

Progress through Racial Extermination: Social Darwinism, Eugenics, and Pacifism in Germany, 1860-1918

Richard Weikart
California State University, Stanislaus

Until the late nineteenth century the idea of bringing progress to the world and European societies was associated with Christian pastors or missionaries and liberal or socialist humanitarians, who focused on imbuing the indigenous peoples in the colonies with European culture and elevating the poverty-ridden masses at home with the higher values of religion, freedom, or equality. But in the pre-World War I decades, racial ideologies gained prominence, which argued that the educational efforts of religious and secular-humanitarian emissaries were in vain. Instead, scientific racism suggested a different path to progress. In Friedrich Hellwald's magisterial four-volume work on ethnology, Rudolf Cronau used social Darwinist arguments to dismiss the idea that the "lower races" could be elevated:

The current inequality of the races is an indubitable fact. Under equally favorable climatic and land conditions the higher race always displaces the lower, i.e., contact with the culture of the higher race is a fatal poison for the lower race and kills them.... [American Indians] naturally succumb in the struggle, its race vanishes and civilization strides across their corpses.... Therein lies once again the great doctrine, that the evolution of humanity and of the individual nations progresses, not through moral principles, but rather by dint of the right of the stronger.¹

Cronau—along with a host of leading scientists, physicians, and social thinkers who embraced Darwinian social explanations and eugenics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—thus argued that the key to progress was the annihilation of the "lower races," who stood in the way of advanced culture and civilization.

Some social Darwinist thinkers went further, arguing that racial extermination, even if carried out by bloody means, would result in moral progress for humanity.

Brutality would not necessarily triumph in the struggle for existence, since, as Darwin had argued in *Descent of Man*, morality conferred a selective advantage.² Therefore, according to this twisted logic, since Europeans were morally superior to other peoples, the extermination of other races would rid the world of immorality. The University of Leipzig geographer, Alfred Kirchhoff, articulated this point in his posthumously published work, *Darwinism Applied to Peoples and States* (1910). He justified racial extermination as part of the human struggle for existence: "So the righteousness of the struggle for existence, cool to the core, wills it." This conferred a kind of sanctity to the harsh realities of

the struggle for existence between the peoples, [which] causes the extermination of the crude, immoral hordes.... Not the physically strongest, but the [morally] best ones triumph. If there were not a diversity of peoples, if there were no international rivalries, where would be the guarantee for the preservation of the fitness of the peoples, not to mention for the progress of humanity?³

Thus Kirchhoff, who was by no means alone in this matter, not only conferred the status of scientific inevitability to racial extermination, but also made it seem righteous and noble.

Since these views on racial extermination are so unreasonable, it is understandable that many scholars have distanced such exterminationist racism from modernity.⁴ They are undoubtedly right that the ideology of racial extermination undermined cosmopolitan egalitarianism and humanitarianism, which is widely regarded as the essence of modernity. Yet social Darwinism, on which exterminationist racism relied, was the epitome of modernity in other respects. First, social Darwinists consistently appealed to scientific laws and evolutionary progress in order to eliminate traditional ideas and structures that appeared to stand in the way of thorough modernization. They also called for radical secularization, which is commonly considered a concomitant to modernity. The promise of radical modernization that positivist science—including Darwinism—appeared to offer for the liberation and progress of humanity strongly appealed to many leftists.⁵ Even pacifism was often closely linked with eugenics because it offered a complete departure from the imperfect men of the past.⁶ However we may define modernity today, social Darwinists and eugenicists certainly viewed themselves—and their racial theories—as rational, scientific, progressive, and modern.⁷

Such links of social Darwinism and eugenics to radical social reform in German thought have been variously explored in the past, but surprisingly little attention has been paid to the appeal of one particular kind of racist thought—exterminationist racism.⁸ Racism does not always imply extermination, but often functions as a justification for slavery or economic oppression. Some German colonial administrators and physicians even argued that German policy should aim at increasing the indigenous African populations, so they could exploit more labor.⁹

My essay will show, however, that scientific racism based on social Darwinism radicalized racism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by providing a scientific rationale for exterminating non-European races. George Mosse, who was one of the few to trace the origins of modern “scientific” racism to a demystified post-Enlightenment world, which required scientific rationalization to justify inequality and suppression, erred when he stopped short of linking racial extermination to these roots and argued that such killing dreams were exclusively the province of irrationalist and mystical race theorists. He thus exonerated scientific racism from exterminationist racism, asserting that eugenics “was not geared either to the elimination of inferior races or even to the necessity of race war.”¹⁰

Not only was much scientific racism exterminationist, but scientific racism even made inroads into the pacifist movement, especially via eugenicists with pacifist sympathies. Thus, rather surprisingly, even some pacifists endorsed some kind of exterminationist racism. Paul Crook has shown that many Darwinian-inspired eugenicists espoused pacifism, but he did not go on to explore the limits of their pacifism, especially in regard to race relations.¹¹ The existence of exterminationist racism among pacifists problematizes the history of pacifism, since pacifism is—rightly—viewed as quintessentially modern as well as humanitarian. Yet some pacifists’ eagerness to create a new, modern human led them to embrace ideas that clashed with their humanitarian codes of conduct.

Four elements of Darwinian theory provided fuel for exterminationist racism. First, Darwin propagated Malthus’s idea that the population has a tendency to expand faster than the food supply, a point that seemed confirmed by the rapidly expanding European population. Second, Darwinian evolution required variation within species, and most Darwinists in the nineteenth century considered human races either subspecies or even separate species. Ernst Haeckel, the most famous Darwinist in late nineteenth-century Germany, for example, divided humans into twelve species and even grouped these species into four separate genera!¹² Third, because of the population imbalance, individuals within a species have to compete for scarce resources in a struggle for existence. Many Darwinists, including Darwin and Haeckel, argued that this competition-to-the-death occurred not only between individuals, but also between groups, such as tribes or races. Finally, many Darwinists argued that Darwinism undermined traditional Judeo-Christian ethics, including its stress on the sanctity of human life.¹³ Blended together with their new conception of the value of human life and the competitive struggle between organisms, racial extermination seemed (at least to some) natural and inevitable—indeed, even beneficial and progressive.

Because Haeckel believed in racial inequality and an inevitable struggle for existence among humans, he concluded that “inferior” races would ultimately be exterminated in this struggle. One example of the human struggle for existence, he

stated, was European expansion, which was driving other races, such as the American Indians and Australian aborigines, to extinction. "Even if these races were to propagate more abundantly than the white Europeans," he averred, "yet sooner or later they would succumb to the latter in the struggle for existence."¹⁴ Haeckel was one of the earliest and certainly the most influential Darwinist to argue that racial extermination was an unavoidable consequence of the human struggle for existence.

In the 1860s-1890s a number of prominent Darwinian biologists, ethnologists, and other social thinkers took up the theme of racial extermination in their writings. Though some stressed the peaceful nature of this racial competition, some admitted that the struggle often produced violent warfare. A few even seemed to glory in the brutality of the racial conflict, while others regretted the inevitable extermination of the "inferior" races. These Darwinists agreed, however, that the extermination of the "inferior" races was on the whole a positive development leading to progress.

Probably the first scholar to justify racial extermination on a Darwinian basis was Oscar Peschel, editor of *Das Ausland* and later professor of geography at the University of Leipzig, who began promoting Darwinian theory immediately after Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared. In an 1860 article on races he argued that the two highest races are Caucasians, as the most intelligent, and black Africans, as the best adapted for the tropics. Because of competition from whites and blacks, other races were dying out. The American Indians and Polynesians "could not be saved, their time had come, as soon as a white face appeared." Peschel exonerated Spaniards for slaughtering Indians, claiming it was not brutality—they were merely following natural law. He stated, "This is the historical course. If we view it with the eye of a geologist, and indeed a geologist which accepts the Darwinian theory, we must say that this extinction [of human races] is a natural process, like the extinction of secondary animal and plant forms."¹⁵

He thus accepted all the death and misery of racial extermination with equanimity, appealing to science to legitimate his stance. Later, in his major work on ethnology, Peschel argued that racial extinction was caused not by European brutality, nor disease nor alcohol, but because the natives simply lose the desire to live, stop reproducing, and sometimes even kill their own offspring. Thus they bring about their own demise.¹⁶

Peschel's position resonated with the social Darwinist Friedrich Hellwald, Peschel's successor as editor of *Das Ausland*. In his 1880 book, *The Natural History of Humans*, Hellwald called the decline of the Australian aborigines, which he and many contemporaries considered the lowest race in the world, "race suicide," since allegedly they had simply stopped reproducing. Hellwald showed no regret about this process, quoting Peschel with approval:

Everything that we acknowledge as the right of the individual will have to yield to the urgent demands of human society, if it is not in accord with the latter. The

decline of the Tasmanians therefore should be viewed as a geological or paleontological fate: the stronger variety supplants the weaker. This extinction is sad in itself, but sadder still is the knowledge, that in this world the physical order treads down the moral order with every confrontation.¹⁷

Nature thus trumps ethics every time, so there is no point in decrying natural processes like racial extinction.

In his earlier major work, *History of Culture* (1875), which he dedicated to Haeckel, Hellwald was even more callous in his treatment of racial extermination. He derided all ethical considerations, maintaining that the ends justify the means and that “in nature only one law rules, which is no law, the law of the stronger, of violence.”¹⁸ He agreed with the social Darwinist writer, Robert Byr, whom he quoted: “Whoever it may be, he must stride over the corpses of the vanquished; that is natural law. Whoever shrinks back in hesitation from this, deprives himself of the chance for existence.”¹⁹ Like most Darwinists, Hellwald considered the extermination of “inferior” races a natural development necessary to bring progress, but unlike many of his contemporaries, he seemed to revel in the brutality of that struggle.

Even more influential than Peschel or Hellwald was Ludwig Büchner, a popularizer of Darwinism who believed that people could use reason to influence, though not totally escape, the struggle for existence. On many occasions he expressed sympathy with the peace movement.²⁰ However, despite his opposition to war, Büchner continued to believe that races were locked in a Darwinian struggle for existence that would ultimately result in the annihilation of “inferior” races. In the early 1870s he wrote, “The white or Caucasian human species [!] is ordained to take dominion of the earth, while the lowest human races, like Americans, Australians, Alfuren, Hottentots, etc., are proceeding toward their destruction with huge steps.” Büchner was not as explicit as Hellwald, but he implied that racial extermination is a positive development.²¹

So how did Büchner square his opposition to war with his view on racial extermination? We cannot know for sure, for despite often discussing both issues separately, he never explained the relationship between war and racial competition. There are two ways that Büchner could have answered this question, however, both of which were upheld by some of his contemporaries. He could have held that: 1) “inferior” races would die out through peaceful competition; or 2) warfare was justified against “inferior” races, but not against other “civilized,” i.e., European, peoples.

Opting for the former explanation was Ernst Krause (pseudonym, Carus Sterne), who behind Haeckel and Büchner was probably the most influential popularizer of Darwinism in Germany. Krause earned a doctorate in botany in 1866, wrote popular books on science, and edited *Kosmos*, a leading scientific journal devoted to Darwinism. Krause took the same view of racial inequality as Haeckel, admitting that the “inferior” races were dying out as a result of contact

with the more “civilized” races. However, this was not so much the result of bloody conflict as peaceful competition, as the example of the Tasmanians proved: “For the scientist this highly painful drama had great interest, inasmuch as it showed him how the struggle for existence in some circumstances entirely loses the character of violence and yet just as infallibly favors the rise of the more capable race.”²² According to Krause, Europeans were only indirectly responsible for the death of “lower” races.

By the end of the 1870s, racial extermination had already received considerable treatment by social Darwinist writers, but in the 1880s two new currents of thought would emerge to foster social Darwinist racism even more in the German academy. First, law professor and sociologist Ludwig Gumplowicz developed his Darwinian-inspired sociology of group conflict, focussing on *Racial Struggle*, the title of his 1884 book. Secondly, the prominent geographer Friedrich Ratzel began publishing his theory of *Lebensraum* (living space), which, though more subtle in its treatment of racial struggle than Gumplowicz’s theory, was nonetheless an important weapon in the arsenal of imperialists.

Gumplowicz’s ideas were not radically new. As we have seen, many social Darwinists had already presented racial conflict as part of the Darwinian struggle for existence. But Gumplowicz systematized many of the ideas we have already examined, placing racial struggle at the center of his analysis: “The *racial struggle for dominion* in all its forms, whether open and violent, or latent and peaceful, is therefore the actual *driving principle, the moving force of history*.” Gumplowicz believed that racial hatred was ingrained in humans, manifesting itself in racial conflict, including violence and bloodshed; violent enslavement and extermination of races is simply a part of the natural order.²³ Gumplowicz differed from most social Darwinists of his time, however, by defining race as a sociological, not a biological, category.²⁴ As a Polish Jew at the German-speaking University of Graz in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Gumplowicz had firsthand knowledge of ethnic rivalries. By presenting ethnic hostility as inevitable and “scientific,” Gumplowicz provided further grist for the mill of racist imperialists. Gumplowicz’s term “racial struggle” became firmly entrenched in race discourse by the early twentieth century.²⁵

Ratzel’s ideas about *Lebensraum* were also based on Darwinian thinking.²⁶ Before switching to geography, Ratzel was a zoologist and wrote a popular exposition of Darwinism, *Being and Becoming* (1869). Therein Ratzel argued that the extermination of the primitive peoples by Europeans was a powerful example of Darwinian natural selection in operation.²⁷ Later, Ratzel’s geographical theory, which he hoped would become “nothing less than the foundation of a new theory of humanity,” focused on human migrations and the “struggle for space.”²⁸ Ratzel claimed the struggle for space (*Lebensraum*) was the same as the human struggle for existence, and he believed it resulted in the extermination of less civilized peoples.²⁹ In one of Ratzel’s later books, *Political Geography*, he explained the

significance of his *Lebensraum* theory for colonization and warfare. The entire sixth chapter, “Conquest and Colonization,” is, in effect, a plea for Germans to wage war against native populations, especially in Africa, to wrest land away from them.³⁰ Though Ratzel was more egalitarian in his racial views than were most social Darwinists, his geographical theories provided clear support for settler colonization. *Lebensraum* ideology was easily appropriated by exterminationist racist thinkers, since despite Ratzel’s racial egalitarianism, policies based on his theories would lead to the same result: death to the indigenous peoples.

By the 1890s and early 1900s Darwinism had become well entrenched in the German academy, and racial theories—many built on social Darwinism—were spreading. Earlier most discussions of racial struggle and extermination were tucked away in brief passages in longer articles or books (except for Gumplowicz), but in the 1890s and especially after 1900 there was a proliferation of books and articles entirely devoted to race theory. Julius Langbehn, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Ludwig Schemann’s Gobineau Society, the Bayreuth Circle, and many others promoted a view of history and society founded on race. Race had moved from the periphery to center stage.

Simultaneously, the eugenics movement emerged in Germany, forthrightly based on Darwinian presuppositions, including its stress on biological inequality. Since eugenicists’ primary goal was the biological improvement of the human species, they hoped to rid the world of “inferior” or “degenerate” people. Most eugenicists concentrated on regenerating their own nation through measures either encouraging, discouraging, or even prohibiting reproduction of certain individuals, depending on their perceived biological value. However, since many eugenicists also believed that non-European races were inferior to Europeans, another way to improve the race would be eventually to replace non-Europeans with Europeans. Even among eugenicists who were not primarily concerned with race, it often lurked in the background. Biological improvement of Europeans would give them a greater advantage in the struggle against other races, while biological degeneration—which many eugenicists feared was occurring—might lead to disaster for Europeans in the global struggle for existence.

One prominent eugenicist making race a central concern was Ludwig Woltmann, a physician who founded the journal *Politisch-Anthropologische Revue* in 1902. Woltmann’s social theory was a blend of Marx, Darwin, and Gobineau, with the latter two predominating.³¹ Woltmann equated the racial struggle for existence with a “war of extermination.” He believed that the Germanic race, as the only culture-producing race, would eventually conquer the globe: “The Germanic race is called to encompass the earth with its dominion, to exploit the treasures of nature and the labor forces, and to make the passive races serving members of their cultural development.”³² Woltmann gathered around his journal a circle of like-minded racial thinkers preaching Germanic supremacy.

One member of Woltmann's circle was the freelance anthropologist Otto Ammon, who published three major books in the 1890s trying to apply Darwinism to society. He exulted in war and racial competition as a part of the Darwinian struggle for existence. He even tried to recruit the racial theorist Matthäus Much to write newspaper articles on racial struggle.³³ He also joined the Pan-German League and organized meetings promoting German navalism (and thus imperialism).³⁴ In 1900 he wrote an article arguing that because of population expansion, the white races must gain new space: "The inferior races (blacks, Indians) would thereby succumb in the struggle."³⁵

Woltmann's and Ammon's racial ideas spread even more widely through the tireless propaganda efforts of Ludwig Schemann, founder of the Gobineau Society. In his memoirs Schemann claimed that among his contemporaries Ammon was the greatest influence on his thinking, though he also acknowledged an intellectual debt to Woltmann.³⁶ Schemann cultivated close contact with the Pan-German League, which financially supported the Gobineau Society, seeing its racial theory as a justification for German imperialism.³⁷

Though Woltmann and his circle were outsiders to academic circles, many anthropologists in universities in the early twentieth century adopted social Darwinist racism and considered racial struggle and racial extermination inevitable. Eugen Fischer, an anthropologist at the University of Freiburg, was heavily influenced by Woltmann's circle.³⁸ In 1908 Fischer studied a Southwest African group, who were half-European and half-African. Fischer considered these "half-breeds" inferior, and in free competition with Europeans, he maintained, both blacks and half-blacks would perish. How, then, should Europeans treat these "inferior" people? Fischer recommended strict segregation. For the time being, it may be wise to allow them to increase their population, so they can provide labor for Europeans. But once they are no longer useful, he asserted, they must be done away with:

Therefore one should guarantee to them only the measure of protection that they *need* as a race inferior to us, in order to survive, but no more, and only so long as they are useful to us—otherwise [allow] free competition, which in my opinion means [their] demise!³⁹

Thus Fischer claimed the authority of his scientific investigations for a brutal policy of colonial exploitation and even racial extermination.⁴⁰ One of his students, Fritz Lenz, who became the first professor of race hygiene in Germany at the University of Munich in 1923, likewise exalted the interests of one's own race above all ethical considerations in a 1917 article.⁴¹

Even those anthropologists resisting Woltmann's race theories did not always escape the lure of social Darwinist ideology. The first professor of anthropology at the University of Berlin, Felix von Luschan, was liberal enough in his racial views

that he was invited to address the Universal Race Congress in London in 1911, a meeting committed to fostering racial reconciliation.⁴² They were in for a surprise. Luschan began by admitting that no race is inferior to another, but later warned against allowing “coarser or less refined elements,” such as blacks, Asians, and even Eastern Europeans, to immigrate into “civilized” nations. Near the end of his speech he opposed the very purposes of the congress he was addressing, stating,

The brotherhood of man is a good thing, but the struggle for life is a far better one. Athens would never have become what it was, without Sparta, and national jealousies and differences, and even the most cruel wars, have ever been the real causes of progress and mental freedom. As long as man is not born with wings, like the angels, he will remain subject to the eternal laws of Nature, and therefore he will always have to struggle for life and existence. . . . Nations will come and go, but racial and national antagonism will remain.⁴³

So much for racial reconciliation.

Not only was rhetoric about racial extermination becoming increasingly inflammatory around 1900, but it was also disseminating widely. Prominent professors, like Max von Gruber, a leading eugenicist, were advocating German population expansion and imperialism to wrest land away from indigenous peoples.⁴⁴ Other figures on the fringe of the eugenics movement, like Willibald Hentschel and Heinrich Driesmans, were intensely racist and did not hesitate to discuss the extermination of “inferior” races.⁴⁵ Viennese occultist race theorists, led by Guido von List and Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels, likewise publicized the dangers of other races and the blessings of their elimination.⁴⁶ Ideas about social Darwinist racial extermination even spread to influential military figures, such as the German general Friedrich von Bernhardi, the Austrian general Conrad von Hötzendorf, and the Austrian officer-turned-sociologist Gustav Ratzenhofer, whom Gumplowicz called a genius.⁴⁷

What seems incongruous, however, is that some pacifists and proponents of peace eugenics, who often criticized the views of social Darwinist militarists, also advocated racial extermination. In order to understand this phenomenon, we need to examine the rationale behind eugenicists’ opposition to war. When we examine their views closely, it becomes apparent that very few eugenicists opposed war *per se*; rather they opposed modern warfare, because they viewed it as contraselective. Modern warfare was wrong, in their view, not because of the huge death toll, but because the *wrong* people died—the strong and “fit”—while the weak and sickly stayed home and fathered children. Some eugenicists’ opposition to war was paper-thin, disappearing completely once World War I broke out.

Perhaps this is not all that surprising, since most German pacifists were not absolute pacifists, as Roger Chickering has shown. What has not been explored is

the stance of the German pacifist movement to racism and colonial wars. Chickering points out that many pacifists considered population expansion a legitimate cause for colonization, but some, like Otto Umfrid, a leading figure in the German Peace Society, believed colonization could be a peaceful process—Europeans should only move to areas of low population density.⁴⁸ But it is not clear that all German pacifists were committed to peaceful expansion, especially in areas occupied by races they deemed inferior. What is striking about much pacifist rhetoric is the frequent appeal to peace among the “civilized” nations and peoples, implying that the “uncivilized” may not be included.⁴⁹

In order to make sense of all this, it is helpful to look again at Haeckel, for despite our portrayal of his racism above, Haeckel called himself a pacifist in the early 1900s.⁵⁰ Despite Haeckel’s belief in the human struggle for existence, his opposition to militarism was manifest already in 1870, when he warned about the deleterious effects of modern “military selection” on civilized nations: “The stronger, healthier, more normal the youth is, the greater is the prospect for him to be murdered by the needle gun, cannons, and other similar instruments of culture.” However, the weak and sick evade military service, so they can have more children, leading the nation into biological decline.⁵¹ He continued to embrace this view throughout his life, and it exerted tremendous influence among eugenicists in the early twentieth century.

Haeckel’s dim view of military selection led him to join various peace organizations in the early 1900s. The Monist League, founded by Haeckel in 1906, likewise promoted pacifism. An editor of the Monist journal wrote to Alfred Fried, “The idea of world peace naturally belongs to the cultural program of Monism.” Later this editor successfully recruited Fried to write articles on pacifism for their journal, stating, “We consider pacifism one of the most important practical tasks of the German Monist League.”⁵² However, while promoting peace, Haeckel also supported German colonialism by joining the Pan-German League in 1890-91 and by advocating imperialism in his writings.⁵³

Further, despite his overt pacifism, Haeckel’s views on racial inequality and racial extermination remained unchanged. In an entire chapter of his book, *Wonders of Life* (1904), he argued that the biological inequality of human races means that their lives have different values. He argued that since the Australian aborigines’ psyche is closer to apes and dogs than to Europeans, their lives do not have the same value as Europeans.⁵⁴ In the expanded 1911 edition of *Natural History of Creation* Haeckel argued that the “fitter” human species [!] expand at the expense of the “lower” ones. Some “lower” races might survive, because they can adapt better to certain climates, but

the other races . . . will sooner or later completely succumb to the overwhelmingly powerful Mediterranean [race]. . . . The Americans and Australians are already

proceeding toward their extermination at a quick pace, and the same is true of the Veddas and Dravidas, the Papuas and Hottentots.⁵⁵

Racial extermination did not seem to bother this Darwinian pacifist.

Haeckel's pacifism could not weather the outbreak of World War I, despite his claim later that he was still in principle a pacifist. Within two weeks he wrote an article blaming England for the war, and three months later he argued that this war was a violent episode in the universal human struggle for existence.⁵⁶ In his 1917 book, *Eternity*, he expressed horror that Germany's enemies were using non-European troops against them, calling this an "underhanded *betrayal of the white race*." These members of "wild" races simply did not have the same value as Europeans, according to Haeckel.⁵⁷ In 1917-18 Haeckel opposed the Reichstag Peace Resolution and favored the annexationist Fatherland Party.⁵⁸

Haeckel's ambivalence toward pacifism, especially when other races came into play, was not at all unusual in the eugenics movement, which had been heavily influenced by his writings. These ambiguities are apparent in the writings of Wilhelm Schallmayer. Sheila Faith Weiss emphasizes his antimilitarism and opposition to Aryan racism, but this was only one side of Schallmayer.⁵⁹ Though less racist than Woltmann, at times he referred to races as higher and lower, specifically claiming that black Africans are mentally inferior to Europeans.⁶⁰ In a letter to the American biologist David Starr Jordan he stated that blacks and Eastern Europeans were racially inferior to the average American.⁶¹

Schallmayer also admitted that wars are a selective agent in the human struggle for existence. In the past, he argued, wars were beneficial in elevating the human race, precisely because they resulted in the annihilation of "lower" peoples. Though Schallmayer usually relegated race to the background, the "national efficiency" for which he strove ultimately aimed at making the nation strong to triumph against competing nations and races.⁶² In two 1908 articles he explained that this competition is not always peaceful. While opposing modern wars between European countries, because they are contraselective, he argued that wars between races that are unequal—such as between Europeans and black Africans—are beneficial, especially if they lead to the extermination of the "lower" races!⁶³ His conclusion about war was that "on the whole the influence of war on human evolution should still be considered overwhelmingly favorable."⁶⁴ So much for Schallmayer's reputation as a pacifist and opponent of racism.

Alfred Ploetz, the key organizer of the German eugenics movement, took essentially the same position as Schallmayer on militarism. He saw war as beneficial in the past, but detrimental in the present, at least among European nations. If war must come, however, Ploetz suggested drafting all young men, including the weak, into the army. Then, "during the campaign it would be good to bring the specially assembled [biologically] bad elements to the place where one needs primarily cannon fodder."⁶⁵ To be fair, Ploetz was probably not entirely

serious about this proposal, embedded as it was in a discussion of a eugenics utopia, but it seems rather provocative nonetheless.

Ploetz was also much more racist than Schallmayer, though he usually kept his racial views private. In 1907 he founded a secret organization called the Nordic Ring to promote a more racist form of eugenics. In 1911 Ploetz wrote a tract to recruit German youth to the Nordic Ring, warning that Germans and their fellow Nordic types were engaged in a "struggle for existence against the other races." In order to win this struggle, he suggested increasing reproduction and then providing economically for the growing population, if necessary by fighting, since, "Only the race that consistently has the greatest excess natality will, in the end of the struggles, have conquered the world."⁶⁶ That same year he congratulated Luschan for stressing the necessity of war among races and nations in his 1911 speech at the Universal Race Congress.⁶⁷ In a later speech he opposed birth control, because it would endanger the "highly endowed Nordic (Teutonic or Germanic) race" in its struggle against African and Asian races.⁶⁸ Thus for Ploetz, as for Schallmayer, eugenics was a means to win the Darwinian racial struggle.

Some eugenicists were even more actively involved in the pacifist movement than Ploetz and Schallmayer, but even so, most of them continued to believe that certain races would ultimately perish in the Darwinian struggle for existence. August Forel, a prominent Swiss psychiatrist who was a decisive influence on Ploetz, was well known for his participation in the peace movement.⁶⁹ However, he was even more racist than Schallmayer, whom he criticized for not placing enough emphasis on racial inequality.⁷⁰ In his memoirs he confessed that during his career he wrestled with the following questions: "Which races can be of service in the further evolution of mankind, and which are useless? And if the lowest races are useless, how can they be gradually extinguished?"⁷¹ Though he never provided a clear answer to the latter question, he did on occasion suggest that "inferior" races needed to be eliminated. In an 1899 article, "On Ethics," he argued that ethics needs to focus on two issues: suppressing races "dangerous to culture" and improving "our own race" through eugenics.⁷² To be sure, Forel never advocated slaughtering those of other races, but he clearly wanted their eventual elimination.

Another advocate of peace eugenics who remained true to pacifist convictions during World War I was Helene Stöcker, the leader of the League for the Protection of Mothers. Stöcker tirelessly promoted her "new ethics," which drew heavily on Darwinism, eugenics, and Nietzsche. Because of her world view, she declared, "we come to condemn war, this mass murder, which is opposed to all eugenics ideals."⁷³ During World War I Stöcker remained firm in her opposition to war, warning about its deleterious effects on the health and vitality of society. However, Stöcker's concern was embedded in larger concerns about racial competition. She believed that

this war of the white races among themselves immensely threatens the domination of the white race in relation to the yellow and black races. If before the war we could hear so often about the dangers of the yellow race, since then this danger has multiplied tremendously.⁷⁴

In this same article she called the goal of eugenics “the dominion of the most valuable race,” i.e., the white race. Unity among the white races would facilitate this goal. Thus Stöcker saw pacifism as a means to facilitate European domination of other races.⁷⁵

Stöcker was not the only eugenics enthusiast concerned about “the yellow peril.” The philosopher Christian von Ehrenfels, best known today for his early work on Gestalt theory, devoted much of his career to promoting eugenics, especially his pet reform, the introduction of polygamy for the “fittest” men. Ehrenfels was so convinced of the contraselective effects of modern warfare that he suffered a mental breakdown in the middle of World War I, depressed by the slaughter of those he deemed biologically most valuable.⁷⁶ Despite his antipathy for war, however, he continually warned about the “Yellow Peril,” since he saw Asians as the chief threat to Europeans in the racial struggle. His fear of Chinese racial prowess led him to the conclusion that “if there is no change in current practices, this will lead to the annihilation of the white race by the yellow race.”⁷⁷ Eugenics policies, especially polygamy, were Ehrenfels’ solution to this problem. Though Ehrenfels was not explicit on this point, presumably the elevation of the Europeans he desired would lead to the annihilation of the East Asians, as well as other races, whom Ehrenfels considered far inferior to Europeans.

G. F. Nicolai, a physiologist at the University of Berlin, was so committed to pacifism that he was imprisoned during World War I for opposing the war in his lectures. While in prison, he wrote an antiwar book, *The Biology of War*. In his book Nicolai was consistent in opposing all wars, including wars against “inferior” races. However, his reasoning is interesting. There is no need to fight wars against the “inferior” races, Nicolai argued, since

Practically these peoples will undoubtedly be exterminated gradually by the white race, but it has been apparent for a long time that it would be highly foolish to wage war against these peoples. They disappear on their own, when they come into contact with whites, for the bloodless war is always more effective than the bloody one.⁷⁸

He admitted that the struggle against the East Asians was the most dangerous for Europeans, but instead of fighting them militarily, he suggested using eugenics to improve the Europeans biologically. This would lead to ultimate victory, while military conflict is more hazardous.⁷⁹

Finally, it is instructive to examine the racial views of a leading figure in the pacifist movement, Alfred Fried, who had sympathy with and close connections to the eugenics movement. Fried was enthusiastic about the Darwinian revolution, calling it greater than the French Revolution in its effects.⁸⁰ He often used Darwinian rhetoric to advance his cause. He confessed that struggle is indeed universal, but he denied that struggle means war. The lesson that he drew from evolution was more Spencerian than Darwinian: the ineluctable advance to ever higher levels of organization, which would culminate in a world government.⁸¹ In this he was following Bertha von Suttner's lead, for she was enthusiastic about Spencer's philosophy of evolutionary progress.

When it came to race relations, Fried's pacifism, like that of so many of his contemporaries, was somewhat ambivalent. He clearly believed in the racial superiority of Europeans, arguing that they had every right to colonize other parts of the earth. Before the Hague Peace Conference of 1899 he even suggested that Europeans should divide China among themselves, in order to avoid friction on this issue at the conference.⁸² At times he insisted that colonization should occur peacefully. A united Europe could, he believed, colonize without bloodshed.⁸³ He also welcomed the Algeciras Conference in 1906, which would "regulate the civilizing exploitation of Morocco, of a people needing tutelage." He called the "subjugation of lower peoples under the leadership of the higher cultured peoples" a "task in the service of culture."⁸⁴

However, some passages in his books betray less peaceful intentions toward "lower" races. In 1905 he reacted against the accusation that pacifists are unrealistic in pressing for peace throughout the whole world. He claimed that, on the contrary, pacifists recognize that pacifism is only possible among peoples who have reached a high level of culture. "The peace movement," he continued,

by no means dreams of a possible ideal condition after centuries, where Germans and Botokunden, Frenchmen and Persians, Englishmen, Turks, and Bushmen will in peaceful harmony enjoy a time without wars based on legal principles. The peace movement supports itself consciously on the experiences of history, wherein war is a culture-promoting factor in the life of peoples up to a certain stage of cultural development.⁸⁵

Fried shut out non-European races from the legal community of nations that he was advocating, which made their position rather perilous. To be sure, Fried favored peaceful exploitation, but he clearly asserted the right of Europeans to defend themselves against "uncivilized peoples standing outside the legal community."⁸⁶

It should be clear that many German scientists and intellectuals viewed racial extermination as an inevitable process that may be lamentable, but is ultimately beneficial for humanity. Only through racial extermination could humanity improve

biologically and advance to higher cultural levels, since the “lower” races are not mentally capable of producing culture. I have demonstrated the prevalence of such ideas among social Darwinists and eugenicists, including some who called themselves pacifists. Many Germans still opposed exterminationist racism, to be sure, but it was growing more *salonfähig* by the early twentieth century, especially among intellectuals committed to science, reason, and progress.

Ideas about racial extermination were not necessarily connected to anti-Semitism. More often they referred to non-European races, especially American Indians, Australian aborigines, blacks, and East Asians. Though some of the social Darwinists and eugenicists I have discussed were anti-Semitic in varying degrees — some rabidly so — none of them ever referred to the extermination of Jews. Some even opposed anti-Semitism, and German and Austrian Jews were just as likely to justify racial struggle and racial extermination as other German thinkers.⁸⁷ Of course, there were some anti-Semitic thinkers advocating elimination of the Jews, and even a few radical anti-Semites advocating extermination, as Goldhagen has reminded us (while overstating his case). But the notion of racial extermination was much more widespread in forms not associated with anti-Semitism, especially among the educated elites.

So what practical effect did these ideas about racial extermination have? First of all, the most immediate impact was on German imperialism and colonial policy. Helmuth Stoecker points out that German colonialist propaganda lacked the religious and humanitarian rhetoric so characteristic of British imperialist propaganda, relying instead on social Darwinist and biological racist arguments.⁸⁸ Carl Peters, famous for bringing German dominion to German East Africa (presently Tanzania), believed that human history was subject to natural laws, including the Darwinian struggle. He argued that “if Darwin is right, then perhaps a time would be conceivable, in which they [Germans and British] would be the sole lords of this earth.”⁸⁹ Wilhelm II’s *Weltpolitik* was also based on the rhetoric of racial extermination. He informed Theodore Roosevelt in 1905,

I foresee in the future a fight for life and death between the “White” and the “Yellow” for their sheer existence. The sooner therefore the Nations belonging to the “White Race” understand this and join in common defense against the coming danger, the better.⁹⁰

Since quite a few social Darwinist thinkers that I have discussed were already promoting exterminationist racism before Germans began colonizing Africa, Hannah Arendt’s thesis that virulent racism arose out of colonial practices after 1884 simply does not fit the evidence. Although Arendt is probably right that colonial practices helped racism achieve even greater popularity among Germans, it seems that scientific racism, including its exterminationist form, preceded

colonialism and was important in shaping the attitudes of the colonizers. Thus Arendt conflates causes with effects.⁹¹

The most obvious case demonstrating the influence of biological racism on German colonial policy was the attempted genocide of the Hereros in Southwest Africa (presently Namibia), in which over 80 percent of the Hereros were annihilated. One German missionary lamented that

the average German here looks upon and *treats* the natives as creatures being more or less on the same level as baboons (their favorite word to describe the natives) and deserving to exist only insofar as they are of some benefit to the white man. . . . Such a mentality breeds harshness, deceit, exploitation, injustice, rape and, not infrequently, murder as well.⁹²

General Trotha, who issued the notorious annihilation decree, overtly defended his actions by appealing to the Darwinian struggle for existence.⁹³ He believed that the contest between the Germans and Hereros was a racial struggle that must ultimately end in the extermination of one party or the other.⁹⁴

Secondly, the attitudes of peace eugenicists toward military conflict and racial struggle help make intelligible the fragility of some sectors of the German Peace Movement. Peace eugenics—especially when fused with an ideology of racial struggle—was a flimsy basis for pacifism, and many of its proponents became rabid warmongers and annexationists during World War I. Other factors were probably more important in explaining the collapse of the German peace movement during World War I, since many German pacifists who jumped ship during World War I were not eugenics enthusiasts, but it was one factor among others.⁹⁵

Finally, ideas of racial extermination captivated the minds not only of Hitler, but also of many others, who would cooperate with his attempts to create a racial utopia. Hitler's ideas were by no means idiosyncratic, even though they were not dominant in German thought, either. Hitler appealed to the ideology of race struggle often in his speeches. In *Mein Kampf* he stated,

But this preservation [of culture and culture-producing races] is tied to the iron law of necessity and the right of victory of the best and the strongest. . . . Whoever wants to live, must struggle, and whoever will not fight in this world of eternal struggle, does not deserve to live. Even if this is harsh—it is simply the way it is!⁹⁶

The idea of racial extermination bore wicked fruit when applied with such pitiless logic.

¹ Friedrich Hellwald, *Kulturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung*, 4th ed., 4 vols. (Leipzig: Friesenhahn, 1896), IV: 615-16.

² Charles Darwin, *Descent of Man*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1871), I: 166.

³ Alfred Kirchhoff, *Darwinismus angewandt auf Völker und Staaten* (Frankfurt: Heinrich Keller, 1910), 73, 86-87.

⁴ Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963). Some scholars admit that Nazism had both modern and antimodern elements, but they often associate racism with its antimodern side—see Norbert Frei, “Wie modern war der Nationalsozialismus,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 19 (1993): 367-87; Jeffrey Herf, *Reactionary Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Ippermann, *The Racial State* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1991). Others stress the modern side of Nazism—see Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 202-4; Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989); Michael Prinz and Rainer Zitelmann, eds., *Nationalsozialismus und Modernisierung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991); Richard Rubenstein, “Modernization and the Politics of Extermination,” in *A Mosaic of Victims*, ed. Michael Berenbaum (New York: New York University Press, 1990), 3-19; and Rainer Zitelmann, *Hitler: Selbstverständnis eines Revolutionärs* (Hamburg: Berg, 1987); Detlev Peukert, “The Genesis of the ‘Final Solution’ from the Spirit of Science,” *Reevaluating the Third Reich*, ed. Thomas Childers and Jane Caplan (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1993), 234-52.

⁵ Alfred Kelly, *The Descent of Darwin* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); Richard Weikart, “The Origins of Social Darwinism in Germany, 1859-1895,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54 (1993): 469-88; *Socialist Darwinism: Evolution in German Socialist Thought from Marx to Bernstein* (San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1999).

⁶ Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Michael Schwartz, *Sozialistische Eugenik: Eugenische Sozialtechnologien in Debatten und Politik der deutschen Sozialdemokratie, 1890-1933* (Bonn: Dietz Nachf., 1995).

⁷ On the ambiguities inherent in modernity, see Kevin Repp, *Reformers, Critics, and the Paths of German Modernity, 1890-1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

⁸ Benoit Massin, “From Virchow to Fischer: Physical Anthropology and ‘Modern Race Theories’ in Wilhelmine Germany,” in *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic*, ed. George W. Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996).

⁹ Pascal Grosse, *Kolonialismus, Eugenik und Bürgerliche Gesellschaft in Deutschland, 1850-1918* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2000); Wolfgang Eckart, *Medizin und Kolonialimperialismus: Deutschland 1884-1945* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1997).

¹⁰ George L. Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1978) 81-82.

¹¹ Paul Crook, *Darwinism, War and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

¹² Haeckel, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, 11th ed. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911), 754-56. On Haeckel’s racism, see Daniel Gasman, *Scientific Origins of National Socialism* (London: MacDonal, 1971); Gasman must be used with caution.

- ¹³ Richard Weikart, "Darwinism and Death: Devaluing Human Life in Germany, 1859-1920," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63 (2002): 323-44.
- ¹⁴ Ernst Haeckel, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte* 1st ed. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1868), 206.
- ¹⁵ Oscar Peschel, "Ursprung und Verschiedenheit der Menschenrassen," *Das Ausland* 33 (1860): 393.
- ¹⁶ Oscar Peschel, *Völkerkunde*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1875), 153-55.
- ¹⁷ Friedrich Hellwald, *Naturgeschichte des Menschen*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Spemann, 1880), I:54-66; quote at 66; originally in Oscar Peschel, "Nekrolog der Tasmanier," *Das Ausland* 43 (1870): 189.
- ¹⁸ Friedrich Hellwald, *Culturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung* (Augsburg: Lampart, 1875), 44-45.
- ¹⁹ Quoted in *ibid*, 797-98.
- ²⁰ Ludwig Büchner, "Alternative," *Die Waffen Nieder* 4 (1895): 241-43.
- ²¹ Ludwig Büchner, *Der Mensch und seine Stellung in der Natur*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Theodor Thomas, 1872), 53, 137-39, 154, quote at 147.
- ²² Carus Sterne (pseudonym of Ernst Krause), *Werden und Vergehen*, ed. Wilhelm Bölsche, 6th ed., 2 vols. (Berlin: Gebrüder Borntraeger, 1905), 2: 381.
- ²³ Ludwig Gumplowicz, *Rassenkampf* (Innsbruck: Wanger'schen Univ.-Buchhandlung, 1883), 65-66, 160-94, 234-38; quote at 218; see also Emil Brix, ed., *Ludwig Gumplowicz oder die Gesellschaft als Natur* (Vienna: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1986).
- ²⁴ Ludwig Gumplowicz to Lester F. Ward, 10 June 1907, in *Letters of Ludwig Gumplowicz to Lester F. Ward*, ed. Bernhard J. Stern (Leipzig: Hirschfeld, 1933), 24-25.
- ²⁵ Heinz Gollwitzer, *Die gelbe Gefahr* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), 169.
- ²⁶ Woodruff D. Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); and *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986). James M. Hunter wrongly denies Darwinian influence on Ratzel's geographical theories in *Perspective on Ratzel's Political Geography* (Lanham, MD : University Press of America, 1983), but more balanced are Gunther Buttman, *Friedrich Ratzel: Leben und Werk eines deutschen Geographen* (Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1977); and Mark Bassin, "Imperialism and the Nation State in Friedrich Ratzel's Political Geography," *Progress in Human Geography* 11 (1987): 473-95.
- ²⁷ Friedrich Ratzel, *Sein und Werden* (Leipzig: Fuess, 1869), 469.
- ²⁸ Friedrich Ratzel to Eisig, 20 May 1885, quoted in Gerhard H. Müller, *Friedrich Ratzel* (Stuttgart: Verlag für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik, 1996), 74.
- ²⁹ Friedrich Ratzel, *Lebensraum* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1901), 1, 51-60.
- ³⁰ Friedrich Ratzel, *Politische Geographie oder die Geographie der Staaten, des Verkehrs und des Krieges*, 2nd ed. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1903), ch. 6.
- ³¹ Weikart, *Socialist Darwinism*, 210-13; Peter Emil Becker, *Sozialdarwinismus, Rassismus, Antisemitismus und volkischer Gedanke* (Stuttgart: Georg Thieme, 1990), ch. 8.
- ³² Ludwig Woltmann, *Politische Anthropologie: Eine Untersuchung über den Einfluss der Deszendenztheorie auf die Lehre von der politischen Entwicklung der Völker* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1903), passim, esp. 261-67; quote at 267.
- ³³ Otto Ammon to Matthäus Much, 22 January 1897, in Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Aut. 124.941.

³⁴ Otto Ammon, *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürlichen Grundlagen*, 3rd ed. (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1900), 164; Otto Ammon to Ludwig Schemann, 27 November 1899, in Ludwig Schemann papers, Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg, IV B 1/2; Becker, *Sozialdarwinismus*, ch. 7.

³⁵ Quoted in Gollwitzer, *Die gelbe Gefahr*, 169-70.

³⁶ Ludwig Schemann, *Lebensfahrten eines Deutschen* (Leipzig: Erich Matthes, 1925), 295-96; Ludwig Schemann to Otto Ammon, 18 April 1909; Otto Ammon to Ludwig Schemann, 26 December 1909, in Ludwig Schemann papers, Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg, IV B 1/2.

³⁷ Gobineau-Vereinigung Mitgleider Verzeichnis, Feb. 1902-Sept. 1903; Gobineau-Vereinigung; "Elfter Bericht über die Gobineau-Vereinigung," 1911; in Gobineau-Vereinigung papers, Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg, D II; Becker, *Sozialdarwinismus*, ch. 3.

³⁸ Eugen Fischer, *Sozialanthropologie und ihre Bedeutung für den Staat* (Freiburg: Speyer and Kaerner, 1910), 18-19.

³⁹ Eugen Fischer, *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1913), 296-306; quote at 302.

⁴⁰ On Fischer, see Niels Lösch, *Rasse als Konstrukt: Leben und Werk Eugen Fischers* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1997).

⁴¹ Fritz Lenz, *Die Rasse als Wertprinzip, Zur Erneuerung der Ethik* (Munich: J. F. Lehmann, 1933); originally published in 1917. In the 1933 foreword Lenz bragged that his essay contained the fundamental tenets of Nazism!

⁴² "First Universal Races Congress" announcement and program, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Deutsche Kongress Zentrale, Box 256.

⁴³ Felix von Luschan, "Anthropological View of Race," in *Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, Communicated to the First Universal Races Congress*, ed. G. Spiller (London: P. S. King and Son, 1911), 23; see also Luschan, "Die gegenwärtigen Aufgaben der Anthropologie," *Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte. 81. Versammlung* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1910), Part 2, 201-8.

⁴⁴ Max von Gruber, *Ursachen und Bekämpfung des Geburtenrückgangs im Deutschen Reich*, 3rd ed. (Munich: Lehmann, 1914); *Krieg, Frieden und Biologie* (Berlin: Carl Heymanns, 1915); "Rassenhygiene, die wichtigste Aufgabe völkischer Innenpolitik," *Deutschlands Erneuerung* 2 (1918): 17-32.

⁴⁵ Heinrich Driesmans, *Dämon Auslese: Vom theoretischen zum praktischen Darwinismus* (Berlin: Vita, 1907), xiv, 260-64; Willibald Hentschel, *Varuna: Das Gesetz des aufsteigenden und sinkenden Lebens in der Geschichte* (Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1907), 14-15, 33.

⁴⁶ Jörg Lanz-Liebenfels, "Rasse und Wohlfahrtspflege, ein Anruf zum Streik der wahllosen Wohltätigkeit," *Ostara* Heft 18 (December 1907), 3-5, 16; Nicholas Goodrick-Clark, *The Occult Roots of Nazism* (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 85 and passim.

⁴⁷ Friedrich von Bernhardi, *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg*, 6th ed. (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1913), 11-21; Conrad von Hötzendorf, *Private Aufzeichnungen*, ed. Kurt Peball (Vienna: Amalthea, 1977), 148, 302-7; Lawrence Sondhaus, *Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf: Architect of the Apocalypse* (Boston: Humanities Press, 2000), 15-16, 82; Gustav Ratzenhofer, *Wesen und Zweck der Politik*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1893), II: 251; Ludwig Gumplowicz to Lester F. Ward, 7 August 1902, in *Letters of Ludwig Gumplowicz to Lester F. Ward*, ed. Bernhard J. Stern (Leipzig: Hirschfeld, 1933), 10-11.

⁴⁸ Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and a World without War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 306-7, 320-25.

⁴⁹ In scanning the leading pacifist journal in Germany, *Friedenswarte*, edited by Alfred Fried, I could not find any articles discussing the German colonial wars—the Herero Revolt and the Maji Maji Revolt—in the first decade of the twentieth century.

⁵⁰ Gasman, *Scientific Origins*, 143, n. 20, consigns Haeckel's pacifism to a single footnote.

⁵¹ Haeckel, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, 2nd ed. (1870), 153-54.

⁵² "Das Monistische Jahrhundert" (signed by W. Blossfeldt, Redaktion) to Alfred Fried, 18 June 1912 and 3 October 1912, in Suttner-Fried Collection, League of Nations Archives, United Nations Library, Geneva.

⁵³ Haeckel, *Welträttsel* (Bonn: Emil Strauss, 1903), 141; *Indische Reisebriefe* (Berlin: Gebrüder Paetel, 1883), 354-55.

⁵⁴ Haeckel, *Lebenswunder* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner, 1904), ch. 17, esp. 449.

⁵⁵ Haeckel, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, (1911), 752-53.

⁵⁶ Haeckel, "Englands Blutschuld am Weltkriege," *Das monistische Jahrhundert* 3 (1914-15): 538-48; Haeckel, "Weltkrieg und Naturgeschichte," *Nord und Süd* 151 (November 1914): 140-47.

⁵⁷ Haeckel, *Ewigkeit* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1917), 35-36, 110-11, 120-23; quotes at 85-86, 35.

⁵⁸ Ernst Haeckel to Richard Hertwig, 19 September 1917 and 12 January 1918, in *Ernst Haeckel. Sein Leben, Denken, und Wirken*, ed. Victor Franz, 2 vols. (Jena: Wilhelm Gronau, 1943-44), 1:64, 66.

⁵⁹ Sheila Faith Weiss, *Race Hygiene and National Efficiency: The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 38, 91-103, 141-42.

⁶⁰ Wilhelm Schallmayer, "Der Krieg als Züchter," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* 5 (1908): 367, 387.

⁶¹ Wilhelm Schallmayer to David Starr Jordan, 2 November 1913, in David Starr Jordan papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University; see also Wilhelm Schallmayer to Ludwig Schemann, 21 April 1912 and 3 May 1912, in University of Freiburg Library Archive, Ludwig Schemann papers, IV B 1/2.

⁶² Schallmayer, *Vererbung und Auslese* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1903), 111-15, 177-78, 245, 250, 296; Schallmayer, "Die Erbentwicklung bei Völkern," *Menschheitsziele* 1 (1907): 95.

⁶³ Schallmayer, "Die Auslesewirkungen des Krieges," *Menschheitsziele* 2 (1908): 381-85.

⁶⁴ Schallmayer, "Krieg als Züchter," 395-96.

⁶⁵ Alfred Ploetz, *Die Tüchtigkeit unsrer Rasse und der Schutz der Schwachen* (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1895), 61-63, quote at 147.

⁶⁶ Alfred Ploetz, "Unser Weg," in Alfred Ploetz papers, privately held by Wilfried Ploetz, Herrsching am Ammersee.

⁶⁷ Alfred Ploetz to Felix von Luschan, 18 November 1911, in Felix von Luschan papers, Staatsbibliothek Berlin.

⁶⁸ Alfred Ploetz, "Neo-Malthusianism and Race Hygiene," in *Problems in Eugenics: Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress* (London: Eugenics Education Society, 1913), 2:189.

⁶⁹ August Forel, "August Forel," in *Führende Psychiater in Selbstdarstellungen* (Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1930), 53-87; Hans H. Walser, "Über Leben und Werk von August Forel," in *August Forel: Briefe, Correspondance, 1864-1927* (Bern: Hans Huber, 1968), 11-39.

- ⁷⁰ August Forel, *Die sexuelle Frage* (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1905), 584; see also 519.
- ⁷¹ August Forel, *Out of My Life and Work*, trans. Bernard Miall (New York: Norton, 1937), 193.
- ⁷² August Forel, "Ueber Ethik," *Zukunft* 28 (1899): 580-81.
- ⁷³ Helene Stöcker, "Staatlicher Gebärzwang oder Rassenhygiene?" *Die neue Generation* 10 (1914): 145.
- ⁷⁴ Helene Stöcker, "Rassenhygiene und Mutterschutz," *Die neue Generation* 13 (1917): 138-42.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 141.
- ⁷⁶ Christian von Ehrenfels to his friends (Rundbrief), November 1920, in Christian von Ehrenfels papers, Forschungsstelle und Dokumentationszentrum für Österreichische Philosophie, Graz; Christian von Ehrenfels, "Gedanken über die Regeneration der Kulturmenschheit" (privately published, 1901; available at Forschungsstelle und Dokumentationszentrum für Österreichische Philosophie, Graz), 21.
- ⁷⁷ Christian von Ehrenfels, "A Program for Breeding Reform," (23 December 1908) in *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society*, ed. Herman Nunberg et al. (New York: International Universities Press, 1967), II: 94-97, quote at 94; Ehrenfels, "Die gelbe Gefahr," *Sexualprobleme* 4 (1908): 185-205; Ehrenfels, "Weltpolitik und Sexualpolitik," *Sexualprobleme* 4 (1908): 472-89.
- ⁷⁸ G. F. Nicolai, *Biologie des Krieges* (Zurich: Art. Institut Orell Füssli, 1917), 83.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 82-85.
- ⁸⁰ Alfred Fried, "Unser Jahrhundert," *Die Friedenswarte* 2 (1900): 2.
- ⁸¹ Alfred Fried, *Die Grundlagen des revolutionären Pacifismus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1908), 35; Fried, *Handbuch der Friedensbewegung*. (Vienna: Oesterrichischen Friedensgesellschaft, 1905), 34-35; Fried, *Die moderne Friedensbewegung* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1907), 2-4.
- ⁸² Brigitte Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner: Ein Leben für den Frieden* (Munich: Piper, 1986), 254-56.
- ⁸³ Alfred Fried, "Und wieder ein Krieg!" *Die Friedenswarte* 2 (1900): 97-99.
- ⁸⁴ Alfred Fried, *Der kranke Krieg* (Leipzig: Alfred Kröner, 1909), 141.
- ⁸⁵ Alfred Fried, *Handbuch der Friedensbewegung*, 23-24.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 22.
- ⁸⁷ John F. Efron, *Defenders of the Race: Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).
- ⁸⁸ Helmuth Stoecker, "The German Empire in Africa before 1914," in *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the Second World War*, ed. Helmuth Stoecker, trans. Bernd Zöllner (London: Hurst, 1986), 209-12.
- ⁸⁹ Karl [Carl] Peters, *Deutsch-national: Kolonialpolitische Aufsätze*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Walther und Apolant, 1887), 8-9.
- ⁹⁰ William II to Theodore Roosevelt, 4 September 1905, quoted in Ute Mehner, *Deutschland, Amerika und die "gelbe Gefahr"* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995), 9.
- ⁹¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harvest Books, 1973), xvii, 183-85.
- ⁹² Horst Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting: The Struggle of the Herero and Nama against German Imperialism (1884-1915)*, trans. Bernd Zöllner (London: Zed Press, 1980), 67-68, n. 6; see also Jon Bridgman and Leslie J. Worley, "Genocide of the Hereros," in *Genocide*

in *the Twentieth Century*, ed. Samuel Totten et al, (New York: Garland, 1995), 10; Bridgman, *The Revolt of the Hereros* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 60-63.

⁹³ Peter Schmitt-Egner, *Kolonialismus und Faschismus* (Gießen: Andreas Achenbach, 1975), 125.

⁹⁴ Bridgman and Worley, "Genocide of the Hereros," 18; see also Jon Swan, "The Final Solution in Southwest Africa," *MHQ: The Quarterly Journal of Military History* 3 (1991): 36-55.

⁹⁵ Klaus Schwabe, *Wissenschaft und Kriegsmoral. Die deutschen Hochschullehrer und die politischen Grundfragen des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1969); Roland N. Stromberg, *Redemption by War: The Intellectuals and 1914* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1982).

⁹⁶ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 2 vols. in 1 (Munich: NSDAP, 1943), 316-17.