture*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013.

- Shils, Edward. "Tradition." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 13, no. 2 (1971): 122–59.
- Shmidt, Victoria. "Public Health as an Agent of Internal Colonialism in Interwar Czechoslovakia: Shaping the Discourse about the Nation's Children." *Patterns of Prejudice* 52, no. 4 (2018): 355–87.
- Shmidt, Victoria, ed. *The Politics of Disability in Interwar and Socialist Czechoslovakia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2019.
- Shmidt, Victoria. "The Politics of Surveillance in the Interwar Czechoslovak Periphery: The Role of Campaigns Against Infectious Diseases." *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 68, no. 1 (2019): 29–56.
- Shmidt, Victoria. "Race Science in Czechoslovakia: Serving Segregation in the Name of the Nation." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 83, no. 101241 (October 2020): 1–13.
- Shmidt, Victoria, and Bernadette Nadya Jaworsky. *Historicizing Roma in Central Europe: Between Critical Whiteness and Epistemic Injustice*. London: Routledge, 2021.
- Sieder, Reinhard. "Housing Policy, Social Welfare, and Family Life in 'Red Vienna', 1919–34." *Oral History* 13, no. 2 (Autumn 1985): 35–48.
- Sieder, Reinhard. "Das Dispositiv der Fürsorgeerziehung in Wien." *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 25, no. 1–2 (2014): 156–93.
- Sieder, Reinhard. "Wiener Arbeiterkinder: Praktiken des Alltagslebens und die Anfänge der eugenischen Fürsorgepolitik." In *Kindheit und Schule im Ersten Weltkrieg*, edited by Hannes Stekl and Christa Hämmerle, 260–85. Vienna: New Academic Press, 2015.
- Silverstein, Sara. "The Periphery Is the Centre: Some Macedonian Origins of Social Medicine and Internationalism." *Contemporary European History* 28, no. 2 (May 2019): 220–233.
- Silverstein, Sara. "Reinventing International Health in East Central Europe: The League of Nations, State Sovereignty, and Universal Health." In *Remaking Central Europe*, edited by Natasha Wheatley and Peter Becker, 71–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Silverstein, Sara. "Doctors and Diplomats: Health Services in the New Europe, 1918–1923." In *A New Europe, 1918–1923: Instability, Innovation, Recovery*, edited by Bartosz Dziewanowski-Stefańczyk and Jay M. Winter, 142–60. London: Routledge, 2022.
- Simon, Attila. *Az átmenet bizonytalansága: Az 1918/1919-es impériumváltás Pozsonytól Kassáig* [The Uncertainty of the Transition: The 1918/1919 Imperial Change from Bratislava to Košice]. Budapest: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet-Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2021.
- Šimůnek, Michal. "Eugenics, Social Genetics and Racial Hygiene: Plans for the Scientific Regulation of Human Heredity in the Czech Lands, 1900–1925." In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–*

1940, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 145–66. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.

Šimůnek, Michal. “Pro et contra. Debaty o zavedení eugenické sterilizace v Československu, 1933–1938” [Pro et Contra: Debates on the Introduction of Eugenic Sterilization in Czechoslovakia, 1933–1938]. *Speciální pedagogika* 22, no. 3 (2012): 224–40.

Šimůnek, Michal. “Bohumil Sekla.” In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900–1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 174–75. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Šimůnek, Michal. “‘...před areopagem učenců z celého světa’: tzv. Zollschanova akce (Zollschan-Aktion) mezi vědou, diplomacií a politikou, 1933–1938” [“... Before the Areopagus of Scholars from all over the World”: The So-called Zollschan-Aktion Between Science, Diplomacy and Politics, 1933–1938]. In *Za rovnocennost evropských plemen: Československá antropologie tváří v tvář rasismu a nacismu* [For the Equivalence of European Races: Czechoslovak Anthropology in the Face of Racism and Nazism], edited by Milan Ducháček, 76–129. Prague: NLN, 2023.

Šimůnek, Michal, and Uwe Hoßfeld. “Selected Bibliography on Heredity, Medicine, and Eugenics in Bohemia and Moravia, 1900–1950.” *Folia Mendeliana* 49, no. 2 (2013): 5–31.

Sinkulová, Ludmila. *Lékaři, stát a zdraví lidu: z historie zdravotní služby v zemích českých* [Doctors, the State, and the Health of the People: From the History of Healthcare in the Czech Lands]. Prague: Státní zdravotnické nakladatelství, 1959.

Sipeki Irén. “A pályaválasztási tanácsadó tevékenységének és történetének áttekintése” [Overview of the Activities and History of Vocational Guidance]. *Neveléstörténet* 2, no. 1–2 (2005): 126–34.

Skinner, Quentin. “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas.” *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53.

Sluga, Glenda. “UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley.” *Journal of World History* 21, no. 3 (September 2010): 393–418.

Sluga, Glenda. *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Snow, George. “International Congresses on Alcoholism.” In *Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History: An International Encyclopedia*, edited by Jack Blocker, David Fahey, and Ian Tyrrell, 318–19. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2003.

Soyka, Hermann. “Zwischen Jugendbewegung und Abstinenzbewegung: Wurzeln – Gemeinsamkeiten – Abgrenzungen – Wandel am Beispiel der Vereinsgeschichte der ‘Deutschen Gemeinschaft für alkoholfreie Kultur’.” M.A. Thesis, University of Graz, 2013.

Spöring, Francesco. “Du musst Apostel der Wahrheit werden: Auguste Forel und der sozialhygienische Antialkoholdiskurs, 1886–1931.” In *Biopolitik und Sittlichkeitsreform: Kampagnen gegen Alkohol, Drogen und Prostitution 1880–1950*,

edited by Judith Grosse, Francesco Spöring, and Jana Tschurennev, 111–44. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2014.

Star, Susan Leigh, and James R. Griesemer. “Institutional Ecology, ‘Translations’ and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39.” *Social Studies of Science* 19, no. 3 (August 1989): 387–420.

Stauter-Halsted, Keely. *The Devil’s Chain: Prostitution and Social Control in Partitioned Poland*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015.

Steffen, Katrin. “Who Belongs to the Healthy Body of the Nation? Health and National Integration in Poland and the Polish Army after the First World War.” In *From the Midwife’s Bag to the Patient’s File: Public Health in Eastern and Southeastern Europe*, edited by Heike Karge, Friederike Kind-Kovács, and Sara Bernasconi, 119–44. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2017.

Steffen, Katrin. *Blut und Metall: Die transnationalen Wissensräume von Ludwik Hirszfeld und Jan Czochralski im 20. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2021.

Stergar, Rok. “National Indifference in the Heyday of Nationalist Mobilization? Ljubljana Military Veterans and the Language of Command.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 43 (2012): 45–58.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Stone, Dan. “Nazi Race Ideologues.” *Patterns of Prejudice* 50, no. 4–5 (2016): 445–57.

Streibel, Andreas. “Von der Alm zur Puszta: Zur Rolle völkischer Schutzvereine bei der Angliederung des Burgenlandes an Österreich.” *Burgenländische Heimatblätter* 56, no. 2-3 (1994): 49–77, 89–118.

Strnadová, Martina. “Karel Slavoj Amerling očima jeho pokračovatelů” [Karel Slavoj Amerling Through the Eyes of His Successors]. B.A. Thesis, Charles University, 2014.

Suba, János. “Az Országos Hadigondozó Hivatal” [The National Military Welfare Office]. *Rendvédelem-történeti Füzetek* 18, no. 21 (2010): 123–39.

Surman, Jan, Franz Leander Fillafer, and Johannes Feichtinger. *The Worlds of Positivism: A Global Intellectual History, 1770–1930*. New York: Springer, 2018.

Švec, Michal. *Komunální politika ve Velké Praze: obecní volby, politické strany a zvolené orgány v letech 1923-1938* [Municipal Politics in Greater Prague: Municipal Elections, Political Parties, and Elected Bodies in the Years 1923-1938]. Prague: Karolinum, 2012.

Svobodný, Petr, and Ludmila Hlaváčková. *Dějiny lékařství v českých zemích* [History of Medicine in the Czech Lands]. Prague: Triton, 2004.

Szacki, Jerzy. “Three Concepts of Tradition.” *The Polish Sociological Bulletin* 9, no. 20 (1969): 17–31.

- Szegedi, Gábor. “Good Health Is the Best Dowry: Marriage Counseling, Premarital Examinations, Sex Education in Hungary 1920-1952.” PhD Thesis, Central European University, 2014.
- Taschwer, Klaus. “Geheimsache Bärenhöhle: Wie eine antisemitische Professorenclique nach 1918 an der Universität Wien jüdische Forscherinnen und Forscher vertrieb.” In *Alma Mater Antisemitica: Akademisches Milieu, Juden und Antisemitismus an den Universitäten Europas zwischen 1918 und 1939*, edited by Regina Fritz, Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, and Jana Starek, 221–42. Vienna: New Academic Press, 2016.
- Taschwer, Klaus. *Der Fall Paul Kammerer: das abenteuerliche Leben des umstrittensten Biologen seiner Zeit*. München: Carl Hanser, 2016.
- Taschwer, Klaus. “Darwin und die frühe Eugenik in Wien: Wie und warum der Soziallamarckismus in Österreich die biopolitischen Diskussionen rund um den Ersten Weltkrieg bestimmte.” In *Darwin in Zentraleuropa: Die wissenschaftliche, weltanschauliche und populäre Rezeption im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Wolfgang L. Reiter and Herbert Matis, 343–60. Vienna: Lit, 2018.
- Teicher, Amir. “Medical Bacteriology and Medical Genetics, 1880–1940: A Call for Synthesis.” *Medical History* 64, no. 3 (July 2020): 325–354.
- Teicher, Amir. *Social Mendelism: Genetics and the Politics of Race in Germany, 1900–1948*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Teicher, Amir. “Kristine Bonnevie’s Theories on the Genetics of Fingerprints, and Their Application in Germany.” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 92 (April 2022): 162–76.
- Teschler-Nicola, Maria. “Volksdeutsche and Racial Anthropology in Interwar Vienna: The ‘Marienfeld Project.’” In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 55–82. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Ther, Philipp. “‘Imperial Nationalism’ as a Challenge for the Study of Nationalism.” In *Nationalizing Empires*, edited by Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, 573–92. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015.
- Thompson, Edward P. “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century.” *Past and Present* 50, no. 1 (1971): 76–136.
- Thomson, Mathew. “Disability, Psychiatry, and Eugenics.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, edited by Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine, 116–33. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Tilly, Charles. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Timmermann, Carsten. “Constitutional Medicine, Neoromanticism, and the Politics of Antimechanism in Interwar Germany.” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 75, no. 4 (2001): 717–39.

- Todes, Daniel P. *Darwin without Malthus: The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Toshkov, Alex. *Agrarianism as Modernity in 20th-Century Europe: The Golden Age of the Peasantry*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.
- Trencsényi, Balázs, Maciej Janowski, Monika Baár, Maria Falina, and Michal Kopeček. *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe. Volume I: Negotiating Modernity in the "Long Nineteenth Century."* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Trencsényi, Balázs, Michal Kopeček, Luka Lisjak Gabrijelčič, Maria Falina, Mónika Baár, and Maciej Janowski. "A New State for 'New Men.'" In *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe: Volume II: Negotiating Modernity in the "Short Twentieth Century" and Beyond, Part I: 1918-1968*, 205–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Tresch, John. "Cosmologies Materialized: History of Science and History of Ideas." In *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Samuel Moyn and Darrin M. McMahon, 153–72. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Troch, Pieter. "Interwar Yugoslav State-Building and the Changing Social Position of the Sokol Gymnastics Movement." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire* 26, no. 1 (2019): 60–83.
- Trubeta, Sevasti. *Physical Anthropology, Race and Eugenics in Greece (1880s-1970s)*. Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Turda, Marius. "'A New Religion'? Eugenics and Racial Scientism in Pre-First World War Hungary." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 3 (September 2006): 303–25.
- Turda, Marius. "The First Debates on Eugenics in Hungary, 1910–1918." In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 185–221. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Turda, Marius. "The Nation as Object: Race, Blood, and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania." *Slavic Review* 66, no. 03 (2007): 413–441.
- Turda, Marius, and Paul J. Weindling, eds., *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Turda, Marius. "'To End the Degeneration of a Nation': Debates on Eugenic Sterilization in Inter-War Romania." *Medical History* 53, no. 01 (January 2009): 77–104.
- Turda, Marius. "Entangled Traditions of Race: Physical Anthropology in Hungary and Romania, 1900–1940." *Focaal* 2010, no. 58 (2010): 32–46.
- Turda, Marius. *Modernism and Eugenics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

- Turda, Marius. "In Search of Racial Types: Soldiers and the Anthropological Mapping of the Romanian Nation, 1914–44." *Patterns of Prejudice* 47, no. 1 (February 2013): 1–21.
- Turda, Marius. *Eugenics and Nation in Early 20th Century Hungary*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Turda, Marius, ed. *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Turda, Marius. "Introduction." In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, xi–xxii. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Turda, Marius. "Iordache Făcăoaru." In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 328–31. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Turda, Marius. "Iuliu Moldovan." In *The History of East-Central European Eugenics, 1900-1945: Sources and Commentaries*, edited by Marius Turda, 296–99. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Turda, Marius. "Minorities and Eugenic Subcultures in East-Central Europe." *Acta Historiae Medicinae, Stomatologiae, Pharmaciae, Medicinae Veterinariae* 34, no. 1 (November 2015): 8–17.
- Turda, Marius. "Romanian Eugenic Sub-Culture and the Allure of Biopolitics, 1918–39." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 114 (2016): 29–58.
- Turda, Marius, and Bolaji Balogun. "Colonialism, Eugenics and 'Race' in Central and Eastern Europe." *Global Social Challenges Journal* 20, no. 1 (2023): 1–11.
- Turda, Marius, and Aaron Gillette. *Latin Eugenics in Comparative Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- Turda, Marius, and Maria Sophia Quine. *Historicizing Race*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018.
- Uzarczyk, Kamila. "Moses Als Eugeniker? The Reception of Eugenic Ideas in Jewish Medical Circles in Interwar Poland." In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 283–97. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Valman, Nadia. "Dracula." In *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution*, edited by Richard S. Levy, 188–89. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005.
- Vanthemsche, Guy. *Belgium and the Congo, 1885-1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Varga, Imre. "Náray-Szabó Sándor reformtevékenysége és hatása a szegedi és a debreceni gyógypedagógiai intézetekre" [The Reform Activities of Sándor Náray-Szabó and His Impact on the Special Education Institutes in Szeged and Debrecen]. *Különleges Bánásmód* 1, no. 1 (2015): 7–24.

- Varshizky, Amit. "Between Science and Metaphysics: Fritz Lenz and Racial Anthropology in Interwar Germany." *Intellectual History Review* 27, no. 2 (April 2017): 247–72.
- Varshizky, Amit. "Non-Mechanistic Explanatory Styles in the German Racial Science: A Comparison of Hans F. K. Günther and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß." In *Recognizing the Past in the Present: New Studies on Medicine before, during, and after the Holocaust*, edited by Sabine Hildebrandt, Miriam Offer, and Michael A. Grodin, 21–43. New York: Berghahn Books, 2020.
- Vermeiren, Jan. *The First World War and German National Identity: The Dual Alliance at War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Vermeiren, Jan. "Notions of Solidarity and Integration in Times of War: The Idea of Europe, 1914–18." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire* 24, no. 6 (2017): 874–88.
- Veselý, Jiří. "Theodor Balk (Fodor Dragutin)." In *Azyl v Československu 1933-1938* [Asylum in Czechoslovakia, 1933-1938], 275. Prague: Naše vojsko, 1983.
- Wachtel, Andrew. *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation: Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Wagner, Florian. *Colonial Internationalism and the Governmentality of Empire, 1893–1982*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- Walter, Franz. "Der Verein sozialistischer Ärzte." In *Sozialistische Akademiker- und Intellektuellen-Organisationen in der Weimarer Republik*, edited by Peter Lösche and Franz Walter, 131–201. Bonn: Dietz, 1990.
- Wasserman, Janek. *Black Vienna: The Radical Right in the Red City, 1918-1938*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014.
- Weigl, Marius. *Internierung und Militärdienst: Die "Lösung der Zigeunerfrage" in Österreich-Ungarn im Ersten Weltkrieg*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2022.
- Weindling, Paul J. *Health, Race and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Weindling, Paul J. *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Weindling, Paul J. "The League of Nations Health Organization and the Rise of Latin American Participation, 1920-40." *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos* 13, no. 3 (2006): 1–14.
- Weindling, Paul J. "Central Europe Confronts German Racial Hygiene: Friedrich Hertz, Hugo Iltis and Ignaz Zollschan as Critics of Racial Hygiene." In *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling, 263–282. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.

- Weindling, Paul J. "A City Regenerated: Eugenics, Race, and Welfare in Interwar Vienna." In *Interwar Vienna: Culture between Tradition and Modernity*, edited by Lisa Silverman and Deborah Holmes, 81–114, Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 2009.
- Weindling, Paul J. "Racial Expertise and German Eugenic Strategies for Southeastern Europe." In *Health, Hygiene, and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta, and Marius Turda, 27–54. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011.
- Weindling, Paul J. "Introduction." In *Race, Genetics, and Science: Resisting Racism in the 1930s*, by Iltis Hugo, 25–42. Brno: Masaryk University Press, 2017.
- Weingart, Peter, Jürgen Kroll, and Kurt Bayertz. *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992.
- Weir, Todd H. "The Riddles of Monism." In *Monism: Science, Philosophy, Religion, and the History of a Worldview*, edited by Todd H. Weir, 1–44. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Weiss, Sheila Faith. *Race Hygiene and National Efficiency: The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Wetzell, Richard. "Eugenics, Racial Science, and Nazi Biopolitics: Was There a Genesis of the 'Final Solution' from the Spirit of Science?" In *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, edited by Richard Wetzell, Devin Pendas, and Mark Roseman, 147–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Wheatley, Natasha. "Central Europe as Ground Zero of the New International Order." *Slavic Review* 78, no. 4 (2019): 900–11.
- Więckowska, Elżbieta. *Lekarze jako grupa zawodowa w II Rzeczypospolitej* [Doctors as a Professional Group in the Second Polish Republic]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2004.
- Wingfield, Nancy M. "The Enemy Within: Regulating Prostitution and Controlling Venereal Disease in Cisleithanian Austria during the Great War." *Central European History* 46, no. 03 (September 2013): 568–98.
- Wingfield, Nancy M. *The World of Prostitution in Late Imperial Austria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Wingfield, Nancy M., and Maria Bucur, eds. *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Wojtas, Andrzej. *Problematyka agrarna w polskiej myśli politycznej 1918-1948* [Agrarian Issues in Polish Political Thought, 1918-1948]. Warsaw: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1983.
- Wolff, Larry. *Woodrow Wilson and the Reimagining of Eastern Europe*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2020.

- Wyss, Johana. “New Settlers as Implicated Subjects: Case Study of Collective Amnesia in Czech Silesia.” In *No Neighbors’ Lands in Postwar Europe: Vanishing Others*, edited by Anna Wylegała, Sabine Rutar, and Małgorzata Łukianow, 359–81. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2023.
- Yeomans, Rory. “Racial Politics as a Multiethnic Pavilion: Yugoslavs, Dinarics, and the Search for a Synthetic Identity in the 1920s and 1930s.” In *National Races: Transnational Power Struggles in the Sciences and Politics of Human Diversity, 1840-1945*, edited by Richard McMahon, 295–338. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019.
- Yip, Ka-che. *Health and National Reconstruction in Nationalist China: The Development of Modern Health Services, 1928-1937*. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1995.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Zabłotniak, Ryszard. “Dzieje Polskiego Towarzystwa Eugenicznego” [History of the Polish Eugenics Society]. *Kwartalnik Historii nauki i techniki* 16, no. 4 (1971): 769–87.
- Zahra, Tara. “‘Each Nation Only Cares for Its Own’: Empire, Nation, and Child Welfare Activism in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1918.” *The American Historical Review* 111, no. 5 (December 2006): 1378–1402.
- Zahra, Tara. *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Zahra, Tara. “Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis.” *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 93–119.
- Ziegerhofer, Anita. “Xanthippen, Schmutzlieschen, Zitron-Eulalien: Österreichs Frauen im Kampf gegen den Alkoholismus im 19./20. Jahrhundert.” *GeschlechterGeschichten* 47 (2017): 185–200.
- Zimmerman, Andrew. “Foucault in Berkeley and Magnitogorsk: Totalitarianism and the Limits of Liberal Critique.” *Contemporary European History* 23, no. 2 (2014): 225–36.
- Zylberman, Patrick. “Fewer Parallels than Antitheses: Rene Sand and Andrija Stampar on Social Medicine, 1919-1955.” *Social History of Medicine* 17, no. 1 (April 2004): 77–92.
- Zylberman, Patrick. “Civilizing the State: Borders, Weak States and International Health in Modern Europe.” In *Medicine at the Border: Disease, Globalization and Security, 1850 to the Present*, edited by Alison Bashford, 21–40. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Zylberman, Patrick. “‘Debordering’ Public Health: The Changing Patterns of Health Border in Modern Europe.” *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos* 27, suppl 1 (September 2020): 29–48.

Online Sources

- “Rasismus” [Racism]. In *Lístkový lexikální archiv (1911-1991)*. On-line. Accessed May 15, 2022. <https://psjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=rasismus>.
- “Zákon č. 320/1919 Sb., kterým se mění ustanovení občanského práva o obřadnostech smlouvy manželské, o rozluce a o překážkách manželství” [Act No. 320/1919 Coll., Which Amends the Provisions of Civil Law on the Ceremonies of the Marriage Contract, on Separation and on Obstacles to Marriage]. In *Systém ASPI*. On-line. Accessed January 16, 2023. <https://www.aspi.sk/products/lawText/1/1221/0/2/zakon-c-320-1919-sb-kterym-se-meni-ustanoveni-obcanskeho-prava-o-obradnostech-smlouvy-manzelske-o-rozluce-a-o-prekazkach-manzelstvi/zakon-c-320-1919-sb-kterym-se-meni-ustanoveni-obcanskeho-prava-o-obradnostech-smlouvy-manzelske-o-rozluce-a-o-prekazkach-manzelstvi?timeslice=06.06.1924&lastPara=undefined>.
- Fillafer, Franz Leander, and Johannes Feichtinger. “How to Rethink the Global History of Knowledge Making from a Central European Perspective.” *History of Knowledge: Research, Resources, and Perspectives*. Published October 9, 2019. On-line. Accessed May 10, 2023. <https://historyofknowledge.net/2019/10/09/global-history-of-knowledge-making-from-central-european-perspective/>.
- Révész, Tamás. “Post-war Turmoil and Violence (Hungary).” In *1914-1918-online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, edited by Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer, and Bill Nasson. Issued by Freie Universität Berlin. Last modified March 9, 2023. On-line. Accessed April 20, 2023. <https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/post-war-turmoil-and-violence-hungary>.
- Shapira, Elana. “Eugenie Schwarzwald.” In *Shalvi/Hyman Encyclopedia of Jewish Women*. Jewish Women’s Archive. Last modified June 23, 2021. On-line. Accessed January 25, 2022. <https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/schwarzwald-eugenie>.
- Skinner, Quentin. “Belief, Truth and Interpretation.” Keynote Address presented at the *Ideengeschichte. Traditionen und Perspektiven*, Ruhr-University Bochum, November 18, 2014. <https://youtu.be/VJYsTJt8vvg>.