



**Nazi Germany and
Southern Europe,
1933–45**

Science, Culture and Politics

Edited by
**Fernando Clara
Cláudia Ninhos**

Nazi Germany and Southern Europe, 1933–45

Nazi Germany and Southern Europe, 1933–45

Science, Culture and Politics

Edited by

Fernando Clara and Cláudia Ninhos

Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

palgrave
macmillan



Selection and editorial matter © Fernando Clara and Cláudia Ninhos 2016
Individual chapters © Respective authors 2016
Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2016 978-1-137-55151-1
All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this
publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted
save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the
Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence
permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency,
Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication
may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this
work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2016 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited,
registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke,
Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC,
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies
and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States,
the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-56746-1 ISBN 978-1-137-55152-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/9781137551528

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully
managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing
processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the
country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Contents

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	ix
1 'The "invisible" export of thought': German Science and Southern Europe, 1933–45 <i>Fernando Clara</i>	1
2 Beyond Germanness? Music's History as 'Entangled History' in German Musicology from the End of the Nineteenth Century to the Second World War <i>Mauro Fosco Bertola</i>	25
3 Tourism as Networking for a Pan-fascist Mobilization before the Second World War <i>Mário Matos</i>	38
4 Student and Scholar Mobility between Nazi Germany and Southern/Southeastern Europe <i>Johannes Dafinger</i>	52
5 International Contacts in the First Years of the Spanish CSIC, 1940–45 <i>Pablo Pérez López</i>	68
6 The Role of Culture in German–Spanish Relations during National Socialism <i>Marició Janué i Miret</i>	84
7 The Longing for a 'Conservative Revolution': German Influences over the Greek Inter-war Politicization of Technology and Science <i>Vassilios A. Bogiatzis</i>	105
8 Portugal at the 'Third Front' <i>Cláudia Ninhos</i>	120

9	The Library of the <i>Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom</i> and Postwar Perceptions of German Scholarship <i>Frederick Whitling</i>	141
10	Tracing Eugenics: German Influences on a Greek Background, c. 1930–45 <i>George Kokkinos and Markos Karasarinis</i>	153
11	The Mild Eugenics Temptation in Portugal <i>Irene Flunser Pimentel</i>	169
12	A ‘Fascist’ Colonialism? German National Socialist and Italian Fascist Colonial Cooperation, 1936–43 <i>Eric S. Roubinek</i>	183
13	Breaking Points of the ‘Axis’: Austrian Scholars, Politics, and Nazi Expansion to the South <i>Michael Wedekind</i>	198
14	Planning a ‘Modern Colonization on European Soil’? German Scientific Travels and Expeditions to Greece during National Socialism <i>Maria Zarifi</i>	217
15	Citizens of the Third Reich in the Tropics: German Scientific Expeditions to Brazil under the Vargas Regime, 1933–40 <i>Magali Romero Sá and André Felipe Cândido da Silva</i>	232
	<i>Index</i>	256

Figures and Tables

Figures

14.1	von Thünen's ring model	221
------	-------------------------	-----

Tables

5.1	Scholarships, 1941–45	76
5.2	Funds for visiting professors, 1941–45	77

Acknowledgements

This book stems from an international conference that was held in October 2012 at the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences of the New University of Lisbon. The conference was organized within a three-year research project funded by the Portuguese National Science and Technology Foundation (FCT) and titled 'The Power of Science: German Science in Portugal, 1933–45' (grant PTDC/HIS-HCT/111330/2009). The aim of the conference was to go beyond the initial geographic horizons of the project and to foster a broader international discussion on science in National Socialist Germany from the point of view of its relations with Southern Europe, taking into account not only the political internationalization of the fascist regimes, but also the circulation and appropriation of knowledge and the important role that cultural relations and scientific networking played in that process.

As editors, we would like above all to thank our contributors for their patience, time, and effort. We are also grateful for the generous support of the Portuguese National Science and Technology Foundation and of the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, New University of Lisbon. At Palgrave Macmillan, we acknowledge the enthusiastic support of Emily Russell and the helpful guidance of Angharad Bishop.

A final word of gratitude is justly due to Mikael Hård, Staffan Müller-Wille, Luís Reis Torgal, and Alfred Opitez (†) for their friendly support and valuable advice.

Contributors

Mauro Fosco Bertola is Lecturer in Musicology at Heidelberg University. He is the author of *Die List der Vergangenheit: Musikwissenschaft, Rundfunk und Deutschlandbezug in Italien, 1890–1945* (2014). He has published numerous articles on the emergence of Italian musicology at the end of the nineteenth century, the role of ancient music in Italian and German radio, and the link between opera, film, and ideology.

Vassilios A. Bogiatzis is a postdoctoral researcher at the Research Center for Modern History, Panteion University, Athens, Greece. His research interests include the diffusion and circulation of fascist ideas in the Greek inter-war context. He is the author of *Ambivalent Modernism: Technology, Scientific Ideology and Politics in Interwar Greece* (2012, in Greek).

Fernando Clara is an assistant professor at the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, New University of Lisbon. His publications include *Worlds of Words. Travels, History, Science, Literature: Portugal in the German-speaking World 1770–1810* (2007, in Portuguese); the edited book *Other Horizons: German-Portuguese Encounters in Colonial Contexts* (2009, in Portuguese); and the co-edited volume *Europe in Black and White: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Immigration, Race and Identity in the 'Old Continent'* (2011).

Johannes Dafinger teaches Contemporary History at the Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt. He has published a monograph on German–Soviet scientific relations before 1941 and is now working on concepts of Europe and transnational networks within the National Socialist sphere of influence. In his doctoral thesis, he investigates the history of Nazi Germany's bilateral friendship societies (*zwischenstaatliche Gesellschaften*).

Maricó Janué i Miret is Associate Professor of Contemporary History at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona. Her current research interests include German–Spanish relations in the period 1870–1945, particularly the links between cultural relations and political interests. She is the author of ‘“Woe Betide Us If They Win!”: National Socialist Treatment of

the Spanish “Volunteer” Workers’ (*Contemporary European History* 23 (3): 329–357, 2014). She is currently working on a book provisionally titled *The Role of Culture in German–Spanish Relations during National Socialism*.

Markos Karasarinis holds a PhD in modern history and is a regular contributor to the books section of the newspaper *To Vima* (*The Tribune*). He has been a research associate at The Institute of Neohellenic Research of the National Hellenic Research Foundation and has published articles on Social Darwinism and eugenics.

George Kokkinos is Professor of History Didactics at the Department of Primary Education, University of the Aegean, Rhodes. He has published widely on the epistemology of history, history didactics, memory, and historical trauma. His latest book is *The Holocaust: The Management of Traumatic Memory* (2015, in Greek).

Mário Matos is Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies (German Literature and Culture) at the University of Minho, Portugal. His research and publications have focused on the history of travel culture and intercultural relations, including several articles and chapters in books on tourism and travel writing in the Third Reich and the GDR. He is also the co-editor of *Intercultural Mnemo-Graphies* (2012) and *Zonas de Contacto: Estado Novo/III Reich, 1933–1945* (2011).

Cláudia Ninhos is a researcher at the Institute for Contemporary History, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, New University of Lisbon. Her research focuses on the Holocaust, National Socialism, Fascism, and German–Portuguese relations. Her publications include *Salazar, Portugal and the Holocaust* (2013, in Portuguese, with Irene Pimentel) and the co-edited volume *The Anxiety of Influence: Politics, Culture and Science in Germany’s Relations with Southern Europe, 1933–45* (2014, in Portuguese, with Fernando Clara).

Pablo Pérez López is Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Navarre, Spain. He works in political and cultural history, with a special interest in the influence of religion in these fields, and also in the democratization process. He is the author of *Personajes de fe que hicieron historia* (2014), ‘Diversity and Decentralization in the Democratization Process in Spain’ (*International Relations and Diplomacy* 2, February 2014), and *Charles de Gaulle: Una idea de Francia* (2003).

Irene Flunser Pimentel holds a PhD in institutional history and contemporary politics from the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, New University of Lisbon. She is a researcher at the Institute of Contemporary History and is working on a postdoctoral project, approved by the Portuguese National Science and Technology Foundation, titled 'The Political Justice Process Regarding the Political Police from the Dictatorship, in Transition to Democracy in Portugal'. She is author of several books about the Portuguese dictatorship (the 'New State'), the political police, gender issues, and Portugal during the Second World War. Her recent books include *Opposing Portuguese Dictatorship, 1926–1974* (2014, in Portuguese), *Spies in Portugal during World War II* (2013, in Portuguese), and *Salazar, Portugal and the Holocaust* (2013, in Portuguese, with Cláudia Ninhos).

Eric S. Roubinek is Assistant Professor of History at the University of North Carolina Asheville. He is co-editor of *The Weimar Republic (1918/19–1933)* in the German Historical Institute's *German History in Documents and Images* series. His current research focuses on the shared visions of nation and race that were created through the colonial collaboration of Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany.

Magali Romero Sá is a senior researcher at the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Brazil. She has published widely on the history of tropical medicine, the history of natural history, the scientific relations between Germany and Brazil in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the German pharmaceutical industry in Brazil. She is editor of 'Brazil–Germany: Medical and Scientific Relations Dossier' and co-author of the article 'Policy of Disseminating Germanism through the Bayer Periodicals *Revista Terapêutica* and *O Farmacêutico Brasileiro*' (*História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos*, 2013). With André Felipe Cândido da Silva, she is writing the history of German scientific expeditions to Brazil during the Third Reich.

André Felipe Cândido da Silva is a researcher at the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Brazil. His research investigates the history of science, medicine, and public health, with a focus on German–Brazilian relations and on transnational intellectual networks involving Brazilian scientists. He is the author, with Jaime Benchimol, of 'Malaria and Quinine Resistance: The Circulation of a Medical and Scientific Issue between Brazil and Germany (1907–1919)' (*Medical History* 58 (1): 1–26, 2014) and "'The Scientist-Diplomat": Henriques da Rocha Lima

and the Germany-Brazil Relations, 1919–1927' (*Jahrbuch für Geschichte Lateinamerikas* 50: 261–288, 2013).

Michael Wedekind is an assistant professor at the University of Vienna. He has published on Central, South and Southeast European contemporary history with regard to various forms of nationalism, twentieth-century dictatorships, and the Second World War, as well as on the history of European tourism. His studies include *Nationalsozialistische Besatzungs- und Annexionspolitik in Norditalien 1943 bis 1945: Die Operationszonen 'Alpenvorland' und 'Adriatisches Küstenland'* (2003) and *The Mathematization of the Human Being: Anthropology and Ethnopolitics in Romania in the Late 1930s and Early 1940s* (2010); he is currently preparing a study on *Scholarship and Politics: Reshaping South-Central Europe, 1939–1945*.

Frederick Whitling is a postdoctoral researcher at the Swedish Institute in Rome. He is presently working on the project 'Gustaf VI Adolf as Archaeologist and Patron of the Arts', on the role of the former king of Sweden in the organization of research and scholarship, which is also the subject of a conference volume that he has recently edited (2014). He is currently preparing two volumes for publication: one on foreign schools in Rome and Athens, and the other on the first quarter century of the Swedish Institute in Rome, 1925–50.

Maria Zarifi is Lecturer in History and Philosophy of Science at the Hellenic Open University in Greece. She is also a fellow at the Heidelberg Centre for Transcultural Studies (HCTS). Her publications include *Science, Culture and Politics: Germany's Cultural Policy and Scientific Relations with Greece 1933–1945* (2010). She is currently working on issues regarding transcultural modernity and knowledge transfer between Germany and Greece from 1832 to 1952, focusing on medical science and public health.

1

‘The “invisible” export of thought’: German Science and Southern Europe, 1933–45

Fernando Clara

A report on the commemorations of the ‘Quatercentenary of the University of Coimbra’, written by the Irish chemist Frederick George Donnan and published in the pages of the British scientific journal *Nature* (Donnan, 1938), offers a helpful and insightful first approach to understand many of the questions that the chapters in this book deal with.

Donnan’s report gives a detailed depiction of the celebrations held at Coimbra between 6 and 9 December 1937. It is a sympathetic and diplomatic text focusing mainly on institutional and social events, in which the author does not spare laudatory comments about the Portuguese authorities, most especially about the former ‘distinguished Professor of that University’ and ‘great Prime Minister’ of Portugal, ‘Dr. Salazar’. Towards the end of the text, however, the style changes somewhat; it becomes less formal and its author more expansive. Donnan seems to feel obliged to give his readers some professional and more personal notes on two visits he made during his stay at Coimbra that were apparently not included in his official programme. The first one, described as a ‘remarkable experience’, was to the Chemical Laboratory (‘a building in the neo-classical style erected in the last quarter of the eighteenth century’), the second to the English Institute at the University of Coimbra. This last ‘very interesting visit’ was paid to an institute ‘due to the energy and initiative of Dr. [Sidney George] West’ and ‘worthy of the strongest support’. Donnan is ‘astonished to find [there] a library containing some English scientific journals and a goodly number of the most modern English books on chemistry and physics’, and this leads him to a series of interesting personal reflections about the ‘modern

world' that end up in a significant concluding observation (Donnan, 1938: 65):

In the modern world the 'invisible' export of thought is an element of deep significance and importance. Britons in the past have been too apt to think that foreign nations are bound to assimilate the products of their thought and research by reasons of some sort of inevitable predestination. This curious diffidence – or sublime trust in Providence – is not much good in the rough catch-as-catch-can of the thrusting modern world.

It is important to emphasize that Donnan knows exactly what he is talking about. War in Europe was just around the corner; the British scientific journal in which his report was published had been banned in Germany in November 1937 (Anon., 1938a); and Donnan knew only too well what war meant, both for science and for the state. Besides the two articles published on the subject (Donnan, 1915, 1916), he had been 'in the thick of the scientific and technological battle' (Freeth, 1957: 26) during the Great War as an active member of several British warfare scientific committees.

Furthermore, Donnan is perfectly aware of the deep 'significance and importance' of this 'export of thought' because he is, himself, a product of it. In fact, like several other scientists of his generation, he spent a great part of the last decade of the nineteenth century in Germany, where he studied chemistry under Ostwald and van't Hoff. He obtained his PhD from the University of Leipzig in 1896, and several of his scientific papers were written in German and published in German scientific journals. Like many other scientists and scholars of this period, Donnan is, therefore, a product of German science. His personal and professional connections to German laboratories and universities were interrupted but not broken off by the Great War. In 1933, after the death of Wilhelm Ostwald, he delivered the Ostwald Memorial Lecture at the Royal Society (Donnan, 1933). During the Nazi period, he helped German Jewish scientists fleeing the country (Herman Arthur Jahn, Edward Teller, and Herbert Freundlich, among others), and in 1939, just a few months before the Second World War broke out, he left in the *Notes & Records of the Royal Society* a curiously sympathetic brief report on a visit to the Kaiser Wilhelm Society in Berlin (Clark and Donnan, 1939; further biographical details on Donnan in Oesper, 1941 and Freeth, 1957).

Finally, it should be worth noting that Donnan received honorary degrees from several universities (among them Athens and Coimbra)

and that he was a member of various international scientific societies, as, indeed, would be expected from a firm believer in the internationalization of science who, as early as 1910, had translated a book on *International Language and Science* in which the following epic paragraph can be found (Pfaundler et al., 1910: [VII] from the 'Translator's Preface'):

Internationalisation of thought is the motto of the twentieth century, the device on the banner of progress. Science, the Super-Nation of the world, must lead the way in this as in all other things.

The chapters in this book tackle the rather complex mixture of social, political, and cultural events, international scientific meetings, and personal networks that Donnan's report on his visit to Coimbra partly unveils. This book is, therefore, about the 'internationalisation of thought' or, to be more specific, about the 'export', circulation, and appropriation of German scientific 'thought' in Southern European countries during the Nazi period.

The last two decades have seen a growing flood of publications concerned with science in National Socialist Germany. In an article that appeared 15 years after his important book *Scientists under Hitler* was published (Beyerchen, 1977), Alan Beyerchen distinguishes two basic streams of publications dealing with the subject (Beyerchen, 1992: 615–616):

One stream is that of collected essays surveying the role of the university (or a specific university) under National Socialism; in contrast to most such volumes published before the 1970s, careful attention is paid to the relationship of the scientific institutes with the regime. [...] The other stream is that of examinations of specific disciplines and their practitioners or of specialized institutions.

Beyerchen's review of literature still seems generally germane today, in spite of the many other books and essays that have appeared since 1992 and in spite of important commissioned research projects focusing on German science during the Nazi era that have been launched since then. The research programme promoted by the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft in 1999 on the *History of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society in the National Socialist Era* deserves special mention in this context, as do several other projects initiated by German universities (Berlin, Munich, Heidelberg, and Göttingen, among others) that sought to understand their own entangled (hi)stories in the Nazi period. All of these projects

have undoubtedly contributed with a very significant number of works to a much clearer understanding of how the National Socialist regime controlled some of its most important scientific institutions, and its results are generally in line with Beyerchen's perspective (see Becker et al., 1998; Kaufmann, 2000; Bruch et al., 2005; Eckart et al., 2006; Kraus, 2006; Schmuhl, 2008; Heim et al., 2009; Hoffmann et al., 2014).

However, the chapters in this volume would have some difficulties completely fitting into the two streams of publications envisioned by Beyerchen. They certainly examine the role of universities, research laboratories, and other scientific actors and institutions under National Socialism, but they do it in a considerably different setting. First, their main focus is on the circulation and appropriation of knowledge in an international – bilateral, and sometimes also multilateral – environment. Second and furthermore, this environment is not exclusively scientific but also strongly determined by the political and cultural foreign policies of the states involved (in this respect, see for example Hård and Jamison, 1998). In other words: what this double shift of perspective means is that these essays deal with a hybrid international environment and an intricate set of objects that include social, cultural, or scientific events and personal networks along with scientific theories, disciplines, technologies, or methodologies.

Considering, therefore, the variety of this set of materials, and the fact that the internationalization of 'German scientific thought' during the period operates at a complex level where the scientific, the cultural, and the political are often closely intertwined, the term 'science' can only be understood here in the broadest sense of the German *Wissenschaft*, thus including both the *Naturwissenschaften* and the *Geisteswissenschaften*. Odd, or at least unusual, as it may sound in a post-'Two Cultures' world, it should nevertheless be pointed out that this meaning of 'science' corresponds more accurately not only to the general use of the word in Germany, but also to the perception of the concept of *Wissenschaft* that the particular period and the Nazi regime appeared to favour. It is true that the cleavage between the *Naturwissenschaften* and the *Geisteswissenschaften* was already clearly perceivable, including in Germany, by the late nineteenth century, as the controversy between Dilthey and Du Bois-Reymond, which led the former to publish his *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, clearly shows. But the fact is that between 1933 and 1945 the growing relevance and conspicuousness of the political and ideological spheres somehow managed to set aside the differences between the 'Two Cultures'. One only needs to recall the pivotal role played by the humanities in some of

the more relevant scientific research institutions of that epoch, like the above-mentioned Kaiser Wilhelm Society, whose first president, and one of its founders, was the theologian Adolf von Harnack. And, as to the specific role and functions of the *Geisteswissenschaften* in the building of international scientific networks, the concluding observations of a speech given by the physicist Heinrich Koenen in November 1929 at the general meeting of the Emergency Association of German Science (*Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft*) leave no doubt about their significance: ‘oriental studies, archaeology, research expeditions and philosophy are indispensable to support our decisive future foreign policy and as close to real life as bacteriology or mechanical engineering’ (Koenen, 1930: 64).¹

The change of focus that such a perspective entails admittedly calls for a reassessment of the literature on Nazi science somewhat different from the one drawn by Beyerchen in 1992, though not necessarily contradictory to it.

Apart from some scattered and very differently motivated publications that appeared during the first decade immediately after the Second World War and whose authors, in one way or another, were all involved in the conflict – among them Max Weinreich’s *Hitler’s Professors* (1999, 1st edition 1946), Leslie A. Simon’s *German Research in World War II* (1947), and George Schreiber’s *Deutsche Wissenschaftspolitik von Bismarck bis zum Atomwissenschaftler Otto Hahn* (1954) – it is above all from the mid-1960s that Germany begins to reconsider the role of science and technology as well as the role of universities during the Nazi period. Most of the essays published in that decade (Abendroth, 1966; Kuhn et al., 1966; Erdmann, 1967) come from lecture series held in 1965 and 1966 at the universities of Tübingen, Berlin, Munich, and Kiel. But by 1969, the publication of Fritz K. Ringer’s *The Decline of the German Mandarins* already anticipated much of the work and research lines of the next decade. In fact, the 1970s go far beyond the panorama of occasional memorial lectures, important as they were, by bringing a significant shift to discourse in this area with the first academic dissertations on the subject (for example, Beyerchen, 1977) and a growing number of articles on similar topics published in international scientific journals (Düwell, 1971; Forman, 1971; Schroeder-Gudehus, 1972, among others). Of course, it is important to stress that works like the ones mentioned earlier were largely outnumbered by an already remarkable number of publications dealing with the Nazi regime from a historical-political point of view. The 200-page bibliography on National Socialism compiled by Peter Hüttenberger in 1980 might well be considered an

emblematic milestone of the research interests until then: while most of the works listed there deal with historical–political topics (fascist theories, ideology, history of the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP), and so on), only three meagre pages itemizing 40 publications are devoted to the section ‘Sciences/University’ (Hüttenberger, 1980: 100–104).

Nevertheless, the shift of historiographical discourse to an international academic arena, announced in the 1970s, was to produce significant results in the following decades. Among these are several congress proceedings, edited volumes, and academic dissertations that basically fall into the two streams identified by Beyerchen in his aforementioned review essay (Macrakis, 1993; Walker, 1993, 1995; Brocke and Laitko, 1994; Hentschel and Hentschel, 1996; Hutton, 1999; Hausmann, 2000, 2001, 2002; Schmuhl, 2000; Heim, 2001; Szöllösi-Janze, 2001; Proctor, 2002; Bruch et al., 2005; Bialas and Rabinbach, 2006; Hoffmann and Walker, 2007; Maas and Hooijmaijers, 2009; Weiss, 2010; Jütte et al., 2011, to name only a few published after Beyerchen’s review).

Now, what is interesting about the vast majority of these publications is that they all share one common feature: they are mainly entangled in the inner landscapes and networks of German science and are, thus, primarily concerned with demystifying its internal organization, structures, and functions. That is to say: they tend to operate at local national levels, hence reproducing, to a certain extent, the typical parochiality attributed to the political and cultural systems they seek to analyse. The “invisible” export of thought’ remained, therefore, still ‘invisible’.

The European fascist period was certainly a period of exclusions and disruptions, but it was also a time of intense international network building and scientific and cultural exchange: the exhibitions, public lectures, and academic or even touristic exchange that Germany organized between 1933 and 1945 in Southern European countries (from Portugal to Romania and Bulgaria, not forgetting Spain, Italy, or Greece) reflect a hybrid (that is, political, cultural, and scientific) obsession to ‘persuade’ and to ‘seduce’, ‘to make a friend out of an enemy or to make a friend out of an indifferent’ (Schwabe, 1940: 10).

The fact that international hybrid networks like these have attracted only incidental attention from researchers should not be surprising. On the one hand, the analysis of such complex networking systems implies an often intricate cross-disciplinary and cross-national point of view, as information gathered in German institutions needs to be cross-checked with data collected at similar local national institutions and vice versa. On the other hand, research in this particular area is

confronted with many missing links, for it is heavily dependent on German institutions whose archives were either seriously damaged or completely destroyed during the war, as is the case for the archives of the Humboldt Foundation, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), and the German Student Association for Foreigners (*Deutsche Studienwerk für Ausländer*) (see Impekoven, 2013: 30–35). Finally, it should be acknowledged that the analysis of top-level institutions that were major actors in this area, such as the German Foreign Office (*Auswärtiges Amt*), was in part neglected until recently another commissioned research project threw new and, above all, more detailed light on this organization (Conze et al., 2010; Frei and Fischer, 2011).

Certainly, there are many available primary sources and studies on Nazi foreign policy (see, for example, the section ‘International Relations’ in Hüttenberger, 1980: 135–157; Jacobsen and Smith, 2007; Kimmich, 2013), yet these deal mainly with specific bilateral case studies and were undertaken within the traditional historical-political framework. With a few exceptions (for example, Abelein, 1968; Twardowski, 1970; and more recently Cuomo, 1995; Trommler, 2013), most of these studies leave the German Foreign Office’s international scientific and cultural policies as good as untouched.

Research dealing with such an incomplete, sometimes diffuse, and, without doubt, difficult scenario is, of course, not abundant. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify three main strands of studies addressing the internationalization of German science and thought from such a cross-disciplinary and cross-national comparative perspective during the period.

In the first place, there is a set of publications that deal with German node institutions which were specifically devoted to promote foreign academic and cultural international relations, and therefore cannot avoid noticing the constitutive role played by bilateral or multilateral international hybrid networks in these institutions. Among them is Laitenberger’s thesis on the DAAD (Laitenberger, 1976), Liehr et al.’s (2003) volume on the Ibero-American Institute, Michels’ book (2005) on the German Academy and the Goethe Institute, Gesche’s book (2006) on German scientific institutes, Waibel’s thesis (2010) on German schools abroad, and Impekoven’s (2013) on the Humboldt Foundation. Essays addressing other important actors of these international academic settings (students, teachers, researchers, institutions) should also be considered within this set of texts: for instance, the case of von Olenhusen’s (1966) and Paschalidis’ (2009) essays or Bodo’s (1998 and 2003) works.

Second, there is a set of works, most of them developed under the specific framework of the historiography of science, that deal with the international situation of German science after 1918 and during the Nazi period. Brigitte Schroeder-Gudehus' thesis of 1966 on *German Science and International Cooperation (1914–1928)* might well be considered a pioneer study as far as this topic goes. Her work was followed by a number (albeit relatively modest) of other studies (Forman, 1973; Crawford et al., 1986, 1993; Crawford, 2002) until more recently Carol Sachse and Mark Walker edited a volume of *Osiris* on 'Politics and Science in Wartime: Comparative International Perspectives on the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute' (Sachse and Walker, 2005), while Sheila Faith Weiss (2005) was also drawing attention to the political role played by German science in the 'international arena'.

Finally, there is a third set of publications that focus more explicitly on the circulation and appropriation of knowledge and ideas in fascist Europe. A subset of these works adopts a comparative political perspective and appears above all interested in the internationalism of fascist thought (for example, Mosse, 1979; Griffin, 1998; De Grand, 2004; Patel, 2004; Bauerkämper, 2007, 2010; Pinto, 2011) or in the circulation of political ideas and values among European regimes that, despite not disguising their ideological affinities, also do not seem willing to give up their nationalistic differences (Baldoli, 2003; Ivani, 2008). And lastly, there is a second subset of publications that assumes a somewhat different, and to a certain extent broader, scope of analysis by concentrating on the scientific and cultural 'export of thought' that takes place in specific bilateral political settings (Hera Martínez, 2002; Koutsoukou, 2008; Janué Miret, 2008; Zarifi, 2008, 2010; Rebok, 2010; Vares, 2011) or in wider regional contexts (Carreras, 2005; Turda and Weindling, 2007).

Like some of the aforementioned works, this book brings into focus the international networks that were established, developed, or maintained between Germany and the Southern European region during the Nazi period. Dealing with a complex network of individuals and institutions that thrive in a hybrid scientific, cultural, and political environment, these chapters aim to go beyond both the surface of diplomatic discourse and the well-studied political and ideological affinities of those fascist regimes. They lay bare the parasitic use that Nazi propaganda made of an internationally recognized and reputable tradition – that of science produced in German academies, universities, and laboratories – by centring their analysis on concrete actors, institutions, events, measures, and actions that fostered the circulation and appropriation of knowledge between National Socialist Germany and the totalitarian

regimes of Southern European countries. Furthermore, they explore the skilful linking of very diversified local interests, which gave rise to international influence networks that survived the fall of Nazi Germany, lasting in some cases (Spain, Greece, and Portugal, for instance) until the mid-1970s.

International relations and the 'soft power' of German science

Unweaving a web of international networks like these is far from being a simple task, all the more so when the global political and cultural context is strongly moulded by ultranationalist ideologies. The paths of confrontation and possible points of disruption between international and national structures are to be found virtually everywhere, from beliefs to thoughts and actions, from everyday life to scientific activities. The 'export of thought' to which Donnan ascribed 'deep importance and significance' is not immune to these clashes, nor do its tracks lie outside these conflict paths. Quite the contrary, in the 'modern world' the 'export of thought' is particularly affected by them.

Scientific matters, the circulation of knowledge, and the internationalization of science were neither a minor nor a lateral issue during the period in question: not only because physics played a decisive role in a war that was decided by laboratory research rather than bravery on the battlefields (cf. Anon., 1939a), but also because scientific and pseudoscientific discourse pervaded the public sphere of the epoch with a panoply of noisy events and discussions that were probably unique in the history of mankind. Einstein's case, which reached the world newspapers before the Nazi seizure of power and stayed there during the Second World War and long thereafter, can be considered emblematic of the global centrality of the role played by science in the first half of the twentieth century. During the period, there were certainly several other events and topics that caught the attention of the media as well as that of scientific and scholarly journals. The forced migration of Jewish scholars and scientists from Germany and the loud discussions around the concept of race were definitely among them. But what seems important to emphasize is that all these pieces of news were clearly pointing in one direction: Germany. At the centre of this new public opinion turmoil was German science, or, to be more accurate, the specific national(istic) views on science that, from 1933 on, emanated from German laboratories, academies, and universities (from physics to biology, not forgetting disciplines that were less popular in the media and yet important, such

as archaeology, geography, economics, agriculture, or even philology and philosophy).

Underlying the discussions that pervaded Western public opinion during the period was a notorious clash between German and non-German science that can be traced back to the events that followed the end of the First World War and to the fragile and desperate situation in which German science found itself by then. The reorganization of international scientific institutions and the consequent segregation of German science in the aftermath of the Great War is a well-studied case that has received significant research attention (Schroeder-Gudehus, 1966, 1973; Kevles, 1971; Cock, 1983; Crawford, 1988; Reinbothe, 2010). Nevertheless, it still seems important to recall here the atmosphere of violent verbal hostility that surrounded German scientists at that time. And, for that matter, the brief note on ‘German Naturalists and Nomenclature’ published by the British entomologist Lord Walsingham in *Nature* on 5 September 1918 (Walsingham, 1918: 4) is clear enough not to require any further comment:

I trust that the great majority of naturalists will read with approval the following sentence in Sir Georg Hampson’s paper on ‘Pyralidae,’ published in the Proceedings of the Zoological Society, 1918 (p. 55): – ‘No quotations from German authors published since August, 1914, are included. “Hostes humani generis.” [...]’

Let us trust that for the next twenty years, at least, all Germans will be relegated to the category of persons with whom honest men will decline to have any dealings.

Even though this kind of hostile discourse faded with the years, the arrival of the Nazis to power brought a different and more complex framework for these discussions, which included the relations of science and society (see, for instance, Merton, 1938; Bernal, 1939; Park, 1940), the relations of science and politics (Haldane, 1934; Aydelotte, 1940; Benedict, 1940), (inter)nationalism, neutrality, and independence of science (Jackson, 1934; Leland, 1934; Haldane, 1941; Darrow, 1943), and academic freedom (Anon., 1933a; Veit, 1937; Mason, 1940). These were not entirely new discussions within the epistemological framework of science, but it is important to bear in mind that they were now being fuelled by very specific and very mediatic examples of racism and exclusion, among them the news regarding the situation of the Jewish refugees (see, for example, Anon., 1933b, 1936, 1937) or the

heated debate on the race question (see, for example, the important contributions from eminent scientists like Boas, 1934, 1937; Huxley et al., 1935; Fleure, 1936, 1937; Benedict, 1940). And that meant that the interference of (national) politics in science was no longer a matter restricted to scientific or intellectual circles, but an issue that the Nazis had been able to put on the public agenda.

The whole academic and scientific atmosphere in which these debates took place is well captured in a brief passage from a declaration of the American Association for the Advancement of Science adopted in 1937 and reproduced in several scientific journals thereafter: ‘Science is wholly independent of national boundaries and races and creeds and can flourish permanently only where there is peace and intellectual freedom’ (Anon., 1939b: 294). The emphasis put on ‘races’, ‘creeds’, ‘peace’, and ‘freedom’ leaves no doubt about the fact that the statement can only be read against the background of the political situation and events in Germany. However, the statement also mentions – and right at the beginning – that ‘Science is wholly independent of national boundaries’, and in doing so it unveils a somehow different debate that is going on at a different level: it does not appear to be a public denunciation of the contemporary political–scientific situation in Germany (or, at least, not in a direct, immediate way), or a discussion about ‘Aryan’ and non-‘Aryan’ science, but a debate between two colliding views of science and of scientific (inter)nationalism. It was a debate, therefore, about scientific principles and about science and politics that touched on a core question of scientific thought: its universalism.

Now, what is interesting about this (perhaps) more fundamental debate is that the line that was expected or supposed to divide German from non-German scientists becomes less clear. In 1932, the American biologist T.D.A. Cockerell already noted that, even if science should be ‘the leading international cult’, ‘scientific men must recognise the limits of internationalism on the emotional side, and the positive disadvantage of trying to make all people *feel* alike’ (Cockerell, 1932: 831, italics in original). And, in 1938, a subtle brief note published by *The Lancet* stressed that ‘work conceived and executed purely in the interest of a particular nation may end in conferring benefits upon the whole of humanity’ (Anon., 1938b: 1125). At this level of debate, the discussions appear to lose (at least some of) their radicalism, and it therefore comes as no surprise to find that Germany recognizes, in its turn, the dangers of ultranationalism in these areas. In fact, it is worth noting that German science was aware of its fragile position and conscious of the risks of further isolation that it was running in 1933 with the Nazis’ seizure of

power. A clear warning came from a report of the Emergency Association of German Science of that same year: ‘the threads of German research to foreign countries must not tear off’ (Notgemeinschaft, 1933: 83). And the proof that these risks were also taken very seriously by the Nazi regime is the declaration released to the press by the Reich’s minister of education, Bernhard Rust, on 7 May 1933 concerning foreign students in German universities (Rust, 1933):

The abominable propaganda in foreign countries has apparently also disseminated false ideas about the German universities. As many inquiries show there is abroad often the fear that the universities in Germany might be less friendly disposed than before to the study of foreigners. The fear is unfounded. The student youth from abroad who has interest and understanding for German character and German science is welcome to study in Germany. It will find with us sincere hospitality and extensive support.

The most important German scientific institutions and the highest political authorities were thus conscious that their isolation in areas related to the circulation of knowledge could be dangerous, and that the racially based Nazi ideology could actually be fatal in educational and research contexts, which were already highly internationalized by then. In other words: as far as science, research, and education were concerned, the new Nazi Germany was conscious that it could very well be the first victim of Nazi ideology.

This state of affairs was admittedly not new for Germany. The above-quoted passage from Lord Walsingham clearly demonstrates that the spectre of segregation in these areas had already haunted the German *Kulturwelt* since the Great War. And, although the whole situation had different contours by 1933, the truth is that the strategy used by Germany to overcome this renewed isolationist threat was basically similar to the diplomatic strategies successfully tested and used during and after the First World War.

A pamphlet entitled ‘The German Professors and the World War’, published by the liberal and pacifist Walther Schücking in 1915, has the merit of describing the German strategy vividly and in a few words. Drawing the attention of the reader to Count Bernstorff, former German ambassador in the United States and ‘one of the most competent diplomats of the German Reich’, the author stresses the fact that Bernstorff took special care in fostering his relations to American universities, and had received for this several honorary degrees. Schücking recalls

an episode involving the same Bernstorff that should, in his view, be considered an example and a future road map for German diplomacy (Schücking, 1915: [1]):

When he was asked whether the collection of American honorary degrees had become a new sport for him, he replied with resignation that his task would be primarily to gain sympathy for his German home state, the only circles that had a suitable soil for that were the scholars, and therefore he first approached American science in order to work there for Germany.²

Moreover, Schücking notes that 'The spiritual isolation of Germany at the outbreak of the present war is sufficient proof that this diplomat [...] has correctly assessed the situation' and concludes: 'This reputation of German science abroad was for us a big German capital, doubly valuable in a time where, after all, our assets were actually so surprisingly low.'

'Scholars', 'universities', and 'science' were thus the 'soft' – and yet very powerful – German diplomatic antidotes to the international isolationist threat during the Great War. From a German point of view, they were simultaneously the most important channels that kept international communication flowing for Germany and invaluable tools 'to make a friend out of an enemy', to use Schwabe's words quoted above.

Fifteen years after Schücking's pamphlet, much had changed in Germany, but not its international, diplomatic, and political networking strategies. A book published anonymously in 1931 and entitled *The Struggle for German Foreign Policy (Der Kampf um die deutsche Aussenpolitik)* offers a detailed and deep insight into these continuities, while at the same time foreseeing many of the rhetorical changes that the Nazi regime would bring two years later. With its more than 400 pages and a very exhaustive table of contents that covers all the main topics related to foreign cultural policy (from Australia to China and from the League of Nations to domestic policy), the book might be considered, without doubt, a true guideline for future German diplomacy. It is, however, worth noting that its author seems rather distant from the political and ideological convictions of the Nazi party: he holds the view that fascism should be rejected as a political solution for Germany (Anon., 1931: 135) and that Germany's domestic policy should promote the 'struggle against any type of dictatorship'; he professes pacifism and disarmament in Europe (Anon., 1931: 407); and, while very critical of the world power of the Jews (Anon., 1931: 128: 'Germany is today almost completely under Jewish rule'), he nevertheless agrees that 'a fundamentally

anti-Semitic German policy would only result in the gravest dangers for German interests' (Anon., 1931: 132).

Despite these views (or precisely because of them), the chapter specifically dedicated to foreign cultural policy is of undeniable interest because of the way it exposes the continuities underlying these particular areas and at the same time unveils the future German diplomatic guidelines (Anon., 1931: 105, italics in the original):

International cultural policy is something that a State does to its own advantage; it is not an *act of charity*. From a foreign-political point of view it is therefore unwise to speak of the merits 'of cultural elevation' of another country, as it happens too often in Germany. [...]

The use of our own culture as a *means of foreign policy* is more necessary for Germany today than in the past because other essential fundamentals of foreign policy efficacy, such as the military or the financial and economic powers have been either partially eliminated or severely undermined.

And, after distinguishing between a cultural foreign policy for foreign countries and states (*Ausländerkulturpolitik*) and a cultural foreign policy for Germans living abroad (*Auslandsdeutsche*), the author proceeds with a remarkable listing of the main German institutions that should be involved in the cultural policy specially designed for foreign countries: German schools abroad, universities, German scientific institutes abroad, international congresses, arts and sports events, and so on (Anon., 1931: 106–108).

A remarkable and truly impressive listing indeed, not only because it is an extended and updated list of the instruments that German diplomacy had put to use since the First World War, but also because these were de facto the main German 'soft tools' that later enabled the strategic circulation of knowledge between Nazi Germany and Southern Europe, as the chapters in this book seek to show.

Approaching Southern Europe: Culture, science, politics

In general terms, the cultural foreign policy methods used by Nazi Germany to approach Southern European countries were, therefore, apparently no different from those adopted by Bernstorff in the United States from 1908 to 1917, or those described with detail in the book on German foreign policy anonymously published in 1931. The main

structures and institutions involved were the same, even if retouched by local colours, and the sequentially ordered strategy used to approach foreign countries followed one basic pattern: cultural contacts and events usually preceded scientific, technical, or economic linking, and if the whole atmosphere was favourable, political discourse would take over – actually, parasitize – the already opened communication channels.

However, even if Bernstorff's methods in the United States can be regarded as typical of a long-term German diplomatic strategy, it must also be added and acknowledged that North America was not (and is not) Southern Europe. The differences lie not so much in the physical-geographical characteristics of each of these two regions of the globe, but in the fact that they may be *seen differently* by different observers with different interests and goals. In other words, if geography is a matter of perspective, political geography or (perhaps better in this case) *Geopolitik* is even more so. Hitler makes this perfectly clear when he distinguishes North America from Central and South America (Hitler, 1941: 392):

North America, the population of which consists for the greatest part of Germanic elements – which mix only very little with the lower, colored races – displays a humanity and a culture different from those of Central and South America, where chiefly the Romanic immigrants have sometimes mixed with the aborigines on a large scale.

In this brief excerpt from *Mein Kampf*, the comparison between the Americas basically serves as an argument and example against 'any mixing of the blood'; nonetheless, the way the distinction is drawn is interesting enough to deserve further discussion. First, it must be noted that Hitler significantly concentrates on the 'racial' features of the American populations, and not on the geographical characteristics of the different regions. On the other hand, it must also be pointed out that his understanding of the 'American population' has almost no space for indigenous peoples, which are considered 'lower races'. It is not they but the 'Germanic' and 'Romanic' 'elements' that are at the very centre of the distinction drawn. The picture that emerges from this passage is thus much more a picture of Europe than one of America. Hitler transposes to the American setting the North-South 'racial' divide that he imagines in Europe, so that in the end he does not see or depict America at all, but only his European fiction.

Perspective does matter, indeed, and from a German point of view the 'South' and above all 'Southern Europe' are definitely not empty or neutral geographical concepts. On the contrary, they are historically

and culturally laden concepts with values and fantasies attached to them that call forth different interests.

For Germany, 'Southern Europe' is a set of complex, multi-layered, and dynamic visions that include the fertile and mythical 'land where the lemon-trees bloom' (Goethe, 1824: 229); Humboldt's Greeks, a people that is not only 'useful to know historically, but an ideal' (Humboldt, 1908: 609), and also its well-known reverse images, the 'Black Legend' (Greer et al., 2008) as well as other similar 'Southern Horrors' (Bonifas and Monacelli, 2013). Furthermore, from the Nazis' point of view, this already bipolar image of 'Southern Europe' becomes an even more fractured concept. On the one hand, the European North–South divide that had been steadily growing since the Reformation gains new arguments and new strength from the racial views coming from National Socialist Germany. On the other hand, however, Germany's proclaimed 'Drive to the East' (Wippermann, 1981; see also Hitler, 1941: 933–967), which the anonymous author of the book on German foreign policy already anticipated when he wrote that 'Germany's future can only be re-established through Ostpolitik' (Anon., 1931: 34), introduces a new axis to the Nazis' stereotypical and prejudiced geopolitical view of the world – the West–East axis – that brings complexity and ambiguity with it. The 'Germanic North' still remains 'superior' to the 'South', but at the same time the 'West' is also considered 'superior' to the 'East'. The hierarchy of values becomes less rigid and less simple than it was before creating grey zones that might threaten the whole congruence of the Nazi mindset (what, for example, would be the relative position of Northeastern and Southwestern European regions along the 'superior–inferior' axis?).

From the moment the East became a priority for Nazi Germany, much of the 'superior–inferior' radical logic implicit in the classical North–South divide was momentarily bridged and transferred to the West–East axis. As a result, the Southeastern part of 'Southern Europe' emerged as a differentiated geographical entity, which was called upon to play a decisive role in Germany's 'existential questions' (Liulevicius, 2009: 1), being, as it was, at the centre of several other National Socialist policies and plans intended to provide Germany with *Lebensraum* for territorial expansion and the needed resources for exploitation (see, among others, Hirschfeld, 2003; Thum, 2006; Liulevicius, 2009: 171–202).

For National Socialist Germany, there were, therefore, many Souths in this European South. There were different projects, goals, and interests at stake that motivated somewhat differentiated relational strategies. It is true that underlying Germany's global first approach to Southern European countries was an overall feeling of 'cultural anxiety', also