

The Racism of Eric Voegelin

WULF D. HUND

University of Hamburg, Germany (WulfD.Hund@wis0.uni-hamburg.de)

As a young scholar, Eric Voegelin wanted to prove whether the ‘race idea’ could function as a means of political integration. He published two books on race that, after his flight to the USA, were eventually passed off as an early critique of racism. This is a complete misinterpretation and inversion of his endeavor. In his tracts, Voegelin only criticized a certain direction of race thinking that he identified as a materialistic biological approach to the problem. At the same time, he advocated another spiritual and metaphysical attempt, represented by the examples of Carl Gustav Carus, Othmar Spann, and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß. Both versions of race thinking were abundant in different types of fascism and also in Nazi Germany. That is why Voegelin could publish his books in Germany—and one of them even at the recommendation of a Nazi philosopher, with a publisher close to völkisch and fascist ideology. The reevaluation of his racist texts was only possible on the basis of their affirmative or superficial and uncritical reading against the backdrop of the development of a one-dimensional conception of racism.

Key words: racism; Nazi race theories; race mysticism; Carl Gustav Carus; Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß; Othmar Spann; Eric Voegelin

From the ‘Kaiserreich’ to the ‘Third Reich,’ Bayreuth was a hotbed of racism. From here, with the support of Cosima and Richard Wagner, the *Bayreuth Papers* circulated a militant antisemitism; from here, Houston Stewart Chamberlain obtained suggestions for his antisemitic concoction, *The Foundation of the Nineteenth Century*; and from here, Ludwig Schemann received support for his propagation of the race ideology of Arthur de Gobineau. Inspired by his example, Schemann not only founded an influential ‘Gobineau Society’ but also applied himself to the history of the race idea. His studies finally found expression in three large volumes of *Studies to the History of the Race Idea*. The books were published between 1928 and 1931. Two years later, they were commended in an examination of race and its political function by Eric Voegelin: “Ludwig Schemann, in his great work on race in the humanities, assembled outstanding materials on the history of thinking about race” (RS 15).¹ At the same time, in naming Jean Finot and Frederick Hertz, the author referred to “the opponents of race theory.” He concluded that their “opposition to race theory” was “not in any way well-founded” and that their “attacks on race theory are in fact of such low-grade character that they could not persuade its proponents but only annoy them” (RS 12).²

One of the problems with this statement is that Voegelin, who praised an antisemite and found fault with critics of race thinking, was subsequently treated as an early opponent of racism. But he shared the fate of Hertz only with regard to the biographical facts that both of them escaped from Austria in 1938 and afterwards anglicized their first names. Concerning the approach to what at this time was already occasionally called ‘racism,’ Hertz objected to it, whereas Voegelin only criticized a certain form of race thinking but commended another one that was not an iota less racist.

By praising Schemann’s compilation, Voegelin emphasized an apologetic study of race.³ This also included a political statement. Schemann, for many years a leading member of the *völkisch* ‘Pan-German League’ (‘Alldeutscher Verband’), was a well-known antisemite and apologist of white supremacy. Furthermore, he stood in the center of a scientific scandal widely discussed by the press: the leading German scientific association cancelled its financial support of

Schemann's work on his race books—but not until the social-democratic newspaper *Vorwärts* had exposed them for providing a grant for this biased antisemitic survey.⁴

This, of course, is only a secondary piece of evidence. Much more relevant is Voegelin's effort to obtain a position at a German university based on his books about race after January 30, 1933—and predominantly relevant is the reasoning of these studies itself. Proceeding from there, I will at first deal with Voegelin's assumption that his deliberations on race constituted a recommendation for a career in Nazi Germany (section 1). Next, I will outline the focus of Voegelin's undertaking concerning the history and function of 'race' and locate this endeavor in the important field of contemporary racisms—not least different racisms in connection with the ideology and politics of National Socialism (section 2). Subsequently, I will examine two of Voegelin's references to the suitable direction that race thinking should pursue, Carl Gustav Carus and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß (section 3). Finally, I will turn to the peculiar fact that, from 1933 up until now, Voegelin's racist thoughts have evolved into a misrepresentation in which they have been considered early anti-racist reflections in both apologetic and critical race studies (section 4).

1 With 'German Greeting'

When, in 1934, American sociologist Earle Edward Eubank interviewed Erich Voegelin in Vienna, they addressed the two books on race published the year before. In this context, Voegelin pointed out that his study on *The History of the Race Idea* “did incur displeasure because it was published by the official publisher of the National Socialists.”⁵

This statement (like the pretension, expressed in the same breath, that he was continuing the work of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and Jean Bodin) was a bit gargantuan.⁶ But it is true that the publisher had a “national-socialist program” and that the list of its authors “read like a ‘Who is who’ of the national-socialist elite.” In a letter to his contact man at the Rockefeller Foundation, Voegelin disclosed that his “book on the history of the idea of race will be published by a very nationalist firm, on recommendation of Professor Baeumler, [...] in spite that the results of the book are strictly opposite to the present race-doctrine and politics in Germany.”⁷

That, too, was only half the truth. Alfred Baeumler, who had been a convinced national socialist since the early 1930s,⁸ would never have recommended a study ‘strictly opposite’ to the contemporary discourse of race. What he advised was a manuscript that was directed against one (‘materialistic’) form and emphasized another (‘spiritual’) form of race thinking. At this time, both (and other) versions were prominently represented not only in the *völkisch* movement but also in the national socialist party. It was, therefore, not unrealistic for Voegelin to assume that his books on race could be tickets to a university career in the new ‘Reich.’

His ambitions in this direction found expression in two insistent attempts to recommend himself for academic functions in Germany in an exchange of letters with Alfred Baeumler and Ernst Kriek. In both instances, he approached national-socialist representatives of the scientific system and tried to explore the option of employment at a German university. His recommender at the Rockefeller Foundation noted that his books on race are “not orthodox in the Hitler sense” but take “the race problem seriously as a political factor.” That “may lead to V[oege]lin's being called to Germany. He would accept despite preference for Austria.”⁹

Taking the race problem ‘seriously’ does not mean criticizing racism—not in the eyes of all racist authors of the past and most certainly not in the eyes of an agent representing the foundation of a benefactor, who, like Rockefeller, promoted scientific efforts for the creation of a “superior race.” His money also benefitted German researchers and still facilitated German eugenicists after 1933.¹⁰ The support of his foundation for Voegelin's race studies was in

accordance with this position, and so was Voegelin's attempt to gain employment at a German university by networking with two leading academics of the new regime.¹¹

The one, Baeumler, drifting from a young-conservative position to National Socialism, became a member of the influential Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg's 'Militant League for German Culture' ('Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur') already in 1930. During the elections for the Reichstag in 1932, he publicly pronounced himself in favor of the Nazi party. In 1933, the national socialist Prussian Minister for Cultural Affairs appointed him to a professorship for philosophy and political pedagogy at the University of Berlin without the usual involvement of the faculty.

The other, Krieck, an early member of the 'Militant League for German Culture,' became a member of the National Socialist Party as early as 1932, and because of his political agitation, was suspended from his position at a pedagogic academy. After the so-called 'Machtergreifung' in 1933, he was appointed professor of pedagogy and, by ministerial decree, made vice-chancellor of the University of Frankfurt.

Viewed in this light, both of them did have considerable influence in the academia of the new system. But Voegelin did not only contact Baeumler and Krieck for the sake of expediency. He also could regard them as allies for a spiritually oriented race theory. One year after Voegelin's books had been released, the very publishing house that had produced one of them on Baeumler's recommendation issued a collection of Baeumler's essays written between 1929 and 1933, in which he affirmed the mutual dependency of body and soul.¹² Even at the beginning of the forties, Baeumler was supposed to contribute to the projected journal *Sanguis e Spirito* ('Blood and Spirit'), envisaged by Julius Evola to propagate (bilingually in Italian and German) the significance of spiritual compared to mere biological racism.¹³

Krieck had stated as early as 1922 that "race" has "its profound reason and highest worth in the spiritual domain," and he considered "race and 'blood'" as "spiritual values."¹⁴ Ten years later, he wrote (in a book that was released in 1936 in its twentieth edition) that "biology as science of the body [Leib] would be able to address the race problem only from one side." Rather, "race interweaves the entire human being, likewise in the areas of the spiritual and mental life." That is why "biology in the narrower sense remains indeed insufficient with regard to the race problem." Hence, the "cultivation of race" ought to originate from the "trinity of body [Leib], soul and mind."¹⁵

Despite his efforts, Voegelin's attempts failed—but not because he was identified as an anti-racist opponent of National Socialism. Emmanuel Faye has thoroughly analyzed the correspondence of Voegelin with Baeumler and Krieck. He shows that Voegelin, at this time, had no reservations about collaborating with fascist scientists and that he even emphasized to them his 'immaculate' pedigree in terms of Nazi race ideology. From this, Faye draws the conclusion that Voegelin had a "relaxed relation" towards his correspondents, which could be named "philonazism."¹⁶

This is underlined by the fact that Voegelin not only sent his book on *Race and State* to Baeumler and Krieck, but also to Arnold Gehlen, Hans F. K. Günther, Gunther Ipsen, and Erich Rothacker—all of whom were members of the Nazi Party (at least in May 1933) or forthright supporters of National Socialism. Furthermore, Voegelin tried to ensure that his deliberation would attract the interest of his addressees. After he sent the manuscript of *Race and State* to the publisher, he, one month after the so-called *Machtergreifung* in Germany, pored over an introduction for his book in March 1933.¹⁷

In this work, he on the one hand interpreted the eclectic and mystical racism of Alfred Rosenberg as a gleam of hope for a holistic race thinking that integrates the issues of body, mind, and soul. He emphasized this statement by the parallelization of his "body idea" of race with Rosenberg's racial "myth" (RS 14). On the other hand, he underlined the relevance of politics to this development: "Out of the political movement itself there evolved the idea of the unity of the

total human nature,” in which “the mind is not dependent on the body, but blood and soul are merely different ways of expressing the unity of the Nordic image of man” (RS 14 f.).

In the summer of 1933, Voegelin travelled to Berlin for a week to establish contacts and to explore his chances to get an assistantship from Baeumler. These efforts were not fruitful in the end. This was not because Baeumler would have repudiated Voegelin’s thoughts on the race question. After all, he had recommended one of his books to a pro-fascist publisher. But ultimately he had reservations about Voegelin’s background—namely as an assistant of Hans Kelsen.¹⁸ At this point of time, the liberal democrat and theoretical opponent of Carl Schmitt, who had left Vienna in 1929 and accepted a professorship in Cologne, was already dismissed from his academic position by means of the antisemitic and anti-communist ‘Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service.’¹⁹

Voegelin’s next attempt to secure employment in Germany started with the dispatch of his second book on race, *The History of the Race Idea*, to Krieck in late autumn of 1933. His addressee informed him that he would acquire *Race and State* as well and requested that Voegelin provide “detailed information” concerning his biography.²⁰ Voegelin answered as rapidly as he did strategically, calculatingly adapting the description of his descent and his family background to Krieck’s own vita. As the Rhenish teachers’ journal had reported in May 1933, Krieck, the newly appointed head of the University of Frankfurt, was the “child of Alemannic peasants and craftsmen.” In his letter, Voegelin emphasized his “alamanic origin” on his father’s side and that “[a]ll of the generations [...] are unobjectionable in the sense now required in order to qualify as being of German descent.” He added that his wife was the daughter of a “farmer” and that her ancestry originally “stems from a family of craftsmen.”

More importantly, as a consequence of his experience with Baeumler, Voegelin took the offense in broaching his former employment as an assistant of Kelsen. He commenced the relevant section of his letter with the confession: “I must bring a ‘burden’ to your attention that has hurt me before.” Substantially, his remarks resulted in the statement that he had worked at Kelsen’s academic chair but had never shared his views: “I was never a supporter of Kelsen’s theory, but exactly the opposite.”²¹

As he received no answer, after some time Voegelin asked Krieck again. This time he closed his letter “With German greeting.”²² Krieck, who had already expressed a favorable view of Voegelin’s book, had not changed his opinion. But he was overwhelmed with his work simultaneously purging the university and pushing on with his career. In Frankfurt, he had occupied the vacant chair of Max Scheler, and only one year later he was appointed professor of philosophy as the successor of the retired Heinrich Rickert at the University of Heidelberg. That way, he became—together with Baeumler—one of the “most important protagonists of a decidedly national-socialist philosophy.”²³ The very busy Krieck let Voegelin know that “today it is still not possible to give you a positive answer.”²⁴

Hence, Voegelin’s second attempt to gain a foothold in Nazi Germany failed as well. The reason for his unsuccessful endeavors was not his approach to the race question. This at least is clearly recognizable by the fact that Voegelin’s second book on race brought him a subsequent contract from the very same publisher he himself had classified as ‘national-socialist.’ He was asked to write a “‘research report’ on the current state of the theory of race.” However, after he had worked on this task for some months, the publisher changed opinions. Purportedly, the Party had pointed out “that it would perhaps not be a good idea if this report on such an important subject were to be written by a ‘scholar living in Austria.’”²⁵

That does not mean that Voegelin could not publish in Germany any longer. He even came out with contributions to the race question. But on the whole, he changed the emphasis of his theoretical endeavor and, in the course of his further studies, turned to the legitimization of Austrofascism. At length, he devoted an expansive book to the apology of this authoritarian

form of government (categorically distancing himself from Kelsen in a long chapter at the same time).²⁶

'Race' played only a minor part in this text. Here, Voegelin did not ask whether race could be a sustainable foundation for an elitist and illiberal state but how to establish and justify an authoritarian state on its own terms. From this point of view, he considered Germany an example "par excellence" of a 'racial state,' where "the idea of the primacy of the people [Volk] in the power triangle state-nation-people resonates throughout." For a counterexample, he pointed to the United States and suggested that "the race idea as a world view is *not* to be found" there because "[l]ines of social demarcation are not drawn according to a race theory of biological provenance, or according to a metaphysics of race." As a striking proof of this peculiar thesis, Voegelin introduced his own experience in New England, where he had "inquired about the ethnic makeup" of a city. Here he had been told that less than a quarter of the inhabitants would be "white, the rest are Italians, Jews, other Southern and Eastern Europeans, and Negroes."²⁷

2 Body and Soul

"The Nazi understanding of race needs to be set within an evolving intellectual and political landscape, rather than singled out as a single, static and defining idea"²⁸—this remark by Christopher Hutton indicates that German racism in general, *völkisch* racism in particular, and even Nazi racism in the narrower sense in each case existed in the form of a plurality of racisms. The transfer of power to the Nazi Party in 1933 generated a variety of conflicts. After all, the heyday of race science seemed to dawn, and fights for influence and posts broke out: "fierce battles for appreciation and domination raged between the theorists of race (all of whom considered themselves proponents of the true National-Socialist worldview)."²⁹

On the one hand, the categorical impreciseness of the term race implied that it was "permanently in motion and contested with regard to its meaning."³⁰ On the other hand, the term's meaning was related to different political options, with the result that, "during the first years after the 'Machtergreifung,'" there was "an intense tug-of-war over the substance of the frequently invoked 'race idea.'"³¹ This was anything but an orderly competition. The goals were money and influence, and the prize could be an increase in power, but losing could entail a loss of connections and jobs or even punishment.³²

In this context, 'conflict' was not a sign of anti-racism but the mode of existence of Nazi racism. Early on, Paul Weindling referred to a sort of "pluralism within Nazi biology" and to "casualties even among dedicated Nazis." This is why Hans-Walter Schmuhl spoke about "different racisms [...] within the National Socialist ruling elite."³³

In the shadow of Nazi ideology, diverging concepts of race clashed already before 1933. A spectacular dispute arose between Friedrich Merckenschlager, a botanist with a habilitation, and Hans F. K. Günther, a philologist with solely a doctoral degree.³⁴ Merckenschlager had joined the Party as early as 1920 and had participated in the Hitler-Ludendorff-putsch in 1923. Although he did not enter the Party again after its re-establishment in 1925, he envisioned himself as an 'alter Kämpfer' (literally: old fighter) of the German fascist movement. From this scientific as well as political standpoint, Merckenschlager accused Günther—who, in his eyes, was just a scientifically dabbling literary scholar—of "a crime against the spiritual life of the German nation."³⁵ Günther emphasized the 'Nordic race'; Merckenschlager, who was from Bavaria, made the case for the idea of a 'German race,' which he viewed as a positive mixture of equal parts of the white race.

Based on this, Merckenschlager was removed from the status of a civil servant in 1933. Moreover, two years later, he (together with the anthropologist Karl Saller) characterized the Prussians as a perfect 'race mixture' of Teutons and Slavs, in which "the Wends have become

Prussians and therefore Germans by soul and blood.”³⁶ This perspective formed a political and a scientific provocation because it ran contrary to the predominant anti-Slavonic (as well as anti-communist) and expansionist ideology of the Nazis. It also insinuated a comparatively far-reaching flexibility and changeability of race (hereby threatening, among others, an antisemitic ideology claiming the durability and immutability of race). Despite still having intercessors, the book was forbidden in the short run. Saller lost his university employment, and he and Merckenschlager were excluded from the SA (the paramilitary ‘Sturmabteilung’ of the Nazi Party).

This was only one of several settings in which controversies about the understanding of race were staged. In this case, the “battle between Lamarckism and Neo-Darwinism” was decided in favor of Neo-Darwinism and Nordicism.³⁷ Voegelin, who knew of and positively estimated Saller’s work, had already enquired about his difficulties before this incident. He was apprehensive that his race books may have earned him “the enmity of some very influential people.”³⁸ This contributed to the shift of his analysis to the ‘authoritarian state’ but did not alter his disregard for “the last remnants of Darwinism in race theory” that he hoped would “disappear in time” (RS 15).

Guilty of an emphasis on biology instead of philosophy, of privileging the body instead of the soul, and of what Voegelin calls “the system of scientific superstition” (RS 9) was an author to whom he dedicated a whole chapter of *Race and State* (RS 76-82): Walter Scheidt, one of the early profiteers of the transfer of power to fascism in Germany. After studying medicine and natural sciences, he worked as an assistant at the anthropological institute of the University of Munich, where he also habilitated on the subject of racial science. In 1924, he took over the direction of the anthropological section of the Museum of Ethnology in Hamburg.

Scheidt wrote popular texts on race and conducted a comprehensive study on the race biology of a local population from a historical perspective.³⁹ In 1933, he was awarded a professorship for ‘racial and cultural biology’ and became director of the newly founded ‘Institute of Race Biology’ at the University of Hamburg.⁴⁰ At this time, Scheidt, who sympathized with the Nordic idea, was a declared *völkisch* racist but not a member of the Nazi Party. His eugenically oriented racism soon came into conflict with the official party line. He pled in favor of clearing the *Volkskörper* (literally: folk body) from degenerated parts (encompassing more than fifty per cent of the population). The principal direction of racial politics did incorporate this part of racism but was predominantly directed against miscegenation and the suppression of Jews.

This resulted in a decline of Scheidt’s impact on Nazi race science. Nonetheless (and though he never joined the Nazi Party), he maintained the directorship of his institute (not only until 1945, but until his official retirement in 1964). His racism was compatible with several political systems and demonstrated the far-reaching scope of its discriminatory vilifications. It also illustrated that Voegelin’s topic was not a critique of racism. He discussed Scheidt’s position on race without even mentioning one critical argument against the racism of his work. Voegelin was only interested in presenting it as an example of the shortcomings of a body-centered race theory.

Emphasizing “Scheidt’s methodologically very orderly inquiry” (RS 76), Voegelin nonetheless opposed its genetic materialism, along with its attitude of “denying the existence of soul and spirit” (RS 79). A theory like this could not have any inkling “that for man as a spiritual being spirit is an ‘environment’ of the same reality the environment is for man as an animal” (RS 80). For Scheidt, the “so-called body-soul problem” had been solved by modern biology. ‘Soul,’ written in inverted commas, was just “a secondary environment of perception” and therefore “the fictive side piece of the bodily appearance.”⁴¹

In the controversies relating to the race concept, the ‘biological’ point of view did indeed prevail in the end. But this does not mean that, as a result, accentuations of ‘mental’ and ‘spiritual’ characteristics of race became silent.⁴² In fact, it was virtually indispensable to national-

socialist race thinking. From the beginning, its racial antisemitism had to cope with the problem that the 'Jewish race' could be neither filed nor comprehended by the use of scientific biological means. That did not change after 1933, and the antisemitism of the Nazis had to draw on proofs of descent rather than of racial expertise.

Under these circumstances, the Jews were labelled "downright as a 'spiritual race.'"⁴³ Even the influential race scientist Fritz Lenz pointed to the impact of mental and spiritual features years after Voegelin had fled Austria: "The genealogical descent of a human being is more important than the exterior attributes. A blond Jew is a Jew as well. There are certainly Jews having the exterior features of the Nordic race and nevertheless being of Jewish disposition."⁴⁴ Somewhat later, anthropologist and SS-Hauptsturmführer Bruno Beger, a former doctoral student of Hans F. K. Günther who engaged in veritably murderous racial studies, wrote up well-nigh alarmist concerns, transcending any biological dimension of race thinking: "Like Clauss, I take the view that even with the complete annihilation of the Jews in Europe, and eventually perhaps in the whole world, we will still be a long way from exterminating spiritual Jewishness which confronts us at every turn."⁴⁵

A want of biologism in the race question was not per se a detrimental stance.⁴⁶ It only became dangerous in conjunction with accusations considered to be much more serious. This was manifested by the example of a race thinker whose approach to racial theory Voegelin found promising (RS 102 ff.). Othmar Spann, one of Voegelin's academic teachers, ranked high among the protagonists of Austrofascism. His elitist perspective proclaimed a German corporate state. Its hegemony was meant to cover vast parts of Middle Europe. It should be dominated by an intellectual elite and "every lower estate led by the respective higher estate."⁴⁷

This elitism entirely corresponded to Voegelin's view. This included the corresponding attitude concerning the race question. To it, Voegelin devoted a whole chapter, preliminarily attesting that Spann had undertaken "the only major philosophical attempt to get to the heart of the race problem" (RS 102). In accordance with Voegelin's way of thinking, this 'heart' has a physical grounding but a spiritual determination. Its "racial purity" is no question of "the genetic material in the biological sense, but rather the stylistic purity on the human form in all its parts, the possession of a mental stamp" (RS 117f.).

The author of this kind of spiritually grounded race theory was a favorite of the German national students from the outset of his appointment to the University of Vienna in 1919. Soon, he was labelled the "intellectual leader of the Hakenkreuzler [literally: the ones with the swastika]" by the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (the daily of the Austrian Social Democratic Party) in 1925, and "one of the leaders of the current 'Aryan' science" by Hugo Iltis, a courageous critic of racist ideology (and one of those using the term 'racism' at an early point in time).⁴⁸

Spann reminded the Germans to protect their blood against foreign influences in 1932, and became a (clandestine) member of the NSDAP (with an unnumbered membership card) in 1933. At the same time, his ideas impressed the industrial magnate and supporter of the Nazis, Fritz Thyssen, to such an extent that he founded a National Socialist 'Institut für Ständewesen' (institute for corporatism).

When German troops marched into Vienna in 1938, Spann is said to have uncorked a bottle of champagne and proclaimed: "This is the most beautiful day in my life."⁴⁹ But by this time he had already been written off by the Nazis.⁵⁰ One of the alleged reasons admittedly was his "non-biological explanation of the race category." But the accusation that his theory was inspired by Catholicism and as such "trans-völkisch, international [...] and thereby un-German" was every bit as severe.⁵¹

The scenario got worse because, from the perspective of Nazi ideology, he was willing to compromise on the 'Jewish question.' Having basically antisemitic views, Spann nevertheless reckoned that outstanding individuals among Jews and in particular 'half-Jews' would have the possibility of "races' choice" and could adapt to the 'German spirit' by "race conversion."⁵²

When, in 1935, a member of the Spann circle attempted to convince the Nazis of a corporate ‘solution of the Jewish question,’ he did not hesitate to demand the disempowerment of the ‘Jewish spirit’ and the expulsion of Jews from all relevant social institutions and spheres. But simultaneously he believed it possible that the Jews could be committed as a separate corporation to a social ghetto in which they eventually would ungrudgingly acknowledge the superiority of the ‘German spirit.’⁵³

As for the rest, the assertion that “two rival fascisms” existed in contemporaneous Austria⁵⁴ can be modified by the different wings of both movements. Even if Voegelin’s views can be attributed to the moderate wing of Austrofascism,⁵⁵ it is not possible to construe an anti-racist attitude from such a position. His approach was not anti-racism but rather a position within the struggle of racisms for influence in the fascist state.

This has been noticed in the Anglophone discussion as well. A study on ‘Race in the Third Reich’ cautiously but clearly declares that Voegelin’s “elitist philosophical anthropology was ambivalent about contemporary racial anthropology and eugenics.” The author of a review of the American edition of *Race and State* decisively refers to Voegelin’s plea for a prerogative of spirit in the substantiation of race and concludes that “Voegelin [...] will appear to some to have been a bizarre sort of racist.”⁵⁶

3 Race as Mythology

In a recent uncritical approach to the discussion of race by Voegelin (and others), the author apologetically assumes that, “back then,” Voegelin might have underestimated “that the mystic variant of the race idea” was “as dangerous as the ‘materialistic’ one.”⁵⁷ This caveat is out of the question. Specifically, Voegelin’s affirmative dealing with Carl Gustav Carus and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß evidences the contrary.⁵⁸

Voegelin’s statement was embedded in a discussion of the “race problem” as “a part of the body-soul problem” and the fact that “the former requires for its adequate understanding complete clarity about the matter and therefore about the nature of man” (RS 8). In this context, Voegelin acknowledged that he had “not the least doubt that there are connections between body, soul, and mind” and that he was “fully convinced that blood inheritance is of paramount importance to man’s spiritual nature” (RS 86). But for him, this trinity had to be analyzed under the prerogative of mind and soul—an approach he saw realized in the reasoning of the *völkisch* race thinker Clauß. For him, “[p]eople who are permeated by the same kind of soul, the same form idea, constitute a race in the empirical sense” (RS 91). That means that “in a methodologically careful race theory,” the “body” can “not be the same as the body representing our animal nature—which is the subject of biology—but is the mind-permeated [...] body of the human being” (RS 93).

For Voegelin, the fallacy of race theory was not its racism but its elevation of the merely biological body and a shift of the valuation standards from the “community of noble blood” to the “cranial index” (HR 24f.). This is shown in an exemplary way by his appreciation of the elitist racism of Carus, who held the opinion “that among the multiple disparate stocks of mankind necessarily one has to be the most important and one the least.”⁵⁹ Carus considered the previous approaches to this question (from Carl Linnaeus via Johann Friedrich Blumenbach to Gustav Friedrich Klemm) imperfect. His proposal asserted itself to be adequate to a complex problem and to unite cosmic and planetary conditions with social relations and mental qualities. Viewed in this light, humanity breaks down (besides some ‘peoples of transition’) into the large groups of the eastern (Asiatic) and western (American) ‘twilight peoples,’ the ‘night peoples’ (in Africa south of the Sahara and in Australia), and the ‘day peoples’ (in Western Europe and, to a lesser extent, North Africa, Asia Minor, and India).

This is nothing else than the cosmologically-romantically decorated and aestheticized but still vulgar summa of prior race thinking. It eclectically blends anthropological, philosophical, and physiognomic elements and comes to a predictable result. It replicates the racist European worldview by insisting that “the tremendous progress of human intelligence” is entirely “concentrated” to the ‘day peoples,’ wherefore they “are particularly designated to be the developers and rulers of mankind.” In comparison, the ‘night peoples’ are already left behind because of their “cranial capacity.” In addition, their skeletons show “similarities with animalistic structures.” In line with this, the “mental faculties of this stock” are classed as “low,” their “slavery” is seen as “endemic,” and their “advancement” relies on the “influence” of the “day peoples.”⁶⁰

According to Carus, the “Caucasian tribes” at the “dayside of mankind” not only show “the real human entity” and represent “men as such.” They likewise enable “the more accented emergence of personhood.”⁶¹ This process, moreover, generates some particularly outstanding individuals: “The utmost progression of mankind acts [...] in particular chosen characters and will not have an effect on the entire diversity of humans.” Completely within the sense of Voegelin’s thinking, this clarification tries to connect classism and racism premised on the idea of “rare men” (HR 17). Carus’ “great idea of well-born-ness” (HR^G 21)⁶² was based on the elitist concept of the “well-formed spirit” (HR 22). This idea has been completely debunked by the modern naturalistic race theories and “has been degraded to the concept of the eugenic, heritably healthy body—even if it is the body of a highly questionable person” (HR 23).

Voegelin did not criticize the racism of modern race theories (a considerable amount of which he must have found in Carus without even mentioning it), but he found fault with what he deemed its shallow and trivial form. He believed in the “crowning achievement of a good race theory” consisting in “the listing of the psychical types of the major races” (RS 83). At the same time, he was “fully convinced that blood inheritance is of paramount importance to man’s total spiritual nature” but reckoned that this importance “can be discovered only by the most thorough inquiry into the mental structure itself” (RS 86).

That is why the thoughts of Clauß⁶³ are considered to surpass the contemporary biological ideas of the body. For Voegelin, Clauß’s approach “offer[s] the first indications that within race theory the system of scientific superstition [...] is being overcome and the significant idea of race theory is gaining its appropriate form.” This is appreciated as “a new beginning for race theory from which it can continue on the scientific path” (RS 13).

Clauß, valued in such a way by Voegelin, early on became a member of the antisemitic ‘Deutschvölkischer Schutz- und Trutzbund’ (German Nationalist Protection and Defiance Federation). He did not want to habilitate under the guidance of his former academic teacher Edmund Husserl “because he was a Jew.” In 1933 he entered the NSDAP (National Socialist German Worker’s Party) and founded the journal *Rasse* (Race) as an organ of the ‘Nordic Circle’ together with Hans F. K. Günther (the most popular race ideologist of the Nazi era). Though the development of a successful academic career was interrupted by personal conflicts resulting in his exclusion from the Party and his removal from his position as lecturer and civil servant, he would continue his cooperation with the Nazi system until its defeat.⁶⁴ His example is more evidence that race thinking in the time of German fascism was not homogeneous.

For Clauß, “races” could only be “beheld”—like “ideas in a Platonic sense, viz archetypes of being.” Compared to this, mere “natural science” would linger over “isolated occurrences” and could not comprehend the human “gestalt,” which always included “body” and “soul.” And yet, it would be essential to think of the body “from within” as something “whose gestalt is a result of the gestalt of the soul.”⁶⁵

But though Clauß assumed that the “body [...] receives its significance from the soul,” he considered “race” to be determined by “heredity.” Due to that, the ideal unity of “race soul” and “race body” would “often enough be broken up by miscegenation.” To force it back would be a

task for “us knowing ones” for many generations. This challenge was intensified by the fact that members of the “Nordic race” have a “Nordic soul in need of space” which has “no choice: it has to reshape the whole world according to its own image.” The “non-Nordic inhabitants of the earth” had to “accede.” This ideological junk was brewed up to a mixture of historical necessity and racial tragedy. The Nordic race would have “to penetrate the whole world” and hereby at once “nordize” it and, “seen from the principle of the others,” “distort” it.

This sort of imperialist compassion was anything but a sign of racial tolerance. Clauß insisted on the historic vocation of the Nordic race and of its purity, or rather purging it from foreign influence and blood.⁶⁶ His racial empathy was nothing but an abstruse pseudo-philosophical restatement of arguments that have accompanied the development of modern racism from the beginning, in which the civilizing mission of ‘whites’ is associated with regret for the fate of ‘noble savages’ who had to abandon their way of living or perish. In Clauß’s Nordic version of this narration, the group of civilized saviors is limited to a purported elite of the white race and covered up with romanticized sympathy to the destiny of the undeveloped others.

The goose-step fraction of national-socialist race scientists might have perceived this as empathic baggage. But that did not detract from the elementary racist content of the *Rassenseelenkunde* (literally: lore of the race soul) of fascist race mystics. In a comparison of Clauß and Heidegger, Emmanuel Faye has quite rightly noted “that the taking up of a certain distance with respect to ‘biologism’ is perfectly compatible with an unreserved allegiance to the most radical Nazi racism.”⁶⁷

This also applies to Voegelin. His criticism of race theory was not directed against its racism. Rather, it only referenced the “fiasco of research on heredity” (HR 20), which no longer sees, as Carus did, “the human figure [...] as body-spirit,” but rather is “seeing the essence of the figure in the body without the mind” (HR 22).⁶⁸ From Voegelin’s point of view, “[t]he body that, as an idea, contributes to constructing the community, is not the body of biology [...] but always a body of the mind,” that is, “a mystical body” (RS 128f.).⁶⁹

From this position, Voegelin criticized the development of a solely biological race thinking. But at the same time he referred to “Rosenberg and the more recent generation of the nationalist movement” and their new “race idea,” which he acclaimed as a “welcome indication” because it “deliberately presents itself as a ‘myth,’” “as a body idea” of the “Nordic man” that unifies “blood and soul” (RS 14f.).

As shown by his positive evaluation of the race thinking of Carus and Clauß, Voegelin was not in search of anti-racist arguments. On the contrary, his engagement in the discussion concerned the question of whether the category race would have the ability to provide foundations for social and national cohesion. It rested on the conviction that “[p]erson and community are grounded essentially in the body, and therefore body ideas will always share significantly in the structure of the reality of the state, as the idea of dynasty, blood lineage, or as the idea of blood kinship, the mystical body of Christ, or race” (RS 5).

In solving this problem, Voegelin hoped to find insight into the nature of hegemonic rule, which was considered endangered by deficient affirmation and insurgent resistance of the ruled, whom Voegelin occasionally even called “rabble”—“understood as the mass of the spiritually disoriented, capable at any moment of destructive outbursts” (Voegelin 2003: 313).⁷⁰ He imagined successful rule as the realization of a superordinated ‘objective spirit,’ as he verbalized in a longer manuscript: “A human being who dominates another human being (in our sense of domination anchored in a commonly shared spiritual whole) enters into a special type of unity with the spirit, i.e., that of the dominant constitution of existence with the spirit it is called upon to realize.”⁷¹

4 Metamorphosing Racism

When Voegelin departed from Europe for the United States in September 1938, a study on the ‘war against the West’ by Aurel Kolnai, a refugee from Austria as well, was already on the bookshelves. It referred to Voegelin as “a fascist savant,” who had given the ‘racial turn’ in political philosophy “at least a relative justification,” representing a “‘sublimized’ racial ideology.”⁷² Like the associated analysis of Voegelin’s reactionary position, this neither affected the development of his career nor did it have an influence on his later depiction as an early admonisher of racism.

There are several reasons for this peculiar fading down of his racism, which eventually even metamorphosed into an attribution of anti-racism. The most significant reason is a restricted and one-dimensional understanding of racism that developed parallel to the rising of German fascism. When Kolnai labeled Voegelin a ‘fascist savant,’ the Nazis had just rolled over a fascistically oriented movement in Austria. ‘Austrofascism’ combined clerical-fascist and national-fascist elements, advocated a corporative society, and argued the case for an authoritarian state.⁷³

After the failure of his attempt to get an academic foothold in Germany, Voegelin devoted a legitimizing study to this political form. Whereas in 1933 he had tried to examine the category of race regarding its applicability to an elitist understanding of politics, in 1935-36 he shifted the focus of his reflections to the authoritarian state, with race playing only a minor part.⁷⁴ In 1938-39, Voegelin further narrowed his sight of the category of race and integrated it into a concept of totalitarianism. In the course of this, he declared the ‘race idea’ in its developed form to be a specific German phenomenon and the center of a political religion.⁷⁵

At the same time, he excluded “the race concept used in natural science,” “political and social relations between the white and the colored races,” and “the improvement of a given human population through eugenic measures” from the scope of critique. That scope, for him, only encompassed the “race idea [...] as it is used by modern creeds, of the type of National Socialism.”⁷⁶

This was, at least analytically, Voegelin’s last word concerning the race question. But practically it continued to bother him—however, not in a critical manner. Manfred Henningsen (a former student and assistant of Voegelin’s, who affirmatively appraises his race books) laments “the racist tone that crept in” once Voegelin defended the American Right. He also addresses the strange fact that a supposed anti-racist thinker, who had studied in the USA (from 1924 to 1926) and migrated to the United States in 1938 where he worked for many years (at the University of Baton Rouge from 1942 to 1958 and again after 1969), not only never brought up American racism but also explicitly denied the existence of racial ideology in the States. The reason for this was Voegelin’s “acceptance of white-American racism” and “of institutionalized racism in the United States” already “in the 1920s” and his avoidance to “touch on the question of the race idea in the United States.”⁷⁷

This is just another indication of the fact that Voegelin never intended an overall critique of race thinking or even tried to develop an anti-racist perspective.⁷⁸ His interest was directed to the question of whether the race concept could provide a useful foundation for political integration and national organization. Though he considered this to be quite possible, he considered the biological interpretation of race inappropriate. This was a result of his elitist view of society according to which race should be understood from the predominance of the spirit and organized correspondingly. That National Socialism could be capable of coping with such a challenge was not excluded from the deliberations of his books on race.

But Voegelin’s rejection of a certain form of race thinking was nevertheless a bridgehead from which to pass him off as a critic of racism. The success of this endeavor was not least due to ambivalence at the initial stage about the category of racism. The word was directed against

National Socialism and its attacks on members of the ‘white race’ like Jews and Slavs but, at the same time, this narrow conceptualization of the term marginalized other racisms, first of all, those affiliated with the colonial history of the ‘West’ and the imagination of white supremacy.

In France, there was a “semantic and ideological rupture” already in the early twentieth when the word *racisme* was at first used to translate the German word *völkisch* and eventually named the ultra-right German race thinking including that of National Socialism.⁷⁹ In the United States, Ruth Benedict developed a similar perspective. While writing her critique of ‘racism,’ she had a long controversy with the publisher concerning the title of her book. She argued for *Race and Racism* and explained: “The special point of the book [...] is its complete separation of Race from Racism and its ‘propaganda analysis’ of racism.”⁸⁰ The publisher wanted to avoid a title with a ‘negative’ connotation and suggested *Races of the World* or *The Races of Mankind*. When the text was published in 1940, the compromise was *Race: Science and Politics*.⁸¹

In the same year, Voegelin addressed “National Socialist racism” as well and related it to its biological version just as in his earlier race books.⁸² This constricted perspective provided the foundation on which Voegelin’s disciples, followers, and apologists passed off his books on race as anti-racist studies. In this sense, a right-wing intellectual and admirer of Voegelin, who also tried to make his readers understand fascist savants like Hans Freyer, Arnold Gehlen, or Carl Schmitt, classified Voegelin’s books on race as “condemnations of National Socialist ideology” (though he *en passant* pointed to the “relatively appreciative discussion of the race theories of Ludwig Clauss and Othmar Spann”).⁸³

Besides, the subtitle of his paper was partly fictitious and attested to Voegelin a “Critique of European Racism.” This strategy also turned up in an apologetic study suggesting that Voegelin had written “two books on European racism.”⁸⁴ But he had neither discussed race thinking in a European perspective nor had he intended an analysis of racism (but only questioned the usability of the race concept for political integration). Hence, it is hardly surprising that the text skates over authors (like Carus, Clauß, and Spann) who had been positively evaluated by Voegelin and does not bring up their obvious racism at all.

Though Voegelin’s race books had not yet been translated, attentive Anglophone readers of this “uncritical study written by a Voegelin devotee” could have noticed in a review by Roderick Stackelberg that “Voegelin accepted the validity, even the value, of what he called the idea of race as a means of constituting and unifying a political community” and “only denied that it was susceptible to scientific explanation as biological race theorists seemed to assume or that it could be defined by physical criteria alone” because “ideas of race that fail to promote the development of an intellectual [...] elite lose their value as potential ideals.”⁸⁵

The fact that Voegelin’s race books were for a long time only available in German facilitated their rating as a critique of racism and even put rumors in circulation. In the English-speaking region, these rumors became enriched by the fantasy that Voegelin had published the two texts only after his flight from Germany (though they had been published in Germany a long time before his flight from Austria) and ultimately culminated in the totally fabricated assertion that he had to flee because he was a Jew.⁸⁶

Against a backdrop grounded in such a way, even critical discussants of the topic ‘racism’ have referred to Voegelin as an early critic of racist thinking.⁸⁷ His race books have been classified as “important,” “thoughtful,” or simply as “classical studies”⁸⁸ and their argumentation was distorted. This, for instance, becomes apparent in the faulty assumption that Voegelin “concluded that racialisation was crucial” to “the process of state formation” and leads to the misrepresentation that “[t]he two key figures in the pioneering conceptualisation of the State as ‘racial’ [...] are W. E. B. Du Bois and Erich Voegelin.”⁸⁹

Voegelin did not postulate an essential relation of race and state, and he was no critic of the ‘racial state’ but wanted to work out whether state cohesion could be organized on a racial basis (which, according to him, had to be elitist as well as spiritually determined in order to

succeed). The same applied to his idea of the body. He was no critic of political body metaphors. He believed that the race concept, if it should make sense politically, must not rest upon a crude materialistic construction but rather had to understand bodies as *Leiber* and these as being formed by the spirit.⁹⁰ To pass off his race books as “a very early example of a work of political anti-racism”⁹¹ has no grounding and reverses his reasoning into its opposite.

Voegelin was never interested in a critique of racism—neither as a young scholar writing two books and some papers on race in Austria nor as an established academic teaching at a segregated university in the American South. There, he accepted political conditions determined by white supremacy and avoided any public comment on the blatant racism of the time. Prior to that, he had studied the history of the race idea, without mentioning the racism of its exponents, and discussed the contemporary manifestations of race thinking in Germany from the perspective of a political scientist who wanted to examine whether the concept of race could be adapted for an elitist policy of social integration. In doing so, he criticized and rejected the biologist version of Nazi race thinking. From his point of view, this Nazi position overrated the bodily dimensions of race and disregarded the importance of mind and soul for the shaping of race. But he located this perspective in another spiritual and mystical orientation also present in Nazi race thinking. He positively reviewed and appraised this approach, in its elitist versions, as a possible starting point for a politically meaningful theory of race.

Wulf D. Hund is professor emeritus of sociology at the University of Hamburg. The focuses of his research are social philosophy and the analysis of racism. His last book publications are *Wie die Deutschen weiß wurden* [*How the Germans Became White*] (2017) and *Rassismus und Antirassismus* [*Racism and Anti-Racism*] (2018). Among his English publications are *Wages of Whiteness & Racist Symbolic Capital* (2010), ed. by Wulf D. Hund, Jeremy Krikler, David Roediger; *Racism and Sociology* (2014), ed. by Wulf D. Hund and Alana Lentin; and *Simianization: Apes, Gender, Class, and Race* (2015), ed. by Wulf D. Hund, Charles W. Mills, Silvia Sebastiani.

¹ Eric Voegelin, *Race and State* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997), quoted as RS; the original in German, Erich Voegelin, *Rasse und Staat* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), is quoted as RS^G. The two versions of Eric Voegelin, *The History of the Race Idea: From Ray to Carus* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998) and Erich Voegelin, *Die Rassenidee in der Geistesgeschichte: Von Ray bis Carus* (Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1933) are quoted as HR and HR^G.

² It is worth mentioning that, with Finot and Hertz—cf. Jean Finot, *Le préjugé des races* (Paris: Alcan, 1906); Friedrich Hertz, *Rasse und Kultur: Eine kritische Untersuchung der Rassentheorien* (3rd exp. ed., Leipzig: Kröner, 1925)—Voegelin disparaged two Jewish authors (with Polish and Austrian roots). For Finot (a naturalized French journalist and sociologist of Polish origin), see Jennifer Michael Hecht, *The End of the Soul: Scientific Modernity, Atheism, and Anthropology in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), esp. 269-276; concerning Hertz (an Austrian economist and sociologist who fled to London in 1938 and received British citizenship in 1946), see Paul J. Weindling, “Central Europe Confronts German Racial Hygiene: Friedrich Hertz, Hugo Iltis and Ignaz Zollschan as Critics of Racial Hygiene,” in *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*, ed. Marius Turda, Paul J. Weindling (Budapest etc.: Central European University Press, 2007), 263-280.

³ Cf. Ludwig Schemann, *Die Rasse in den Geisteswissenschaften: Studien zur Geschichte des Rassengedankens*, vol. 1: [*Allgemeiner Teil*] (München: Lehmanns, 1928), vol. 2: *Hauptepochen und Hauptvölker der Geschichte in ihrer Stellung zur Rasse* (München: Lehmanns, 1930), vol. 3: *Die Rassenfragen im Schrifttum der Neuzeit* (München: Lehmanns, 1931). In view of Schemann (a translator and propagator of the racist works of Arthur de Gobineau, *völkisch* ideologue and

- eugenicist), see Julian Köck, “Ludwig Schemann und die Gobineau-Vereinigung,” *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 59, no. 9, (2011): 723-740. For the heterogeneous *völkisch* movement—with its emphasis on an organically understood *Volksgemeinschaft* (literally: folk community) and prevailing strong antisemitism—see ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, Justus H. Ulbricht, *Handbuch zur Völkischen Bewegung, 1871-1918* (München etc.: K. G. Saur, 1996). With regard to the famous opera composer Richard Wagner and his antisemitic circle, see Paul Lawrence Rose, *Wagner: Race and Revolution* (New Haven etc.: Yale University Press, 1992) and Annette Hein, “Es ist viel ‘Hitler’ in Wagner”: *Rassismus und antisemitische Deutschtumsideologie in den ‘Bayreuther Blättern’ (1878-1938)* (Tübingen: Niemeyer 1996).
- 4 Cf. Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics, 1927-1945: Crossing Boundaries* (Dordrecht: Springer Science, 2008), 112-14; see also Julian Köck, “Die Geschichte hat immer Recht”: *Die Völkische Bewegung im Spiegel ihrer Geschichtsbilder* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2015), 184-210.
- 5 Quoted in Dirk Käsler, *Soziologische Abenteuer: Earle Edward Eubank besucht europäische Soziologen im Sommer 1934* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1985), 146.
- 6 Since 1920, the “official publisher” of the NSDAP was the *Eber Verlag* in Munich—cf. Oron James Hale, *The Captive Press in the Third Reich* (Princeton etc.: Princeton University Press, 1964). The publisher with the most extensive output of scientific racist literature was *J. F. Lehmanns Verlag*, also in Munich—cf. ed. Sigrid Stöckel, *Die ‘rechte Nation’ und ihr Verleger: Politik und Popularisierung im J. F. Lehmanns Verlag 1890-1979* (Heidelberg: Lehmanns, 2002). *Junker & Dünnhaupt*, the publisher of Voegelin’s second book on race, was founded in 1927 in Berlin and, in the late twenties and early thirties, published i.a. books by Alfred Baeumler, Eugen Fischer, Arnold Gehlen, Walter Groß, Arthur Gütt, Ernst Jünger, and Ernst Kriek—cf. Ute Schneider, “Wissenschaftliche Verlage,” in *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Drittes Reich, Part 1*, ed. Ernst Fischer, Reinhard Wittmann (Berlin etc.: de Gruyter, 2015), 381-424, 395-97; the following quotes are taken from p. 395 (‘program,’ ‘elite’).
- 7 Eric Voegelin, “Letter to John Van Sickle, August 28, 1933,” in Eric Voegelin, *Selected Correspondence 1924-1949* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009), 112-14, 114.
- 8 Cf. Werner Treß, “Baeumler, Alfred Albin,” in *Handbuch des Antisemitismus: Judenfeindschaft in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Wolfgang Benz, vol. 2.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 40-2; see also the chapter “Alfred Baeumlers Weg vom ‘Konservativen Revolutionär’ zum Nationalsozialisten,” in Christian Tilitzki, *Die deutsche Universitätsphilosophie in der Weimarer Republik und im Dritten Reich* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002), 545-83.
- 9 John Van Sickle, quoted in Christian Fleck, *A Transatlantic History of the Social Sciences: Robber Barons, the Third Reich and the Invention of Empirical Social Research* (London etc.: Bloomsbury, 2011), 61.
- 10 Cf. Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America’s Campaign to Create a Master Race* (Washington: Dialog Press, 2003), 370 (‘superior race’); Paul Weindling, “The Rockefeller Foundation and German Biomedical Science 1920-1940: From Educational Philanthropy to International Science Policy,” in *Science, Politics and the Public Good: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gowing*, ed. Nicolaas A. Rupke (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), 119-40, 131 ff. (‘benefits’).
- 11 For the following biographical details see Treß (2009); Benjamin Ortmeier, “Pädagogik, Rassismus und Antisemitismus: Ernst Kriek,” in *Erziehungswissenschaft und Pädagogik in Frankfurt—eine Geschichte in Portraits: 90 Jahre Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität*, ed. Micha Brumlik, Benjamin Ortmeier (Frankfurt: Fachbereich Erziehungswissenschaft der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2006), 41-66; Emmanuel Faye, “Eric Vogelins Haltung zum Nationalsozialismus: Überlegungen zum Briefwechsel Kriek-Voegelin (1933-1934),” in *Politisierung der Wissenschaft’: Jüdische Wissenschaftler und ihre Gegner an der Universität Frankfurt am*

- Main vor und nach 1933*, ed. Moritz Epple, Johannes Fried, Raphael Gross, Janus Gudian (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2016), 111-46.
- 12 Cf. Alfred Baeumler, “Sinn und Aufbau der deutschen Leibesübungen,” in Alfred Baeumler, *Männerbund und Wissenschaft* (Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1934), 45-74, 52.
- 13 Cf. Peter Staudenmaier, *Between Occultism and Nazism: Anthroposophy and the Politics of Race in the Fascist Era* (Leiden etc.: Brill 2014), 292f. Another envisaged German contributor was Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß. But Evolas adversaries successfully opposed this project and in the end it was not implemented. Nevertheless, this episode casts a light on the “diversi ‘razzismi’ del fascismo” in Italy and beyond. See Giorgio Israel, *Il fascismo e la razza: La scienza italiana e le politiche razziali del regime* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2010), 233; the author notes that “Voegelin, che detestava il razzismo biologistico, era più indulgente nei confronti di quello di Rosenberg.” Concerning the diverse varieties of racism in Italy, see Aaron Gillette, *Racial Theories in Fascist Italy* (London etc.: Routledge, 2002).
- 14 Ernst Kriek, *Philosophie der Erziehung* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1922), 116.
- 15 Ernst Kriek, *Nationalpolitische Erziehung* (20th ed., Leipzig: Armanen-Verlag, 1936 [1st ed. 1932]), 28 (‘biology,’ etc.), 30 (‘trinity’).
- 16 Faye (2016: 124, 134, for ‘relation’ and ‘philonazism’ respectively); for the following names see 130.
- 17 Cf. Erich Voegelin “Letter to Eduard Baumgarten, March 2, 1933,” in Voegelin (2009: 107-8, here 108).
- 18 Cf. Alfred Baeumler, “Letter to Erich Voegelin, November 22, 1933,” documented in Faye (2016: 115 f.).
- 19 Cf. ed. Stanley L. Paulson and Michael Stolleis, *Hans Kelsen: Staatsrechtslehrer und Rechtstheoretiker des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Lars Vinx, *The Guardian of the Constitution: Hans Kelsen and Carl Schmitt on the Limits of Constitutional Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). See also Eckhart Arnold, “Eric Voegelin,” in *Der Kreis um Hans Kelsen: Die Anfangsjahre der Reinen Rechtslehre*, ed. Robert Walter, Clemens Jabloner, Klaus Zeleny (Wien: Manzsche Verlags- und Universitätsbuchhandlung, 2007), 513-52.
- 20 Ernst Kriek, “Letter to Erich Voegelin, December 12, 1933,” quoted in Faye (2016: 124).
- 21 Erich Voegelin: “Letter to Ernst Kriek, December 15, 1933,” in Voegelin (2009: 115-17), 115 (‘family’), 115 f. (‘Kelsen’); see *Rheinische Lehrerzeitung* 39, no. 20, 1933 (Kriek’s descent).
- 22 Erich Voegelin: “Letter to Ernst Kriek, [March 1], 1934,” in (Voegelin 2009: 117).
- 23 Tilitzki (2002: 613).
- 24 Cf. Ernst Kriek: “Letter to Erich Voegelin, December 12, 1933” and Ernst Kriek [signed p. p. Riegner]: “Letter to Erich Voegelin, March 7, 1934”—both documented in Faye (2016: 124 and 139), 124 (‘race idea’), 139 (‘positive answer’).
- 25 Erich Voegelin, “Letter to Eduard Baumgarten, April 13, 1934,” in Voegelin (2009: 121-24, here 123).
- 26 Cf. Erich Voegelin, *The Authoritarian State: An Essay on the Problem of the Austrian State* (Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 1999), [1st German ed. 1936].
- 27 Eric Voegelin, “Race and State [1935],” in Erich Voegelin, *Published Essays 1934-1939* (Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 40-53 [first published 1935 in Germany], 48 (‘par excellence’), 50 (‘primacy’), 46 (USA, ‘ethnic makeup’).
- 28 Christopher M. Hutton, “Nazi Race Theory and Belief in an ‘Aryan Race’: A Profound Failure of Interdisciplinary Communication,” *The International Journal of Science in Society* 1, no. 4, (2010): 149-56, 154.

- 29 Irmgard Pinn, Michael Nebelung, “Kontinuität durch Verdrängung,” in *Jahrbuch für Soziologiegeschichte 1990*, ed. Heinz-Jürgen Dahme, Carsten Klingemann, Michael Neumann, Karl-Siegbert Rehberg, Ilija Srubar (Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1990), 177-218, 208 f.
- 30 Tino Plümecke, “Ordnen, werten, hierarchisieren: Der sozial dichte Begriff ‘Rasse’ und seine Gebrauchsweisen im Nationalsozialismus,” in *Moralisierung des Rechts: Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten nationalsozialistischer Normativität*, ed. Werner Konitzer on behalf of the Fritz Bauer Institut (Frankfurt: Campus, 2014), 147-65, 160.
- 31 Cornelia Esser, *Die ‘Nürnberger Gesetze’ oder Die Verwaltung des Rassenwahns 1933-1945* (Paderborn etc.: Schöningh, 2002), 64.
- 32 Cf. Richard F. Wetzell, “Eugenics, Racial Science, and Nazi Biopolitics: Was There a Genesis of the ‘Final Solution’ from the Spirit of Science?,” in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devon O. Pendas, Mark Roseman, Richard F. Wetzell (Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 147-75.
- 33 Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 492, 506; Hans-Walter Schmuhl, “Rasse, Rassenforschung, Rassenpolitik: Annäherungen an das Thema,” in *Rassenforschung an Kaiser-Wilhelm-Instituten vor und nach 1933*, ed. by Hans-Walter Schmuhl (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003), 7-37, 5.
- 34 Cf. Cornelia Essner, “‘Im Irrgarten der Rassenlogik’: Nordische Bewegung und nationale Frage (1919-1935),” *Historische Mitteilungen* 7, (1994), 81-101; Christopher M. Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk* (Cambridge etc.: Polity Press, 2005), esp. 149-54; Andreas Lüddecke, *Der ‘Fall Saller’ und die Rassenhygiene: Eine Göttinger Fallstudie zu den Widersprüchen sozialbiologischer Ideologiebildung* (Marburg: Tectum, 1995).
- 35 Friedrich Merckenschlager, *Götter, Helden und Günther: Eine Abwehr der Güntherschen Rassenkunde* (Nürnberg: Spindler, [1927]), 26.
- 36 Friedrich Merckenschlager, Karl Saller, *Vineta: Eine deutsche Biologie von Osten geschrieben* (Breslau: Korn, 1935), 88.
- 37 Essner (2002: 73).
- 38 Cf. Erich Voegelin, “Letter to Eduard Baumgarten, February 14, 1934” in (Voegelin 2009: 118-20; 118 for Saller, 120 for ‘enmity’).
- 39 Cf. Walter Scheidt, *Rassenkunde* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1930); *Bevölkerungsbiologie der Elbinsel Finckenwälder vom dreißigjährigen Krieg bis zur Gegenwart* (Jena: Fischer, 1932).
- 40 Cf. (also for the following) Christian Hünemörder, “Biologie und Rassenbiologie in Hamburg 1933 bis 1945,” in *Hochschulalltag im ‘Dritten Reich’: Die Hamburger Universität 1933-1945*, ed. Eckart Krause, Ludwig Huber, Holger Fischer, vol. 3 (Berlin etc.: Reimer, 1991), 1155-96; Ralph Busch, “Walter Scheidt”, in *NS-Dabeigewesene*, ed. Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Hamburg—[https://www.hamburg.de/clp/dabeigewesene-dokumente/clp1/ns-dabeigewesene/onepage.php?BIOID=208#FN_6%20\[27.3.2019\]](https://www.hamburg.de/clp/dabeigewesene-dokumente/clp1/ns-dabeigewesene/onepage.php?BIOID=208#FN_6%20[27.3.2019])
- 41 Walter Scheidt, “Die von der Rassenhygiene gestellten psychologischen und kulturbiologischen Aufgaben der Anthropologie,” in *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 24 (= Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Alfred Ploetz), ed. Fritz Lenz (München: Lehmanns, 1930), 6-11, 9. At this time, Scheidt was one of the German scientists investigating the racial structure of the German *Volk*, a project sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation. Another participant was Karl Saller (cf. Gretchen E. Schaft, *From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich* (Urbana etc.: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 51-3.
- 42 Concerning the manifold criticism levelled against a merely biological understanding of race see Tilitzki (2002: 1041-74); for the ‘mystical’ dimension of race thinking during the Nazi era, cf. also Dan Stone, “Nazi Race Ideologies,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 50, nos. 4-5, (2016): 445-57.

- 43 Werner Dittrich, *Vererbung und Rasse: Ein Hand- und Hilfsbuch für den Lehrer* (Stuttgart: Franckh'sche Verlagshandlung, 1936), 75.
- 44 Fritz Lenz, "Über Wege und Irrwege rassenkundlicher Untersuchungen," *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie* 39, (1941): 385-413, 397.
- 45 Letter from Bruno Beger to Rudolf Brandt, April 13, 1943, quoted from Peter Staudenmaier, "Anti-Semitic Intellectuals in Fascist Italy: Promoting 'Spiritual Racism', 1938-1945," in *Intellectual Antisemitism: Comparative Studies from a Global Perspective*, ed. Sarah Danielsson (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2018), 95-116, 100; concerning Beger see Julien Reitzenstein, *Das SS-Abnenerbe und die 'Straßburger Schädelammlung': Fritz Bauers letzter Fall* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 2018).
- 46 Cf. i.a. the firm statement of Emmanuel Faye, *Heidegger: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy in Light of the Unpublished Seminars of 1933-1935* (New Haven etc.: Yale University Press, 2009), 28: "it must be understood once and for all that the fact of insisting on the importance of spirit and of expressing reservations with respect to 'biologism' indicates not at least a distancing from the Hitlerian conception of race, but on the contrary a perfect conformity with the 'spirit' of Hitlerism."
- 47 Othmar Spann, *Der wahre Staat: Vorlesungen über Abbruch und Neubau der Gesellschaft* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921), 220.
- 48 Hugo Iltis, "Rassenwissenschaft und Rassenwahn," *Die Gesellschaft: Internationale Revue für Sozialismus und Politik* 4, no. 2, (1927): 97-114, 98; cf. Weindling (2007) and Wulf D. Hund: "Die Befreiung der unterdrückten Rassen kann nur das Werk der unterdrückten Rassen selbst sein: Marginalie zur Kritik des Rassismus durch Hugo Iltis," *Das Argument* 57, no. 314, (2015): 493-502.
- 49 Cf. Thomas Olechowski, Tamara Ehs, Kamila Staudigl-Ciechowicz, *Die Wiener Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät 1918-1938* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2014): 588 f. ('Hakenkreuzler,' 'institute,' 'champagne'); Janek Wasserman, *Black Vienna: The Radical Right in the Red City, 1918-1938* (Ithaca etc.: Cornell University Press, 2014), 100 (protection of blood); Andreas Huber, *Rückkehr erwünscht: Im Nationalsozialismus aus 'politischen' Gründen vertriebene Lehrende der Universität Wien* (Vienna etc.: Lit, 2016), 92 (NSDAP).
- 50 Spann, whilst being a member of the Nazi Party and an advocate of the 'Anschluß,' i.e. the annexation of Austria by Germany, was arrested for several weeks (though the assertion that he was interned in a concentration camp is wrong). Back home, he lost his employment at the University of Vienna (but he retained his membership in the Austrian Academy of Sciences). After 1945 (despite being rated as "a pioneer of the fascist ideology in Austria" and his membership in the NSDAP), he was reinstated in his old job (and received the benefit of the corresponding salary) and pensioned at the same time (and in this way prevented from reviving his lectures)—see Christian Fleck, "Soziologie in Österreich zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus," in *Handbuch Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Soziologie*, ed. Stephan Moebius, Andrea Ploder, vol. 1, *Geschichte der Soziologie im deutschsprachigen Raum* (Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2018), 169-88, 184 (arrest, 'pioneer,' pension); Olechowski et al. (2014: 589 for employment, membership). This is just another example demonstrating that conflicts with the official line of the policy of National Socialism are no indicator for an anti-racist attitude.
- 51 Quoted from Olechowski et al. (2014: 589).
- 52 Othmar Spann, *Erkenne Dich selbst: Eine Geistesphilosophie als Lehre vom Menschen und seiner Weltstellung* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1935), 281 ff.
- 53 Cf. John Haag, "The Spann Circle and the Jewish Question," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 18, (1973): 93-126.
- 54 Michael Mann, *Fascists* (New York etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 208.

- 55 Cf. Wasserman (2014: 209).
- 56 Hutton (2005: 178 for ‘ambivalent’); Mark Milosch, “Review of Erich Voegelin, Race and State,” *H-Net*, December 1998, <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=2587> [27.3.2019] (‘bizarre’).
- 57 Mario Marino, “Rassenidee und Philosophische Anthropologie in den 1930er Jahren (Voegelin, Plessner, Gehlen): Historisch-kritische Vorbemerkungen zur Ausarbeitung eines kritischen Potentials der Philosophischen Anthropologie,” in *Philosophische Anthropologie und Politik*, vol. 2, ed. Guillaume Plas, Gérard Raulet, Manfred Gangl, (Nordhausen: Bautz, 2013), 459-98, 493.
- 58 This chapter goes back to Wulf D. Hund, “Die Gemeinschaft edlen Blutes: Marginalie zum Rassismus von Eric Voegelin,” *Sozial.Geschichte Online* 9, no. 21, (2017): 49-74. For Carus, a physician, philosopher, painter, physiognomist, and race theorist, see Richard T. Gray, *About Face: German Physiognomic Thought from Lavater to Auschnitz* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004), 113 ff., 151 ff.; for Clauß, a philosopher, psychologist, orientalist, and *völkisch*-antisemitic race theorist, see *ibid.*, 286 ff. and Robert Bernasconi, “Ludwig Ferdinand Claus and Racialization,” in *Husserl’s Ideen*, ed. Lester Embree, Thomas Nenon (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013), 55-70. With regard to Voegelin’s racism, there are other ideological backgrounds, which, however, are less obvious and not as directly affiliated to the race concept as was his positive valuation of Carus, Clauß, and Spann. For instance, Emmanuel Faye (2016: 129 ff., 136 f.) references influences of Stefan George and Martin Heidegger. Such connections are also addressed by apologists of Voegelin’s race books—albeit from completely uncritical affirmation to intellectual complicity—cf. William Petropulos, *Stefan George und Eric Voegelin* (Munich: Eric-Voegelin-Archiv, 2005); David Walsh, “Voegelin and Heidegger. Apocalypse without Apocalypse,” in *Eric Voegelin and the Continental Tradition: Explorations in Modern Political Thought*, ed. Lee Trepanier, Steven F. McGuire (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2011), 166-91.
- 59 Carl Gustav Carus, *Ueber ungleiche Befähigung der verschiedenen Menschheitstämme für höhere geistige Entwicklung: Denkschrift zum hundertjährigen Geburtsfeste Goethe’s* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1849), 32; for the following, see *ibid.*, 14f., 18f. (‘day peoples’ / ‘night peoples’).
- 60 Carl Gustav Carus, *Physis: Zur Geschichte des leiblichen Lebens* (Stuttgart: Scheitlin’s Verlagshandlung, 1851), 180 (‘rulers’), 176f. (‘cranial capacity,’ etc.). As to the “contrast of the day people and the night people,” Carl Gustav Carus writes that Africans would show a “certain convergence to the ape” in *Symbolik der menschlichen Gestalt: Ein Handbuch zur Menschenkenntnis* (2nd ed., Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1858), 344. For this dimension of racism see i.a. the papers in ed. Wulf D. Hund, Charles W. Mills, Silvia Sebastiani, *Simianization: Apes, Gender, Class, and Race* (Berlin etc.: Lit, 2015).
- 61 Carl Gustav Carus, *System der Physiologie [...] für Naturforscher und Aerzte. Erster Theil* (Dresden etc.: Fleischer, 1838), 126 f.; the following quote is from 116.
- 62 The English translation deletes the classist dimension of this expression by translating it as “great idea of man as well-born” (HR 23)—but Voegelin was convinced that not all men were well-born and that the “idea of the unity of mind and body” was ideally shown by the “well-born man as the centre of others of the same kind” (HR23).
- 63 The name Clauß is written with the letter ‘ß’ (called ‘Eszett’ or ‘sharp s’), representing the double-s frequently but not invariably after long and stressed vowels and diphthongs.
- 64 The study of Peter Weingart, *Doppelleben: Ludvig Ferdinand Claus. Zwischen Rassenforschung und Widerstand* (Frankfurt etc.: Campus, 1995) is apologetic, refrains from scientific standards of referencing, and uncritically downplays the racism of Clauß. See Horst Junginger, “Sigrid Hunke (1913-1999): Europe’s New Religion and its Old Stereotypes,” in *Antisemitismus, Paganismus, Völkische Religion*, ed. Hubert Cancik, Uwe Puschner (München: Saur, 2004), 151-

- 62, 152: “Clauss did not intend any kind of racial (or other) equality between Aryans and Jews. He claimed to be the founder of the Third Reich’s race-psychology and he never questioned its anti-Jewish policy at all. In a letter to the dean of the Berlin philosophy department he stated, that his books are rightly esteemed as antisemitic. [...] It is naïve to concede to Clauss, as Weingart does, the status of an oppositional figure. His ‘Rassenseelenkunde’ was an important variety of National Socialist racism and not a counterpart. Clauss never argued or acted against National Socialism. He held his introductory lecture in the ‘brown shirt’ and during the war he became a collaborator of the secret service of the SS.”
- 65 Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß, *Rasse und Seele: Eine Einführung in den Sinn der leiblichen Gestalt* (12th ed., Berlin: Büchergilde Gutenberg, 1938 [1st ed. 1933]), 115ff; for the following quotations see *ibid.*, 28 (‘body’ to ‘heredity’) and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß, *Die nordische Seele: Eine Einführung in die Rassenseelenkunde* (8th ed., Munich: Lehmanns, 1940), 96 (‘race soul’ to ‘miscegenation’).
- 66 Cf. Felix Wiedemann, “The North, the Desert, and the Near East: Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß and the Racial Cartography of the Near East,” *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 12, no. 2, (2012): 326-43, 330 and *passim*.
- 67 Faye (2009: 21); for the comparison of Heidegger and Clauß see *ibid.*, 19 ff.
- 68 The German original uses ‘Gestalt’ (HR^G 20 f.), where the English version translates ‘figure’ and thereby embezzles the contemporary theoretical milieu.
- 69 Voegelin left no doubt concerning the elitist meaning of this mysticism and shuddered with disgust considering “the dangerous superstition that the self-formation of the select community by the attraction of noble men to each other could be replaced by organization” (HR 24).
- 70 Eric Voegelin, “The Theory of Governance,” in Eric Voegelin, *The Theory of Governance and other Miscellaneous Papers, 1921-1938* (Columbia ETC: University of Missouri Press, 2003), 224-372. The translation alleviates Voegelin’s diction. His ‘rabble’ is constituted by the “Masse der Geistverlassenen,” “mass of those left by the spirit”—Erich Voegelin, *Grundlagen der Herrschaftslehre: Ein Kapitel des Systems der Staatslehre* (2nd ed., München: Eric-Voegelin-Archiv, Occasional Papers LV, 2009), 47; cf. the comprehensive but totally uncritical and affirmative study by Regina Braach, *Eric Voegelins Politische Anthropologie* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2003).
- 71 Voegelin, (2003: 302). Here, too, the original wording escaped from the translation: “Menschliches Dasein, das über anderes herrscht (in unserer Bedeutung der Rückverbundenheit der Herrschaft mit dem gemeinsam geistigen Ganzen) ist eine besondere, eben die herrschaftliche Daseinsverfassung, eine Art von ausgezeichnete Verbundenheit mit dem Geist, den zu verwirklichen es berufen ist” (Voegelin 2009: 37).
- 72 Aurel Kolnai, *The War Against the West* (New York: Viking Press, 1938), 447 (‘savant’), 448 (‘justification’), 187 (‘ideology’).
- 73 Cf. i.a. the chapter “Austro-Fascists, Austrian Nazis” in Mann (2004: 207-36).
- 74 Cf. Eric Voegelin, *The Authoritarian State: An Essay on the Problem of the Austrian State* (Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 83 ff., 194 ff.
- 75 Cf. Eric Voegelin, “The Political Religions,” in Eric Voegelin, *Modernity Without Restraint* (Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 19-73; in the foreword to the English edition he declares referring to National Socialism: “Resistance against a satanical substance that is not only morally but also religiously evil can only be derived from an equally strong, religiously good force. One cannot fight a satanical force with morality and humanity alone” (Voegelin 2000: 24).

- 76 Eric Voegelin, “The Growth of the Race Idea,” in Eric Voegelin, *Published Essays 1940-1952* (Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 27-61, 27.
- 77 Ed. Barry Cooper, Jodi Bruhn, *Voegelin Recollected: Conversations on a Life* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008): 41 (‘racist tone’); Manfred Henningsen, “Eric Voegelin’s Deconstruction of Race in 1933,” *New School of Social Research Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 35, no. 1/2, (2012): 207-21, 212 (‘white racism’), 217 (‘institutionalized racism’), 212 (avoidance).
- 78 That likewise becomes clear by the fact that Voegelin did not deal with the contemporary critique of racism. Apart from his brief invective against Finot and Hertz, he ignored contributions from that side of the debate. At the same time he avoided the category racism (which was already used by Magnus Hirschfeld, Hugo Iltis, and others in the Germanophone discussion) and ignored black critics of race thinking like Firmin or Du Bois—cf. Anténor Firmin, *De l’égalité des races humaines: Anthropologie positive* (Paris: Cotillon, 1885); W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches* (Chicago: McClurg, 1903); “Die Negerfrage in den Vereinigten Staaten,” *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 22, (1906): 31-79; *The Negro* (New York: Holt, London: Williams and Norgate, 1915). And yet, the names of Du Bois and Marcus Garvey were even mentioned as dangerous opponents of the ‘white race’ in the work of one of the influential Nazi ideologists of racism, Alfred Rosenberg’s *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, a book quoted by Voegelin with a positive overtone (RS 14); see Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltungskämpfe unserer Zeit* (33rd-34th ed., München: Hoheneichen-Verlag, 1934 [1st ed. 1930]), 645, 667.
- 79 Pierre-André Taguieff, *The Force of Prejudice: On Racism and Its Doubles* (Minneapolis etc.: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 87 (‘ideological rupture’). Despite efforts like that to enclose the category racism, it was also used as self-designation from the ultra-nationalist and fascist side. In France, for instance, Charles Maurras already stated in 1895 “je suis raciste” and correlated that statement to an elitist national racism, which he explicitly set off against ordinary German ideas by explaining that he did not understand the category “dans le sens boche, comme une parenté physique et unité ethnique ou matérielle” but as “parenté de langues” and “identité d’éducation et de tradition” (quoted from Carole Reynaud-Paligot, “Maurras et la notion de race,” in *Le Maurrassisme et la culture: L’Action française. Culture, société, politique* (III), ed. Olivier Dard, Michel Leymarie, Neil McWilliam [Villeneuve d’Ascq: Presses Universitaires de Septentrion, 2010], 111-19, 119). The political founding manifesto of the ‘official’ racism of the Italian state argued in another way in 1938. It stated under the title *Il Fascismo e i problemi della razza*: “The time has come for Italians to openly declare themselves racists. All the regime’s efforts up to this point have been founded upon racism. [...] In Italy the question of racism must be approached from a purely biological point of view, without philosophical or religious preconceptions. Italian racism must be conceived of as essentially Italian and as tendentially Aryan-Nordic” (“The Manifesto of Race,” in: *A Primer of Italian Fascism*, ed. Jeffrey T. Schnapp [Lincoln etc.: University of Nebraska Press, 2000], 173-75, 174. In Germany the co-founder of academic sociology, Werner Sombart, spoke of ‘racism’ and a ‘racist point of view’ and thereby pointed at the contemporary race thinking altogether—cf. Werner Sombart, *Vom Menschen: Versuch einer geisteswissenschaftlichen Anthropologie* (Berlin: Buchholz & Weisswange, 1938), 341, 344. For a provisional collection of the early uses of ‘racism’ and ‘racialism,’ see *Fragments from the History of ‘Racism,’* compiled by Wulf D. Hund (<https://www.academia.edu/37368498/> [27.3.2019]).
- 80 Ruth Benedict, letter dated July 13, 1940, quoted in Mark Anderson, “Ruth Benedict, Boasian Anthropology, and the Problem of the Colour Line,” *History and Anthropology* 25, no. 3, (2014): 395-414, 400; for the following see Tracy Teslow, *Constructing Race: The Science of Bodies and Cultures in American Anthropology* (New York etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 237.

- 81 Cf. Ruth Benedict, *Race: Science and Politics* (New York: Modern Age Books, 1940); already in 1941 a Spanish translation appeared in Mexico as *Raza. Ciencia y Política* and in 1942 the book was published in the UK with the title *Race and Racism* (cf. Margaret Mead, “Ruth Fulton Benedict 1887-1948,” *American Anthropologist* 51, no. 3, (1949): 457-63, 466); the 1947 German translation had the title *Die Rassenfrage in Wissenschaft und Politik*—“The Race Question in Science and Politics.” See i.a. Barnor Hesse, “Racism’s Alterity: The After-Life of Black Sociology,” in *Racism and Sociology*, ed. Wulf D. Hund, Alana Lentin (Berlin etc.: Lit, 2014), 141-74, 150 ff.
- 82 Eric Voegelin, “The Growth of the Race Idea,” in (Voegelin 2000: 27-61, 57). When Voegelin returned to a critique of National Socialism after 1945, he did this without any analysis of racism at all. In his lectures on ‘Hitler and the Germans,’ even the category ‘racism’ did not exist (though it was part of the public and scientific discourse by this time). Apparently, Voegelin was not interested in making use of it as an analytical tool. By contrast, his attempt to explain the behaviour of many Germans during the so-called ‘Third Reich’ manifested an obvious closeness to racist thinking. Voegelin attributed this behaviour to the fact that these Germans were “rabble,” a category of people he generated by means of an alleged modernization of the Aristotelian “slave by nature” and the Hesiodian “useless man” and which he combined with the assertion that this modern “rabble” was additionally hallmarked by “stupidity” and “illiteracy” (Eric Voegelin, *Hitler and the Germans* [Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 1999], 89f.). Here, Voegelin’s old scheme of a “community of noble blood” comes out of hiding—together with the likewise previously used category “rabble” (see above).
- 83 David J. Levy, “Ethos and Ethnos: An Introduction to Eric Voegelin’s Critique of European Racism,” in *Race and Philosophy in Continental Philosophy*, ed. Robert Bernasconi, Sybol Cook (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 98-114, 99, 102; see also Robert Bernasconi, *Measure of Man: Incursions in Philosophical and Political Anthropology* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993) for Freyer etc.
- 84 Thomas W. Heilke, *Voegelin on the Idea of Race: An Analysis of Modern European Racism* (Baton Rouge etc.: Louisiana State University Press, 1990), 33.
- 85 Rod[erick] Stackelberg, “[Review of] Thomas W. Heilke, *Voegelin on the Idea of Race* [etc.],” *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4, (1991): 1191-92, 1191.
- 86 Cf. Alana Lentin, *Racism: A Beginner’s Guide* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2008), 7f.: “Voegelin wrote two volumes on race which he published in 1933 after fleeing Nazi Germany”; David Theo Goldberg, *Sites of Race: Conversations with Susan Searls Giroux* (Cambridge etc.: Polity Press, 2014), 67: “Voegelin first explicitly addressed the relation between race and state in the early 1930s (as a Jew, he fled Austria in 1933).” In fact, “Voegelin was baptized and buried a Christian,” as the founding director of the Eric Voegelin Institute at the Louisiana State University has assured (Ellis Sandoz, “Carrying Coals to Newcastle: Voegelin and Christianity,” in Ellis Sandoz, *Republicanism, Religion, and the Soul of America* [Columbia etc.: University of Missouri Press, 2016], 114-20, 116). More precisely, “Voegelin was born of a Lutheran father and a Roman Catholic mother and was raised in the Lutheran church” (Eugene Webb, *Eric Voegelin: Philosopher of History* [Seattle etc.: University of Washington Press, 1981], 223).
- 87 Ina Kerner, *Differenzen und Macht: Zur Anatomie von Rassismus und Sexismus* (Frankfurt etc.: Campus, 2009), 84-96, here 85f. is rightly speaking of the “irritating” transformation of Voegelin from a “race theorist” to a “theorist of anti-racism” in this context. The range of efforts in this direction is paradoxically long and manifold (cf. Hund 2017: 49f., fn. 1). Only recently, Christian Geulen in an overall superficial paper affirmatively classified Voegelin’s *Race and State* as ‘lucid’ without even mentioning the ambivalence of its argumentation—Christian Geulen, “Ideology’s Logic: The Evolution of Racial Thought in Germany from the

- Völkisch Movement to the Third Reich,” in *Beyond the Racial State: Rethinking Nazi Germany*, ed. Devon O. Pendas, Mark Roseman, Richard F. Wetzell (Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 197-212; and John Harfouch based his deliberations concerning the connection of ‘white supremacy’ and the ‘body-soul problem’ on an uncritical reading of Voegelin’s race books—cf. John Harfouch, *Another Mind-Body Problem: A History of Racial Non-Being* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2018).
- 88 Edward Said, *Orientalism*, 25th Anniversary Edition With a New Preface by the Author (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 363 (‘important’); Paul Gilroy, *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), 57 (‘thoughtful’); Justin E. H. Smith, *Nature, Human Nature, and Human Difference: Race in Early Modern Philosophy* (Princeton etc.: Princeton University Press, 2015), 231 (‘classical’).
- 89 Steve Garner, *Racisms: An Introduction* (London etc.: Sage, 2010), 53 (‘racialisation’); Steve Garner, *A Moral Economy of Whiteness: Four Frames of Racialising Discourse* (London etc.: Routledge, 2016), 37 (‘pioneers’).
- 90 From Voegelin’s point of view, human beings do not only have a body = ‘Körper’ (i.e., an objective material form) but this body is also a body = ‘Leib’ (i.e., animated and subjective) and furthermore—in contrast to animals—ensouled and inspirited. Even German thinkers cannot name this with a distinct word, as Voegelin expressly regrets, because his reflections are centered around the “Geistgestalt des Leibes” (RS^G 65) (literally: spiritual shape of the Leib) which is on no account merging into a simple ‘body.’ That is why the English edition has to go back to German words and translates: “We use the word ‘body’ [*Körper*] to designate the human form we perceive with our senses in its material qualities; we also use the word ‘body’ [*Leib*]—still more clearly with the qualifier ‘pneumatic’—to designate the human form as animated; but we lack a word for the human form as thoroughly permeated by the spirit. Animals have bodies in the sense of *Körper* and in the sense of *Leiber* and nothing more; human beings also have *Körper* and *Leiber*, and in addition they have the spiritual form [*Geistgestalt*] of the body” (RS 64).
- 91 Alana Lentin, *Racism and Anti-Racism in Europe* (London etc.: Pluto Press, 2004), 40.