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This thesis discusses three intellectuals, each from a distinct academic background, and their relationship with National Socialism. Persons covered are Carl Gustav Jung, Martin Heidegger, and Eugen Fischer. This thesis aims at discovering something common and fundamental about the intellectuals' relationship to politics as such. Major sources include the writings, scholastic and apologetic, of the three principals. Following a brief introduction, each person is discussed in a separate chapter. The relationship each had with National Socialism is evaluated with an eye to their distinct academic backgrounds. The conclusion of this thesis is that intellectuals succumb all too easily to political and cultural extremism; none of these three scholars saw themselves as National Socialists, yet each through his anti-Semitism and willingness to cooperate assisted the regime.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis discusses three intellectuals and their relationship with National Socialism. Carl Gustav Jung, once a disciple of Sigmund Freud, became associated with the Nazi Party through his service as President of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy. Martin Heidegger was a German philosopher whose relationship with the party included membership within the NSDAP and serving as rector of the University of Freiburg under the Nazis. Eugen Fischer, a German anthropologist, contributed his theories of race hygiene and eventually became director of the single most important center for race studies in Nazi Germany - the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics, and Eugenics.

Carl Gustav Jung, Martin Heidegger, and Eugen Fischer all had some relationship to the Nazi party. The extent to which these people supported the Nazi cause, and how their involvement was meaningful, is less clear. This thesis will examine the connections each of them had with Nazism. Did these intellectuals truly support the Nazi party as has been charged? If so, what part of the Nazi program appealed to them, and what were the circumstances surrounding their support? These are the questions this thesis explores.
The work of intellectuals, Carl Boggs suggested, because it involves the production and dissemination of ideas, has always been a manifestly social and political activity. The notion of an intelligentsia - a term which applies to professionals, writers, artists, scientists, and journalists as a class who in some way deal with ideas, beliefs, and attitudes - makes the term "intellectual" vague indeed. If intellectual activity is, by its nature, so diffuse in the modern world, why attempt a study of intellectuals and politics? Peter Hruby claimed that attempting such an understanding is worthwhile because:

it [has] become clear that personal views and motivations of actors in the political arena can easily lead to crimes perpetrated on a mass scale. . . . [and] if humanity wants to survive at all, it [must] understand the motivations of crime and develop preventive measures before fanatics and lunatics [have] a chance [at] enslaving millions of people and of liquidating thousands or millions under any ideological pretext.

Anti-Semitism plays a role in each of the three case studies below. The two spheres of Nazism and anti-Semitism are dealt with separately to the degree it is possible to do so. The reason for the separation is not merely stylistic,

---


but follows from the logic that it is possible to be anti-Semitic without supporting Nazism, but not the reverse.

Carl Gustav Jung was born in 1875 in Switzerland. He worked with Sigmund Freud for a number of years, edited the Annual for Psychoanalytic Research, and, at Freud's suggestion, was appointed the first president of the International Psychoanalytic Association. Jung began as a clinical psychiatrist, but he was always interested in occult forces and mystical experiences. He is best known for his doctrine of analytical psychology.

Jung is charged with having Nazi sympathies through his association with the General International Medical Society for Psychotherapy. Under the Nazis, the German chapter of this society threw out its Jewish members. Jung, as president of the society, became the target of much criticism from the professional psychological community. His writings directly discussing National Socialism and Adolf Hitler specifically are sparse, but Jung wrote an important essay in 1936 entitled "Wotan" which gives insight into how he perceived National Socialism.

Far more vast is the written material concerning Jung's alleged anti-Semitism. He wrote about Jewish psychology before and during the Nazi takeover. Jung's ideas on Jewish psychology, as expressed in "The Role of the Unconscious" and "Psychological Types," are representative and will also be examined. Additionally, Jung's relationship and break
with Sigmund Freud provided yet another dimension to Jung's alleged anti-Semitism.

Jung himself claimed that he, as President of the General International Medical Society for Psychotherapy, wished to remain above politics and to tend only to matters pertaining to the profession of psychotherapy. He stipulated that he would only remain president as long as he could advance the profession without regard to politics. Regarding the charge of anti-Semitism, Jung later apologized for having remarked on Jewish psychology and seems to have felt genuine regret.

The first author who dealt with the subject of Jung's alleged Nazism and anti-Semitism in a historical manner was Ernest Harms.³ His article, "Carl Gustav Jung - Defender of Freud and the Jews," is a major source of information on the subject. Although Harms was an adherent neither of the Freudian nor the Jungian school, he studied under both men at different times. His article covers the relationship between Freud and Jung and discusses the reasons for its termination. James Kirsch also studied with Jung, and his article, "Carl Gustav Jung and the Jews: The Real Story," repeats many of the same points found in Harms's article.⁴


Kirsch's contribution to the subject is his focus on the historical timing of Jung's writings on Jewish psychology during the 1930s.

Geoffrey Cocks, author of "The Nazis and C. G. Jung," contrasts European anti-Semitism with Nazi anti-Semitism. He then evaluates Jung's alleged anti-Semitism in this context and contributes the notion of a professional responsibility among intellectuals who face political crisis. Andrew Samuels also examines Jung's alleged Nazism and anti-Semitism in his article "National Socialism, National Psychology, and Analytical Psychology." He disputes, however, Cocks's use of the idea of European anti-Semitism to distinguish Jung from the Nazis. The key to Jung's alleged Nazism, Samuels claims, is contained in his theories on the psychology of nations.

Michael Vannoy Adams addresses Jung's alleged anti-Semitism in his article "My Siegfried Problem - and Ours: Jungians, Freudians, Anti-Semitism, and the Psychology of Knowledge." Adams addressed the issue of


6Andrew Samuels, "National Socialism, National Psychology, and Analytical Psychology," in Lingering Shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and Anti-Semitism, 177-209.

collective psychological differences among different groups, and he cites a specific group study which sought to establish the existence of such collective differences. His article represents an attempt to affirm the value and usefulness of Jung's analytic psychology despite his alleged Nazism and anti-Semitism.

Jung's alleged Nazism involves the issue of anti-Semitism as well as his possible dealings or sympathies with the Nazi party. That Jung ideologically broke from Sigmund Freud gives Jung's alleged anti-Semitism a peculiar twist. If Jung was anti-Semitic, what does one make of his relationship with Sigmund Freud? How does one evaluate Jung's Nazi sympathies when he was Swiss, not German? In order to fully evaluate Jung's alleged Nazism, these questions must be considered.

Martin Heidegger was born in 1889 in Messkirch. He is remembered primarily as a keen analyst of Being with a large French following. While Heidegger carries a reputation for a difficult style, his early mentor, Edmund Husserl, was often equally abstruse. Other influences on Heidegger's thought included Friedrich Nietzsche, Immanuel Kant, and Søren Kierkegaard. Although he is often considered an existentialist, his concern with the human situation was always driven by a desire to disclose Being.

Heidegger is also remembered as a supporter of the Nazis. He accepted the rectorship of the University of
Freiburg under Hitler's regime in 1933, and he was supportive of the German cultural revival which National Socialism promised. Heidegger's support of the Nazi Party is not disputed. The significance of his support as related to his philosophy defines the following debate. To what extent Heidegger's political involvement can be predicted from his earlier works and to what extent they continued to play a role on his later works are the questions which will be explored. *Being and Time*, Heidegger's magnum opus of 1927, will be examined below.

The charge of anti-Semitism recurs with Heidegger's Nazi involvement. Because anti-Semitism is a defining element of Nazism, his statements and actions toward Jewish students and colleagues have been called into question. It is reputed that Heidegger, while rector of the university, refused to supervise a doctoral student based on her Jewish heritage. Because Heidegger did not attend Husserl's funeral and because he withdrew the dedication of *Being and Time* to his one-time mentor, Heidegger's relationship with Husserl has been examined for possible anti-Semitism.

Heidegger's defense of his Nazi involvement remained consistent until his death. He maintained that his intention while rector was to aid in the reestablishment of the university to an integral role in German culture. Heidegger never publicly apologized for his Nazi involvement, and many believe this silence indicates that he
had no regrets over his political involvement. He was not, however, totally silent. Privately Heidegger seems to have remembered his Nazi involvement with regret.

Karl Löwith, who studied with Heidegger and Husserl in Freiburg, wrote an article entitled "The Political Implications of Heidegger's Existentialism."\(^8\) Löwith, examined Being and Time and Heidegger's Rectorial Address, "The Self-Assertion of the German University," for possible political content. The article also examines Heidegger's relationship with Husserl for evidence of anti-Semitism.

Jürgen Habermas's article, "On the Publication of the Lectures of 1935," is noteworthy for its treatment of Heidegger's work An Introduction to Metaphysics.\(^9\) The book was published in 1953 from notes used in a lecture of the same name which he gave in 1935. The book was published supposedly without revision and mentions National Socialism specifically. The article is significant because it began the debate over the timely authenticity of An Introduction to Metaphysics, which Heidegger presented as unaltered, and thus representative of how he viewed National Socialism in 1935.


Otto Pöggler's article, "Heidegger's Political Self-Understanding," examines Heidegger's politics within the context of the desperate period in German history which gave rise to Nazism. Pöggler examined Heidegger's personal understanding of National Socialism with the public version of National Socialism as it is remembered. Although his article does not delve into the issue of anti-Semitism, Pöggler examined Heidegger's silence critically.

Ernst Tugendhat brings the notion of Heidegger's accountability to the fore in his article "Heidegger's Idea of Truth." In this article Tugendhat examines Heidegger's writings on the nature of truth as "disclosedness." Central to Tugendhat's inquiry is the question of whether Heidegger's understanding of truth played a role in his political decisions.

Historian Hugo Ott brought to light archival material that showed Heidegger's Nazi commitments to be a fact, but it was Victor Farías's book, Heidegger and Nazism, which incorporated and benefitted most from Ott's work. Farías has been widely criticized for his biased approach and

---

10 Otto Pöggler, "Heidegger's Political Self-Understanding," in The Heidegger Controversy, 200-244.
tendency to oversimplify the complex nature of Heidegger's National Socialist involvement. *Heidegger and Nazism,* however, remains important for giving Heidegger's politics and philosophy exhaustive treatment. Farias also started the debate in the country with the largest Heideggerian influence - France.

Farias's book prompted responses from the French Heideggarians Philipe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jacques Derrida. In Lacoue-Labarthe's *Heidegger, Art, and Politics,* he compared early and later Heideggarian philosophy with Nazism.\(^1\) He examined *Being and Time* with special emphasis on whether the work succeeded in breaking with the tradition of Western metaphysics. Additionally, Lacoue-Labarthe examines Heidegger's changing interpretation of Nietzsche as reflective of a shift from early to later Heideggarian philosophy.

Jacques Derrida, one of the most famous French Heideggarians, also contrasts early and late Heideggarian philosophy in *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question.*\(^2\) He focuses on Heidegger's use of the word spirit in his political speeches of 1933. The absence of the word spirit in later Heideggarian writings, Derrida claims, reveals a


philosophical shift following the Nazi era.

Jean-François Lyotard's *Heidegger and "the Jews"* expands upon some of the points Derrida and Lacoue-Labarthe made.¹⁵ Lyotard examines how humanism forces an interpretation of the Holocaust that is different from an evaluation in Heideggarian terms. Lyotard's contribution to the debate on Heidegger and National Socialism is that it makes a case for the value of Heideggarian philosophy as one that serves as its own "apology."

Eugen Fischer was born in 1874 in Karlsruhe. He earned his reputation as the leading German anthropologist for his 1913 study of an inter-racial South African colony *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen* (The Rehobarth Bastards and the Problem of Bastardization Among Humans) and studied under the famous Freiburg zoologist August Weismann.¹⁶ At the time the Nazis took power, Fischer had established himself as a major authority in the pseudo-science of race hygiene which was inspired by eugenics.

Fischer is associated with the Nazis because he directed the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in Berlin from 1927 until his

---


retirement in 1942. He became the first Nazi Rector of the University of Berlin and, like Heidegger, was a member of the NSDAP. In 1921 Fischer co-authored what became the standard work on race hygiene. The book, *Grundriß der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene* (Teaching of Human Heredity and Race Hygiene), will be examined below. The ideas expressed in the name of race hygiene, of which Fischer was the leading exponent, provided the Nazis a biological justification for their crimes.

Anti-Semitism played a leading role in Fischer's Nazism. That his race hygiene theories discussed, though they were not limited to, the Jewish people, again introduces a distinction between benign or cultural anti-Semitism — benign even if ethically disgraceful — and lethal anti-Semitism. This distinction is put forth to distinguish the degree to which one's anti-Semitism was consistent with the Final Solution.

Fischer never put forth a defense or apology for his Nazi involvement. He was not formally tried for any war crimes and was made an honorary member of the reconstituted post-war German Anthropological Association. In 1959 he published a brief memoir entitled *Begegnungen mit Toten* (Encounters with the Dead). If Fischer ever put forth an apology, it might be found there.

Bently Glass notes that none of Fischer's own writings, nor any of the writings on him, shed any light on his
relationship to the Nazi party. Glass's article, "A Hidden Chapter of German Eugenics Between the Two World Wars," examines Erwin Bauer's collaboration with Eugen Fischer and Fritz Lenz in writing *Teaching of Human Heredity and Race Hygiene.* Despite success in Nazi Germany, the book was heavily criticized elsewhere.

Loren R. Graham's article "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s" explains the reception of eugenics in Nazi Germany as related to a decrease in, what he calls the optimistic variation of Social Darwinism. Eugen Fischer is described as a reluctant supporter of sterilization as a viable solution only after struggling with his Catholic faith which forbade the practice.

Paul Weindling's article "Weimar Eugenics: The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in Social Context" examines the relationship between eugenics and genetics during the Weimar Republic. He evaluates the creation of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute

---


for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in the context of Weimar culture and post-World War I Germany. Fischer, Weindling claims, exemplifies the difficult transition eugenics underwent in the Third Reich. Fischer is portrayed as a scientist who became involved in politics while attempting to maintain professional integrity.

Peter Weingart's article, "German Eugenics between Science and Politics," examines the history of eugenics in light of the theories of evolution and human heredity. He notes how Fischer was instrumental in bringing about a shift from physical anthropology to race anthropology. This transition, taking place with his directorship of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics, brought him in line with the Nazi ideology.

The following thesis will individually examine the three intellectual figures mentioned above with respect to their Nazi involvement. There is growing scholarly treatment of this type of subject - especially on Jung and Heidegger. Fischer has received far less. Although each person considered comes from a different academic background, in the end, this thesis will examine how their political involvement bears upon all intellectuals.

---

CHAPTER II

CARL GUSTAV JUNG, THE FÜHRER, AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Carl Gustav Jung has repeatedly been charged with being a Nazi collaborator and an anti-Semite. Historians, Jewish scholars, and psychologists have written extensively about his political and racial beliefs. The circumstances of his Nazi involvement arise from his acceptance, under the Nazis, of the office of President of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy. The society and its journal, the Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete, were allegedly gleichgeschaltet (brought into line) to the Nazi program, and Jews were excluded from membership. Suspicion of his anti-Semitism emerged because Jung made statements about the psychology of Jewish people which remain suspect.

It seems natural to ponder the fact that Jung wrote at a time when the Jewish presence within the psychoanalytic movement was at its height. Were his writings on Jewish psychology, in a sense, utterly timely? Any alternative to the prevailing psychanalytic theories was destined also to be an alternative to Jewish psychoanalysis. Dennis B. Klein observed that: "If the tendency to deny the psychoanalytic
movement's Jewish content is strong, the opposite tendency to exaggerate, or overestimate it, for many, is strong."

Carl Gustav Jung worked closely with Sigmund Freud from 1906 to 1913. As the son of a Swiss Reformed pastor, Jung was an important recruit for the development of psychoanalysis - Freud was concerned that psychoanalysis not become merely a "Jewish national affair." Freud and Jung worked together closely, and in 1909 traveled together to the United States in an effort to increase the standing of psychoanalysis. Despite their close relationship, major divisions were evident from the beginning.

Freud believed sexual drives were fundamental in psychological development. For Jung the more general interpretation of the libido as a life force made more sense. Such an interpretation, he believed accounted more meaningfully for the individual's growing intellectual and spiritual activities as that individual grew into maturity. The two men broke off relations entirely in 1913. Finally, Jung believed in an expanded role of the unconscious, called the collective unconscious, which allowed an individual to experience thoughts and feelings of prior generations.

\[^{1}\text{Dennis B. Klein, Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1981), vii.}\]

Jung was interested in the psychology of leaders and entire nations, and he wrote about Adolf Hitler, National Socialism, and Germany. Jung's statements about these phenomena can be interpreted in various ways. Jung labelled himself as non-political, and his comments on Hitler and National Socialism, in many instances, were almost devoid of political commitment. Being Swiss he was perhaps more able to view political events in Germany with objectivity.

To evaluate Jung's alleged anti-Semitism, one must consider both his statements and his actions. Although he accepted the presidency of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, his motivations for doing so may have run counter to the Nazi cause. Additionally, the specific policies regarding Jewish membership in the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy must be examined. Jung's statements and actions are important because, often, they seem to be in contrast with each other - especially regarding his anti-Semitism. What follows deals with that aspect of Jung's career which led to the charges of Nazism.

The International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy was based in Germany, and its journal, the Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete, was published in Germany. The president of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy in 1933 was Professor Ernst Kretschmer. The impending gleichschaltung
(bringing institutions into line with Nazi theory), which included every German scientific society, motivated Kretschmer to resign.\(^3\) German psychotherapists who were members thereupon approached Jung, then honorary vice president of the Society, to accept the presidency.\(^4\) Being Swiss, the German psychotherapists believed Jung would enjoy greater freedom from German political matters. With his acceptance, they hoped to secure luster in their bid for autonomy from psychiatry and to dissociate themselves, in the eyes of the Nazi Party, from Freud.\(^5\) Jung, in accepting the presidency, simultaneously assumed the editorship of the journal.\(^6\)

Almost immediately upon assuming the presidency, Jung was tied to Nazism owing to a manifesto which appeared in the December 1933 issue of the Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete which urged the subordination of member psychotherapists to National


\(^4\)Ibid., 79.


\(^6\)Jaffé, From the Life and Work of C. G. Jung, 79.
Socialist principals and Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. The manifesto appeared in the several pages immediately following Jung's "Foreword." Jung claimed later to have been under the impression that only a German supplement to the *Zentralblatt* would contain the manifesto.

In a letter to Rudolf Allers, on 23 November 1933, Jung stated that Dr. M. H. Goring, cousin of the Nazi leader, Herman Göring, was responsible for the content of the German supplement of the *Zentralblatt*. Jung also said that, for the German supplement, he would prefer to find an editor who was gleichgeschaltet (coordinated) because such a person would have a better idea about what would and would be unacceptable to print. Additionally, Jung expressed his desire that psychology maintain its current position inside the German Reich despite the political climate within Germany.

At the 7th Congress in May 1934 at Bad Nauheim, Jung redrafted the statutes of the society giving it de jure
international structure. Since its creation, the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy had been international in character. When Jung became president, the society was dominated by the Germans who held the main executive posts. Leading members agreed with Jung's request to form national groups; those represented were Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland. Local bylaws determined the conditions of membership in a national group, but association with a national group was purely voluntary. The resolutions of the 7th Congress made individual membership possible regardless of political, religious, or national affiliation, and it stipulated that no national group could hold more than forty percent voting power. Jung presented a brazenly apolitical speech at the 7th Congress, entitled "A Review of the Complex Theory," in which he made favorable references to Freud.11

Dr. C. A. Meier, of Zurich, was appointed managing editor of the Zentralblatt following the Bad Nauheim Congress.12 It was Jung and Meier who kept the journal from being gleichgeschaltet for a time. In 1936, however, Jung


11Ibid., 545.

12Jaffé, From the Life and Work of C. G. Jung, 83.
made Göring co-editor, and this appointment led to a decline in Jung's reputation.\textsuperscript{13}

The Dutch withdrew an offer to host the 1936 Congress for the psychoanalytic society, at which action Jung expressed disappointment. In a letter of 3 January 1936 to J. H. van der Hoop, he described their withdrawal, owing to their opposition to the treatment of member Jews in Germany, as a disavowal of the scientific attitude. Also in this letter Jung suggested that he might resign the presidency under certain conditions. The most important criterion would be if he judged that his presence as president hindered the success of the society.\textsuperscript{14} In another instance Jung turned down Oluf Brüel's proposal to discuss "nationalism as a conditioning factor in psychotherapy."\textsuperscript{15} Jung explained to Brüel in a letter of 12 December 1936 that such a discussion would only produce a "National Socialist outburst of devastating sterility."\textsuperscript{16}

Jung did not allow all book reviews to appear in the Zentralblatt. On 16 November 1937, Jung wrote Göring a letter concerning a review Göring had done of a book by the major Nazi theoretician Alfred Rosenberg. Jung described the work as an egregious exposition based on the

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{14}Jung, \textit{Letters}, 207.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid, 221.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.
pseudo-scientific foundations of Nazi doctrines on civilization. Jung stated that he did not wish his name to be associated with such lapses and recommended to Göring that the book be passed over in silence.  

Jung continued to show discretion in potentially political matters at the Society's annual meetings. In a letter to Dr. Strauss, he recalled that the new regulations of the Society made membership possible regardless of one's political or religious convictions. Jung explained that he would not exclude non-Aryan speakers, but he wished, however, for all speakers to refrain from "remarks apt to arouse the political psychosis of our days." 

Jung's attitudes toward Nazism are perhaps best represented in his remarks on the movement's leader, Adolf Hitler. At an interview in October 1938, Jung described Hitler as ruled by his unconscious - that he listened to it and acted upon it. Asked by the interviewer, H. R. Knickerbocker, to place Hitler psychologically, Jung responded that [he] would not place him as a man, for individually he is quite uninteresting and unimportant. He

17Jung, Letters, 238.
is simply a great phenomenon." In a subsequent interview of May 1939, Jung claimed that Hitler spoke for all of Germany and was not to be trusted because a nation cannot have a "word" to keep.

Jung made efforts to keep himself at a distance from the Nazis at meetings of the Society for Psychotherapy. In a letter of 28 June 1939 to Hugh Crichton Miller, Jung requested that Miller, the newly promoted vice president, be present at the next annual congress because he was perceived as being "above board." At that meeting Miller's recommendation that Dr. van der Hoop succeed Jung as president, however, only served to arouse Göring's anger. Göring apparently took offense because he desired a German successor. In a letter of 2 September 1939 Jung advised Miller not to take Göring's reactions seriously. Jung also predicted that Hitler, along with the entire German psychosis, was reaching a climax.

In 1940 Jung clarified his earlier use of the word "phenomenon" in describing Adolf Hitler. He explained that

---

20 Ibid., 138.


22 Jung, Letters, 271.

23 Ibid, 275.
by describing Hitler as "a great phenomenon," he should not be understood as praising the Führer.24

Also in 1940 Jung's "Terry Lectures" were released in Germany and subsequently suppressed. Jung claimed that the release of this work led to his work being black-listed in Germany. In the "Terry Lectures" Jung attacked mob action for its lack of accountability. Jung wrote that when "an indescribable hell of devastation is let loose, nobody seems to be responsible . . . since everybody is blindly convinced that he is nothing more than his own extremely unassuming and insignificant conscious self."25 After Germany invaded France, the Gestapo destroyed all Jung's books in their French edition.26

In a letter of 26 October 1940 to J.H. van der Hoop, Jung discussed his decision to resign the post of President.27 He decided to resign when Italy, Hungary, and Japan applied for membership to the society. With their membership pending and Göring pressing for their acceptance, Jung decided to resign. At the last congress of the German


27Jung, Letters, 286.
group in Vienna, Göring, illegally referring to the delegates as a meeting of the delegates of the International Society, declared the Society gleichgeschaltet. The Zentralblatt met with the same fate.\textsuperscript{28}

In his 1945 publication of "After the Catastrophe," Jung reflected on the holocaust and Hitler. He called Nazi race theories pseudo-science, and he claimed the mere existence of these theories did not excuse the extermination of Jews. Jung believed the Germans had sold their souls for technology and became greedy. Anti-Semitism, Jung believed, was an attempt by Germans "to use others as a scapegoat for [their] own greatest fault!"\textsuperscript{29} Given this definition of what anti-Semitism means to the German, Jung claimed that "Germans are not among the ones that may enjoy power and possessions with impunity."\textsuperscript{30} He described Hitler as self-admiring, lacking insight into his own character, and suffering from "pseudologia phantastica" - the form of hysteria in which one believes one's own lies.\textsuperscript{31}

In an attempt to explain psychologically the actions of Hitler and the Nazis, Jung published "The Fight with the Shadow," in 1946. Jung claimed that the shadow represented

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29}Jung, "After the Catastrophe," in Civilization in Transition, 213.
\textsuperscript{30}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{31}Ibid, 203.
the inferior part of everybody's personality. The weakness felt within, he wrote, originated from being subjected to such pressures as whimsical economic conditions and led to a reaction for power of which Hitler was the supreme manifestation.\textsuperscript{32}

Also published in 1946, was Jung's "Epilogue to 'Essays on Contemporary Events,'" which reflected on the recent German outbreak. He called the phenomenon of National Socialism an abnormal psychic epidemic -- because genocide is not in any way normal. He conceded, however, that the term normal is rarely meaningful within psychology, and he refused to whitewash mass murder as an excusable blunder. Jung recalled seeing National Socialism in 1933 as an essentially archetypal movement capable of producing a positive or negative result which was impossible to predict accurately. He described the recent German events as being equivalent to the psychological condition of dissociation -- a condition said to be present when two diametrically opposite tendencies manifest themselves. He claimed that Germany was dissociative because this highly civilized country committed crimes which exceeded those the world had yet seen.\textsuperscript{33}


Many were aware that Jung was a disciple of Freud and subsequently broke from his master. Their relationship did not, however, follow a standard master/disciple model. Jung and Freud first met at the 1908 Psychoanalytic Congress in Salzburg. The Congress brought together the Zürich and Vienna schools of psychiatry - Jung's and Freud's respective schools. It was the problem of the "complex-theory" which brought Jung into contact with Freud. Although major differences were evident as early as 1909, Freud claimed that the final break did not occur until the fall of 1913.\(^{34}\)

What follows deals, to some extent, with Jung's specific criticisms of Freud but also with a series of writings on Jewish psychology that led to the charge of anti-Semitism.

The earliest reference to Jung's alleged anti-Semitism appeared in a letter Freud wrote to Karl Abraham. In the letter, dated 26 December 1908, Freud claimed Abraham came closer to understanding Freudian ideas than Jung ever had because Jung, being the son of a Catholic minister, approached their friendship with difficulty.\(^{35}\)

In 1914 Freud publicly accused Jung of being an anti-Semite. In the official history of psychoanalysis, On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement, Freud claimed that Jung, upon entering their relationship, had "to give up


\(^{35}\)Freud, A Psycho-Analytic Dialogue, 92.
certain racial prejudices which he had previously permitted himself.  

In "The Structure of the Unconscious," which appeared in 1916, Jung discussed the uniqueness of Jewish psychology. He warned of the danger associated with identifying one's personality with the collective unconscious. Such persons, he claimed, are labeled crazy because those who are normal relate to individuals rather than the universal. Jung claimed that such a person makes the mistake of ignoring differences in the psyche of his fellows and glosses over personal and racial differences. Jung claimed that it was quite unpardonable to "accept the conclusions of a Jewish psychology as generally valid." He maintained that in the early stages of psychic development, all races had a common collective psyche, but

---


37 Jung, "The Structure of the Unconscious," in Two Essays on Analytical Psychology (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), 275. Jung uses the term "Jewish psychology" to refer to the psychology of the Jewish people as distinct from that of non-Jews, but in other contexts he is referring to the theories of Freud and Adler.

38 The collective unconscious refers to the universal unconscious shared by all regardless of race or religion.

with the advent of racial differentiation essential differences developed in their collective psyches.\textsuperscript{40}

In 1918, Jung described how he believed Jewish psychology differed from Germanic psychology. In "The Role of the Unconscious," he claimed that Jews live amicably with the earth, but without feeling the power of its chthonic quality.\textsuperscript{41} Jung believed the Jew lived with two cultures: the culture of the ancient world and the culture of the nation in which he lived. To counterbalance the ascendancy of these two cultures, Jung claimed that Jews developed psychological explanations which seek to reduce or simplify experience.\textsuperscript{42} Two main examples of such "simplifications," Jung believed, were Freud's and Adler's views on the primacy of sexual drives and power drives in psychological structures. Additionally, he claimed that these Jewish psychological theories were unacceptable to the Germanic mentality.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40}This racial aspect to Jung's thinking, especially as it pertains to the Jewish people, is what is most vulnerable in his theories. This error in considering Jews a race recurs throughout this thesis.

\textsuperscript{41}C. G. Jung, "The Role of the Unconscious," in Civilization in Transition, 13.

\textsuperscript{42}Alfred Adler is important for his formulation of the theory of "individual psychology." Freud and Adler are in agreement on the importance of infantile experiences, but rather than taking sexuality as the primary formative force on character, Adler emphasizes the individual's need to establish himself in the social milieu.

"Psychological Types" appeared in September 1921 during a time in which Jung was still defining his differences with Freud and Adler and developing his own theories. In this essay Jung examined the theories of Freud and Adler, but he did not criticize their psychology on the basis of its Jewishness. Jung concluded the essay with a confession that, despite the weaknesses of the theories of Freud and Adler, he had not yet created a better alternative theory.  

During his life, Jung had Jewish colleagues and clients, and it is from his relationships with them that he generalized about Jewish psychology. In 1923 Jung referred a Jewish client, whom he had treated for two years, to Freud. The patient had difficulty accepting his Jewish heritage. Finding that Freud's treatment was not helpful, the patient later returned to Jung, was finally adjusted, and later discharged. This event is significant in demonstrating that Jung could help Jewish patients.  

In 1930 Jung commented on Freud's theories in "Freud and Psychoanalysis." He claimed that Freud's personal psychology influenced his technique too much. Jung also affirmed that in psychoanalysis the patient could proceed no further than the analyst had progressed. Jung noted that  

44 Jung, "Psychological Types," in Psychological Types, 509.  

only if the analyst had analyzed himself could he act as a legitimate guide to a patient.\textsuperscript{46}

The essay "The State of Psychotherapy Today" also contained severe remarks on Jewish psychology. Jung claimed that Freud, as a Jew, could comprehend neither National Socialism nor the German psyche. Jung claimed the German unconscious was a creative and intuitive depth of the soul, rather than being a collection of unfulfilled infantile desires, as a Freudian interpretation might claim.\textsuperscript{47} He described the Aryan unconscious as containing explosive forces and the seeds of an unborn future, and the still youthful Germanic peoples were capable of creating new cultural forms which lay dormant in their unconscious. On the other hand, he maintained that Jews, with a civilization twice as old as the Aryans', were vastly more conscious of human weakness, and, like the cultured Chinese, had a wider psychological consciousness than Aryans. Jung claimed that though the Jewish psyche is more conscious of human weakness than the Germanic, it is also more capable of living peaceably with this knowledge. He described the Aryan as less capable of confronting the unconscious because the

\textsuperscript{46}Jung, "Freud and Psychoanalysis," in Freud and Psychoanalysis, 325.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid, 166.
Aryan is steeped too deeply in ideals and convictions designed to ensure his contentment. Jung claimed that the psychological makeup of the Aryan is both advantaged and disadvantaged. The Aryan is advantaged in that he is capable of creating cultural forms. Cultural forms, Jung claimed, were distinct from culture, and although he recognized a distinct Jewish culture, there were no Jewish cultural forms. Jung concluded that the average Jew is too "conscious" to go about pregnant with the tensions of an unborn future. He also claimed that Jewish psychological categories, which are not universal even among Jews, had erroneously been applied to Germanic and Slavic Christendom. Jung claimed that his warnings against such universal application of Jewish principles has been mistaken for anti-Semitism for decades. He claimed that "[t]he Jewish race as a whole - at least this is my experience - possess an unconscious which can be compared with the "Aryan" only with reserve."

Jung received public pressure from an article which appeared in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung on 27 February 1934. The article, by a Dr. Bally, entitled "German Psychotherapy" attacked the contents of the recent Zentralblatt of December 1933, and charged Jung with poor timing in making comments.

---

48 Ibid, 165.
49 Ibid, 166.
50 Ibid.
on Jewish people, given the political situation in Germany.\textsuperscript{51}

Jung continued, however, to write on Jewish psychology. In a letter of 22 December 1935 to Erich Neumann Jung, he wrote that the "cultivated Jew" is always on the way to becoming a "non-Jew."\textsuperscript{52} In the same letter he admitted to having difficulty understanding the Jewish psyche because Jews have not grown up on any particular soil.

Abraham Aaron Roback, author of \textit{Jewish Influence in Modern Thought}, corresponded with Jung on the psychology of the Jewish people. In a letter of 19 December 1936, Jung expressed an interest in seeing the results of Roback's experiments on the mental differences between Jews and non-Jews. Jung added that he found Jews typically connected with the unconscious in a way that is rare in non-Jews. Encountering the unconscious, he explained, was often a source of excitement for Jews while the same encounter felt like a restriction of moral freedom to non-Jews.\textsuperscript{53}

In 1942 Jolande Jacobi published \textit{The Psychology of C. G. Jung}. The book featured, with Jung's approval, a psychic genealogical tree. The tree was drawn in diagram form and was put forth to resolve a problem with Jung’s theory of racial psychologies. The racial psychologies, which Jung

\textsuperscript{51}Jung, \textit{Letters}, 145.

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., 206-7.

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., 223.
spoke of, required the existence of a distinct racial unconscious. The formal advent of a racial unconscious originated in a major shortcoming in the theory of the collective unconscious. The collective unconscious, and its archetypes, because it existed at a deeper level than any cultural manifestations, would imply a greater degree of cultural homogeneity than can be observed in the world. The racial unconscious was introduced to cover this anomaly.\textsuperscript{54}

In his 1957 publication, \textit{The Undiscovered Self}, Jung completely discarded the term "average" as being useful in psychological terminology. The idea of average, in regards to a universally valid psychology, he claimed, was useless in understanding the individual precisely because the universally valid characteristics do not necessarily constitute the individual. He suggested that one might reasonably expect to find nothing but exceptions to the rule.\textsuperscript{55}

During the years Jung was involved with the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, he repeatedly explained his involvement as non-political and always with a view to promoting the survival of psychotherapy as a profession. In the "Foreword" to the

\textsuperscript{54}Andrew Samuels, "National Socialism, National Psychology, and Analytical Psychology," in \textit{Lingering Shadows}, 183.

December issue of the *Zentralblatt* that contained the manifesto, Jung expressed his desire that the discipline of psychotherapy proceed without regard to politics. He also stated that the journal would no longer gloss over the differences which existed between Jewish and Germanic psychology because such a distinction between the two psychologies was no different than speaking of the unique psychology of the Oriental. 

In his 1934 an essay "The State of Psychotherapy Today," Jung reiterated his concern for the survival and progress of psychotherapy as a discipline. He also expressed his desire to open communication between the various isolated schools of psychoanalysis because internal factions hampered the growth of the discipline.

Regarding his role of President of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, in a letter of 22 January 1934 to fellow Swedish psychotherapist, Poul Bjerre, Jung stated that Professor Göring was the leader not of the entire society but only of the German group. He mentioned again his desire to keep German political influence from affecting the Society as a whole. Jung wrote Oluf Brüel, the

---


president of the Danish group of the Society, on 2 March 1934 and again mentioned that the oath of Nazi support should only have appeared in the German supplement of the December 1933 Zentralblatt.\textsuperscript{59}

Jung responded to Dr. Bally's criticisms of the recent issue of the Zentralblatt on 13, 14, and 15 March in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung.\textsuperscript{60} In his editorial reply, "A Rejoinder to Dr. Bally," Jung again responded that the publication of the manifesto was only to have appeared in the German supplement and that he found the contents of the manifesto disagreeable. He also repeated his contention that Jewish psychology was distinct and that the mere mention of this fact does not make one anti-Semitic. Jung claimed that the peculiar aspect of psychology is that it deals with "imponderable differences" which everybody knows exist but cannot always define. The lack of an adequate explanation, he added, did not render the differences any less real. Jung noted that psychology is unique in that its object of study is also its organ of study. Also, in response to Dr. Bally concerning the timing of his remarks on Jewish differences, Jung explained that he had been studying subjective psychological premises, as they concerned racial distinctions, since 1913.

\textsuperscript{59}Ibid., 144.

\textsuperscript{60}Jung, "A Rejoinder to Dr. Bally," Civilization in Transition, 538-44.
In further defense of his statements about Jews, Jung wrote in a letter to a colleague, A. Pupato, on 2 March 1934 that his comments on Jewish psychology were as harmless as mentioning the differences between Eastern and Western thinking.\textsuperscript{61}

On 28 March 1934, Jung wrote to Max Guggenheim that he had obtained a Jewish editor for the review section of the Zentralblatt and claimed to have intervened on behalf of certain Jewish psychotherapists.\textsuperscript{62} He complained that his actions in this regard had unfortunately not been made public. One month later Jung, in a letter to B. Cohen, likened his distinctions between Jews and Germanics to being like those he pointed out in The Secret of the Golden Flower.\textsuperscript{63} This book, which Jung co-wrote with Richard Wilhelm, examined the differences between Eastern and Western thinking.

In an address to a Swiss symposium in May 1935 Jung explained his motivation to assume the presidency of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy.\textsuperscript{64} His primary reason was to save psychotherapy from being swallowed up by either psychiatry or neurology. The

\textsuperscript{61}Jung, Letters, 147.

\textsuperscript{62}Ibid, 155.

\textsuperscript{63}Ibid, 159.

\textsuperscript{64}Jung, "Contribution to a Discussion on Psychotherapy," in Civilization in Transition, 557.
discipline's survival was, he claimed, also dependant upon its international contacts. By allowing individual membership, he hoped to both salvage the international nature of the organization and obviate the effects of the German *gleichschaltung*.

In 1936 Jung published an essay entitled "Wotan" where he revealed how he perceived National Socialism. Wotan, a figure from Germanic mythology, is described as a restless wanderer who, at different points in history, created unrest and strife. Jung explained that the recurrence of anti-Semitism occurred as a function of the reawakened Wotan. Though the spirit could easily be referred to as Dionysus, Jung believed that Wotan was a more accurate name because it described the god of storm and frenzy, unleasher of passions, and lust for battle. This spirit, Jung believed, explained more about the occurrence of National Socialism than economic or political explanations. He predicted that if his interpretation of Wotan as an agent in history was correct, National Socialism marked only the beginning of far worse events which would occur in the next few years or decades.  

65 Jung's alleged Nazism has been widely discussed in dozens of scholarly articles. Andrew Samuels, in his essay entitled "National Socialism, National Psychology, and Analytical Psychology," noted that in Jung's day certain

types of anti-Semitic remarks were common. Alternatives to such anti-Semitism, however, existed even in Germany - such as the judenfreunde (friends of the Jews) and rassenschander (race defilers; those practicing inter-racial marriage). Samuels concluded that Jung was initially passive about the publications which appeared in the Zentralblatt because he was more concerned with the fate of psychotherapy. That fate, he believed, lay in securing membership of German Jewish psychotherapists from the Nazis. Jung, according to Samuels, was ultimately anti-Semitic, however, because he did not account for economic and social factors when generalizing about racial character.

J. J. Clarke characterized Jung as skeptical of the Nazi takeover in Germany and said that Jung's sparse comments on politics were not significant to his alleged Nazism. Further, Clarke claimed, if Jung had had Nazi sympathies, he missed the perfect opportunity to share them with an admiring and attentive audience while President of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy.

Anelia Jaffe, Jung's personal secretary, does not believe Jung was a Nazi sympathizer or anti-Semitic. She

---


67 Ibid, 185.

claimed, however, that his comments on Jewish psychology were poorly timed because they were made at a time when mentioning any difference between Jews and other groups was fuel for fanaticism. Another advocate of Jung's poor timing is Gerhard Wehr. Wehr noted that Jung admitted to having erred in making the racial comments at such a sensitive time. Volodymyr Walter Odajnyk also agreed with the charge of poor timing leveled against Jung but added that poor timing did not make Jung an anti-Semite.

Jung's alleged Nazism cannot be supported from the above evidence. The closest he came to cooperation with the Nazis was in making Göring co-editor for the Zentralblatt, and this move, Jung claimed, was so no material would be printed which might cause trouble inside Germany. Otherwise, his actions and statements while president of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy indicate a strong sense of political independence. His efforts to keep meetings free of subjects likely to arouse political reaction among the Nazis show both foresight and prudence.

Jung's anti-Semitism is more complicated problem. He claimed to base his theories of racial psychology on his

---

69 Jaffé, *From the Life and Work of C. G. Jung*, 96.


71 Odajnyk, *Jung and Politics*, 107.
"experiences." Moreover, he claimed that the differences which existed between Aryans and Jews are not binding on all Jews. Jung's statements, therefore, generalize, not about an entire people, but only certain members. Because he did not refer to all Jews, Jung cannot be accused of being anti-Semitic without some qualification. Jung's understanding of the term average underwent change following the war. His discarding of the term "average" as meaningful was significant because it reveals how Jung's thought is most vulnerable. The criticism that Jung's thought is speculative and un-systematic is a cliché among his detractors. His theories on Jewish psychology, after all, are based on anecdotal instances. Such as it is, Jung's technique parallels stereotyping -- forming a composite from isolated instances. Jung attempted to give definition to those differences which exist between racial, national, cultural, and religious groupings in an effort to create an alternative psychological theory. There is no doubt, however, that his misunderstanding of race and the Jewish people contributed significantly to the charge of anti-Semitism.

The issues raised regarding Jung's Nazism mimic very closely the issues raised in the following investigation of Martin Heidegger. Husserel parallels the position Freud occupied in Jung's career. Many believe, as with Freud and Jung, that Husserl and Heidegger had a mentor/disciple
relationship and, subsequently, that Heidegger's work represents a development Husserl's phenomenology. Additionally, both Jung and Heidegger, allegedly because of anti-Semitism, broke contact with their former mentors.
CHAPTER III

MARTIN HEIDEGGER, NATIONAL SOCIALISM, AND
A PHILOSOPHY OF BEING

Martin Heidegger's involvement with National Socialism has been written on extensively. Many scholars attempted revisionary interpretations of his philosophy following his Nazi involvement. Because Heidegger's support for the Nazis is a matter of fact, the debate is primarily philosophical. The following chapter examines some of the major areas of Heidegger's philosophy as it may have pertained to his Nazi involvement. Charges of anti-Semitism will also be explored for their possible relevance to his Nazi support.

Heidegger was born on 26 September 1889 in Messkirch. At the age of seventeen he first grappled with a problem which had been called insoluble and would concern him for the rest of his life -- Being. A pastor at the Trinity Church in Constance gave young Heidegger the dissertation of a Franz Brentano entitled On the Manifold Meaning of Being According to Aristotle. This work also introduced Heidegger to the problem of translation. The difficulty of the dissertation seemed to be exacerbated because "German words from recent times [were] trying to translate Latin words from a bygone age that were trying to translate Greek words
from antiquity."¹ After four semesters at Freiburg University and further exposure to philosophy, Heidegger made philosophy his major field of study.

Husserl is often considered to be Heidegger's mentor. In 1916 Husserl received the chair in philosophy at the University of Freiburg, bringing him into contact with Heidegger, who by that time had served in World War I and been admitted to the university as a Privatdozent.² Although the father of phenomenology's influence was strong, Heidegger had completed his dissertation before ever meeting Husserl. In 1919, not long after their personal and philosophical relationship had begun, Heidegger began enumerating his differences with Husserl's phenomenology.

From 1923 to 1928 Heidegger served as an associate professor at Marburg University. The most fruitful years of his entire teaching career were spent there. In the winter semester of 1925-26 the faculty nominated him for the chair of philosophy at Marburg. His appointment was held up by the ministry of culture in Berlin because Heidegger had not published a book in the past decade. He immediately submitted a manuscript for publication but it was returned by the ministry marked "Inadequate."³ Through Husserl in

²A Privatdozent is a non-salaried university lecturer.
³Krell, Basic Writings, 17.
Freiburg, however, the manuscript, yet unfinished and bearing the title Sein und Zeit (Being and Time) was published in February of 1927. The ministry subsequently withdrew its disapproval and Heidegger assumed the chair at Marburg.  

Heidegger moved from Marburg to Freiburg in 1929, and he assumed the Rectorship of the University of Freiburg on 23 April 1933 three months after Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. As rector Heidegger, and many German academics, supported Hitler and the Nazi party in their call for a German "resurgence." Heidegger held the rectorship for less than one year. Additionally, his contact with Husserl, who was Jewish, dropped dramatically during his term as rector. Because of the nature of his relationship with Husserl and other statements regarding Jews, Heidegger has been criticized for harboring anti-Semitic beliefs. Heidegger's relationship to the Nazi party, and his support of it, will be examined presently. Immediately following will be an examination of the charges of anti-Semitism and Heidegger's own explanation of his Nazi involvement.

Being and Time represented a major challenge to the history of Western philosophy. Heidegger's goal in this treatise was to explore the nature of Being. He claimed that the history of philosophy had focused exclusively on beings to the neglect of Being in general. This element of

Heidegger's work is called the ontological. Heidegger claimed that Dasein (human being), because its own being is an issue for itself, offered privileged access to understanding Being in general, and he sought this meaning through Dasein's various modalities such as Being-in-the-world, Being-as-such, and Being-with-others. Division two of Being and Time explores temporality aimed at a more refined understanding of Dasein. Modes of Dasein with a specifically temporal element, such as death and guilt, are examined.

Following his stay at Marburg, Heidegger returned to Freiburg to fill the chair of philosophy Husserl had vacated. Upon his return in July 1929 Heidegger gave his inaugural lecture to the combined faculties in which he stressed key issues in his recently published Being and Time. The lecture also established how Heidegger perceived the current state of the German University. This lecture was later published under the name What Is Metaphysics?.

Heidegger used what became his trademark approach in this metaphysical lecture. He did not discuss metaphysics as such but, rather, attempted to discover the essence of metaphysics by asking a metaphysical question. He asked: "What happens to us, essentially, in the grounds of our existence, when science becomes our passion?"\(^5\) In what

followed, Heidegger described the way scientific fields lack unity and how only the technical organization of the university faculties consolidated this burgeoning multiplicity of disciplines. His concern about the internal unity of the university anticipates Heidegger's attitude as rector under the Nazis.

Each discipline, he claimed, had its peculiar specifications, but science was unique in that it gave itself the first and last word - it resonated between theory and practice. Science, Heidegger noted, lacked a code of ethics. It did not ask its researchers and practitioners to accept accountability for their actions as, for example, the profession of medicine does. Science also wished only to concern itself with beings, and it wished to know nothing about the nothing. The ultimate question, Heidegger concludes, which metaphysics begs be asked, is: "Why there are beings at all, and why not rather nothing?"

Heidegger was elected rector by the combined faculties of Freiburg University on 21 April 1933. Heinrich Wiegand Petzet, friend and student of Heidegger, recalled that Heidegger accepted the rectorship only at the repeated suggestion of Professor of Anatomy von Möllendorf and other colleagues. Petzet recalled also that Heidegger would

6Ibid., 112.

7Heinrich Wiegand Petzet, Encounters and Dialogues with Martin Heidegger: 1929-1976, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly, with an Introduction by Parvis Emad (Chicago:
personally have preferred to avoid all administrative responsibilities of the rectorship so that he might devote his life exclusively to his work.

Heidegger's most commonly cited piece from his rectorship period was his Rectorial Address given to the faculty and students on 27 May 1933. The speech, entitled "Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität" (The Self-Assertion of the German University), asked both students and teachers to aid in the realization of the self-assertion of the German University. This assertion was to be realized by means of a common will toward the university's essence. Heidegger claimed that the will toward the essence of the German university was identical to the will toward science and the historical spiritual mission of the German people who identify themselves with their state.  

Reiterating the notions of his inaugural lecture of 1929 "What is Metaphysics?," Heidegger again described the departmentalization within the modern university. He emphasized the need for science to once again unite with its

---

University of Chicago Press, 1993), 30. The assertion that he would rather take up his work than deal with administrative responsibilities was made in a letter to Petzet's father. Heinrich Petzet does not cite the letter, but he indicates that it was in late 1932 that Heidegger wrote it.

Greek foundations of questioning, an act once valued in itself but one which had become merely a preliminary step on the way to knowing. Heidegger also emphasized the importance of "labor service," "military service," and "knowledge service" and claimed that these types of service should be realized by subscribing to the new Student Law.

Passed on 1 May 1933, as part of a larger effort to integrate the universities into the National Socialist state, the Student Law sought to organize students according to the **Führerprinzip**. Heidegger called participation with this law the highest freedom. According to Heidegger, this freedom was distinct, and opposite from, the arbitrariness and lack of concern characteristic of what academic freedom had formerly meant. Heidegger believed that this Student Law could "tear[s] down departmental barriers and overcome[s] the staleness and falseness of superficial professional training." Knowledge, Heidegger claimed, "does not serve the professions but the reverse: the professions effect and administer that highest and essential knowledge of the people concerning its entire existence."

In a subsequent speech given on 30 June 1933, Heidegger spoke again of a joint effort between students and teachers

---
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in deciding upon the fundamental questions of Wissenschaft. From a teaching based on such an understanding of the essential, Heidegger believed true research would emerge - one interlocked with the Volk and its bond to the state. Heidegger predicted, however, that the battle for the institutions where Germany’s leaders were educated would continue for a long time.

Heidegger's concern over the fate of the German university continued throughout his rectorship. He differed, however, with the Nazis over their newly proposed constitution for the university. In a letter of 30 August 1933 written to a Jewish friend, Elisabeth Blochmann, Heidegger complained that the new constitution being debated by rectors and deans could be disastrous. Heidegger saw in the new constitution major differences from his own philosophical program for a spiritual renewal and self-assertion of the university. Rather than being conducive to an education of the educators, Heidegger believed the

---


university reform act, with its increased organization, was potentially stifling.\textsuperscript{15}

That Heidegger had faith in Hitler as the proper leader of Germany's resurgence is evident in an article he wrote favoring Hitler's withdrawal from the League of Nations. Hitler actively sought support from all sides ex post facto for the withdrawal, and in an appeal published in the \textit{Freiburger Studentenzeitung} entitled "German Men and Women," Heidegger sought support for Hitler's move.\textsuperscript{16} In his appeal, Heidegger claimed there could be no separation between foreign and domestic policies and that there was only one unified will toward the full existence of the state awakened by the Führer.

Heidegger's post as rector lasted only ten months. He resigned, of his own accord, disenchanted with the Nazi party. After resigning the rectorate, he could, however, still be considered for an important party office. Heidegger also participated in the Academy of German Law and in the \textit{Deutsche Hochschule für Politik} with a list of lecturers which included the party's chief ideologue Alfred Rosenberg.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{16}Martin Heidegger, "German Men and Women!," in \textit{The Heidegger Controversy}, 48-9.

\textsuperscript{17}Neske, \textit{Martin Heidegger and National Socialism}, xiii.
Heidegger's thought experienced a turn from the publication of "What is Metaphysics" in 1929 to "The Origin of the Work of Art" in 1935. This phase consisted in an emphasis away from a Dasein-centered philosophy of existence to an independent theory of a history of Being. During this period, Heidegger began hyphenating Da-sein to emphasize the "there" of Being, and he revised his views on Nietzsche as well.\textsuperscript{18}

From 1936 through 1941, in four lecture courses and at least six lecture essays, Heidegger attempted to place Nietzsche within the context of the history of Being. Though many contemporary thinkers bemoaned the decline in European values, Nietzsche claimed that it was not a decline of these traditional values per se which prompted nihilism, but their decline was due rather to the essentially nihilistic character of these values. According to Nietzsche, the life-denying character of the traditional Platonic/Christian metaphysical view of the world provided the recipe for this decline.\textsuperscript{19}

Nietzsche claimed that by virtue of insight into the afflictions of European modernity, he was able to prophesy the self-overcoming of a European nihilism with notions of eternal-recurrence, superman, and will to power. Nietzsche


\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., 133.
conceived of these notions as post-metaphysical, but Heidegger ultimately concluded that Nietzsche was the last metaphysician who merely supplanted a supersensuous metaphysical truth with an equally metaphysical sensuous truth. Heidegger believed that all previous metaphysics, including Nietzsche's, was unable to appreciate the onto-ontological difference of Being and beings.\(^{20}\)

In "Overcoming Metaphysics," a series of notes contemporaneous with his Nietzschean period, Heidegger also revised his views of Ernst Jünger whom he had previously viewed favorably.\(^{21}\) Having formerly believed that Junger's Arbeiterwelt (society of workers) was a positive alternative to bourgeois everydayness, Heidegger revised his earlier position and viewed the Arbeiterwelt to be the creation of a defunct metaphysics. Despite his changed view of Jünger, the concept of work remained key in Heidegger's transition phase as an ideal mediating agency between the transcendence of Sein (Being) and the immanence of Dasein (Human being).\(^{22}\)

This philosophical turn in Heidegger's thought is significant because it was during this change that he assumed, and stepped down from, the rectorship. In an effort to explain philosophically Heidegger's actions, the

\(^{20}\)Ibid., 134-5.


\(^{22}\)Ibid., 132.
significance of this turn cannot be underestimated. If, because of this philosophical turn, Heidegger's views changed on National Socialism and its goals, then, by inference, one can better understand his motivations for accepting the rectorship in the first place.

In the spring of 1945 Heidegger and the rest of the philosophy department at Freiburg University had taken to the hills of the Black Forest east of the city. In the village of Wildenstein they taught their courses to the remaining students and awaited the inevitable. When Heidegger returned, the French occupation forces were threatening to confiscate his house, give away his library, and insisted on setting up an internal de-Nazification committee to investigate his conduct.

In September 1945 the committee issued its report. Four charges were made. Heidegger 1) had an important position in the Nazi regime; 2) changed the structure of the university by introducing the Führer principle; 3) engaged in Nazi propaganda; and 4) incited students against allegedly reactionary professors. The report stated that Heidegger's speaking of labor, military, and knowledge-service provided the Nazis with the means to exploit his speech for political ends. Additionally, the Commission found that Heidegger's association with the National Socialist movement aided in legitimizing the movement in the eyes of educated Germans.
Debate over the report stretched into 1946, and in March 1946 Heidegger was admitted to a sanatorium after suffering a nervous breakdown. The long and complicated de-Nazification hearings ended in March 1949 with the State Commission for Political Purification concluding that Heidegger was a "fellow traveler" of the Nazis and he was prohibited from teaching. After the university and especially its philosophy department defended him, Heidegger was allowed to teach again in 1951.23

On 4 November 1945 Heidegger wrote to the Rector of Freiburg University requesting emeritus status. In the letter Heidegger gave his own account of the Rectorship in the years 1933 and 1934, his entry into the party, and his relation to the party after 1933. The account he gives of these events is essentially the same as that given in "The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts" and in his interview with Der Spiegel entitled "Only a God Can Save Us."24 Heidegger's account of his Nazi involvement in "The Rectorate 1933/34" is covered below.

Though Heidegger had a personal and philosophical relationship with Husserl, Heidegger's work did not represent a continuation of Husserl's phenomenology. When

---


Husserl arrived in Freiburg in 1916, Heidegger had already completed his education under Heinrich Rickert.\textsuperscript{25} Significantly, Heidegger and Husserl differed in their views on phenomenology. Husserl's phenomenology focused on "the things themselves," which sought to attain a vision of consciousness uncontaminated by interpretation, science, common sense, religion, etc. Heidegger's phenomenology was interpretive, and he sought to understand phenomenology through investigation of phenomenological questions.\textsuperscript{26} The main idea Heidegger took from Husserl's method of phenomenological "seeing" was in its relation to the Aristotelian or Greek problem of being, i.e. "being in the sense of the true."\textsuperscript{27} When Husserl was asked in 1922 to write an article on Phenomenology for the 13th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, he consulted Heidegger on the writing of the article. The final copy that appeared in the Encyclopaedia, however, included none of Heidegger's suggestions.\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{26}Martin Heidegger, \textit{The Basic Problems of Phenomenology}, trans. Albert Hofstadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 1.

\textsuperscript{27}Krell, \textit{Basic Writings}, 13.

\textsuperscript{28}Spiegelberg, \textit{The Phenomenological Movement}, 279-81.
Heidegger broke off contact with Husserl following the change in government. Like other "Germans who owed their position to a German Jew," Heidegger stopped all personal contact and dropped the dedication of Being and Time to Husserl. Disputes over whether Heidegger's lack of contact with Husserl was a result of anti-Semitism or a lack of civil courage continue.

Added to the charges of anti-Semitism is Heidegger's letter of support for a colleague Eduard Baumgarten. In this letter of 2 October 1933 Heidegger claimed that "at stake is nothing less than the urgent awareness that we stand before a choice: once again to provide our German spiritual life with genuine, indigenous manpower and educators, or to deliver it over definitively ... to increasing Judification." Two months later, however, Heidegger and Baumgarten had a falling out. Heidegger wrote another letter to the head of the National Socialist professor's organization, but this time he made negative

---
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remarks about Baumgarten's political unreliability and his associations with the Jew Eduard Frankel.\footnote{Farías, Heidegger and Nazism, 234.}

Heidegger revealed further concern over the composition of the department of medicine. Max Müller, who studied with Heidegger after 1928 at the University of Freiburg, noted that Heidegger expressed concern over the shift from two Jewish doctors to only two non-Jewish doctors within the internal medicine department.\footnote{Max Müller, "Martin Heidegger: A Philosopher and Politics: A Conversation," 186-7.}

On 3 November 1933 Heidegger gave a speech in which he called upon German students to use their knowledge for the strengthening of the entire Volk itself. He asked students not to "pervert the knowledge you have struggled for into a vain, selfish possession. Preserve it as the necessary primal possession of the leader in the völkisch professions of the State."\footnote{Martin Heidegger, "German Students," in The Heidegger Controversy, 46. Heidegger's use of the term völkisch is discussed below.} In this same speech Heidegger claimed that the Führer alone was the present and future German reality and its law. It sports the salutation "Heil Hitler!"\footnote{Ibid.}

In 1936 Karl Löwith, a former Heidegger student, visited with Heidegger in Rome. Their conversation, in part, consisted of discussing Heidegger's political
remark: "Hundreds of thousands die en masse. Do they die? They perish. They are cut down. Do they die? They become items of the material available for the manufacture of corpses. Do they die? Hardly noticed, they are liquidated in extermination camps."³⁹

Over the years key writings and personal accounts have accumulated on Heidegger's Nazi involvement. Those accounts will be examined below in an effort to reveal Heidegger's motivations for accepting the rectorship and his reasons for resigning.

Karl Löwith recalled how Heidegger claimed in 1936 that the concept of historicity was the basis for his political engagement with the Nazis and that he believed National Socialism was the correct path for Germany.⁴⁰ Heidegger seemed concerned, however, that "vital energies" would be compromised through "excessive organization."⁴¹ Additionally, Heidegger was bitter with resentment over the fact that he had been alone in his support without the aid of other "intellegensia."⁴²

"The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts" Heidegger wrote in 1945 following the collapse of the National

³⁹Ibid., xxix.

⁴⁰Karl Löwith, "Last Meeting with Heidegger," in Martin Heidegger and National Socialism, 158.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid., 159.
involvement. Löwith asked how Heidegger could sit at the same table as the rabidly anti-Semitic Julius Streicher at the Academy for German Law.\textsuperscript{36} Heidegger's reply was that he disliked Streicher and could not understand why Hitler tolerated him. Heidegger also referred to Streicher's publication, \textit{Der Stürmer}, as being nothing but pornography.\textsuperscript{37}

On the occasion of the second lecture to the Club of Bremen on 1 December 1949 under the title "Das Gestell" ("The Enframing") Heidegger made a controversial remark. This lecture was later revised, enlarged, and published later under the title "The Question Concerning Technology." The remark which Heidegger made in the original version appeared as follows: "Agriculture is now a motorized food industry: in its essence it is the same thing as the manufacture of corpses in gas chambers, the same thing as blockades and the reduction of a region to hunger, the same as the manufacture of hydrogen bombs."\textsuperscript{38} The revised edition does not include mention of the gas chambers.

In another lecture to the Bremen Club entitled "The Danger," which remains unpublished, Heidegger made a similar

\textsuperscript{36} Karl Löwith, "Last Meeting with Heidegger," in \textit{Martin Heidegger and National Socialism}, 158. Julius Streicher was a Nazi and founder and editor of the anti-Semitic periodical \textit{Der Stürmer}.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 159.

\textsuperscript{38} Heidegger, "Das Gestell," quoted in \textit{Martin Heidegger and National Socialism}, xxx.
Socialist Regime. He later gave the handwritten manuscript to his son Hermann Heidegger with the request that it be published at the proper time. In this account, Heidegger claimed that his acceptance of the Rectorship was motivated by a desire to reorganize the university's loose confederacy of sciences as described in "What is Metaphysics." He admitted to being reticent because of the prevalence of a then new political science which, he claimed, was based on a falsification of the essence of truth. Heidegger was also skeptical of the tendencies of professors to remain within their own departments and to reject any attempt to unite the university. Despite his reticence, Heidegger claimed to have accepted the rectorship because he saw in National Socialism a renewal of the people toward the discovery of its own historical Western purpose, and he hoped the university would participate in this purpose. Additionally, he hoped to lead those capable of this renewal, regardless of party membership, and he emphasized the positive aspects of the movement. Heidegger claimed that he never intended to blindly put party doctrines into effect.

Indeed, Heidegger portrays himself in "The Rectorate" as maintaining his own political autonomy. He claimed that

---
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he did not seek, nor was sought out for, political advice, and he did not maintain political relations to Party functionaries in any other way.\textsuperscript{46} Heidegger also described how Minister of Education Otto Wacker, after hearing the "Rectorial Address," told Heidegger that it sounded as if he subscribed to his own private National Socialism. Additionally, Wacker found Heidegger's rejection of political science unacceptable.\textsuperscript{47}

"The Rectorate" also explained some terms which, Heidegger believed, needed elaboration. He first explained that the idea of military service, as it was discussed in the "Rectorial Address," should not be interpreted as militaristic or aggressive but defensively.\textsuperscript{48} Secondly, the idea of battle, Heidegger explained, was derived from Heraclitan fragment 53. The word πόλεμος begins the fragment, but its meaning is not war but strife. This strife is of the type which comes about through confrontation with the essential. This type of confrontation within the sciences, Heidegger explained, was the way he imagined the university would realize its essential ground and self-assertion.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., 23.
\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., 20.
\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., 21-2.
"The Rectorate" also describes events of his rectorship as taking place in a confused atmosphere of diverse groups with political power, in which Heidegger found no opportunities to cultivate those efforts which inspired him to assume the rectorship in the first place. He noted that on the second day of his rectorship, he prohibited the posting of anti-Jewish posters which were part of a campaign to stop any un-German spirit. Heidegger also recalled how he was notified by Dr. Baumann of the SA Office of Higher Education that the notice must be posted or else he would face removal from his position as rector or even the closing of the university.\(^{50}\)

Heidegger claimed that although he accepted party membership with the understanding that he would be free from party activity, circumstances forced him to do otherwise. Upon learning of a plan to replace department deans with loyal party members, Heidegger claimed to have felt it necessary to act in such a way as to forestall any threat to the autonomy of the university. When, however, the notion of race became prevalent in teacher training, Heidegger began to feel helpless in stopping the interference of the Nazi party.\(^{51}\) Heidegger claimed to have resigned following his refusal to comply with Ministerial Counselor Fehrle's

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 23.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 25-6.
request that Heidegger replace the dean of medicine and dean of law because of their political unreliability.⁵²

Privately, Heidegger made at least one apology for his Nazi involvement, but publicly he was silent. In a letter of 8 April 1950 to Karl Jaspers, Heidegger admitted to having a personal shame which grew from having been involved with National Socialism.⁵³

An Introduction to Metaphysics appeared in Germany in 1953, and it purports to be the fully reworked text of a lecture of the same title given at the University of Freiburg in Breisgau in the summer of 1935. In the preface to the 1953 German Edition, Heidegger claimed to have published the new edition without change to the content. He states that he only broke up long sentences, remedied oversights, etc., for the sake of readability.⁵⁴ At one point, Heidegger wrote:

The works that are being peddled about nowadays as the philosophy of National Socialism but have nothing whatever to do with the inner truth and greatness of this movement (namely the encounter between global technology and modern man) - have all

⁵²Ibid., 28.

⁵³Walter Biemel and Hans Saner eds., Martin Heidegger-Karl Jaspers Briefwechsel, 1920-1963 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann/Piper, 1990), 201.

been written by men fishing in the troubled waters of 'values' and 'totalities.'

On 23 September 1966 Heidegger participated in an interview with the German magazine Der Spiegel. Georg Wolff and the editor of Der Spiegel, Rudolf Augstein, conducted the interview. Heidegger expressed that he wished for the interview to be published after his death. The reason, he claimed, was neither pride nor stubbornness but his wish to remain focused on his work. The substance of the interview is essentially in accord with his account given in "The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts," and was entitled "Only a God Can Save Us." The article first appeared in Germany in Der Spiegel on 31 May 1976.

He affirmed again in the 1966 Der Spiegel interview that the above parenthetical remarks above were in the original manuscript, although they were not read at the time. Heidegger claimed that the parenthetical remarks reflected a negative interpretation of National Socialism. In his letter of 24 September 1953 to the editor of Die Zeit, Heidegger claimed to be in agreement with Christian Lewalter's interpretation of the parenthetical remark as

---
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meaning a symptom of a general decline of metaphysics. Both Otto Pöggler and the editors of Heidegger's Gesamtausgabe believe, however, that the remark was in fact added later. In December 1987 Rainer Marten, a former Heidegger intimate, explained that he inserted the remark as a compromise after refusing the advice of his editorial staff to strike entirely the reference which referred to "the inner truth and greatness of National Socialism." The manuscript page in question is now missing.

Heidegger also made a negative remark about democracy in this interview. He remarked that in light of the demands technology places it was hard to imagine how any political system could be assigned to today's technological age at all. He claimed that democracy had not convinced him it was the answer.

Exactly three years later Heidegger agreed to another interview. The interview was televised and took place on 24 September 1969 between Heidegger and Richard Wisser. One week prior to the taping the two men met to discuss the substance of the interview. Heidegger stated that, despite Wisser's desires, he would not answer questions about his 1933/34 rectorship. Heidegger said that he had responded to

58Martin Heidegger, "Letter to the Editor" in The Heidegger Controversy, 187.

59Wolin, The Heidegger Controversy, 188.

60Ibid., 54.
these questions in an interview with Der Spiegel, and his responses would be revealed in due time. He did, however, discuss his remarks from What is Metaphysics? on the structure of the university which, he claimed, influenced his decision to accept the rectorship.\textsuperscript{61}

Apart from the above formal responses Heidegger made about his involvement with National Socialism, he never publicly apologized for this involvement. Heidegger’s silence has been the source of much criticism. With the publication of Poetry, Language, Thought in 1971, Heidegger, some have claimed, put forth a veiled apology. In a collection of poems entitled "The Thinker as Poet," Heidegger concludes with the following lines: "[p]atience nurtures magnanimity; He who thinks greatly must err greatly."\textsuperscript{62} Heidegger died on 26 May 1976 in Freiburg.

Much has been written on Heidegger’s involvement with National Socialism. The debate consists more of philosophy than it does of history even at this point. Emil Kettering, one of the editors of Martin Heidegger and National Socialism: Questions and Answers, raised this very point. He said: "It is hoped that the publication of further original Heideggarian documents from this time, particularly

\textsuperscript{61}Martin Heidegger and Richard Wisser, "Martin Heidegger in Conversation with Richard Wisser," in Martin Heidegger and National Socialism, 93.

his correspondence, will provide new information. It seems to me that more of a sense of history is desirable." Some of the more important writings, a few by former Heidegger students and friends, will be discussed presently.

Heinrich Petzet recalled how Heidegger, immediately following his resignation, described assuming the rectorship as the greatest stupidity of his life. Petzet also noted that Heidegger's failure to attend Husserl's funeral was an error Heidegger always regretted, and anti-Semitism, Petzet added, was not the reason Heidegger did not attend. Petzet claimed that Heidegger did not attend because at the time of Husserl's death in 1938, Heidegger was one of those who was looked upon with suspicion by the Nazis. Petzet also explained Heidegger's use of the term volkisch in his political speeches as consistent with the general sense it had for Johann Gottlieb Fichte and not the Nazi sense.

Many of Heidegger's defenders speak of the need for a greater sense of historical perspective. A former student of Heidegger's, Georg Picht, wrote in 1977:

---
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66Petzet, Encounters and Dialogues, 33-4. The word volkisch was a word which was used before, during, and after the Nazis rose to power, but the word underwent a transformation during the National Socialist period. The Nazi meaning carried with it a racial connotation.
The year 1933 has receded as far away from us as the Middle Ages. Today it appears to us as the first year of a regime on which our verdict has been settled. This perspective, which can only be granted retrospectively, is also imposed on its beginning. It is forgotten that no one could have known then what era had just begun. Much of what happened was horrifying... But what National Socialism was and what it became only started to become apparent after the Röhm putsch and was only clear in 1938."\textsuperscript{67}

In like manner, Hans-Georg Gadamer, perhaps Heidegger's most famous student, called National Socialism a corrupted revolution, not the great renewal of spiritual and moral strength of the people for which Heidegger hoped.\textsuperscript{68}

Another interview of 9 October 1987 with another former Heidegger student, Hans Jonas, was broadcast in Switzerland.\textsuperscript{69} Jonas linked Heidegger's thought on authenticity and resolve to his political engagement. He claimed, however, that Heidegger, though political in a nationalistic sense, developed his ideas independent of the political reality. Heidegger and the new Reich, Jonas claimed, both sought a new beginning.

Parvis Emad noted how the minister of culture demanded that all rectors became party members. Without being a
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\textsuperscript{69}Hans Jonas, "Heidegger's Resoluteness and Resolve," in Martin Heidegger and National Socialism, 202-3.
member of the party, Emad claimed, Heidegger could not have stopped book burnings, hanging of anti-Jewish posters, etc. Heidegger knew these activities were forthcoming, and he stopped them upon becoming a party member. Emad noted also that a deadline for becoming a member of the party added impetus and perhaps haste to Heidegger's decision.\textsuperscript{70}

The former Heidegger student Max Müller gave an interview on 1 May 1985 discussing his impression of Heidegger's political involvement.\textsuperscript{71} The significance of this interview is the suggestion of Heidegger's continued commitment to National Socialism after 1934.

Müller recalled how Heidegger, in the late 1920s, was fond of the conservative revolutionary Ernst Jünger because he so effectively combined romanticism and technicism.\textsuperscript{72} Jünger argued that a totalitarian \textit{Arbeitergesellschaft} (society of workers) could surmount the incapacitating fragmentations and divisions of a liberal political system. The political element present in Heidegger's seminars of 1928 and 1929, Müller claimed, could only be described as national or völkisch, though they were not connected with any specific political movement.


\textsuperscript{71}Max Müller, \textit{Martin Heidegger: A Philosopher and Politics}, in \textit{Martin Heidegger and National Socialism}, 175-95.
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Müller claimed that though Heidegger was never personally spiteful to a Jew, he lacked civil courage. Although Heidegger's removal of the dedication to Husserl in *Being and Time* was probably necessary for the work's publication, Müller claimed that Heidegger's lack of contact with his mentor after 1933 showed his lack of civil courage.\(^73\)

Richard Wolin agreed that Heidegger saw National Socialism as the genuine embodiment of Ernst Jünger's *Arbeitergesellschaft*.\(^74\) Wolin also claimed that Heidegger's thought, politically interpreted, relies significantly upon the categories of resolve and decisiveness. The resolve which characterizes authentic Dasein, Wolin believes, is the counterpart to the irresolution of inauthentic existence which Heidegger refers to as "They."\(^75\)

Wolin claimed that Heidegger's notion of an a priori division between the authentic and inauthentic forms of Dasein reflects an anti-democratic attitude. Moreover, Heidegger's separation essentially condemns members of the inauthentic sphere, because they are not capable of self-rule, to a life of perdition and submission to rule from above. Given Heidegger's belief that when Dasein is

\(^{73}\)Ibid., 186.

\(^{74}\)Wolin, *The Heidegger Controversy*, 121.

resolute it can become the conscience of others, Wolin concludes that it is easy to divine his later political loyalties.\textsuperscript{76}

Wolin's conclusions insist that Heidegger's \textit{Being and Time} be understood in the historical context of the German intellectual community.\textsuperscript{77} Wolin described how as World War I neared there was a politicization of the German academic community along reactionary lines. One of the major factors influencing this political reaction was the increasing threat to the academic community's position of social privilege posed by both the parvenu bourgeoisie and the politically organized working class. These concerns were reflected in the German mandarin intelligentsia and the Prussian social structure. The nationally inclined intelligentsia seemed besieged from all quarters, which led to the belief that culture and democracy were antitheses, the former being elitist and the latter inviting a leveling of values that promoted vulgarity. The intelligentsia responded with a militant assertion of German cultural superiority in response to the perceived political and intellectual threat posed by the Western powers.

Additionally, Wolin claims that one cannot separate Heidegger's thought from his political activities because

\textsuperscript{76}Ibid., 46.

\textsuperscript{77}Ibid., 26-7. This political reaction among intellectuals may help to explain some of Heidegger's skeptical statements about democracy. See below.
Heidegger's philosophy itself effaces the separation of thought and action. Much of Being and Time, Wolin noted, is concerned with the division between theoretical and practical reason and is evidenced by the pragmatic point of departure of its main analytic Dasein. The result is a focus on Being-in-the-world rather than the Cartesian thinking substance. Moreover, the essential existential determinants of human Being-in-the-world, rely on commitment to decisions and actions for fulfillment of the claimed authenticity. An authenticity, according to Wolin, that is merely a potentiality is nonsensical.

Jeffrey Herf described Nazi ideology as a reconciliation between antimodernist, romantic, and irrationalist ideas which were part of German nationalism and the most obvious mean/ends rationality of modern technology. He claims that Heidegger's view of Germany's role as a technological state was different from others in a group he calls reactionary modernists. Heidegger, Herf claimed, was unable to reconcile his contradictory desires and appealed to Germans to save the world from the soulless technology of the Russians and Americans, while refusing...
Germany the technical advances necessary to achieve its cultural mission.\textsuperscript{80}

Heidegger's theory of truth, which is not one of criterion but of essence was responsible for Heidegger's inability to make cogent political decisions. Heidegger wrote: "If one being did not simulate another, we could not make mistakes or act mistakenly in regard to beings; we could not go astray and transgress, and especially could never overreach ourselves.\textsuperscript{81}" Explaining Heidegger's Nazi involvement on the basis that he mistook National Socialism for the truth - and this due to a faulty theory of truth - misses Heidegger's point entirely. Such an interpretation explains no more about Heidegger's support of National Socialism than anyone's erroneous support for National Socialism. Heidegger's theory of how truth overlaps with untruth is not reckless moral relativism. Simply because Heidegger did not focus on criteria for truth does not mean that he did not, nor could not, use them.

The modalities of authentic and inauthentic, as mentioned above, have also suffered criticism. The criticism, however, seems flawed. Heidegger himself was engaged in a political movement which resulted in disaster, but it does not follow that engagement, as such, is

\textsuperscript{80}Ibid., 115.
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questionable. Authentic and inauthentic forms of existence do not, in themselves, carry Nazi connotations.

Wolin claimed that by adding the parenthetical remarks in 1953, Heidegger misrepresented his later, and critical, interpretation of National Socialism - one that emerged from his re-evaluation of Nietzsche of the late 1930s - as a view held in 1935. Heidegger's negative interpretation of Nietzsche was, however, present in 1935. In the paragraph immediately following the one in which the disputed parenthetical remarks were made, Heidegger wrote: "His [Nietzsche's] entanglement in the thicket of the idea of values, his failure to understand its questionable origin, is the reason why Nietzsche did not attain the true center of philosophy."82

Heidegger's alleged anti-Semitism, it seems, was of a different variety than the Nazis. In the letter in which Heidegger expressed concern over the number of Jews holding professorships, his remarks do not suggest murder as a solution. If, however, Heidegger believed that the intellectual honesty of the university was threatened by the existence of a strong Jewish presence, then his understanding of what it means to be Jewish was certainly incorrect.

Heidegger's philosophy perhaps in part accounted for his support of National Socialism, but the connection is not

82 Heidegger, An Introduction to Metaphysics, 199.
in his notions of truth, Dasein, or authenticity. His support for a German resurgence and renewal of the university are clear. Heidegger's short term as rector makes sense in this light; that is, the rectorship itself falls historically into period in which his philosophical "turn" took place. His stepping down from the rectorship appears driven by a frustration at the difficulty of accomplishing what he had originally hoped to accomplish for the university. Additionally, Heidegger might also, given his changing philosophical outlook, have had a growing suspicion that the German cultural renewal which the Nazis promised, sought to revive ideals which he began to suspect were not worthy of reviving.

The following study of Eugen Fischer differs from the above studies of Heidegger and Jung. The difference consists largely in separating the charge of anti-Semitism from the Nazi question. Fischer's race hygiene theories provided the very foundation of his Nazi support. The significance of examining Fischer concludes a trilogy of the soft science of psychology, the liberal arts tradition of philosophy, and the science of anthropology.
CHAPTER IV

EUGEN FISCHER AND RACE HYGIENE IN THE THIRD REICH

Eugen Fischer was born on 5 June 1874 in Karlsruhe. He was a Professor of Anthropology and the first Nazi rector of the University of Berlin.¹ Fischer was a student of the famous Freiburg zoologist August Weismann. His reputation derived from experiments he performed on rats in which their tails were cut off and then bred. Finding that the offspring did not include rats with shorter tails, Weismann's experiment provided the most widely cited refutation of Lamarckian inheritance - the mechanism of inheritance which was widely accepted in the nineteenth century. Weismann's contribution also provided the impetus for the nature versus nurture debate. Race hygienists, discussed below, were particularly receptive of Weismann's views.²

Nazi Germany's focus upon race and improving human stock was a continuation of a growing interest in race within science, history. In 1855 Arthur Comte de Gobineau published his Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races which cast race for the first time as the primary force in

²Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 32.
world history. He claimed that something he called "racial vitality" was the root of all great historical transformations. Greece flourished and Rome fell because of this vitality. Gobineau's work also posits the existence of a fair-haired Aryan race superior to all others. The remains of this race, he claimed, could still be found in various countries in Europe. He described Aryans as a tiny racial aristocracy being crushed by the weight of inferior races. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Gobineau's disciple, published the two-volume, and immensely popular work, The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century. In it he claimed that the German race represented the purest form of Aryanism, and he damned inferior races, Jews and Negroes, as degenerate.

In the last decades of the nineteenth century in Germany, optimistic and pessimistic variations of Social Darwinism were present. The optimistic interpretation emphasized that the competition within society, while often harsh, benefitted society overall. The pessimistic interpretation of Social Darwinism emphasized how social

---


welfare programs and medicine allowed the unfit to not only survive but flourish. Hurt society and drained economies. In Germany, the pessimistic interpretation dominated. ¹

In 1883 the British scientist Francis Galton coined the word eugenics. Galton, cousin of Charles Darwin, focused on the possibilities of evolutionary theory for humans. He predicted that it would be possible to produce a highly gifted race through judicious marriages over several generations.

Although eugenics itself is not necessarily racist, in Nazi Germany the theories of Social Darwinism, eugenics, and race hygiene became fused so strongly that it was impossible to differentiate them. In Germany eugenics took the name Rassenhygiene from Alfred Ploetz's book of the same title, published in 1895. In 1903 Ploetz founded the chief journal in the field - Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie. The goal of the journal was to investigate the principles of optimal conditions for the development and maintenance of race. In an article Galton published in this journal in 1909, he claimed that eugenics and Rassenhygiene were synonymous. ² Although the Nazis turned the important racial hygiene centers toward the conservative, liberal versions of


racial hygiene continued to appear in the medical and popular press.³

Ploetz also established the Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene in 1905 also for the cause of human racial improvement. The Society changed its name in 1907 to the Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene, and in 1909 the Society established a local branch in Freiburg with Eugen Fischer named as chairman.⁴

On 11 January 1911 the Kaiser Wilhelm Society was founded with the aim of being a large research center for the various sciences. Many German scientists argued that in order to be competitive internationally researchers needed to be free from administrative university duties. This administration-free environment, however, did not apply to directors of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute's various departments.⁵

Fischer's approach to anthropology had a scientifically distinctive feature in that he emphasized biological heredity rather than just the measurement of physical characteristics. He relied less on craniometry and other anthropometric methods than on genetics. Fischer was also concerned with the mapping of racial variation in terms of

³Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 20.
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biological characters such as blood groups and inherited diseases.

In 1913 Fischer published a book, Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen, which put him on the map as being the leading anthropologist in Germany. He traced the history of this racial mixing back to approximately 1651 when about 4000 European colonists ventured away from Cape City (Kapstadt) in South Africa. In the colony of South Africa, German wives were in short supply. Further, Fischer claimed, the rugged lifestyle of the cattlemen and hunters wishing to venture into the country required a character which few German women possessed. The result, Fischer claimed, was not surprising - that many Boer men and Hottentot women joined for the sake of survival and had half-blood children.6

He dedicated one section of the book to the concept of race, which, as it will be shown later, played a serious role in Fischer's Nazi involvement. Fischer claimed that anthropological traits, just as in the plant and animal kingdom, follow according to Mendelian rules - that the coloration among Mulattos follow the rules of inheritance. He claimed that this had profound implications for our understanding of morphologically distinguishable groups of

---

In 1917 Fischer emphasized that the specter of racial degeneration was not a product of pessimism but was a binding consequence of naked facts. Prior to 1933 there was a considerable belief in a science and eugenics that was value-free. The Nazi position was critical of a value-free science or academics, and those remaining in ivory towers during a time of political need were criticized.  

Eugenics was not politically accepted immediately in Weimar Germany. In 1918 the Reichstag debated a bill concerning sterilization and abortion which explicitly ruled out eugenic indications for sterilization. The bill was not passed into law, but the debate demonstrated a strong anti-eugenic sentiment. Eugenic demands were no doubt resisted because of conflict with individual rights and Christian ethics, but with the war under way, a declining birthrate assumed increased urgency. Eugenicists as a group had to temporarily put aside their concern for quality and focus on the immediate political concern for quantity.  

By 1919 attitudes had shifted toward looking to medicine to solve the societal ills wrought by the Great War. Cooperation with the field of medicine helped raise support, research, and the teaching of hereditary biology.

---

7 Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 290.

established a Beirat für Rassenhygiene, whose original fifteen members evaluated scientifically the racial impact of the War as part of a government effort toward social reconstruction. The council advised on taxation as a factor in marriage age, emigration and rural settlements, abortion, and the racial biology of the family - bearing witness to the fact that eugenics played a role in social policy prior to Nazi Germany.⁹

Fischer co-authored a work that became the standard text-book for race hygiene. The book, Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene (Teaching of Human Heredity and Race Hygiene), was published in 1923 and went through several editions. Fischer, then a professor of anatomy and Director of the Anatomical Institute at the University of Freiburg-in-Breisgau, wrote the second portion of the first volume entitled "Die Rassenunterschiede des Menschen" (The Racial Differences of Mankind).¹⁰

Fischer introduced the idea of the significance of the differences between the racial groups. He speculated upon whether environment, climate, or social milieu played a role. The science which deals with such matters he called


anthropobiology. Anthropobiology contrasted systematic
anthropology which regarded such racial distinctions
exclusively from the anatomical standpoint - describing them
and measuring them. This concern with hereditarily
transmissible traits, Fischer claimed, required biological
knowledge to provide a foundation for racial hygiene.11

Fischer emphasized the dominance of genetic influence
over environment. He enumerated the differences between
human skulls and anthropoid apes. Despite such differences,
Fischer noted, pithecoid characteristics occasionally
appear in humans for unknown reasons - such appearances were
known as atavism. Many skull characteristics in particular
groups are similar, Fischer claimed, only because all
members of the group have been exposed to identical
determining influences. He added, however, that the racial
background of the individual goes further than environmental
influence in determining the appearance of the skull.12
Fischer compared the cranial measurements of two twenty-
three year old Jewesses who were mono-oval twins and claimed
that the overwhelming similarity of the measurements
testifies to the dominance of genetics over environment. No

11Ibid., 82.

12Ibid., 83-4.
environmental influences, he claimed, could possibly act so perfectly alike upon two individuals.\textsuperscript{13}

Fischer repeated Gobineau's claim that race influenced history. The rise and fall of nations, Fischer claimed, was influenced greatly by "racial endowments." Different races of the world differed as much in mental respects as in the bodily. Fischer cited the North American Indians as an example. They had lived for generations in close proximity to copper deposits but lacked the intelligences to either smelt copper or alloy it with tin to make bronze.\textsuperscript{14}

Fischer believed the Hebrews were the products of the Near Eastern and Oriental races. He described two main branches of Jews: the Sephardim and the Ashkenazim. The differences among the Jews in Europe, he claimed, were the result of the populations among which they live. The Sephardim and the Ashkenazim, Fischer believed, represented different racial mixtures. Though he admitted it was difficult to speak of a single Jewish race, Fischer believed it was nonetheless possible to describe the main racial characters of the Jewish people.\textsuperscript{15}

In reaction to the existence of similar institutes in Sweden, the United States, and England, Germany set out to
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establish a scientific center for anthropology. Eugen Fischer was destined to be director; having been established as the leading anthropologist in the country by his 1913 Rehoboth study which helped establish his anthropobiological school. In August 1926 Fischer spelled out the goals of the new institute in a programmatic article. He described Anthropology as a science dealing with the complex relations between heredity and the environment. Especially interesting to him was the question of the Jewish population living among non-Jews - a question which he believed to be anthropologically beyond all tendentious attitudes. Fischer expressed concern that membership in certain social associations had an impact upon reproductive behavior. Specifically, he feared that the better strata of society reproduced at a lower rate than other strata. The control and direction of human reproduction, by way of ethical persuasion and legislation, Fischer believed, was the overriding task of human culture. To preserve hereditary lines, to study and care for them, was the goal inherent in all such research.¹⁶

In August 1926 Fischer published an article entitled "Tasks of Anthropology, Human Hereditary Theory and Eugenics." He claimed in this article that anthropology had developed two distinct internal tendencies. One side concerned itself with biological aspects while the other

¹⁶Weingart, "German Eugenics," 263-4.
focused on social anthropology. He emphasized how human hereditary theory and anthropology were inseparable and that race involved more than morphology because the influence of the environment had far reaching impact on the development of racial traits. Fischer cited findings of the American anthropologist Franz Boas who claimed that Eastern Jews who immigrated to New York showed a change in cranial form by the second generation. Fischer asserted again the necessity of dealing with the problem of Jews living among non-Jews, despite the attitudes which surround the issue. The overriding task for anthropology, he claimed, was to separately depict those characteristics which were transmitted and those which are influenced by the environment - what he called race biology. Race biology, he claimed, concerned itself not only with individual races but with human beings as a whole. On the subject of race crossing, Fischer claimed that moderate crossing between two suitable races is more advantageous than breeding exclusively within one race.

With race hygiene firmly established among the medical community well before the Nazi rise to power, the establishment of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics, and Eugenics was significant.


18Ibid., 754.
in the institutionalization of Racial Hygiene. In the summer of 1922 the Prussian Council for Racial Hygiene recommended the establishment of a Reich Institute for Human Genetics and Population Science staffed by three physicians and a statistician. The council envisioned the mission of this institute to be in providing knowledge useful in the struggle against the physical and mental degeneration of the German population. Research would include an anthropological survey of the German people; effects of alcohol and venereal disease on the germ plasm; analysis of demographic trends and genealogies; and investigations into the heritability of feeble-mindedness, criminality, nervous disorders, cancer, tuberculosis, and other ailments.\textsuperscript{19}

Fischer was appointed director of the institute from its opening in 1927. He was described as a conservative, and nationalist Catholic who surrounded himself with men of like character, but he was not, at least in the early stages of the institute it seems, particularly in line with orthodox Nazi physicians. When the institute opened, Fischer stressed again that the problems included in rassenkunde (race studies) would be researched on a purely scientific basis without regard for political tendencies.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{19}Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 39.

\textsuperscript{20}Weingart, "German Eugenics," 264.
From 1928 to 1933, Fischer also presided over the German and Berlin Racial Hygiene Societies.\textsuperscript{21}

On 29 January 1929 Fischer delivered a speech to the KWI stating that racial mixing of Nordic with non-Nordic peoples of Europe – Alpine, Dinaric, and Mediterranean – was not only not harmful but was in fact beneficial to the achievements of present-day peoples. Where the Nordic race had remained most pure, he claimed, it brought forth no great cultural achievements.\textsuperscript{22} Fischer described the goal of eugenics as an attempt to gain control over the biological wheel of fortune.\textsuperscript{23}

The Senate of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute apparently sought to counter "dilettante racism."\textsuperscript{24} In 1929 there was a major controversy concerning a subsidy for the Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft (state emergency fund for science) going to Gobineau’s disciple Ludwig Schemann. Many eugenicists regarded Gobineau’s work as nothing more than right wing propaganda, using false theories of Aryan racial purity for anti-Semitic and nationalistic ends. Significantly, Fischer was not among those protesting Gobineau. In a letter of 15 June 1929

\textsuperscript{21}Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 315.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 40.


\textsuperscript{24}Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 312.
Fischer supported the funding of Schemann's research.\textsuperscript{25}

Three years prior, Fischer wrote a letter praising Schemann as a fine researcher with the highest intellectual qualifications.\textsuperscript{26}

Fischer's institute had close links with the university. His appointment was joined with a university chair in anthropology at Freiburg University, and the institute took control of the University's anthropological collection. He also emphasized the importance of his work to public health and judicial proceedings. One service the institute provided was the establishment of paternity.\textsuperscript{27}

That the Nazis found race hygiene appealing is evidenced in an article published by Theobald Lang in the December 1930 edition of \textit{National Socialist Monthly}. He described how perfectly race hygiene dovetailed with Nazi ideology. Lang called National Socialism an "applied biology" with a biological perspective as a major defining feature. National Socialism, he claimed, differed from Marxism in that the latter assumed biological equality and denied the importance of biological differences. National Socialism, however, recognized: that particular


\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., 399.

\textsuperscript{27}Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 313.
individuals, races, and race mixtures had different genetic makeup; that it could not be changed; that the current liberal, Weimar economic order and conception of civilization have a negative selection on future generations and thus threatened the German peoples and the entire world.28

The Prussian State Health Council discussed sterilization legislation in a meeting of July 1932. Open disagreements occurred between Fischer and Nazi delegates. The Nazis asserted their position as the only political party advocating sterilization for medical conditions, and they demanded its extension to racial minorities. While Fischer acknowledged that the Nazi program included many good eugenic measures, he dismissed the NSDAP as being far more recent than the eugenics movement. The meeting revealed the balance of opinion among medical officers, doctors's organizations and other welfare bodies to have also shifted toward sterilization. The Nazis, Fischer claimed, were only one group who reinforced the shift in opinion and were out of step in their anti-Semitism.29

Roughly six months before the Nazis assumed power, a letter to several leading race hygienists made clear the Nazi's intention to utilize this group of scientists in helping the German people quantitatively and qualitatively.


29Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 316.
Fischer personally responded to this letter favorably in principle. He claimed to have followed the activities of the Nazis with great interest and supported most of the party's eugenics program, but Fischer still believed his institute should and would be politically independent. Fischer contributed the definition of eugenics to the *Handworterbuch der Naturwissenschaften* (Dictionary of Natural Science), but he noted regretfully that despite wide acceptance of its principles, implementation of eugenic measures remained mill.

The Nazis seized power on 30 January 1933. On 1 February, as part of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society's Winter Lecture Series at Harnack House, Fischer gave a speech entitled "Racial Crosses and Intellectual Achievement." In the speech Fischer repeated the notion that racial cross breeding produced positive cultural results. Where the Nordic race remained pure he claimed that it produced no great cultural achievements.

The Civil Service Law of 7 April 1933 forced the retirement of those persons in government jobs not of Aryan

---

30Weingart, "German Eugenics," 269.


descent. The law was applied to those institutes that received at least fifty percent of their funding from the government.³³

On 14 July 1933, the same day Hitler outlawed political parties other than the NSDAP, the "Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses" (Act for Averting Descendants Afflicted with Hereditary Disease) was passed. The law sought to cleanse the nation of impure and undesirable elements toward the realization of the Germanic ideal.³⁴ It permitted sterilization of those persons who could confidently expect to transmit serious physical or mental defects to their descendants. Those defects included congenital imbecility, schizophrenia, manic-depressive insanity, hereditary falling sickness (epilepsy), hereditary St. Vitus's dance (Huntington's chorea), hereditary deafness or blindness, serious physical deformities, and chronic alcoholism.

Application for sterilization could be made by either the patient, or, with the approval of the Court of Chancery, by his legal representative, or local public health officer. If the patient was in a hospital, sanitorium, or asylum, the director of the institution could apply. The court entitled the Erbgesundheitsgerichte (Hereditary-Health-Court) heard

³³Macrakis, Surviving the Swastika, 53.
the cases for sterilization.\textsuperscript{35} Fischer’s institute helped carry out the Sterilization Law by providing Gutachten (expert opinions) in cases held before the genetic health courts. Additionally, an increasing number of doctors were taking courses on genetic and racial care at the institute. The education of the medical profession on race policies was mandated by the new government.\textsuperscript{36} The staff of teachers of the classes on race hygiene included Fischer and Fritz Lenz. Fischer, in addition to serving at advisory sessions in ministries and committees was also a member of the Hereditary Health Superior Court.\textsuperscript{37}

On 29 July 1933 Fischer was elected rector of the University of Berlin.\textsuperscript{38} In his inaugural lecture, entitled Der völkische Staat (The Racial State), he praised the Nazis but remained true to his earlier views on the benefits of racial cross-breeding. Fischer predicted a new era coming over Germany under the guidance of National Socialism and was glad the new party understood the importance and necessity of biological population politics. He contrasted the Marxist socialist concern for the sick individual with the National Socialist’s concern for sick genetic lines.


\textsuperscript{36}Macrakis, Surviving the Swastika, 127.

\textsuperscript{37}Macrakis, Surviving the Swastika, 128.

\textsuperscript{38}Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 94.
Fischer also anticipated the end of the welfare state and its protection of "lives not worth living."³⁹ He claimed that the liberal approach to economic questions had falsely juxtaposed the idea of humanity with the idea of parity.⁴⁰ All human traits, Fischer claimed, were primarily influenced by genetics - with environmental factors playing only a minor role. Modern science, he claimed, had destroyed the theory of the equality of man.⁴¹ Despite his speech supporting the Nazis cause, Fischer remained in disfavor with the party for some time to come.⁴²

In 1934 the Nazi government published a pamphlet containing oaths of support for the Nazi party. The list included faculty of universities and high schools. Eugen Fischer was included in this lengthy list of supporters.⁴³

On 3 June 1933 Fischer was replaced by the psychiatrist Ernst Rüdin as head of the Society for Racial Hygiene. This change was part of a broad effort by Nazi authorities to sever links with the more moderate wing of the Weimar eugenics movement and place the more radical faction of race

³⁹Eugen Fischer, Der völkische Staat (Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1933), 5.
⁴⁰Ibid., 9.
⁴¹Ibid., 11-12.
⁴²Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 316.
⁴³Eugen Fischer, Bekenntnis der Professoren und den deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialist Staat (Dresden: Privately printed, 1934), 9-10.
hygienists in positions of influence. Fischer was denounced by Karl Astel and Bruno K. Schultz of the Munich Society for Racial Hygiene, and his name was removed from the list of editors of the Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie.  

A directive from the Prussian Ministry of the Interior followed ordering Fischer to be watched by assistants who were to be exclusively Party members.  

In July 1933, however, thanks to the orders of the Kuratorium - the governing body of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society - Fischer was assigned to a commission which served the Reich regarding race hygiene research. At a later meeting of the Kuratorium on 10 May 1935, Fischer claimed that the National Socialist race and population policies went hand in hand with the work of his institute. He also suggested that Walther Gross, head of the party's Agency for Race Policy, be considered for chairmanship of the Kuratorium owing to the link of heredity with population policy. On 6 May 1936 Fischer thanked Hitler personally for enabling scientists to put their research results into the service of the entire people.

---

44 Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 40.
45 Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 316.
46 Weingart, "German Eugenics," 270-1.
48 Ibid., 273.
In 1938 Fischer's assistant Wolfgang Abel became head of a department for studies on race as part of its extension of heredity as science. The department's task was to expand the knowledge of racial traits. Research was undertaken in different parts of Germany and on Jews. Abel's studies on the Rhineland "bastards" - descendants of German women and African soldiers who came to the Rheinland with the French army - proved useful in race policy. The institute subscribed, but did not actively contribute, to forced sterilizations of the Rheinland bastards. The first incidents of illegal sterilization of Jews took place in connection with this campaign. By 1940 the institute prided itself on contributing at least indirectly to the supposed scientific legitimation of the selection and destruction of Jews.\footnote{Ibid., 276.}

From 1939 foreward, Fischer attacked Jews as a threat to the German Erbgut (hereditary-stability) and began a book on Old Testament Jewry. He made comparisons with racial types found in ghettos and participated in state discussions on the Jewish question and of extermination through forced labor.\footnote{Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics," 317.} A contemporary observer noted Fischer's emotional
reaction to criticism at the 1939 Genetics Congress at Edinburgh.51

Although Fischer directed Germany's most prestigious eugenics institute until his retirement in 1942, he did not become a member of the Nazi party until January 1940. This is perhaps the most compelling indication that Fischer wished to remain above party politics for as long as possible.52 When his application for membership was made in 1940, following the German victory in France, Fischer's acceptance into the party was begrudging rather than enthusiastic. The SS Reichsführer Heinrich Himmler wrote:

Although some doubts certainly still exist, I am convinced that Fischer can be allowed to join the Party. In fact I believe that [his] enrollment is a matter of political necessity, since we can hardly use the talents of [this man] to provide scientific support for our ideology while rejecting [him] as [a] member[s] of the Party.53

Fischer attempted to establish a department for experimental hereditary pathology which ran aground.

51Weingart, "German Eugenics," 275. Weingart does not cite the source or the person who was critical of Fischer and his institute.

52Proctor, Racial Hygiene, 292.

53Müller-Hill, Murderous Science, 79. Party membership did not seem to have been of prime importance in contributing to the formation of Nazi racial policies. Besides Fischer, three other race hygiene scientists entered the party very late: Ernst Rüdin and Fritz Lenz in 1937; Otmar von Verschuer in July 1940.
Although he did not turn away from anthropobiology, he did consider "further research on differential distribution of respective genes in different races" to be critical.\textsuperscript{54} Although Fischer tried to maintain a unity within the race biology which had gained support from Nazi ideology, he recognized growing differentiation within the field.\textsuperscript{55}

In Germany race biology encompassed various disciplines, and the underlying problem with these separate disciplines which were grouped together as race biology, proved problematic in establishing race biology in universities. Scientists tended to return to their original disciplines - race scientists turned back to anthropology; hereditary pathology oriented itself to medicine; psychiatric heredity looked to psychiatry. This return to academic beginnings was a long overdue process delayed by the politicization of a field that had entered the Third Reich with too many loose ends and vague delineations.\textsuperscript{56}

In January of 1941 Fischer, predicting a German defeat, submitted a plan to the Kuratorium which mentioned new tasks for the future in phenogenetics. In the plan he claimed that the study of human heredity had advanced far enough to


\textsuperscript{55}Weingart, German Eugenics, 278.
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accurately describe essential characteristics of normal and pathological appearance of these traits. Fischer expressed hope in being able to offer an approximate idea about the impact of environmental effects on them.\textsuperscript{57}

It is difficult to determine the nature of the experiments and services Fischer's institute provided to the state because documents from the institute were destroyed after World War II.\textsuperscript{58} The most damning connection between the institute for anthropology and Nazi death camps, to be certain, were the experiments of Joseph Mengele. Kristi Macrakis claimed that although none of Fischer's doctors were directly involved with the death camps, his institute probably trained a number of them.\textsuperscript{59}

In 1942 Otmar von Verschuer replaced Eugen Fischer as head of KWI for Anthropology. Verschuer's former graduate student, Josef Mengele, served as his assistant. He supplied the institute with "scientific materials: from Auschwitz where he was the assigned camp physician. Anthropological investigations were carried out on the most diverse racial groups of this concentration camp with permission of Himmler. Because war conditions made it difficult for the institute to procure twin materials for study, Mengele's position at Auschwitz offered direct access

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., 276.
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\textsuperscript{59}Ibid., 129.
to diverse racial groupings. Materials sent to the institute, care of Mengele and his Jewish slave assistant Dr. Miklos Nyszli, included bodies of murdered Gypsies, internal organs of dead children, skeletons of two murdered Jews, and blood samples of twins who Mengle infected with typhus.\textsuperscript{60}

After the war courts did not uniformly convict all persons involved in crimes against humanity who claimed to be simply following orders. Some courts were more forgiving than others. It should be noted that certain persons involved in eugenics or racial hygiene were never questioned about their guilt. Those persons tended to be associated with the theoretical aspect of eugenics or race hygiene. Eugene Fischer, though he retired in 1942, continued to edit various scholarly journals and to lecture on anthropology and other topics.\textsuperscript{61} In 1943 Fischer published a lavishly illustrated book \textit{Das antike Weltjudentum} (World Jewry in Antiquity) which compared old portraits with photographs taken in the ghetto in Lodz.\textsuperscript{62}

Whatever apology Fischer may ever have made about his involvement with race hygiene and National Socialism one might expect to find in his memoirs. Indeed, his memoirs avoid mention of the innocent people who died through the

\textsuperscript{60}Proctor, \textit{Racial Hygiene}, 43-4.

\textsuperscript{61}Ibid., 299.

application of the racial theories he espoused. Brenno Müller-Hill related that although only one of Fischer's students claimed Fischer was an anti-Semite, he was asked to chair an Anti-Jewish Congress in Cracow.\footnote{Ibid., 86. The Congress never went beyond the planning stage.}

Despite the lack of a formal apology in his memoirs, two chapters are revealing. In the first chapter of his memoirs, Fischer described how in 1935 he gave an anthropological expert opinion on the recently disinterred skeleton of Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony and Bavaria from 1129 to 1195 - so called because of his fearlessness and colonization of the whole of northern Germany to the Elbe. A misformation of the hip of the skeleton, Fischer claimed, was caused by a hunting accident.\footnote{Eugen Fischer, Begegnungen Mit Toten (Freiburg, Hands Ferdinand Schulz Verlag, 1959), 14-15.} It was later revealed that Fischer had examined the hip of a female with congenital dislocation of the hip and that Fischer contrived the story for the sake of the legacy of Heinrich der Löwe.\footnote{Müller-Hill, Murderous Science, 113-14. The author interviewed the son of Fritz Lenz in writing Murderous Science, Professor Widukind Lenz, and the revelation about the female hip came out of their discussion of Fischer.}

The final chapter of his memoirs "Der wahre Etrusker" (The True Etruscan) describes Fischer's travels to Tuscany where he made enquiries based on Alfred Rosenberg's suspicions that the Etruscans were related to the Jews and
thereby just as destructive and dangerous as the Jews. Fischer examined Etruscan sculptures and paintings and concluded that the Etruscans were a distinct race unrelated to any other.\textsuperscript{65} He photographed a man who he thought represented the typical Etruscan type and was surprised to learn the man had a Bavarian father. Fischer then awoke suddenly and realized that he had dreamt the encounter. He closed his memoirs with a relief in knowing that "the true Etruscan was an Italian."\textsuperscript{67}

The obvious connections which existed between race hygiene and Nazi ideology present in perfect clarity the notion that science does not, despite the jargon of objectivity, merely view the world as it is. Fischer believed in a typological racial concept as early as 1913 in his \textit{Rehobother} studies - whether conceived of as race or \textit{volk} - having its own natural characteristics which had to be preserved and protected.\textsuperscript{66} The coincidence of the party's ideology with that of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics's emphasis on eugenics as an \textit{applied} science makes it difficult to isolate Nazi pressure.\textsuperscript{69}
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H. J. Muller strongly criticized Fischer's contribution to his textbook *Teaching of Human Heredity and Race Hygiene*. The fact that the Baur-Fischer-Lenz text was the best work on the subject of human heredity, Muller claimed, only emphasized more strongly the need for more scientific methods of reasoning in the field.

"As [Fischer] stray[s] further and further from the fields in which rigorous genetic investigations have been conducted, and venture[s] into psychology, anthropology, history and sociology, Fischer . . . become[s] less and less scientific, and we soon find [him] acting as mouthpiece for the crassest kind of popular prejudice. Throwing overboard [his] previously admitted principle that environment as well as heredity is of immense importance in the development of human characteristics, particularly those of a mental nature, [he] readily accept[s] all the superficially apparent differences between human groups as indicative of corresponding genetic distinctions. Intelligence quotients, which are not known to be strongly influenced by training, serve as [his] courts of highest appeal. In addition, [he] twist[s] the records of history and anthropology so as to favor the preconceptions born of [his] own egotism."\(^7^0\)

The assumption that Jews constitute a separate race dovetailed neatly with the equally unfounded belief in the existence of a Nordic race, assumed to be of the highest

\(^7^0\)H. J. Muller, review of *Human Heredity*, by Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, and Fritz Lenz, *In Birth Control Review* 17[1] (January 1933): 20. Muller was reading the translation of the book originally published in 1923. A comparison of the two editions reveals that nothing substantial was changed in Fischer's chapter from its original publication to its translation.
moral and intellectual qualities. The major problem with pre-World War II eugenics and human genetics arose from the assumption that all racial or social differences are primarily genetic.⁷¹ According to L. C. Dunn, the historical lesson of Germany's misuse of applied genetics pertains not only to its supporters, but also to those who, as teachers, failed to point out true and false science.⁷²

There is, however, reason to believe that Hitler did not believe in the biological basis for regarding Jews as a race. Shortly before his death, Hitler dictated to his closest confidant, M. Bormann:

The Jew is the quintessential outsider. The Jewish race is, more than anything else, a community of the spirit. In addition, they have a sort of relationship with destiny, as a result of the persecutions they have endured for centuries... And it is precisely this trait of not being able to assimilate, which defines the race and must reluctantly be accepted as proof of the superiority of the 'spirit' over flesh...⁷³

If Hitler believed that Jews were not a race, then scientists who thought in biological terms become misguided, but useful, accomplices to murder. That Fischer himself began to doubt notions of racial types is perhaps best


⁷³Quoted in Müller-Hill, Murderous Science, 86.
evidenced by the significance he gave in his memoirs to the story of the Etruscan; the possibility that the Etruscan could actually have a Bavarian father seemed a nagging possibility. Unfortunately, Fischer's conscience provided too little too late. Although he seemed neither a total political or professional opportunist, the authoritative support Fischer provided the Nazis certainly made for a dangerous mixture.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Of the above three intellectuals discussed, Jung's alleged Nazism is certainly the least founded. None of his remarks, spoken or written, reflect anything but a negative opinion of National Socialism. Assuming the presidency of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy demonstrated that Jung possessed a great deal of courage. The society and its journal were based in Germany - the country with the largest number of psychotherapists, thus Jung's efforts toward leading the discipline of psychotherapy as president required some interaction with Germany. His appointment of M. H. Göring as co-editor of the society's journal seem only to demonstrate that Jung wished the contents of the journal not to offend the Nazis. His achievements in making membership possible to all regardless of nationality or race illustrate his efforts to remain apolitical.

The most commonly cited connection between Jung and the Nazis is in his alleged anti-Semitism. His writings and speculations about the Jewish people were certainly made public at a rather sensitive historical moment. The main vulnerability in Jung's generalizations about the Jews were in his effort to establish unity where there need be none. The significance of Jung's anti-Semitism lie more in his
method of establishing theories on Jews than in the specific content of his theories. To be certain, his generalizations on Jewish psychology were often negative, but the anti-Semitism of the Nazis was certainly of a more extreme variety.

Martin Heidegger's support of National Socialism leads to a somewhat different set of questions. The main focus of his political involvement is on attempting to discover a philosophical connection between Heideggarian philosophy and Nazism. There does not seem to be anything in his philosophy of Being with specifically Nazi overtones. As a German and academic, there is quite certainly a broader context within which to view Heidegger's support, i.e. the support of the German academics for the Nazi Party's call to a German "resurgence." Heidegger's support was no doubt genuine, and it also seems clear that he assumed the rectorship in order to help the university in its "self-assertion."

Heidegger's alleged anti-Semitism plays a lesser role in the debate in his National Socialist engagement. Although, there is nothing to suggest that this anti-Semitism was of the variety seen in the Holocaust, Heidegger's remarks on the number of Jews holding professional academic positions are telling. His concern that Jews not continue to dominate academic professions and his preference for "indigenous manpower" reflect
misunderstanding of who precisely the Jews were. Having grown up in Germany and spoken the language sufficed for most Jews in making it their Heimat.\textsuperscript{74}

Eugen Fischer's involvement with the Nazis shows that scientists do not view the world with total objectivity. The German eugenicists had both conservative and liberal factions. Notions of a Nordic and Jewish race were believed readily enough, despite evidence to the contrary which was available even in 1933. Eugenics and race hygiene, by their nature, involve major subjective assumptions. Eugenics takes the existence of "lives not worth living" as fundamental. Because the critical questions "what life?," "how measured?," "in whose judgement?," etc., are left unanswered, there was major opportunity for political abuse.

Fischer's Nazi involvement brings into sharper focus the questions this thesis seeks to answer - how does the involvement of these three intellectuals bear upon all intellectuals. Marvin Hier speaks as one who still fears that many continue to miss the Holocaust's central lesson: "that a civilized society voluntarily turned itself into an evil one; that lawyers and judges lied and cheated; that

\textsuperscript{74}Peter Gay, \textit{Freud, Jews and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 165.
teachers . . . taught their students that even God's "thou shall not kill" didn't apply to society's Untermenschen."

Jung's discipline of psychology continues to this day to suffer from the problems inherent in straddling two methodologies - the empirico-mathematical one of the natural sciences on the one hand and the cultural-understanding of the humanities. Such problems are exacerbated by the status insecurity among social scientists leading them to cultivate "official" methodologies and vocabularies which serve neither inquiry nor articulation but only to enhance an image, particularly in the eyes of those who dispense funds for research. That Jung did not cooperate with the Nazis, especially when he was in the perfect position to do so, represents most convincingly his commitment to humanity, as an intellectual, was strong indeed - questions of his suspect methodology notwithstanding.

Philosophy, many complain, often seems to lack something central as a "guiding light" which serves to instruct its inquiries. Heidegger's thought, though certainly not inherently Nazi it seems, suffers as much as any philosophy from the problems associated with seemingly unguided inquiring. Though Heidegger may have had

---


understanding of the scope of thought on the problem of Being, it seems that many see nothing in his thought which would have prevented such a political involvement. It was Immanuel Kant, one of Heidegger's major influences, who noted that the only thing worth having in itself is a good will because all other talents can be turned to ignoble ends.\textsuperscript{77}

This thesis cannot claim to have found the final truth about any one of the above figure's Nazi involvement. One truth, however, worth noting is that intellectuals, by definition, undertake inherently moral and humanistic activity. When this element is lacking, or seemingly lacking, the possibility that a potentially disastrous mismatch between academician and politician rises dramatically. Frank Knopfelmacher noted that for intellectuals, interest in the human condition provides the framework and conceptual purpose of inquiry without which 'empirical facts' tend to dissolve into heaps of meaningless data. It is difficult to see how one can get the hang of such notions if one is not involved with them as a value-participant - accepting or rejecting them but not remaining indifferent to them.\textsuperscript{78}


\textsuperscript{78}Knopfelmacher, \textit{Intellectuals and Politics}, 6.
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