

DESIGNING THE ‘UMVOLKUNG’ NAZI SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY (SOZIALANTHROPOLOGIE) – KARL VALENTIN MÜLLER AND HIS CONCEPT OF ETHNIC RE-ENGINEERING, 1940–1945

URSULA FERDINAND

ABSTRACT

Karl Valentin Müller (1896–1963), an amateur researcher, published his first papers on the synthesis of ‘social’ and ‘racial’ issues in the tradition of German *Sozialanthropologie* around 1930. A decade later, the former member of the German Social Democratic Party had already become a prominent expert on Nazi population policy and *Umvolkung*. In 1941 he was appointed professor at the newly established Institute of Social Anthropology and *Volk* Biology (*Institut für Sozialanthropologie und Volksbiologie*) at the Faculty of Philosophy of the German University in Prague. His professional advancement was strongly supported by high SD and SS officials. In Prague he presented his programme of *Umvolkung*, or ethnic re-engineering, which was based on the idea of reorganising the national composition of the population in Central and South Eastern Europe. The programme was grounded in Müller’s own theories of *Umvolkung* with special focus on Bohemia and Moravia. After the Second World War, he became head of the Institute for Research on Intellectual Giftedness (*Institut für Begabtenforschung*) in Hannover. Later, Müller was appointed professor of empirical sociology at the University of Economic and Social Sciences in Nuremberg and became an active representative of *Sozialanthropologie* in the early Federal Republic of Germany. Müller never abandoned his basic assumptions, which were rooted in his convictions regarding heredity and racial biology and supported by an eclectic methodological mix. He had never been a creative or innovative scientist but he exerted significant influence on the field of applied policy in three German political systems – the Weimar Republic, the ‘Third Reich’, and post-war Western Germany.

Key words: World War Two – Sozialanthropologie – Bohemia and Moravia – German Charles University in Prague – Karl V. Müller

“On August 3, 1963, Karl Valentin Müller, full professor of sociology and social anthropology at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, died unexpectedly at the age of 67. With him, German social anthropology loses its only full-time and scientifically most active representative.”¹

The journal *Homo* commemorated its contributor and ally Karl Valentin Müller, born in 1896 in Bodenbach/Podmokly (Bohemia),² by these words less than twenty years after the

¹ *Nachrichten*, *Homo* 14, 1963, p. 167.

² Universitätsarchiv (hereinafter UA) Nürnberg-Erlangen, Akte K. V. Müller F 2/1, No. 236: enactment April 1, 1955. See Carsten KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie und Politik. Sozialwissenschaftliches Expertentum im Dritten Reich und in der frühen westdeutschen Nachkriegszeit*, Wiesbaden 2009; Hansjörg GUTBERGER, *Bevölkerung*,

end of the Second World War. After 1945, his main area of expertise, i.e., *Sozialanthropologie*, lacked any non-German counterparts³ but in the German science, it remained alive as a borderline science of sociology and biological anthropology.⁴ Müller, who had been an adherent of social Darwinism since the 1920s, belonged to the generation of German sociologists who were ‘infused by Nazism’ (*braun durchwachsen*) and ‘punished with stupidity’ (*mit Dummheit geschlagen*).⁵ In 1946, Müller became head of the Institute for Research

Ungleichheit, Auslese. Perspektiven sozialwissenschaftlicher Bevölkerungsforschung in Deutschland zwischen 1930 und 1960, Wiesbaden 2006.

- ³ The German anthropologist and sociologist Wilhelm Emil Mühlmann (1904–1988) pointed out that the German *Sozialanthropologie* corresponds rather closely to the English concept of social biology. *Sozialanthropologie* was concerned with the biological fate of the human collective, selection, *Siebung* (‘sifting’, i.e., competitive selection), and bio-typological reorganisation of social bodies. Both social biology and *Sozialanthropologie* use the tools of anthropobiology and sociology. See Wilhelm E. MÜHLMANN, *Die Idee einer zusammenfassenden Anthropologie*, in: Karl G. Specht (ed.), *Soziologische Forschung in unserer Zeit. Ein Sammelwerk*. Leopold von Wiese zum 75. Geburtstag, Köln 1951, p. 86, 91.
- ⁴ To the German physical anthropologist Ilse Schwidetzky (1907–1997), *Sozialanthropologie* as an academic subject within the frame of anthropology was the actual basis of population biology. See Ilse SCHWIDETZKY, *Grundzüge der Völkerbiologie*, Stuttgart 1950, p. 2. The German anthropologist and prominent racial biologist Friedrich Keiter (1906–1967) believed that its subject was the interdependence between social processes in the wider sense and biological characteristics of men who are involved in them. See Friedrich KEITER, *Sozialanthropologie*, in: Werner Ziegenfuß (ed.), *Handbuch der Soziologie*, Stuttgart 1956, p. 247. See also Gerhard STRAASS, *Sozialanthropologie. Prämissen – Fakten – Probleme*, Jena 1976, p. 22.
- ⁵ René König quoted in Sonja SCHNITZLER, *Soziologie im Nationalsozialismus zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik. Elisabeth Pfeil und das ‘Archiv für Bevölkerungswissenschaft und Bevölkerungspolitik’*, Wiesbaden 2012, p. 399. See Heinz MAUS, *Bericht über die Soziologie in Deutschland 1933 bis 1945*, *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 11, 1959, pp. 79–80. For current literature on K. V. Müller see i.a. Carsten KLINGEMANN, *Rassenmythos und Sozialwissenschaften in Deutschland. Ein verdrängtes Kapitel sozialwissenschaftlichen Wirkungsgeschichte* (= Beiträge zur sozialwissenschaftlicher Forschungen 85), Wiesbaden 1987; id., *Soziologie im Dritten Reich*, Baden – Baden 1996; id., *Ostforschung und Soziologie während des Nationalsozialismus*, in: Jan M. Pikorski – Jörg Hackmann – Rudolf Jaworski (eds.), *Deutsche Ostforschung und polnische Westforschung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik. Disziplinen im Vergleich*, Poznań 2002; id., *Soziologie und Politik. Sozialwissenschaftliches Expertentum im Dritten Reich und in der frühen westdeutschen Nachkriegszeit*, Wiesbaden 2009; J. GUTBERGER, *Bevölkerung*; id., *Volk, Raum und Sozialstruktur im ‘Dritten Reich’* (= Beiträge zur Geschichte der Soziologie 8), Münster 1999; Johannes WEYER, *Westdeutsche Soziologie 1945–1960. Deutsche Kontinuitäten und nordamerikanischer Einfluß*, Berlin 1984; Gerda VOIGT, *Faschistische ‘Neuordnungspläne’ im Zeichen der ‘Umvolkung’*. *Der Anteil der deutschen Universität in Prag an der faschistischen ‘Volkstumspolitik’*, Leipzig 1972; *Leipziger Universitätszeitung*, 16. 8. 1962; Michael SCHWARTZ, *‘Proletarier’ und ‘Lumpen’*. *Sozialistische Ursprünge eugenischen Denkens*, Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte 42, 1994, pp. 537–570 [564]; id., *Sozialistische Eugenik. Eugenische Sozialtechnologien in Debatten und Politik der deutschen Sozialdemokratie 1990–1933*, Bonn 1995; Karl H. ROTH, *Heydrichs Professor. Historiographie des ‘Volkstums’ und der Massenvernichtungen. Der Fall Hans Joachim Beyer*, in: Peter Schöttler (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918–1945*, Frankfurt/Main 1997, pp. 262–342; id., *‘Generalplan Ost’ – ‘Gesamtplan Ost’*. *Forschungsstand, Quellenprobleme, neue Ergebnisse*, in: Mechthild Rössler – Sabine Schleiermacher (eds.), *Der ‘Generalplan Ost’*. Hauptlinien der nationalsozialistischen Planungs- und Vernichtungspolitik, Berlin 1993; Alena MIŠKOVÁ, *Die deutsche Universität Prag im Vergleich mit anderen deutschen Universitäten in der Kriegszeit*, in: Hans Leung (ed.), *Universitäten in nationaler Konkurrenz. Zur Geschichte der Prager Universitäten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (= Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 86), München 2003, pp. 167–175; Andreas WIEDEMANN, *Karl Valentin Müller – ein Rassenhygieniker im Dienst der Volkstumspolitik*, in: Stephan Albrecht – Jiří Malíř – Ralph Melville, *Die sudetendeutsche Geschichtsschreibung 1918–1960*. Zur Vorgeschichte und Gründung der Historischen Kommission der Sudetenländer, München 2008, pp. 167–181; id., *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung in Prag (1942–1945)* (= Berichte und Studien 28), Dresden 2000; Eduard KUBÚ, *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes im Tschechentum. Der ‘wissenschaftliche’ Beitrag des Soziologen Karl Valentin Müller zu Lösung des Problems der Germanisierung Mitteleuropas*, Bohemia 45/1, 2004, pp. 93–114; Detlef BRANDES, *‘Umvolkung, Umsiedlung, rassische Bestandaufnahme’*. *NS-‘Volkstumspolitik’ in den böhmischen Ländern* (= Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 125), München 2012, p. 202; Ursula FERDINAND, *Historische*

on Intellectual Giftedness (*Institut für Begabtenforschung*) in Hannover, which was transformed into the Institute for Empirical Sociology (*Institut für empirische Soziologie*) after 1950. In 1955, Müller became full professor of empirical sociology with particular focus on social practice at the Nuremberg-Erlangen University of Economic and Social Sciences. In 1961, this was integrated as the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences.

He was a follower of traditions of racial anthropology, racial biology, and eugenics, which – being on the border between biology and sociology⁶ – had formed the basis on which the anthropologist Otto Ammon (1842–1907) had founded *Sozialanthropologie* in the German-speaking lands.⁷ Based on Ammon's works, the French anthropologist and racist George Vacher de Lapouge (1854–1936)⁸, and the British private scholar Francis Galton (1822–1911) then developed *Sozialanthropologie* as the youngest sub-discipline of anthropology.⁹ It strove to describe 'the border region between anthropology and human sociology'. Since it dealt with racial biology of social groups, it touched upon the margins of general anthropology. More specifically, this *Sozialanthropologie* was concerned with racial biology (*Rassenbiologie*) of particular socially structured lineages within populations.¹⁰

K. V. Müller claimed he studied the manifold biological foundations of all social phenomena. He focused especially on the biological foundation of the formation of social structures based on specific talents or aptitudes (*Leistungsanlagen*) within families (*Sippen*). He also researched the accomplishments and characteristics of social groups dependent on similar

Argumentation in den deutschen Debatten zu Geburtenrückgang und differentieller Fruchtbarkeit. Fallbeispiel Karl Valentin Müller (1896–1963), Historical Social Research 31/4, 2006, pp. 208–235 (special issue); id., *Der Geburtenrückgang als Herausforderung an die Bevölkerungswissenschaft in Deutschland*, in: Rainer Mackensen – Jürgen Reulicke – Josef Ehmer (eds.), *Ursprünge, Arten und Folgen des Konstrukts 'Bevölkerung' vor, im und nach dem 'Dritten Reich'*. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Wiesbaden 2009, pp. 229–287.

⁶ ROLF SIEFERLE, *Die Krise der menschlichen Natur. Zur Geschichte eines Konzepts*, Frankfurt/Main 1989, shows that selection-based evolutionary biology, degeneration theory, and racial theory belong to the main fields of biological social theory. P. Sorokin distinguishes four main types of biological theories in sociology – 1. Bio-organisational explanations of social phenomena; 2. Racial-anthropological tradition; 3. Darwinian school of the struggle for life; 4. Instinct-based tradition. Within these, the tradition of (sociological) racial anthropology attached particular importance to the factors of race, heredity, and selection in determining human behaviour, social processes, social selection and the historical fate of a social system. See Pitirim SOROKIN, *Soziologische Theorien im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, München 1931, pp. 53, 59.

⁷ See Ursula FERDINAND, *Die Debatte 'Agrar- versus Industriestaat' und die Bevölkerungsfrage. Eine Fallstudie*, in: Rainer Mackensen – Jürgen Reulicke (eds.), *Das Konstrukt 'Bevölkerung' vor, im und nach dem 'Dritten Reich'*, Wiesbaden 2005, pp. 111–149; R. SIEFERLE, *Die Krise*, p. 162. See also P. SOROKIN, *Sociologische Theorien*, and Hilke LICHTSINN, *Otto Ammon und die Sozialanthropologie* (= Marburger Schriften zur Medizingeschichte 21), Frankfurt/Main – Bern – New York – Paris 1987.

⁸ George V. de Lapouge was the founder of 'anthropo-sociology'. His racial theory was based on the basic assumption that different social and historical movements are originated by different races. Their collisions then shaped the course of history. His analyses concerned solely the history of Europe and France in particular. See R. SIEFERLE, *Die Krise*, p. 146, 147.

⁹ Alfred PLOETZ, *Sozialanthropologie*, in: Gustav Schwalbe – Eugen Fischer (eds.), *Anthropologie*, Leipzig – Berlin, 1923, pp. 588–589. Sheila F. Weiss describes the German school of social-anthropology as "a movement which developed parallel to eugenics, but one that, at least until the Nazi period, was not really part of race hygiene". See Sheila F. WEISS, *Race Hygiene & National Efficiency. The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1987, p. 92. See also Uwe HOSSFELD, *Geschichte der biologischen Anthropologie in Deutschland. Von den Anfängen bis in die Nachkriegszeit* (= Wissenschaftskultur um 1900, 2), Stuttgart 2005, p. 195.

¹⁰ Eugen FISCHER, *Sozialanthropologie*, in: Rudolf Dittler et al. (eds.), *Handwörterbuch der Naturwissenschaften*, IX, Jena 1934, pp. 176–177, 182–183.

factors whose tendencies to increase or prevail were thought dependent on specific environmental factors such as family traditions and the like.¹¹ His racial biology of social groups was meant to be the part of general anthropology which focuses on hereditary biological (*erbbiologisch*) aspect of hereditary lines, which are within a nation segmented into various social hereditary lines subdivided into groups.¹²

K. V. Müller, the only full-time, active representative of the *Sozialanthropologie* after 1945, became an academic representative of this field in the late 1930s without any proper medical or anthropological training.¹³ After earning a doctorate in national economy, history and statistics in Leipzig in 1922,¹⁴ he habilitated in 1937 in Leipzig under the sociologist Hans Freyer (1887–1969).¹⁵ During his work for Freyer, however, Müller focused exclusively on *Sozialanthropologie*, a sub-discipline of sociology. His investigations were always guided by the same question, namely one “of the lawful relations (...) between biological value and social status, the enforcement of genetic values (Erbwerte) in social life”, especially in processes of social mobility. He was highly interested in the labour movement. Only in a handful of cases he focused ‘on entire ethnic groups, e.g., on Germanhood (Deutschtum) in South East Europe’, or ‘on problems of race and eugenics’.¹⁶ Obviously, it was not his professional skills that paved the way for his academic career in late 1930s: “Given ideological convictions and eagerness to adapt statistical and empirical methods to the goals of National Socialism, the rapidity with which Müller was promoted is unsurprising. In 1938 he became private Docent at Freyer’s Institute (Leipzig), shortly thereafter was appointed to junior professorship in Dresden, before being appointed in 1941 to the chair of Sozialanthropologie at the German University of Prague where he headed the Institute for Sozialanthropologie and Volksbiologie.”¹⁷

¹¹ For example by attaching a sort of auxiliary role to anthropology in the sense of racial theory. See Karl V. MÜLLER, *Volksbiologische Beziehungen zwischen Tschechen und Deutschen*, in: Helmut Preidel (ed.), *Die Deutschen in Böhmen und Mähren. Ein historischer Rückblick*, München 1950, p. 292.

¹² Karl V. MÜLLER, *Der Stand der Forschung zur differentiellen Fortpflanzung und Begabungsanalyse*, *Homo* 11, 1960, p. 88. See also id., *Bericht über die Begabtenforschung Niedersachsens*, *Homo* 1–2, 1950, pp. 136–152.

¹³ In 1919, Müller began studying German studies, then changed to political sciences and history. See Universitätsarchiv (hereinafter UA) Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 19. Müller’s statements as to which subjects he studied changed over the course of his life: in the information sheet required for the habilitation, he named history and cameralism. See UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 2. Subsequently, in the personal information and survey sheet for the implementation of the law according to Article 131 of 1951, he stated that he studied eight terms of sociology. See UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file Dr. Karl Valentin Müller – F 2/1, No. 2364, and in the *Bibliography of the Published Papers of Dr. phil. habil. Karl Valentin Müller*, full professor of sociology and social anthropology at the Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg (hereinafter Bibliography..., 1961), p. 5: entries *Staatswissenschaft*, history, sociology, and social biology.

¹⁴ K. V. Müller’s doctoral thesis, which remained unpublished, was inspired by the works of the economic and social historian Alfred Doren (1869–1934). UA Leipzig, Phil. Fak. Prom. 1262; *ibid.*, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 2.

¹⁵ In his request for habilitation, he asked for permission to submit an unpublished dissertation. UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 17, letter of K. V. Müller to the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Leipzig, December 8, 1936. A few days later, he wrote: “If the statement of a subject in the request for habilitation seems necessary after all, I would state sociology and social anthropology.” See *ibid.*, sheet 18, letter of K. V. Müller to Münster, December 12, 1936.

¹⁶ UA Leipzig, PA file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 103, report Hans Freyer, April 4, 1939.

¹⁷ Jerry Z. MULLER, *The Other God that Failed. Hans Freyer and the Deradicalisation of German Conservatism*, Princeton 1987, p. 275.

His curriculum vitae prior to the Prague period indicates that he owed his academic career – which elevated him from a dilettante and amateur researcher in the 1920s to a university professor by the late 1930s – to the patronage and networking of leading figures in German racial hygiene and racial anthropology, especially Fritz Lenz (1887–1976), Alfred Ploetz (1860–1940), and Hans F. K. Günther (1891–1968). After 1933, he had the support of high-ranking Nazi officials such as Werner Studentkowsky (1903–1951) and Martin Paul Wolf (b. 1908), an early professional propagandist (*Reichsredner*) of the NSDAP and after 1933 Müller’s superior in the Saxon Ministry of Education, and staff member of the Security Service (*Sicherheitsdienst*, hereinafter SD) of the NSDAP. And last but not least, there was Karl Hermann Frank (1898–1946), State Secretary to the Reichprotector of Bohemia and Moravia (1939–1943), later German State Minister (1943–1945), and Higher SS and Police Leader in Bohemia and Moravia.

The following paper documents and analyses how K. V. Müller managed to become a well-established social anthropologist and an expert on *Umvolkung*, a subject we would translate as ‘ethnic re-engineering’. For this purpose, we shall outline his synthesis of social enquiry and ‘racial theory’, describe his concept of *Umvolkung*, and follow his career of an expert on *Umvolkung* and head of the Institute of Social Anthropology and *Volksbiologie* at the Faculty of Philosophy at the German Charles University.

1. A Synthetic Attempt: The ‘Social Question’ and ‘Racial Theory’ (*Rassenlehre*)

For K. V. Müller, a synthesis of these two subjects required the balancing of social democratic ideas and notions of racial anthropology, but also the stripping of eugenic and (social) anthropological studies from earlier exaggerations. To achieve that goal, he placed racial theories to the centre of his amateur studies. The decisive impulse came from contemporary racial theory: “I have become an ideological, uncompromising and absolute proponent of racial theory. The task presented to me was to search for a synthesis between social enquiry and racial theory.”¹⁸ His main interest was the worker’s elite (*Arbeiterelite*), their ‘racial’ origins, processes of formation and reformation, and the mechanisms of social mobility between and within social classes.

Early social anthropologists focused on processes of upheaval, from the rural and closed hierarchy to industrialised urban class society, as well as on the intra-societal processes of stratification, which were shaped by the growing mobility of its links. Besides biological selection, they were also interested in processes of sifting (*Siebung* – a term coined by Richard Thurnwald) and their interplay in modern industrial societies.¹⁹ They believed that social differentiation and social inequality is the result of perpetual selection and that

¹⁸ UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 21. According to his statement, K. V. Müller encountered social enquiry, became acquainted with monistic teachings, and became a sympathiser of socialism during this secondary education. *Ibid.*, sheet 20.

¹⁹ According to Wilhelm E. Mühlmann, the early school of social anthropology earned a reputation for being an unbiased field of research due to its research of relations of social mobility and fluctuation (migration, social rise and fall). See Wilhelm E. MÜHLMANN, *Geschichte der Anthropologie*, Frankfurt/Main 1968, p. 115, and U. HOSSFELD, *Geschichte*, p. 197 (footnote 28).

social classes within a population are based on aptitudes of their members. The rise and fall of a nation was then linked to changes in the hereditary characteristics of the population and its social classes.²⁰ Actions of social institutions were interpreted as a sort of sieve and modern social upheavals were seen as processes of ‘sifting’. Selection was viewed as a socio-biological process, which facilitates the reproduction of particular individuals or groups. The abovementioned process of ‘sifting’, however, was seen as a socio-political process, ‘concerned with an individual’s personal success and with the gain of power and influence’.²¹ This was thought to occasionally lead to counterselection since the personalities who did well in the ‘sifting’ process of social selection tend to reproduce at a lower rate. In other words, they are exposed to biological inhibition.²² Concerning the direct correlation between biological reproduction of an individual and the nation’s developmental requirements, social anthropologists assigned vast importance to adaptability and predisposition to ‘fitness’ in the context of beneficial breeding (*Höherzüchtung*). Demographic development was thus evaluated in two distinct ways, whereby the first was based on social or professional achievement potential or aptitude (*Eignung*), while the other was based on reproductive performance (number of children).²³

Müller’s research and his propagandistic and journalistic work were largely shaped by these views. The then still social democrat and unionist embraced the ‘iron law’ of inequality of mankind, the idea the most competent having a free rein (*die freie Bahn dem Tüchtigsten*), and endorsed the meritocratic idea of a racially defined elite leading the labour force.²⁴ As an ardent adherent of racial theory and racial hygiene, Müller believed that the greatest danger to the aspiring labour movement was coming from the *Lumpenproletariat*. He justified this belief by a claim that mankind’s racial characteristics determine the development of cultures, including the success or failure of social movements. To him, the ‘social question’ was based on racial biology, which implied its deterministic nature,²⁵ and racial hygiene was a ‘social weapon’.²⁶

Müller’s studies were concerned with notions of breeding, which had been – ever since discussions of the ‘tomb as the grave of a race’ (O. Ammon) – debated by Fritz Lenz, Friedrich Burgdörfer (1890–1967) and H. F. K. Günther.²⁷ He also developed some

²⁰ Among others Charles PEARSON, *National Life from Standpoint of Science*, London 1901, pp. 26–27, and Christian GEULEN, *Wahlverwandte. Rassendiskurs und Nationalsozialismus im späten 19. Jahrhundert*, Hamburg 2004, pp. 281–282.

²¹ Richard THURNWALD, *Werden, Wandel und Gestaltung von Staat und Kultur im Lichte der Völkerforschung*, Berlin – Leipzig 1935, p. 261.

²² Ibid. cf. Karl V. MÜLLER, *Lebenserfolg und Lebensauslese*, Die höhere Schule 14, 1935, pp. 240–243 [242].

²³ Helen F. HOHMAN (ed.), *Essay on Population and Other Papers by James Alfred Field together With the Material from His Notes and Lectures*, Chicago 1931, p. 242. See U. FERDINAND, *Historische Argumentationen*, p. 216, and Ch. GEULEN, *Wahlverwandte*, p. 272.

²⁴ Among other things, K. V. Müller used his position to mediate to the workers’ movement in Saxony an understanding of the idea of eugenics. See Archives of the Humboldt University (hereinafter A HU) Berlin – Nachlaß (hereinafter NL) Grotjahn, Vol. 130, sheet 2, letter of K. V. Müller to A. Grotjahn, April 10, 1927.

²⁵ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Arbeiterbewegung und Bevölkerungsfrage. Eine gemeinverständliche Darstellung der wichtigsten Fragen der quantitativen Bevölkerungspolitik im Rahmen gewerkschaftlicher Theorien* (= Gewerkschafts-Archiv-Bücherei 6), Jena 1927, p. 66 and id., *Sozialismus und Eugenik*, Archiv für Soziale Hygiene und Demographie, NF IV. Bd., 1929, pp. 322–324 [324].

²⁶ “Our labour force [can] not escape degeneration and thus alienation from their cultural heritage.” A HU Berlin – NL Grotjahn, Vol. 130, sheet 1, the letter of Müller to Grotjahn, April 10, 1927.

²⁷ See U. FERDINAND, *Die Debatte*; R. SIEFFERLE, *Die Krise*, p. 162.

basic notions proposed by Alfredo Niceforo (1876–1960), an Italian statistician and anthropo-sociologist, by supplementing them with genealogy and the science of heredity.²⁸ With reference to Francis Galton’s thesis on the affinity of similar genotypes in mate selection – the inbreeding of social characters or the socio-biological connubium – Müller made the socio-anthropological claim of the essential role of hereditary factors in processes of social design the basic premise of his research.²⁹ He carried out demographic surveys³⁰ and made anthropological observations by ‘intuitive insight’ (*intuitive Schau*).³¹ Müller believed he had the empirical evidence for claiming the ultimate power of heredity when he thought to have found a proof that most of an individual’s social competence (*soziale Bewährung*) depends on a person’s family and racial predisposition, whereby as a side effect of far-reaching racial mixing of European populations, family-run businesses are of crucial importance.³²

He portrayed the elite of the workforce (*Arbeiterelite*) as a socio-biological elite of natural leaders by applying a methodological mix which included eugenic and racially biological ideas, various methods of intelligence research, socio-biological class analysis, the concept of ‘sifting’ (R. Thurnwald) and Joseph Schumpeter’s (1883–1950) notion of social connubium.³³ The rise of capitalism had caused a temporal social decline of the genetic material of the old, dignified, and ‘racially competent’ (*rassetüchtig*) middleclass, i.e., the farmers and craftsmen families of the Middle Ages.³⁴ Only later on, the elite of the workforce re-established itself from this basis as a separate class. For Müller, the resurgence of this class demonstrated a racially biological law: hereditary disposition is an element of nature that is most conservative and least likely to change. It is a constant historical force. In the process of its social resurgence and in contrast to the unskilled labour force, the workforce elite was characterised by decline in its birth rate, which could potentially lead to a loss of ‘racial competence’ (*Rassentüchtigkeit*). As a eugenicist and social anthropologist, Müller promised to stop further demographical and racial decline by implementing a sustainable race and population policy, a policy of selective breeding which would favour the Nordic social aristocracy and prevent the degradation and contamination of its genetic material.³⁵

Müller’s propagandistic work and his amateur research were soon noticed by the racial hygienist F. Lenz and by H. F. K. Günther, a philologist, publicist, and leading Nazi racial

²⁸ See Alfredo NICEFORO, *Anthropologie der nichtbesitzenden Klassen. Studien und Untersuchungen*, Leipzig – Amsterdam 1910; Karl V. MÜLLER, *Arbeiterbewegung*.

²⁹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Arbeiterbewegung*, p. 73; id., *Sozialismus*.

³⁰ UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 26–27. See Karl V. MÜLLER, *Zur Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie des Industriearbeiters*, Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie (hereinafter ARGB) 29/2, 1935, pp. 187–234 [201].

³¹ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Zwei bevölkerungspolitische Tagungen der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, ARGB 19/2, 1927, pp. 189–193 [191]. According to SIEFERLE, Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855–1927) recommended that scientists ought to do without physical anthropology and turn to intuitive viewing instead. See R. SIEFERLE, *Die Krise*, p. 188.

³² Karl Valentin MÜLLER – Martin SPRINGER, *Sozialanthropologische Betrachtungen*, ARGB 18/1, 1926, pp. 55–68 [59].

³³ K. V. MÜLLER, *Arbeiterbewegung*, p. 80.

³⁴ Id., *Rassenhygiene und sozialistische Bewegung*, ARGB 24/4, 1930, pp. 348–366 [366].

³⁵ Id., *Lebensraum und Geburtenregelung*, Süddeutsche Monatshefte (Rassenhygiene), März 1928, pp. 415–419; id., *Arbeiterbewegung*, p. 57. Cf. U. FERDINAND, *Der Geburtenrückgang*.

researcher.³⁶ The latter advised Müller in his socio-anthropological studies and adopted some of his notions into his own studies. Lenz, too, supported Müller with his professional advice and integrated some of his ideas into his work.³⁷ He used him as a paradigmatic example of the view ‘that the prime opponent of racial hygiene is the philistine, not the socialist’. Furthermore, he believed that Müller, a labour union official (*Gewerkschaftsbeamter*) and a socialist, could be a worthy successor to the medical practitioner Ludwig Woltmann (1871–1907), who as a former social democrat was the leading representative of early *Sozialanthropologie*.³⁸ In 1926, Lenz appointed Müller as the only social democratic employee to the most prominent German journal for racial hygiene, *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie*. There, Müller took care of most of the journal content regarding social sciences until 1944. These relationships and his contacts with the *völkisch* publisher Julius Friedrich Lehmann (1864–1935) and Alfred Ploetz made Müller a very important publicist.³⁹ These influences, along with belief in a racially and racially biological ‘cognitive primacy’ (*Erkenntnisprimat*) of his studies paved his seamless transition to Nazi sociology and made him a clear exception within the social democracy.⁴⁰ His eugenic and socio-anthropological studies were compatible with the threefold aims of Nazi population policy: Firstly, provisions for a quantitative protection of the population (*Volksstand*); secondly, qualitative racial hygiene as such, i.e., the achievement of above-average reproduction among the ‘hereditary healthy and competent’ (*Erbgesunde und -tüchtige*) accompanied by restricted reproduction of the ‘hereditary unhealthy and inferior’ (*Erbkranke und -minderwertige*); and thirdly, racial policy, that is, the preservation of racial characteristics of the population accompanied by a simultaneous fight against ‘racial superalienation’ (*rassische Überfremdung*).

2. Academic Career under National Socialism and Becoming an Expert on ‘Umvolkung’

After the war, K. V. Müller thought about the fact that he was able to practice science under the Nazi regime and noted: “Often, however, this was only possible under certain conditions which required the use of a secret language which could only be understood by insiders.”⁴¹ Müller was convinced that neither his stellar career under the Nazi regime nor

³⁶ UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 26. See i.a. Hans F. K. GÜNTHER, *Kleine Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, München 1933.

³⁷ UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 26. See i.a. Fritz LENZ, *Menschliche Auslese und Rassenhygiene (Eugenik)*, München 1931.

³⁸ Fritz LENZ (rec.), *Rassenfrage und Sozialismus*, ARGB 17/4, 1925, pp. 444–446. For L. Woltmann see Jürgen MISCH, *Die politische Philosophie Ludwig Woltmanns. Im Spannungsfeld von Kantianismus, historischem Materialismus und Sozialdarwinismus* (= Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und Pädagogik 94), Bonn 1975; Ehrhard STÖLTING, *Die anthropologische Schule. Gestalt und Zusammenhänge eines wissenschaftlichen Institutionalierungsversuches*, in: Klingemann (ed.), *Rassenmythos*, p. 134.

³⁹ On J. F. Lehmanns Verlag see Sigrid STÖCKEL (ed.), *Die ‘rechte Nation’ und ihr Verleger. Politik und Popularisierung im J. F. Lehmanns Verlag 1890–1979*, Berlin 2002.

⁴⁰ M. SCHWARTZ, ‘Proletarier’, p. 566. See C. KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie*; H. GUTBERGER, *Bevölkerung*.

⁴¹ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller F 2/1 No. 236. Cf. Karl V. MÜLLER, *Empirische Beiträge zur Frage der differentiellen Fruchtbarkeit in Nachkriegsdeutschland*, *Homo* 7, 1956, pp. 87–98.

his willingness to serve Nazi policies were errors or signs of a flaw of character. Like various other Nazi scientists, he saw himself as a 'far-sighted' opponent of Nazism.⁴²

In 1933, Müller quit his membership in the German Social Democracy (SPD) but did not join the NSDAP. He explained this by stating "all experts knew that ever since 1923, I had adopted racial theory as a core of the now prevailing views".⁴³ He stated that he wished to work only in this area and that his 'fighting years' (*Kämpferjahre*) were a sufficient proof of his faith and allegiance to the Nazi Germany.⁴⁴

Müller met Martin P. Wolf in his workplace, at the Saxon Ministry of Education⁴⁵ in Dresden in 1933: "I have known Müller since 1933 when I shared an office with him in the Saxon Ministry of Education for several months."⁴⁶ Müller provided Wolf, employee of the Berlin headquarters of the SD, with information about changes in staff, events behind the scenes of his department, and about the Sudetengerman movement in Czechoslovakia led by Konrad Henlein (1898–1945).⁴⁷ Around this time, he met another important supporter in the person of Werner Studentkowski. The 'strong man' of Saxon politics of higher education⁴⁸ was impressed by Müller's accomplishments in the area of population statistics and *Sozialanthropologie* and arranged for him the possibility of habilitating at University of Leipzig, 'to provide him with a larger sphere of scientific influence'.⁴⁹

Previously, Müller wrote a book named *Der Aufstieg des Arbeiters durch Rasse und Meisterschaft* (The Rise of Workers through Race and Mastery).⁵⁰ In this work, and in accordance with the ideas of Richard Walther Darré (1895–1953) and his ideas, he designed a racially biological 'construction policy' (*Aufbau-Politik*) which would structure the future

⁴² Cited in Hans-Peter KRÖNER, *Von der Rassenhygiene zur Humangenetik. Das Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik nach dem Kriege*, Stuttgart – Jena – Lübeck – Ulm 1998, p. 73.

⁴³ UA Leipzig, Personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet. 24. Müller joined the NSDAP on May 1, 1937 (No. 5.877.252); Archiv bezpečnostních složek (hereinafter ABS) Praha, Z 10-P-238, sheet 1. See E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 95.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Wilhelm Hartnacke (1878–1952) took over the leadership of the Ministry in March of 1933. Hartnacke had many times proclaimed the 'education mania' (*Bildungswahn*) to be the 'death of a nation'. He dogmatically believed in the heredity of intellectual and mental characteristics. See Matthias MIDDELL, *Weltgeschichtsschreibung im Zeitalter der Verfachlichung und Professionalisierung* (= Geschichtswissenschaft und Geschichtskultur im 20. Jahrhundert 6/1–3), Leipzig 2005, p. 712; Michael GRÜTTNER, *Biographisches Lexikon zur nationalsozialistischen Wissenschaftspolitik* (= Studien zur Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte 6), Heidelberg 2004, p. 70; Michael PARAK, *Hochschule und Wissenschaft in zwei deutschen Diktaturen. Elitenaustausch an sächsischen Hochschulen 1933–1952* (= Geschichte und Politik in Sachsen 23), Weimar – Wien 2004, pp. 83–84; Reiner POMMERIN, *Geschichte der TU Dresden 1828–2003*, Bd. 1, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2003, pp. 167–168.

⁴⁶ Státní oblastní archiv (hereinafter SOA, State Regional Archive) Praha, Müller K. V., letter of M. P. Wolf to Dr. A. Six, September 12, 1938 (official information on a private path/Dienstliche Informationen auf privatem Weg), sheet 10. See *ibid.* exchange of letters between Wolf and Müller since 1934. E. Kubů is right in suggesting an almost symbiotic relationship between the two men, see E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 95.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, letters of K. V. Müller to M. P. Wolf, Official information on a private path, sheets 38–56, 66–69, 71–75. See E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 93.

⁴⁸ M. GRÜTTNER, *Biographisches Lexikon*, p. 171; M. PARAK, *Hochschule*; R. POMMERIN, *Geschichte*; Andreas WAGNER, 'Machtergreifung' in Sachsen. NSDAP und Staatliche Verwaltung 1930–1935 (= Geschichte und Politik in Sachsen 22), Köln – Weimar – Wien 2004.

⁴⁹ Sächsisches Haupt- und Staatsarchiv (hereinafter SächsHStA) Dresden, Saxon Ministry for Education, No. 15590, sheet 71, letter of W. Studentkowski to W. Groß, November 22, 1938.

⁵⁰ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Der Aufstieg des Arbeiters durch Rasse und Meisterschaft*, München 1935. He devoted this work to the memory of the publisher Julius F. Lehmann, a supporter and promoter of a strong Reich. Müller hoped to draw the attention of state leadership and other responsible institutions to his statements. *Ibid.*, p. 7. See U. FERDINAND, *Historische Argumentationen*; *id.*, *Der Geburtenrückgang*, p. 253.

Volksgemeinschaft in a racially social and racially stratified way. This policy was based on the idea that the Nordic race was a highly self-sufficient which could accommodate all varieties of challenges by its skills and adaptability, in urban and in rural life, in war and in peace.⁵¹ With the explicit intention ‘to deflate peasantry’s monopoly on the restoration of the nation’,⁵² Müller posited that the farming community should receive support from the working elite. This happened analogously to Darré’s model and was supposed to act as an independent ‘object of breeding and preservation’ (*Zucht- und Hegeobjekt*). Müller thereby expanded Nazi agricultural policy⁵³ to a ‘constructive care of race’ (*aufbauende Rassenpflege*) whose aim would be to care for the quality of the population’s hereditary material. This was to be achieved by a proportioned increase of family lines of those who were especially gifted and fit for life.⁵⁴

K. V. Müller claimed that his model of breeding, which was based on a convoluted mixture of social Darwinism, racial hygiene, and racial biology, had captured the relationship between Darwinism and sociology. Based on his claim that among the culturally capable (*kulturfähig*) ‘races and racially mixed populations’ exist vastly different layers and inheritance lines, Müller evaluated social strata by values of heredity and performance he had posited.⁵⁵ Müller then proposed a model of selection (*Auslese*) for the new design of the stratified population in the sense of racial care (*Rassenpflege*), a methodical human breeding based on racial biology. The new selection design included the establishment of a breeding direction (*Züchtungsrichtung*), as well as the breeder’s influence on the population, i.e. choice of selection groups.⁵⁶

The question as to whether the farmer type or the worker type should be bred had been controversial ever since the debate about agricultural vs. industrial country.⁵⁷ With respect to this question, Müller declared both types – ‘full manhood’ (*Vollmenschentum*, i.e. farmers) and ‘partial manhood’ (*Teilmenschentum*, i.e. workers) – to be unresolved border cases of breeding. He made both types subject to a breeder’s assessment based on a (speculative) scale of socio-anthropological requirements of a future society. As a social Darwinist, he believed civilising selection to be a process of society’s mastering of the environment, of ‘wrenching the executioner’s sword from nature’. While this provided room for ‘degeneration’ (*Entartung*), it also, thanks to specialisation, supported the ‘cultural potential’ (*Kulturfähigkeit*) and the spoke for ‘improvement policy’ (*Aufartungspolitik*) in the direction of partial manhood.⁵⁸ This policy required a birth policy that would correspond to breeder’s standards due to the civilisation process’s intrinsic dilemma of its self-destructive potential. Unlike negative eugenic measures, this aspect of synthesising racial care was difficult to implement, since the breeding of a sufficient amount of children among the racially

⁵¹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Der Aufstieg*, p. 152. Here, he explicitly quoted Professor Karl Astel (1898–1945), racial hygienist from Thuringia, Rector of the Friedrich-Schiller University in Jena, and a prominent member of the SS.

⁵² SOA Praha, Müller K. V., letter of K. V. Müller to M. P. Wolf, August 6, 1934 (official information on a private path), sheet 68, I.

⁵³ See Uwe MAI, ‘Rasse und Raum’. *Agrarpolitik, Sozial- und Raumplanung im NS-Staat* (= Sammlung Schön- ingh zur Geschichte und Gegenwart), Paderborn – München – Wien – Zürich 2002.

⁵⁴ K. V. MÜLLER, *Der Aufstieg*, p. 96.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 32, 59; K. V. MÜLLER, *Empirische Beiträge*, p. 87.

⁵⁶ See U. FERDINAND, *Historische Argumentationen*; *id.*, *Der Geburtenrückgang*.

⁵⁷ See *id.*, *Die Debatte*; Matthias WEIPERT, ‘Mehring der Volkskraft’: *Die Debatte über Bevölkerung. Modernisierung und Nation 1890–1933*, Paderborn – München – Wien – Zürich 2006.

⁵⁸ K. V. MÜLLER, *Der Aufstieg*, pp. 99, 102.

desirable families was impossible to enforce.⁵⁹ Müller believed to have found a practicable path in active precautions, in a policy of double adaptation – of the environment to the race and of the race to the environment. A sustainable (racial) ‘improvement policy’ was supposed to provide the workers’ elite with environmental factors that would preserve ‘selection based on competence’ (*Tüchtigkeitsauslese*), remove the social and psychological distress of child poverty, and facilitate early foundation of families. In such a *Volk*-biological environment, the process of organic selection (*Siebung*) would lead to gradual progress of selected worker type from a man in charge of other men (*Werkmeister*) to a man in charge of heredity (*Erbmeister*).⁶⁰

The amateur researcher who had not been attached to any university since 1935 thought of himself as having designed, in his own breeding model, a plan for the advancement of a population’s performance value. His plan also counted on an expansion of habitat within the framework of Nazi ideas of population policy.⁶¹ According to Nazi propagandistic brochures and according to Alfred Ploetz, his definition of the racial body of the German workforce (*Arbeitertum*) and the thus arising prospects of improvement “opened up new avenues with the aim of selecting racially valuable elements and using them as the basis of breeding a racially advanced population”.⁶²

Such high valuation of his work supported Müller’s ambition of acquiring influence in academic science. The meanwhile 40 years old father⁶³ was certain that due to his busy work schedule, he would not be able to submit an independent habilitation. After numerous efforts by Hans A. Münster (1901–1963),⁶⁴ the then Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Leipzig, and thanks to Studentkowski’s⁶⁵ dedication, Müller achieved his external and cumulative habilitation in 1937 with Hans Freyer: “Despite the reservations of some of Freyer’s colleagues – a professor of statistics noted that Müller’s statistical evidence did not warrant the conclusions he had drawn from it and a professor of medicine doubted that Müller fully understood the biological concepts that he had employed – Freyer gave Müller a positive evaluation and based on the significance of his research and recommended his habilitation.”⁶⁶

After the disputation in early June 1937, Müller, who meanwhile became member of the NSDAP, applied for a lectureship in sociology and *Sozialanthropologie*. He received a positive reply but his demonstration lecture on ‘The Significance of German Blood in Southeast

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 95. See Gisela BOCK, *Zwangssterilisation im Nationalsozialismus. Studie zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik*, Opladen 1986, p. 164.

⁶⁰ K. V. MÜLLER, *Der Aufstieg*, pp. 96, 142–143.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 99; Karl V. MÜLLER, *Zur Bedeutung der Bildung von Auslesegruppen unter züchterischen Gesichtspunkten des Staates*, *Volk und Rasse* 10/3, 1935, pp. 76–82 [77–78].

⁶² Werner KLAUS (rec.), *Karl Valentin Müller: Der Aufstieg des Arbeiters durch Rasse und Meisterschaft*, *Der Vorposten. Mitteilungsblatt der Gauleitung der NSDAP* 11, 1935, pp. 343–345; Alfred PLOETZ (rec.), *Müller, Dr. Karl Valentin, Der Aufstieg des Arbeiters durch Rasse und Meisterschaft. J. F. Lehmanns Verlag, München 1935*, *ARGB* 30/4, 1936, pp. 515–516.

⁶³ Müller, who had been married to the teacher Hertha K. B. Babylon (b. 1909) since 1932, fathered two daughters.

⁶⁴ The non-habilitated H. A. Münster and later informer of the Security Service (SD) took over the chair for journalism in 1933–1934, after the dismissal of Erich Everth (1878–1934).

⁶⁵ W. Studentkowski even called the Reich Governor (*Reichsstatthalter*) of Saxony to make Müller’s work (including his doctoral thesis) freely accessible after it had been banished to the ‘poison cabinet’ of undesirable books. See UA Leipzig, personal file Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 55–56.

⁶⁶ Ibid., sheets 62–67. See J. MÜLLER, *The Other*, p. 275.

Europe' (*Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes in Südosteuropa*) in late January 1938 failed to make the desired impression.⁶⁷ In his second demonstration lecture, Müller disputed the thesis that "German colonisation of the East implied the selection of especially valuable pioneer types and that the Germans, due to their higher genetic value, are able to regularly achieve higher professional positions in their host colonies".⁶⁸ After that, he was appointed lecturer in sociology and population science at the University of Leipzig.⁶⁹

In his academic career, Leipzig was, however, but an intermezzo. In the winter term of 1938–1939, Müller was asked to temporarily fill the chair for sociology at the Technical University (*Technische Hochschule*) Dresden. A year later, he was appointed associate professor for sociology and *Sozialanthropologie* and head of the Department of Sociology (*Abteilung für Soziologie*).⁷⁰ From then on, Müller – unsuccessfully – kept trying to reintroduce his subject as an examination subject at the Technical University and to create a Department for *Volk Studies* (*Abteilung für Volkswissenschaft*).⁷¹ Despite the failure of these particular aims, Müller's studies and research methods became an integral part of German sociology.⁷² In contrast to this, Hans Freyer stated that Müller was in fact only concerned with 'a special part of sociology' and was basically 'just a social anthropologist'.⁷³

Over the following years, Müller gained academic and political reputation as an expert on the subject of *Umvolkung* especially in circles linked to the SD. His colleagues from Dresden supported his aspirations and helped him. Some even shared his ambitions, for example economist Walter Weddingen (1895–1978)⁷⁴ and Emil Lehman (1880–1964), author of the *Sudetendeutsche Volkskunde*⁷⁵ and after his escape from Czechoslovakia honorary professor for ethnology (*Volkskunde*) in Dresden.

After 1937, Müller extended his influence as well as the subject of his study in geographic terms to Central and South East Europe, especially the Sudetenland. He studied the social and biological fabric of the population and the processes leading to of *Umvolkung* using established methods and various then generally accepted claims of social anthropology and

⁶⁷ Besides Hans Freyer, Alfred Helbok and Rudolf Meerwarth, the demonstration lesson was also assessed by Arthur Knick (1883–1944), a practicing physician, by the orientalist Erich Bräunlich (1892–1945), philosopher and sociologist Arnold Gehlen (1904–1976), historian of antiquity Helmut Berve (1896–1979), and historian Herman Heimpel (1901–1988). UA Leipzig, personal files Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 69, record about the scientific debate by E. Bräunlich, 1937.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, sheet 87, Freyer's draft (without date, received on February 2 1938); *ibid.*, sheet 77, E. Bräunlich's letter to the Rector of the University of Leipzig, January 10, 1938.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, sheet 93, letter (copy) of the Ministry of the Reich Ministry of Education etc. to Ministry of Education, Dresden, and to the Dean of the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Leipzig, May 4, 1938; *ibid.*, sheet 18; SächsHStA Dresden – files of Sächs. MfV, No. 15590; resume of K. V. Müller; *ibid.*, sheet 18.

⁷⁰ In the University Archives of the Technical University Dresden, no personal file of Müller exists. According to personnel catalogue and prospectus, Müller had figured as the director of the Department of Sociology since December 1, 1939. Worth mentioning here is that the appointment did not proceed smoothly.

⁷¹ Besides W. Studentkowski, the leader of the Saxon Office for Racial Policy (*Rassenpolitisches Amt*), Wolfgang Knorr (1911–1940) supported the latter project. See SächsHStA Dresden, files Saxon Ministry for Education, no. 15590, sheet 29, record of W. Studentkowski on conversation with K. V. Müller, February 1, 1939.

⁷² Karl H. PFEFFER, *Die Soziologie in Deutschland*, Archiv für Bevölkerungswissenschaft und Bevölkerungspolitik 9/6, 1939, pp. 419–428 [428].

⁷³ UA Leipzig, personal files Müller, K. V. – PA 764, sheet 103, report of H. Freyer, April 4, 1939.

⁷⁴ R. POMMERIN, *Geschichte*, p. 211; A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 63. See also A. MIŠKOVÁ, *Die deutsche Universität Prag*, and E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*.

⁷⁵ Emil LEHMANN, *Sudetendeutsche Volkskunde*, Leipzig 1926.

racial biology.⁷⁶ To Müller, the issue of a law-like relation between biological value and social status was closely linked to proper appreciation of the power of heredity. He claimed to approach the transformation of nations from a new angle would lead to insights into the laws governing the formation and transformation of a nation.⁷⁷ To an adherent of racial theory, the success of this endeavour – which failed to convince in his first demonstration lecture – was a methodological imperative. It also inspired him to describe measures that would lead to *Umvolkung* within the foreseen (violent) re-organisation of Europe. At the centre of these considerations, there was the ‘mobility among peoples’ (*zwischenvölkische Mobilität*) on the level of racially related peoples. In terms of practical politics, Müller promised not only a future ‘straightening’ according to racial and familial competence but also an organisation of South German space under German leadership.⁷⁸

As before, and with explicit reference to Otto Reche (1879–1966), Müller described the Nordic race as culturally creative elements, which had contributed to the historical success of nations of the western world.⁷⁹ Along the lines of Walter Scheidt’s (1895–1976) cultural biology, he proposed *Sozialanthropologie* based on specific ‘variants of performance’ (*Leistungsvarianten*).⁸⁰ Within this framework, Müller described *Umvolkung* as a dynamic process, which proceeds in a direction contrary to transformation of racial identity (*Umrasung*). This dynamic process, which is ‘generational and happens step by step’, results in a shift of structures within a people through specific changes in property.⁸¹ Migration was described as process akin to osmosis, which balances and events out ‘tension and emptiness’.

With his socio-biological diagnosis – high population density, strong migration movement, and disappearance of stability of stratification – Müller described *Umvolkung* as resulting from historical processes of population change and equalisation which, in turn, occurred in consequence of North-South migration.⁸² His socio-biological or

⁷⁶ See Karl V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten bei Wandlungen im sozialanthropologischen Gefüge von rassisch nahestehenden Nachbarvölkern durch Umvolkungsgesetze*, ARGB 31/4, 1937, pp. 326–347; id., *Die Volksschichtung und Volkstumswandel im Sudetenraum. Sozialanthropologische Betrachtungen zur deutsch-tschechischen Nachbarschaft*, *Mitteldeutsche Blätter für Volkskunde* 13/4, 1938, pp. 192–198; id., *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes in Südosteuropa*, *Süddeutsche Forschungen* 3/1, 1938, pp. 582–623.

⁷⁷ K. V. MÜLLER, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 582.

⁷⁸ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*; id., *Die Bedeutung*, p. 597. Cf. C. KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie*; id., *Ostforschung*, pp. 191–192; A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, pp. 65–66.

⁷⁹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, p. 326. For Reche’s concept of race see Katja GEISENHAINER, ‘Rasse als Schicksal’. *Otto Reche (1879–1966) – ein Leben als Anthropologe und Völkerkundler* (= Beiträge zur Leipziger Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Reihe A/1), Leipzig 2002, p. 225; U. HOSSFELD, *Geschichte*, p. 275.

⁸⁰ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*; id., *Die Bedeutung*. It is noted that K. V. Müller explicitly dissociates himself from Ploetz’s *Sozialanthropologie*. See K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, pp. 326–327. See Walter SCHEIDT, *Die Lebensgeschichte eines Volkes. Einführung in die rassenbiologische und kulturbiologische Forschung*, Hamburg 1934; id., *Die Träger der Kultur*, Berlin 1934.

⁸¹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, pp. 326–327, 334–335.

⁸² This point of view distinguished Müller from authors who predominantly focused on the East-West migration and who placed ‘over-foreignisation’ (*Überfremdung*) and infiltration of the German people to the centre of their historical demographic considerations about assimilation and dissimilation. See Alexander PINWINKLER, *Assimilation und Dissimilation in der ‘Bevölkerungsgeschichte’*, *Historische Sozialkunde. Geschichte – Fachdidaktik – Politische Bildung 2* (Raumkonstruktionen und Bevölkerungspolitik im Nationalsozialismus), Wien 2005, pp. 26–31; Ingo HAAR, *Bevölkerungspolitische Szenarien und bevölkerungswissenschaftliche Expertise im Nationalsozialismus – Die rassistische Konstruktion des Fremden und das ‘Grenz- und Auslandsdeutschum’*, in: R. Mackensen – J. Reulecke (eds.), *Das Konstrukt*, pp. 340–370.

socio-anthropological view defined ‘relative overpopulation’ as a manifestation of shortage of living space, lack of opportunities and as interference by ‘imperfect biological self-sufficiency’. The latter then led to social tension, disillusionment with life, and declining in birth rates, most of which would be in the competition of nations compensated by the relocation of the affected upper and middle classes into specific domains outside of the living space of their own nation.

Once more, Müller applied the approved distinction between ‘sifting and selection processes’ (*Siebungs- und Ausleseprozesse*). To him, the ‘sifting’ processes of social selection captured the dependence “of the current historical potential of a people on the favourable or unfavourable occupation of crucial positions of performance”. In contrast to that, selection processes determined ‘the longevity of such a potential’ depending ‘on the design of recruitment’.⁸³ With reference to the idea of a limited range of resources (Malthus), Müller identified disturbances in the (biological/structural) autarchy as ‘relative overpopulation’ of the upper and middle classes in the German people. He found these disturbances to be associated with processes of transformation in the capitalistic society and contrasted this with imperfect biological autarchy – shortage of the middle and upper classes – of the neighbouring peoples in the South East. Müller conceptualised the early historical relationships of these racially related nations as a decline in performance⁸⁴ which had been compensated by the export of high-performing German groups. This migration then initiated the process of *Umvolkung*. Only because of that, the affected nations had been able to acquire their own ‘national competence’.⁸⁵

The idea then inspired Müller’s belief that it had been primarily the German people who gave leaders, innovators, and pioneers to other nations, especially those of the Central and Eastern Europe. From a socio-biological point of view, this was an almost law-like balancing of low and high pressure on specific habitats.⁸⁶

This was close to circular socio-anthropological reasoning and suggested the existence of a highly qualified minority in the neighbouring peoples in the South East. This minority was seen as being formed by family lines with special leading abilities. To Müller, this finding obliged historians and demographers to social anthropologically investigate the width and depth of these biological minorities. Furthermore, he claimed that the biological *Volksforschung* should also consider the qualitative aspects of vertical national structures.

Müller did not see *Volk* as a biological invariable. Rather, he saw it as an entity of political will. From the point of view of the *Umvolkung*, belonging to a *Volk* was fate but one that was also to some extent of one’s own choice. In this aspect he differed from, for example,

⁸³ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, p. 330.

⁸⁴ M. Middell refers to the fact that the notion of ‘distinction between cultural spaces’ was one that characterised national history. Matthias Middel, *Weltgeschichtsschreibung im Zeitalter der Verfachlichung und Professionalisierung* (= Geschichtswissenschaft und Geschichtskultur im 20. Jahrhundert 6/1–3), Leipzig 2005, p. 768. For the construction of the German point of view of a cultural slope at the eastern border, see Norbert ELIAS, *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen*, 1, Frankfurt/Main 1981; Michael JEISMANN, *Das Vaterland der Feinde. Studien zum nationalen Feindbegriff und Selbstverständnis in Deutschland und Frankreich 1792–1918*, Stuttgart 1992, p. 1; Dirk VAN LAAK, *Über alles in der Welt. Deutscher Imperialismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, München 2005, pp. 59–60.

⁸⁵ K. V. MÜLLER, *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes in Südosteuropa*, pp. 596–567; id., *Deutsche Lebensströme im Aufstieg des Tschechentums*, Deutsche Monatshefte 9 (6/9/8), 1942/43, pp. 310–328 [328].

⁸⁶ K. V. MÜLLER, *Zur sozialanthropologischen Bedeutung*, pp. 47–48; id., *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, p. 337.

the notions described by the anthropologist Egon von Eickstedt (1892–1965).⁸⁷ Müller understood *Umvolkung* as a dynamic process, in which *Volk* – unlike the anthropologically defined ‘race’ – was a variable entity. From a biological point of view, nations (*Völker*) are functionally structured in cultural communities but those structures are to some degree flexible and can be altered. These communities are grouped around political cores and are distinct but racially close variants of humankind.⁸⁸

‘Race’, not *Volk*, then formed the foundation of ‘blood’ and heredity. ‘Race’ was the result of a breeding process, while *Volk* was from a biological point of view unstable.⁸⁹

This led Müller to emphasise the importance of the not primarily Nordic stock for the German *Volk*, and to translate this opinion into the political agenda. Borrowing from the historian Adolf Helbok (1883–1968), he used the horticultural metaphor of a ‘seedbed of blood’. *Volk* as a ‘seedbed’ cannot be suitable for all plants because of the specific factors of the soil. But *Volk* was suitable for ‘racial improvement’ (*Aufartung*).

3. New Agenda: Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (1939–1945)

Müller’s scientific ambitions were clearly closely related to the *Zeitgeist*. After the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia arose in German circles the issue of ‘Germanisation’, i.e. assimilation or dissimilation of the Czech population in this region. It led to various political questions which were for the Nazi authorities and decision makers as the very core of their long-term policy in this region. It is known that in August 1940, both Reichprotector Konstantin Freiherr von Neurath (1873–1956) and State Secretary K. H. Frank supported the assimilation of a major part of the Czech population by racial selection. It was supposed to be one of the main principles of their policy. At the same time, they decided on the extermination of political opponents, the intelligentsia, and of course the Jewish and Roma/Sinti population. The final aim of the German policy was ‘the complete integration into a pan-German Reich’ (Neurath) and a ‘total Germanisation of the space and people’ (Frank) as a way to a real *Umvolkung*, that is both in biological and cultural meaning.⁹⁰

K. V. Müller himself was acquainted with these plans concerning population changes south and east of the German space, whose long term aim was a complete ‘Germanisation’ of the Protectorate. In his memorandum *The Czech-German Question*⁹¹ of 1938, he then formulated the following main claims:

– Bohemia and Moravia ought to be subjugated to Germany;

⁸⁷ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, p. 344; id., *Zur sozialanthropologischen Bedeutung*, p. 47. See Egon von EICKSTEDT, *Raumplanung und Menschforschung*, *Raumplanung und Raumordnung* 7, 1943, pp. 133–137.

⁸⁸ K. V. MÜLLER, *Gesetzmäßigkeiten*, p. 345.

⁸⁹ id., *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes im Tschechien*, p. 325; id., *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes in Südosteuropa*, p. 590.

⁹⁰ A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 18. See D. BRANDES, *Umvolkung*, p. 179; René KÜPPER, *Karl Hermann Frank (1898–1946). Politische Biographie eines sudetendeutschen Nationalsozialisten*, München 2010, p. 164.

⁹¹ SOA Praha, K. V. Müller, Memorandum on the Czech-German Question (*Die tschechisch-deutsche Frage*), (official information on a private path), sheets 2–9. See E. KUBÚ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 96.

– The upper classes of the Czech population are the carriers of ‘German blood’ that became alienated and in the course of history ‘Czechised’.

Led by his unquestioned belief in German leadership, Müller proposed a way of bringing this population back to the German *Kulturland* and promoting the ‘German blood’ within the *Volk* by offering social advancement.⁹²

This fitted well with his ideas about the change of *Volkstum*, the role of leadership, and the Nordic race. It made Müller optimistic about the future of Bohemia and Moravia, which he saw as the cradle of humankind in Central Europe.⁹³ He emphasised the practical relevance of his idea when stating that the changes in the kinds of achievements or skills of a nation are grounded in changes of its biological structure. He claimed that the influence of ‘German blood’ had already reached the upper classes of the Czech population.

Already before the September crisis in 1938, Müller offered himself and his ideas in the political arena. One of the persons who were impressed by them was M. P. Wolf⁹⁴ who sent Müller’s memorandum to his superior in the SD headquarters in Berlin, Dr. Franz-Alfred Six (1909–1975), and pointed out that Müller’s document was “important in providing clarification of some basic questions of our own scientific work” on Czechoslovakia.⁹⁵ Later he characterised Müller as an anti-Marxist, who was until 1933 member of the SPD, and an advocate of racial and imperialistic ideas since 1924. In the field of the so-called social biology, Wolf said that Müller was highly esteemed by the *Rassenpolitisches Amt der NSDAP* (Walter Groß) and by Arthur Gütt (1891–1949) from the Reich Ministry of the Interior (*Reichsinnenministerium*).⁹⁶

Müller’s efforts to play an important role as an expert on issues of *Volkstum* and minorities in the thriving settlement policy resulted in a study about *The Importance of the German Blood for the Czechs* in 1940.⁹⁷ M. P. Wolf sent this text to the Reichprotector and to Horst Böhme (1909–1945), head of the local SD headquarters (*SD-Leitabschnitt*) in Prague. Wolf recommended Müller as a ‘politically reliable Sudeten German’ who speaks and understands Czech and is well suited for a university position in Prague.⁹⁸

In Berlin, too, the Department III (Interior Security Service) of the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA) was concerned with Müller’s text. In general, the text – the *Memorandum on the Questions of Umvolkung in the Southeast*⁹⁹ – did not get positive reception in the

⁹² Ibid., sheet 9. See also K. V. MÜLLER, *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes im Tschechien*, p. 329; id., *Zur sozialanthropologischen Bedeutung*, p. 49.

⁹³ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Zur Rassen- und Volksgeschichte des böhmisch-mährischen Raumes*, in: Friedrich Heiss (ed.), *Das Böhmen und Mähren-Buch. Volkskampf und Reichsraum*, Prag – Amsterdam – Berlin – Wien 1943, pp. 127–134 [127].

⁹⁴ P. M. Wolf came to Prague shortly after the German occupation on March 15, 1939. He briefly held the post Deputy Director of the Regional HQ of the SD in Prague. In 1939–1942, he was in charge of sections B1 and E. In the spring of 1942, he took over as head of the Department for Cultural Policy in the Office of the Reich Protector. At the same time, he also worked until 1943 for the SD in Section III C.

⁹⁵ SOA Praha, Müller K. V., letter of M. P. Wolf to Dr. F.-A. Six, May 5, 1938, (official information on a private path), sheet 1.

⁹⁶ Ibid., sheet 10ff., letter of M. P. Wolf to Dr. F.-A. Six, September 12, 1938.

⁹⁷ K. V. MÜLLER, *Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes im Tschechien*; See E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, pp. 97, 105.

⁹⁸ SOA Praha, letter of M. P. Wolf to H. Böhme, May 14, 1940, official information on a private path, sheet 158. See E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 97.

⁹⁹ Ibid.; SOA Praha, Müller K. V., *Denkschrift über Umvolkungsfragen des Südostens* – Statement of the Department III RSHA, (official information on a private path), sheets 155–157.

RSHA because Müller was more or less unknown there.¹⁰⁰ Experts of the Department III criticised the memorandum for several shortcomings: underestimation of the force of nationalism in the 20th century and especially insufficient consideration of racial aspects of the concept of *Umvolkung*. Müller's socio-anthropological considerations and his main research hypothesis about the implementation of the process of *Umvolkung* in the area of Bohemia and Moravia through voluntary selection and support of social mobility did, however, receive positive evaluations.¹⁰¹

With this memorandum, which the current historiographical literature classifies as a work commissioned by K. H. Frank, Müller succeeded in being heard on the issue of *Umvolkung* in the argument between different fractions of interest and institutions, particularly at the SD.

Especially Müller's personal contact with K. H. Frank became important. They met at the latest at a conference on Germanisation strategies in Bohemia in Bad Podiebrad/Poděbrady on September 28–29, 1940. K. H. Frank was impressed with Müller's talk on the *Czech-German Question and the Proportion of German Blood in the Czech Population*. Soon afterwards, he started studying the material Müller collected since it was relevant to the future fate of Bohemia and Moravia and its population.¹⁰² With the help of K. H. Frank, Müller became part of the survey on *Volkstumsarbeit* at the German Charles University in Prague. Together with Professor Walter Weddigen, his colleague from Dresden, Müller was in 1941 invited by Frank to the Protectorate.¹⁰³ With university students, they investigated the socio-anthropological profile of 6,000 Czechs: qualified craftsmen, leading employees, traders and technical experts of four big companies. They reached a conclusion that in this group of Czechs was 'a higher than average number' of persons with 'Nordic racial traits'.¹⁰⁴

Frank also made Müller his policy advisor, which meant he became a colleague of the international lawyer Hermann Raschhofer (1905–1979). Müller became Frank's special advisor in the field of racial issues. K. H. Frank supported Müller's appointment to the German Charles University and advocated on his behalf at the Wehrmacht, where he asked that Müller be called when there arises urgent need for a psychological examination. He claimed that Müller "had carried out important research in German-Czech issues of race and '*Umvolkung*', thus accomplishing a task that was set by the Führer".¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ The Department III seemed to be unaware of Müller's academic career: in the statement, he is also described as a 'referent for the vocational school system in the Saxon Ministry of Education', whose main interest was the research of giftedness, and who only later became interested in racial questions. *Ibid.*, sheet 155.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, statement of the Department III RSHA (official information on a private path), sheets 155–157.

¹⁰² G. VOIGT, *Faschistische*, p. 162; A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 21; *id.*, *Karl Valentin Müller*; C. KLINGEMANN, *Ostforschung*, p. 189.

¹⁰³ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Grundsätzliche Ausführungen über das deutsche und tschechische Volkstum in Böhmen und Mähren*, Raumforschung und Raumordnung V-10/12, 1941, pp. 488–496 [489, footnote 6]. See R. POMMERIN, *Geschichte*, p. 202; D. BRANDES, *Umvolkung*, p. 196 (footnote 86); A. WIEDEMANN, *Karl Valentin Müller*.

¹⁰⁴ E. KUBÚ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 105.

¹⁰⁵ Cited in A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 64. Müller was subject to obligatory military service in the Wehrmacht and was recruited during the Polish campaign and in France in 1939–40. As an officer, he was active mainly in military psychology. See *Bibliography ... 1961*, 6. Cf; UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller – F 2/1 No. 2364 – copy, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität March 6, 1952: August 29, 1939 to April 3, 1940. Landwehr; April 4, 1940 – October 7, 1940. Military service; October 10, 1940 – December 15, 1941. Kriegsverwaltungsrat, May 1, 1942 – July 15, 1942.

Frank's interest in Müller's work and his memorandum was not without self-interest, since he needed to defend his view against other ideas regarding *Umvolkung* in the Protectorate. His basic conviction of the Germanisation potential (*Eindeutschungsfähigkeit*) of the Czechs, which he shared with the SS and with Reinhard Heydrich (1904–1942, chief of the RSHA and in 1941–1942 deputy Reichprotector) made Müller's memorandum rather politically sensitive.

3.1 'Umvolkung'

Müller's 25 pages long memorandum was based on his above-mentioned convictions. In this text, he described a third way of restructuring South Eastern Europe and achieving a sustainable *Umvolkung*. He presented a four step programme:

1. Superimposition of a German leadership throughout the entire German-dominated space;
2. Regaining large parts of the recently de-Germanised strata of capable population for the traditions of their mother nation;
3. Mobilisation of high performers from other nations for work in the German habitat in case these people have proven themselves to be capable workers who present no biological concern;
4. The purification of the German domain from recently naturalised inferior stock via *Rückvolkung* towards the Slavic people of origin.¹⁰⁶

In the long term, Müller aimed at a biologically sound allocation of functions in the German-ruled areas in Central Europe where Germans should remain dominant for ever.

According to Müller's dictum ('Each person in his or her hereditary adequate position.') this was linked to the purification of the 'leading master people' (*führendes Herrenvolk*) and its consolidation as a class of leaders and masters in the shared territory. Entirely in the spirit of Orwell's utopia, it would fall on the master race to sensitively lead the nations of its territory so they remain harmless and satisfied with their subservient position which corresponds to their 'racial character'. Subjugated nations should get accustomed to this order, preserve their cultural and linguistic heritage, and develop into hardworking, docile, and racially inferior populations.¹⁰⁷

With this dual orientation of the programme of *Umvolkung*, Müller was hoping to achieve the establishment of a master race and a 'vassal people' (*Vasallenvolk*).¹⁰⁸ To turn a nation into an ideal 'nation of servants' (*Dienstvolk*), one would have to remove a handful of top performers by offering them opportunities for social advancement and to incorporate these people into the master race. With this kind of *Umvolkung* of the elite, Müller promised to strengthen the elite and prevent ethnically biological dangers, such as lack of high-performing offspring or dilution of ethnic characteristics and the level of performance. Simultaneously, Müller sought to remove inferior elements from the Slavic nations, that is, carry out a *Rückvolkung* of inferior elements. This would then together with the strength of the leading elites determine the potential for Germanisation (*Eindeutschungsfähigkeit*) and ethnic and racial restructuring of territory. Regarding assimilation (re-Germanisation, *Umvolkung*

¹⁰⁶ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Denkschrift zur Umvolkung*, no date [presumably 1940], p. 7.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8. See A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 65; G. VOIGT, *Faschistische*, p. 376.

¹⁰⁸ C. KLINGEMANN, *Ostforschung*, p. 191.

of the elites) and dissimilation (purification, ethnic cleansing), Müller's programme promised to strengthen German leadership in the long run while simultaneously securing the reservoir of labour force of the Slavic people as a 'vassal people'.¹⁰⁹

3.2 'Assimilation' and 'Dissimilation'

Müller promised to implement the historical process of *Umvolkung* and direct the 'osmosis' of the population through politically directed improvement of the population. Regarding assimilation, he said that any "biological threat from recent times and suitable parts of the vassal people would be, to varying degree, subjected to the German rule".¹¹⁰

Since suitable social groups from within the 'vassal people' were to be resettled in the *Altreich*, Müller identified some suitable professional classes, such as university students, future academics, technical experts, physicians and employees, businessmen, farmers and skilled workers.¹¹¹ This selection was based on his positive correlation of 'hereditary biological competence' (*erbbiologische Fähigkeit*) and their social, professional position. According to the biologically determined concept of *Volk*, assimilation was meant to strengthen the German nation in the long term and support German leadership in this territory by removing all national borders of the racially and socially superior class.¹¹²

'Dissimilation', the second factor of Müller's programme, was defined as voluntary subordination of the masses of unskilled industrial and farm workers. The influx of these workers who were needed by the Reich had to be rigorously controlled due to ethnic and biological reasons. To minimise the risk of the mixing of blood, extramarital relations between Germans and these people would be severely condemned, while prevention would take the form of high alimony to be paid by men.¹¹³

Müller's conception of *Volk*, however, was in opposition to the programme outlined in a law of 'racial security'. The objection that Müller had to counter was that his programme ran a high risk of formation of undesirable relations and there was a possibility of persisting allegiance to the vassal nation and its language. Müller's programme did not completely ban the marriage of Germans and Slavs: it made such an option dependent on the abilities of the candidates. Müller did not see as problematic marriage between German men and ethnically foreign (*fremdvölkisch*) women since it aided the purification of the master race and improved the vassal nation.¹¹⁴

Müller refused coercion but was not opposed to state control. This was the essential part of the *volkspolitischen* framework, which would aim at a successful implementation of hierarchic relations between the master race and its vassals by making sure that a limited role of the vassal people of peasant and petit bourgeois character would be a stable one and the biologically strengthened, ennobled, and purified German master race achieved a biological monopoly on high performance in the pan-German space.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Denkschrift*, p. 9.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14. See E. KUBÜ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 106.

¹¹¹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Denkschrift*, p. 15. See E. KUBÜ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 108.

¹¹² K. V. MÜLLER, *Denkschrift*, p. 16.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 19. Against this background, he also supported the existence of a non-German school and education system. *Ibid.*, p. 20. See E. KUBÜ, *Die Bedeutung*, pp. 109–110.

¹¹⁵ K. V. MÜLLER, *Denkschrift*, pp. 24–25; E. KUBÜ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 110.

4. Breakthrough in Local Academia and Politics as a Servant of the SD

With his programme of *Umvolkung*, K. V. Müller in the end secured a professorship for social anthropology and *Volksbiologie* in Prague, where he also carried out research for the Reinhard Heydrich Foundation.

In his memorandum, Müller had demonstrated his ‘knowledge’ of anthropological situation in Bohemia and Moravia and his political loyalty. With the twofold orientation of his *Umvolkung* programme – and not without self-interest – he upheld the basic principle of the potential to Germanisation and thus also the political importance of taking stock of the racial and ethnic composition of the region.¹¹⁶

From October 1940 until December 1941, Müller did his military service in Prague, which gave him the opportunity to advance his academic and political profile. The political circles in Prague appreciated his dedication. In 1940, he was appointed to the chair of social anthropology at the Faculty of Philosophy of the German Charles University in Prague.¹¹⁷ Even before Müller received the official letter of appointment, he informed the dean of his faculty at the Technical University in Dresden “that the German Charles University in Prague was considering his appointment to full professor of Sozialanthropologie”.¹¹⁸ In November 1941, Müller received his appointment and indeed became full professor of social anthropology and *Volksbiologie*.¹¹⁹ Then he left Dresden and moved to Prague on a permanent basis.¹²⁰

At this point, Müller joined the elite circle of researchers of race and ethnicity (*Rassen- und Volksforscher*) at the German Charles University. Later, his *Institut für Sozialanthropologie und Volksbiologie* had a special status within the RHSt; Müller himself was considered a reliable professor who most significantly contributed to the German Charles University’s high ranking in scientific standard and political impact.¹²¹ But before that could happen, the authorities in Prague had to decide whether Müller’s field of expertise, i.e. *Sozialanthropologie*, was indeed an independent subject which would deserve a separate institute.¹²²

¹¹⁶ A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, pp. 22–23. See the paper on the Institute for Racial Biology in this volume.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 66; E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, pp. 97–98.

¹¹⁸ SächsHStA Dresden, file 15062, letter of K. V. Müller (copy) to Dean P. Hofmann, November 8, 1941.

¹¹⁹ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller – F 2/1 No. 2364, letter of the Reichserziehungsminister (copy) to K. V. Müller, November 6, 1941.

¹²⁰ His friend M. P. Wolf assisted him with finding a suitable house in Prague. Among other things, Wolf used his connections to the Central Office for Jewish Emigration. See SOA Praha, letter of K. V. Müller to M. P. Wolf, November 29, 1941; *ibid.* letter of M. P. Wolf to K. V. Müller, December 4, 1941 (official information on a private path), sheets 35, 153.

¹²¹ Martin ZÜCKERT, *Josef Hanika (1900–1963) Volkskundler. Zwischen wissenschaftlicher Forschung und ‘Volkstumskampf’*, in: Monika Glettner – Alena Mišková (eds.), *Prager Professoren 1938–1948. Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik*, Essen 2001, pp. 191–220 [215]; A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 48.

¹²² See Národní archiv (hereinafter NA) Praha, ÚŘP-114, letter of the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy of the German Charles University to the Reich Minister for Science etc. March 27, 1941; *ibid.* letter of the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy to the Curator of the German Scientific Universities, May 14, 1942. I want to thank M. V. Šimůnek for providing copies of these documents.

4.1 Activities in the Academic Circles in Prague

In addition to his *volkspolitisch* motivated research, whose results were highly valued by the Reichprotector,¹²³ Müller also fulfilled the duties of a teaching professor. His lectures and tutorials were closely linked to the topics he addressed in his research: the foundations of social anthropology, selection and counter-selection in the German people (practical ethnic biology), the presence and proportion of German blood in the Czech people (which required applied research), sociology of *Umvolkung* with particular emphasis on Bohemian-Moravian relations, *Volk*, class, race, etc.¹²⁴ Soon, his audience included students of the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Law. When lecturing to the medics, Müller joined forces with the racial hygienist Karl (Johannes) Thums (1904–1976) whose special field of interest was racial/hereditary hygiene and population policy. When lecturing to law students, he held in the summer term 1943 one of his ‘staple’ lectures on ‘Selection and counter-selection among the German people’.¹²⁵ According to his own reports, after being appointed in 1943 professor and head of a new institute,¹²⁶ he focused on four main research tasks:

Volkswandel in the southeast, demographic, psychological, and socio-anthropological investigation of the Protectorate police force in Bohemia and Moravia, research of talent and intelligence in Czech schools, a sociological and socio-anthropological survey of Baťa’s factory in Zlín.¹²⁷

On top of that, Müller was the deputy head of the Prague consortium of universities for ‘spatial research’ (*Raumforschung*, which in fact meant geopolitical reorganisation of territories under German control) and carried out socio-anthropological spatial research in the Sudetengerman regions within the wider university network of the Reichsconsortium for spatial research (*Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft für Raumforschung*, hereinafter RAG).¹²⁸ He discussed his work with Rudolf Hippius (1905–1945), a social and national psychologist (*Sozial- und Völkerpsychologe*). Their aim was to develop a fast procedure for socio-psychological rating of the Czech population. With Hippius and other colleagues, Müller carried out a survey of certain social groups which were seen as candidates for Germanisation.¹²⁹ Müller and Hippius closely collaborated with the Institute for Racial Biology (*Institut für Rassenbiologie*) and the Institute for Hereditary and Racial Hygiene (*Institut*

¹²³ Draft for the Curator of the German University and director of the German Charles University, March 27, 1942 cited by E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 98.

¹²⁴ This information concerns the summer term of 1943, the winter term of 1943/44, and the summer term 1944. See *ibid.*, pp. 98–99.

¹²⁵ A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 89; E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 98; Michal V. ŠIMŮNEK, *Ein neues Fach. Die Erb- und Rassenhygiene an der Medizinischen Fakultät der Deutschen Karls-Universität Prag 1939–1945*, in: Antonín Kostlán et al. (eds.), *Wissenschaft in den böhmischen Ländern 1939–1945* (= *Studies in the History of Sciences and Humanities* 9), Prag 2004, pp. 190–316 [297–298]. According to a H. J. Beyer’s overview from July 12, 1944, the number of students participating in Müller’s courses fluctuated – population policy was attended by 31, doctrines of sociology by 36, performance and racial hereditary in Volk and society was attended by 29, and so on. See NA Praha, ST-110, 110-4-533, sheets 11–15.

¹²⁶ For more on the background, see A. MIŠKOVÁ, *Die Deutsche Universität Prag*, p. 173.

¹²⁷ *Bibliographie der Schriften von Dr. phil. habil. Karl Valentin Müller o. Professor für Soziologie und Sozialanthropologie an der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg*, Nürnberg 1961, p. 6.

¹²⁸ J. GUTBERGER, *Bevölkerung*, p. 365, 459; A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, pp. 66–67.

¹²⁹ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Volksbiologie und Heimatforschung*, *Deutsche Volksforschung in Böhmen und Mähren* 3, 1944, pp. 297–300; *id.*, *Die Gegenanslese im tschechischen Volke*, *Deutsche Volksforschung in Böhmen und Mähren* 3, 1944, pp. 297–300. See K. H. ROTH, *Heydrichs Professor*, p. 307.

für Erb- und Rassenhygiene).¹³⁰ It was determined from the beginning that racial hygiene and *Sozialanthropologie* overlapped in the field of qualitative and quantitative population biology.¹³¹ This was emphasised by Karl Thums in his report about population research at his institute, when he wrote: “A whole range of institutes, seminars, and other scientific facilities in Prague are responsible for the handling of demographic questions in the space of Bohemia and Moravia. In this context, one ought to mention especially the following: Institute for Social Anthropology and Volksbiologie (Prof. K. V. Müller) and the Institute for Racial Biology (Prof. B. K. Schultz) in the Faculty of Natural Sciences.”¹³²

In this quote, Thums indirectly referred to Müller’s research about the significance of interethnic marriages for the body of the nation (*Volkskörper*), the strength of the nation (*Volkskraft*), and the nation as such (*Volkstum*). The debate about interethnic marriages focused specifically on issues of mate selection (*Paarungssiebung*) and the research aimed at creating “a picture on those values and characteristics of the Volk created by families resulting from such interethnic marriages”.¹³³

K. V. Müller was officially supposed to work primarily on issues of depopulation and *Umvolkung* in Bohemia and Moravia. He hoped to create an overview on the constitutional, typological, and racial composition of the population, a summary of the ethnic and social descent of the Protectorate police force over three generations, and the degree of urbanisation of civil servants by gathering socio-anthropological data on civil servants in the Czech Protectorate police force.¹³⁴ In his examination of the leading members of the Czech national sport movement *Sokol*, which was based on a list of members provided by the SD, Müller sought to determine the percentage of German names etc.¹³⁵

Outside the German Charles University, Müller closely collaborated with his colleagues from other Prague institutes and offices. He and Thums were active in the *Anstalt für sudenteutsche Heimatforschung*, more specifically in the Commission for the Research on Race and Genealogy (*Kommission für Rassen- und Sippenforschung*) in 1943. In collaboration with Hans Joachim Beyer (1908–1971) and Hermann Raschhofer, Müller repeatedly inspired the other researchers with his work. This was achieved mainly through the connection to the SS-Obersturmbannführer Viktor Nageler who was situated as an official supervisor of the Hlinka Guard at the German legation in Bratislava, Slovakia. At conferences, Müller lectured on the vitalising German presence within the Czech nation. It was a topic he kept returning to for many years, including at the meeting of the RSHA in Slapy/Slap near Prague in October 1942.¹³⁶

¹³⁰ See, i.a., paper 2 of this volume.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 339; A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, p. 89. See NA Praha, ÚRP-114, letter of the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy of the German Charles-University to the Reich Minister for Science etc., March 27, 1941.

¹³² Karl THUMS, *Bevölkerungsforschung des Universitätsinstituts für Erb- und Rassenhygiene in Prag*, Archiv für Bevölkerungswissenschaft und Bevölkerungspolitik 13/3–4, 1943, pp. 170–173 [171]. See M. V. ŠIMŮNEK, *Ein neues*.

¹³³ K. THUMS, *Bevölkerungsforschung*, pp. 171–172. He also mentioned a ‘wider examination of a sociologically distinct region of Moravia (Zlin)’, which his collaborator Hiebl had largely completed.

¹³⁴ NA Praha, ST-109, 109-8/40, letter of K. V. Müller to K. H. Frank, April 15, 1943. See also K. V. MÜLLER, *Die Gegenauselese*; A. WIEDEMANN, *Karl Valentin Müller*.

¹³⁵ ABS Praha, Z-10-P-238, letter of the SD-Leitabschnitt Prague to K. H. Frank, August 28, 1943. See A. WIEDEMANN, *Karl Valentin Müller*.

¹³⁶ G. VOIGT, *Faschistische*, p. 187.

Müller's research was funded by the RHSt and by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, hereinafter DFG). In 1943, the DFG gave 13,000 Reichsmark to Müller's institute for the development of sufficiently reliable and fast methods of determining the German hereditary share in particular Czech regions and social classes, research of the extent of assimilation of ethnically German families among Czech craftsmen, and for socio-anthropological studies, such as measurement of personnel.¹³⁷ This latter research was based on genealogical questionnaires which included personal details such as name, profession, rank, age, marital status, educational attainment, number of children, etc.¹³⁸ Moreover, Müller also followed 'ethnic degeneration' (*völkische Entartung*)¹³⁹ on the basis of differential fertility and carried out a survey of the Protectorate police as an 'expert for interior security'.¹⁴⁰

This research influenced also Müller's journalistic work and helped him establish a scientific reputation of a man who, basically on his own, opened the whole issue of representation of 'German blood' in the Czech nation.¹⁴¹

4.2 Müller's Journalistic Work

In addition to developing his influence in ethnic biology, Müller, especially in his journalistic work, treated various issues, which had long been of interest to him, such as the 'sifting' (social selection) process and differential fertility.¹⁴² He reminded the experts that "especially to racial hygienists, reproduction customs are seen as an instrument whose real purpose is to function as a selection procedure for the renewal of a nation".¹⁴³ Regarding social selection, Müller performed a socio-anthropological analysis of urban migration and pointed to the dangers to differential fertility associated with changes in selection, which arises in transition from full manhood (rural) to partial manhood (urban).¹⁴⁴

In his collected journalistic works from his Prague years, Müller focused mainly on issues of ethnic biology such as the influence of 'vital' contribution of German blood for the advancement of the Czech people.¹⁴⁵ In his efforts to uncover the core of relations between the Czech and the German people in Bohemia and Moravia, Müller managed to find several

¹³⁷ C. KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie*, p. 14; H. GUTBERGER, *Volk*, p. 461. See Müller's applications to the German Research Foundation, DFG) in 1942 in the Bundesarchiv (hereinafter BArch) Koblenz, R 73/13294, Müller. K. V. – R 73/13294. I wish to thank M. V. Šimůnek for providing me copies of these documents.

¹³⁸ K. V. MÜLLER, *Volksbiologie*, p. 357. See A. WIEDEMANN, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung*, pp. 78–79.

¹³⁹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Die Gegenauslese*.

¹⁴⁰ ABS Praha, Z-755, sheet 2, letter of the SD-Leitabschnitt Prague to Dr. R. Giess, personnel referent of K. H. Frank, September 22, 1943.

¹⁴¹ NA Praha, NSM-110, 110-12/4, sheet 13, letter of the SD-Leitabschnitt Prague to Dr. R. Gies, March 31, 1944.

¹⁴² Karl V. MÜLLER, *Siebungsvorgänge bei der Bildung von Großstadtbevölkerungen*, Archiv für Bevölkerungswissenschaften und Bevölkerungspolitik 12/ 1–2, pp. 1–26; id., *Unehelichkeit und Rassenpflege. Eine Stellungnahme zu dem Aufsatz von S. Tzschucke*, ARGB 36/4, 1942, pp. 345–357.

¹⁴³ Id., *Unehelichkeit*, p. 357.

¹⁴⁴ Id., *Siebungsvorgänge*, pp. 21–22, 24. Müller here explicitly refers to the works of the Czech reform eugenicist and human geneticist Dr. Bohumil Sekla (1901–1987), who in the late 1930s and early 1940s published various issues including differential fertility. They met in 1935 at the International Population Congress held in Berlin and Dresden. During the German occupation, K. V. Müller tried to involve B. Sekla, who was actually active member of the Czech resistance movement, in various activities of his institute. See Bohumil SEKLA, *Růst národa* (Growth of a Nation), Praha 1940.

¹⁴⁵ E.g. Karl V. MÜLLER, *Beobachtungen über die Fruchtbarkeit und Fruchtbarkeitsunterschiede der Gutsbevölkerung in der ehemaligen Provinz Posen*, ARGB 36/1, 1942; id., *Deutsche Lebensströme*.

allies who contributed to his historical and empirical research. Together with Professor Heinz Zatschek (1901–1965), a historian, Müller published a study on *Das biologische Schicksal der Přemysliden* ('The biological fate of the Přemyslids'), where both authors claimed to have verified Müller's hypothesis about the history of this medieval Bohemian dynasty: the relationship between Germans and their south-eastern neighbours had been shaped a cultural gap and heavy borrowing from people of German origin. That is how the south-eastern nations had been able to join the Western cultural development.¹⁴⁶

In his other works on ethnic biology, Müller also tried to solve issues related to the representation of German element in the hereditary structure of the Czech people.¹⁴⁷ With reference to H. F. K. Günther, he pointed to the process of de-Nordification in the transformations of the 19th century.¹⁴⁸ Müller had no doubts retarding the transfer of hereditary potential between peoples in the territory of Bohemia and Moravia through inter-marriage or gradual transition of hereditarily related groups into new territories (*Umvolkungen*). He did, however, reject the idea that Sudeten Germans and Czechs should be seen as racially clearly distinguishable bloodlines (*Blutsbeete*). In a deterministic manner, Müller verified his hypothesis with a methodological mix of genealogy, family studies, graveyard counts regarding language on tombstones, and wealth.¹⁴⁹

Müller eagerly tried to convince biologists and demographers that the question of ethnic origin could be answered directly from a person's sense of belonging to a people. He aimed to achieve this by positing a difference between *Volk* and 'race'. In this endeavour, he found numerous allies in the Prague circles.¹⁵⁰ In his biologically tinted view of the history of a thousand year-long coexistence of the Germans and the Czechs in the region, Müller repeatedly tried to prove that since the very beginning of the contact between these two peoples, anthropological differences were clearly visible in lower classes, while the upper classes consisted of 'classical Old Czechs' (*klassische Alttschechen*), that is, fair-skinned, fair-haired, blue-eyed people of Nordic-Phalial race.¹⁵¹ Based on Adolf Helbok's views, Müller saw this as a consequence of the small Czech nation having been embedded in the larger German nation for nearly 1,500 years. From the very beginning, the Czech nation included not only Slavic elements but also German ones. In all likelihood, the German element was represented in significant numbers and in the past, it was probably racially different from the small, dark Slavs. In his picture of a German *Volks-garten*, Müller described his vision, which has already been outlined in his memorandum on the *Umvolkung*, in more detail: "In every spring of history, seeds used to travel to and from between the small Slavic and the large flowerbed of German blood. This will become even more intense since soon the dividing walls and fences of independent statehood will largely be removed and Bohemia will become a heartland of the German Reich. At the same time, the seeds of the small flowers of the Slavic flowerbed of blood will not be able to essentially change the appearance of the large German *Volks-garten*, and the same holds

¹⁴⁶ Karl V. MÜLLER – Heinz ZATSCHEK, *Das biologische Schicksal der Přemysliden. Ein Beispiel für die aufstehende Wirkung deutscher Erblinien in fremdvölkischen Blutkreisen*, ARGB 35/2, 1941, pp. 136–152 [151–152].

¹⁴⁷ K. V. MÜLLER, *Deutsche Lebensströme*, p. 311.

¹⁴⁸ Id., *Zur sozialanthropologischen Bedeutung*, p. 32.

¹⁴⁹ Id., *Deutsche Lebensströme*; K. V. MÜLLER – H. ZATSCHEK, *Das biologische Schicksal*.

¹⁵⁰ K. V. MÜLLER, *Deutsche Lebensströme*, pp. 311–312.

¹⁵¹ Id., *Grundsätzliche Ausführungen*, p. 488. See K. V. MÜLLER – H. ZATSCHEK, *Das biologische Schicksal*. See E. KUBÚ, *Die Bedeutung*, pp. 100–101.

for other Slavic flowerbeds of blood in the north and in the east. At most, this will happen in some particular lower-performing classes. The settlement of seeds from the historically strict selective breeding of the German *Volksgarten* is eminently sustainable, and over time, it will transform the small flowerbed of Slavic hereditary potential, which will grow to resemble the German *Volksgarten* in its returns or at least grow like the neighbouring flower beds. The picture of described in the original scenario will become untypical and uncharacteristic for the present.”¹⁵²

Müller never tired of trying to prove a ‘heritage of Nordic blood’ among the upper classes of the Czech people and demonstrating the intermingling of the ‘blood’ of both peoples through genealogical research and graveyard counts. He kept trying to emphasise the benefits of inclusion of German ‘blood’ in the Czech social structure. He was convinced he empirically proved that the anthropological picture of the Czechs is converging towards the German blood, that the direction in which the Czech nation is developing is one of assimilation (*Einvolkungsrichtung*).¹⁵³

Especially the *Volk*-oriented academic circles around the RHSt in Prague viewed these claims with avid interest and from these academic circles came in late March 1944 the proposal to award the War Merit Cross (*Kriegsverdienstkreuz*, KVK) to Müller. It was supposed to be a sign of appreciation of Müller’s work, especially his contribution to solving the question of representation of ‘German blood’ in the Czech people by comprehensive socio-anthropological investigations and his devotion to carry out ethnically biological tasks at any time.¹⁵⁴ Müller was honoured after his ethnic-biological assignment in Slovakia when he received War Merit Cross 2nd Class with Swords in late 1944.¹⁵⁵

4.3 Müller’s ‘volkspolitisch’ Mission in Slovakia

Müller’s institute was not affected by the limitations caused by the war in 1944. Nevertheless, the RHSt, which increasingly focused the study of enemy nations and on the mobilisation of population in occupied territories, put his work on ‘employment and race’ on the back burner. In 1944, Müller then travelled with a new *volkspolitische* assignment to Slovakia to study “the significance of *Volk*-bloodedness, as opposed to *Volk*-commitment groups, within a social structure. This was to be achieved in part by a study of centres of talents (points of density), and in part by the so-called graveyard method, as in Bohemia and Moravia. Especially the latter method promises to provide rich results in Slovakia, since there, the three groups *Volk*-born and *Volk*-committed are related to each other.”¹⁵⁶

After his arrival to Slovakia, Müller fell in captivity at the beginning of the Slovak National Uprising in 1944. It happened while he was residing in the selection camp Weinitz/Bojnice, where he intended to carry out anthropological examinations of the Slovak Fascist leadership

¹⁵² K. V. MÜLLER, *Deutsche Lebensströme*, p. 313.

¹⁵³ Id., *Grundsätzliche Ausführungen*, p. 492. See E. KUBÚ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 102. See K. V. MÜLLER, *Deutsche Lebensströme*; id., *Zur Rassen- und Volksgeschichte*.

¹⁵⁴ NA Praha, NSM-110, 110-12/4, sheets 13–14, letter of the SD-Leitabschnitt Prague to Dr. R. Gies, March 31, 1944.

¹⁵⁵ ABS Praha, Z-P-238, sheet 22, letter of the German secretary of state K. H. Frank to K. V. Müller, December 2, 1944.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., sheet 6, report of K. V. Müller on his impressions during the Slovak uprising in 1944, 1944.

of the Hlinka Guard.¹⁵⁷ After the defeat of the uprising by the German Wehrmacht, Müller returned to Prague in early November 1944. A few weeks later, he already presented a lecture on his ‘experiences among the Slovak partisans’ in a series of lectures and discussions organised by the RHSt.¹⁵⁸ In a written version of his experiences, Müller claimed that at the core of Slovak labour movement is an almost law-like excess pressure (congestion) of socially upwardly mobile forces. He forwarded his report to M. P. Wolf, who in the meantime had advanced to Head of Department IV (Cultural Policy) and to K. H. Frank and the SD-local headquarters in Prague.¹⁵⁹ From the point of view of a socio-biologist, less severe congestions in shorter time would lead to quite dramatic political events due to the limited size of the Slovak habitat. He claimed their sociologically and programmatically conflicting nature was a major flaw, which enabled foreign agents and maladapted elements among the Slovak people to carry out terror. Müller viewed Slovaks as “basically plain, virtuous, pious, not particularly talented in broad segments of the population but quite docile and amiable, childlike, incapable of independent judgement, easy to seduce but easy to lead if approached correctly. The problem is rather that proper leadership is missing”.¹⁶⁰

To Müller, his anthropological investigations and experiences pointed towards the inevitability of providing the Slovaks with leadership from the outside. He believed the Hlinka Guard were reliable leaders with pro-German sympathies, whose union of comrades was held together by Nordic character and attitude, more by human selection than by programmatic rules.¹⁶¹ This was an argument against an ‘independent’ Slovak State and in favour of monitoring that no serious obstacles to their advancement arise. Being a socio-anthropologist and ethnic biologist, Müller believed the Slovaks had had an acute problem with leadership and this issue should not be forgotten even during quiet times, “when the future generation of leadership of the Slovak people will be formed, leaders well suited to lead this virtuous and amiable little people and its development”.¹⁶²

His ‘Slovak adventure’ and his ‘valiant devotion’ to the cause won him the abovementioned War Merit Cross. Müller thanked K. H. Frank for distinction with the following words: “You brought me unexpected joy by appreciating my Slovak adventure and awarding me the War Merit Cross (...). Let me express my sincere gratitude.”¹⁶³ Afterwards,

¹⁵⁷ G. VOIGT, *Faschistische*, p. 196, 260; C. KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie*, pp. 314–315. K. V. Müller published his sociological-anthropological studies during his stay after the war. See Karl V. MÜLLER, *Umvolkung und Sozialschichtung in der Slowakei. Ergebnisbericht über soziologisch-anthropologische Studien im slowakischen Staatsgebiet (1944)*, *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 2/3, 1953, pp. 400–424. For Hlinka Guard, see Helmut SCHALLER, *Der Nationalsozialismus und die slawische Welt*, Regensburg 2002, p. 171.

¹⁵⁸ NA Praha, NSM-110, 110-4/529, sheet 6, confidential invitation of the Reinhard Heydrich Foundation from November 17, 1944. H. J. Beyer was the second speaker of this event. He lectured on ‘Experiences with partisans and non-partisans in Southern Europe’.

¹⁵⁹ ABS Praha, Z-10/P-238, sheets 6–16; NA Praha, NSM-110, 110-4/529, sheet 5, letter of M. P. Wolf to K. H. Frank in AO, December 9, 1944. C. Klingemann mentions that Müller wrote a 23 pages long report, which was sent from the SD-unit in Prague to Department III B of the RSHS in 1944. An abridged version followed in December. See Müller’s report on his impressions during the Slovak uprising 1944 and C. KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie*, p. 315.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, sheets 7, 13.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, sheet 13.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, sheet 16.

¹⁶³ SOA Praha, 110-12/9, sheet 7: letter of K. V. Müller to K. H. Frank, December 6, 1944. It shall be mentioned that the historian Josef Pfitzner (1901–1945) was not able to detect any heroism shown during this assignment, and regarded Müller as being a tender little person. See E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, pp. 99–100 and also E. VOIGT, *Faschistische*, pp. 198–199; C. KLINGEMANN, *Soziologie*, pp. 314–315.

Müller accepted SS-leader Otto Ohlendorf's (1907–1951) invitation to Berlin to participate in a meeting of the Reich Ministry of Economy on sociological issues and challenges.¹⁶⁴

Before leaving Bohemia, however, he also tried to settle some problems in his private life which had troubled him for a while. After the birth of his son Gerd Rainer (Valentin) in 1942,¹⁶⁵ his wife repeatedly had to undergo electroshock therapy for health and mental issues.¹⁶⁶ This therapy, however, failed to resolve problems in the marriage. Müller claimed the main cause of the marital conflict was his wife's character, her 'excessive self-esteem' and 'distrustful defensive attitude' towards her social environment. Müller filed for divorce in March of 1943 citing his wife's lack of consideration, attacks on his professional honour and on his authority as a father, her public accusations in which she called him 'a criminal, a scoundrel, and such like' and her threats that she would file a complaint with the police and the Secret State Police (*Gestapo*).¹⁶⁷ He arranged for his eldest daughter and little son – his second daughter died in a hospital in Dresden in the end of 1943 – to stay with his mother in Gohrisch in the end of 1943. Divorce proceedings, which had been interrupted during his stay in Slovakia, concluded in the end of 1944. The outcome was in Müller's favour: the court cited his wife's 'schizophrenia' as the main cause of the failure of the marriage.¹⁶⁸

5. Epilogue

Müller left Prague a few months after his divorce. He went through Bavaria to Lower Saxony, where he identified himself in late 1945 with a refugee identity card A (*Flüchtlingsausweis A, No. 68*)¹⁶⁹ and immediately began looking for employment. His application for the chair of sociology in Hamburg, where he wanted to succeed Andreas Walthers, (1879–1960), was not successful.¹⁷⁰ Soon afterwards, however, the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs of Lower Saxony appointed him lecturer of sociology at a special course for teachers (*Lehrersonderkurs*) in Bad Bederkesa. The Ministry also put Müller in charge of research of sociology of giftedness in Lower Saxony,¹⁷¹ where he created an Institute for the

¹⁶⁴ Carsten SCHREIBER, *Eliten im Verborgenen. Ideologie und regionale Herrschaftspraxis des Sicherheitsdienstes des SS und seines Netzwerkes am Beispiel Sachsens* (= Studien zur Zeitgeschichte 77), München 2008, p. 183.

¹⁶⁵ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller, F 2/1, No. 2364, registration and personal sheet, July 23, 1962.

¹⁶⁶ See SOA Praha, NSDAP Praha, Dr. K. V. Müller, i. a. sheets 20, 25, 37, 39, 43, 87, 141.

¹⁶⁷ SOA Praha, NSDAP Praha, Dr. K. V. Müller, sheets 1–9, claim of K. V. Müller to the German District Court Prague III, March 30, 1943. See E. KUBŮ, *Die Bedeutung*, p. 94 (footnote 5).

¹⁶⁸ NA Praha, NSM-110, 110-12/9, sheet 4, letter of the head of the department of justice to the chief of the ministerial office (in-house), December 13, 1944; *ibid.*, sheet 5; copy note without date; *ibid.*, sheet 6. UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller – F 2/1 No. 2364, K. V. Müller's statement on financial burdens, March 31, 1955; *ibid.*, letters of K. V. Müller to the principal of the University Erlangen-Nürnberg, February 27, 1963. Müller took his divorced wife to a clinic, and his two children to his mother and sister.

¹⁶⁹ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller, F 2/1 No. 2364, December 15, 1945 is specified in the registration and personal sheet of September 19, 1950. A. Wiedemann refers to a report of the National Security in Prague, which states that K. V. Müller left Prague on May 5, 1945.

¹⁷⁰ Rainer WASSNER, *Andreas Walther und das Seminar für Soziologie in Hamburg zwischen 1926 und 1945. Ein wissenschaftsbiographischer Umriss*, in: Sven Papcke (ed.), *Ordnung und Theorie. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Soziologie in Deutschland*, Darmstadt 1986, pp. 386–420 [412].

¹⁷¹ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller, F 2/1 No. 2364, letter (copy) of the Ministry of Lower Saxony, September 22, 1950.

Research on Intellectual Giftedness.¹⁷² Müller then went on researching giftedness using his ‘well-tried’ methodological mix and just like before, he tended to conclude that abilities are ‘environmentally stable’ and ‘differentiated by heredity’. He soon began to include various demographic and socio-anthropological issues in his research on sociology of giftedness.¹⁷³ Shortly after, he found another field of work as the head of the (socio-anthropological) Research Group on Space and Society in the Academy for Spatial Research and Country Planning. In 1950, he then proposed planning criteria in spatial research, which were guided by socio-anthropological aspects of qualitative demography.¹⁷⁴

Müller, who passed through the de-Nazification process as ‘acquitted’ (*entlastet*, category V) in 1949,¹⁷⁵ still did not manage to find a suitable academic position,¹⁷⁶ though his research was already funded by the DFG.¹⁷⁷ In 1953, Müller married Lieselotte Erna Knöfel (b. 1915), Karl Thums’s former PhD student from Prague.¹⁷⁸ In 1955, he was appointed full professor on probation and then full professor of empirical sociology with particular focus on social practice at the Nuremberg-Erlangen University of Economic and Social Sciences.¹⁷⁹ Soon, he arranged for the position to be redefined as a professorship of sociology and *Sozialanthropologie*.¹⁸⁰

This relatively fast professional comeback made it possible for Müller to revive old networks and to find a firm position within them. In addition to the above-mentioned, Müller soon became an international expert on refugee research, an active and early creator of educational policy in the nascent Federal Republic of Germany, and an active academic who linked anthropology, sociology, spatial research, and demography.¹⁸¹ He was to

¹⁷² C. KLINGEMANN, *Flüchtlingssoziologen*, pp. 89–90. The Institute was co-financed by the Central Institute for Education and Teaching (Göttingen, Herman Nohl [1979–1960]), and by the Leibniz-Stiftung. Eight years after his foundation, it had 23 employees. See Christoph WEISCHER, *Das Unternehmen ‘Empirische Sozialforschung’. Strukturen, Praktiken und Leitbilder in der Sozialforschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, München 2004, p. 61.

¹⁷³ I. a. Karl V. MÜLLER, *Bericht über die Begabtenuntersuchung Niedersachsens*, Homo 1/2, 1950, pp. 136–142; id., *Empirische Beiträge zur Frage der differentiellen Fruchtbarkeit in Nachkriegsdeutschland*, Homo 7, 1956, pp. 87–98; id., *Bericht über die Begabtenforschung Niedersachsens*, Homo 1/2, 1949, pp. 136–142.

¹⁷⁴ Hans LINDE, *Raumforschung und Soziologie*, Raumforschung und Raumordnung 10/4, 1950, pp. 191–195 [193–194].

¹⁷⁵ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller F 2/1 No. 2364, certified copy (chief committee for de-Nazification in special professions, Hannover, February 22, 1950).

¹⁷⁶ He received his lecturing position in 1952, at first for sociology at the School of Philosophy and Theology in Bamberg. See J. GUTBERGER, *Volk*, pp. 529–530; id., *Bevölkerung*, p. 86. There, he met old colleagues: over one third of the teaching staff was so called refugees from the East. See Markus MÖSSLANG, *Elitenintegration im Bildungssektor. Das Beispiel ‘Flüchtlingsprofessoren’ 1945–1961*, in: Dierk Hoffmann – Marta Krauss – Michael Schwartz (eds.), *Vertriebene in Deutschland. Interdisziplinäre Ergebnisse und Forschungsperspektiven*, München 2000, p. 380; Hans-Christian PETERSEN, *Bevölkerungsökonomie – Ostforschung – Politik. Eine biographische Studie zu Peter-Heinz Seraphim (1902–1979)* (= Einzelveröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts Warschau 17), Osnabrück 2007, p. 275.

¹⁷⁷ K. V. Müller was funded to a large degree by the DFG, which aided his academic rehabilitation between 1951 and 1954. See J. WEYER, *Westdeutsche Soziologie*, p. 393.

¹⁷⁸ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K.V. Müller F 2/1 No. 2364, marriage certificate Register Office Berlin-Wilmersdorf, December 30, 1953. Her doctoral thesis concerning ‘Socio-anthropological Analysis of Surveys Taken at the National Vocational Competition 1938’ (*Sozialanthropologische Auswertungen an Erhebungen im Reichsberufswettkampf 1938*) from 1942 is listed in M. V. ŠIMÚNEK, *Ein neues*, p. 224 (footnote 161).

¹⁷⁹ UA Nürnberg-Erlangen, file K. V. Müller F 2/1 No. 2364, decree of April 1st, 1955.

¹⁸⁰ *Nachrichten*, Homo 6, 1955, pp. 143–144 [143].

¹⁸¹ See Bernhard VOM BROCKE, *Bevölkerungswissenschaft – Quo vadis? Möglichkeiten und Probleme einer Geschichte der Bevölkerungswissenschaft in Deutschland*, Opladen 1998.

some degree successful, since demand for such synthesis persisted. The journal *Homo*, for example, lamented the lack of contributions of genetics and eugenic research.¹⁸² Moreover, various voices called for an urgent ‘care for demography’ since recent historic events had led to far-reaching population changes, such as expulsion from the East, population increase in urban centres, and increasing decline of earlier familial, feudal, and ethnic communities.¹⁸³

As before, Müller was concerned with the social processes of selection and competitive selection (‘sifting’, *Siebung*) and with differential fertility. Moreover, he critically focused on objections against his assessment of ‘sifting’ as an essential factor in social events¹⁸⁴ and insisted as before on the existence of a firm link between differential fertility and genetics: “One of the most important questions which have been brought forward by social anthropology is the issue of differential reproduction rates between humans of qualitatively different genetic material. Although after the war, this subject has been for various reasons largely forgotten in Germany, it is now increasingly discussed again.”¹⁸⁵

Müller, like many other post-war sociologists, also became interested in the difficulties experienced by displaced persons and refugees. Opportunistically, he claimed to have established a ‘refugee business in science’.¹⁸⁶ He referred thereby to his empirical sociological investigations, which had supposedly shown that though most of the displaced persons did not speak of their former homes and lived in a relatively favourable economic situation, especially the young generation was expressing a wish to return.¹⁸⁷

Müller, who was incapable of reflecting on the ideological, practical, and political implications of his research during the Nazi period, bore passionate hatred towards the regimes behind the Iron Curtain in the early post-war period. At the same time he regretted this attitude since he believed hatred to be a bad advisor, especially when what is at stake is shared history and fate¹⁸⁸ of two closely aligned nations, namely the Czechs and the Germans. Müller proudly recalled his achievements of his Prague years with these socio-anthropological considerations:

1. His dispute with the ‘un-German’ anthropologist W. Oppl in 1939, where he opposed the fundamental anthropological distinctness of the Sudeten Germans.
2. Psychological screening within socio-anthropological investigation of approximately 3,000 Protectorate policemen from all over Prague, which supported his hypotheses.
3. His statistical research on family names, which afforded him insight into the proportion of German ‘blood’ within the Czech nation and proved that the linguistic border of 1919 or 1945 was not a ‘blood’ border, i.e., an ethnic border.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸² H. GREBE (rec.), *Koch, F.: Medizinische Demographien westdeutscher Stadt- und Landkreise 1957*. 121 S., G. Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart 1957, *Homo* 8, 1957, p. 193.

¹⁸³ Erich KEYSER, *Die gegenwärtigen Aufgaben der Bevölkerungswissenschaft in Deutschland*, *Homo* 3, 1952, p. 179.

¹⁸⁴ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Die sozialbiologische Prognose in der Bewährung*, Sammlung 7, 1952, pp. 1–6.

¹⁸⁵ Id., *Zum sozialanthropologischen Problem der Gegenauslese*, *Homo* 13, 1962, pp. 217–221 [217–218]; id., *Der Stand der Forschung zur differentiellen Fortpflanzung und Begabungsauslese*, *Homo* 11, 1960, pp. 88–92.

¹⁸⁶ See C. KLINGEMANN, *Flüchtlingssoziologen*.

¹⁸⁷ Karl V. MÜLLER, *Soziologische und sozialpsychologische Folgen der Austreibung*, in: Regina Silber (ed.), *Das östliche Deutschland*. Ein Handbuch, Würzburg 1959, pp. 757–790.

¹⁸⁸ Id., *Völkbiologische Beziehungen*.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 294–295.

Only five years after the end of the Nazi terror, K. V. Müller stated that the Czech nation as it is now and the Sudeten (and Viennese) Germans are, from a biological point of view, “a general population which is quite extensively blended, related like a family with many shared features while both retain characteristic physical and mental features. A clear border between these two people does not exist. This situation arose in what once was a colony by gradual establishment of a biological equilibrium.”¹⁹⁰

In 1953, Müller even published a report on his studies in sociology and anthropology which he carried out in Slovakia on behalf of the RHSt. It would thus seem that ultimately, Müller, an ardent advocate of racial theory and racial hygiene, returned to his own brand of science, his *Sozialanthropologie*, even after the war.¹⁹¹

Resume

K. V. Müller was a prominent representative of a specific kind of ‘social anthropology’ (*Sozialanthropologie*), which had evolved in Germany since the mid-19th century as an attempt to apply racial hygiene to social affairs. Müller was a devoted adherent of racial theory and racial hygiene, a man who was by 1930s considered an expert in the subject of *Umvolkung*. He helped to develop and establish *Sozialanthropologie* not only throughout the duration of the Third Reich but even later, in the nascent German Federal Republic. Müller remained convinced of the truth of his basic research design and his hypotheses, which he developed in the 1920s, until his death.

It seems that Müller entertained no doubts whatsoever about the scientific soundness of his claims and his methods. In the 1930s and 1940s, he enriched the essential elements of ‘his’ science with some core Nazi notions and was fully convinced of the result. Though his approach to the biology of heredity met with criticism and his concept of giftedness was seen as a *petitio principii* (begging the question), he used both as a theoretical basis of his 1950s studies of giftedness. His general influence on the development of sociological knowledge was limited but his concept of the ‘connubial index’ became well known worldwide.

His ‘Prague period’ of 1940–1945 represented a basic turning point in his academic career, which is characterised by close collaboration with key political representatives of the occupation regime in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. His work focused on the study of strategies of *Umvolkung* into which he incorporated his particular hypotheses. At the latest by 1940, his hypotheses became part of long-term Nazi planning of a so-called solution to the ‘Czech problem’ (*Lösung des Tschechenproblems*). Especially in this context he was seen as one of the leading representatives of German academic circles, which in close collaboration with other Nazi institutions and decision makers, participated in formulating measures, which would lead to racially determined genocide.

In direct continuation of his work in Prague, his post-war career focused on applied policies, especially in the area of education. Though debunked as an adherent of racial theory in the 1950s, he was, like many other Nazi scientists, able to continue his academic career. In

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 299–300.

¹⁹¹ K. V. MÜLLER, *Umvolkung und Sozialschichtung*.

the post-war era he became a prominent member of numerous international scientific organizations including the International Institute of Sociology (Rome) and the German Society for Sociology. He was a founding member of the Historical Commission of Sudetenlands (*Historische Kommission der Sudetenländer*) and the German Society for Population Science (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Isabel Raabe (Oxford), Michal V. Šimůnek (Prague), and Christoph Wichtmann (Berlin). Isabel Raabe translated the text, I have to thank her therefore and for improving the clearness. Michal V. Šimůnek and Christoph Wichtmann read the German and English version of the manuscript and I benefited from their notes and discussions.

*Translated by Isabel Raabe
Reviewed by PhDr. Anna Pilátová*

URSULA FERDINAND

Plánování „Umvolkung“ Nacistická sociální antropologie (*Sozialanthropologie*) – Karl Valentin Müller a jeho koncept „přenárodnění“, 1940–1945

RESUMÉ

Karl V. Müller byl prominentním představitelem oboru tzv. sociální antropologie (*Sozialanthropologie*), jež se v Německu vyvíjela od poloviny 19. století a jejímž cílem bylo aplikovat tehdejší rasově hygienické teorie v sociální sféře. Müller byl jejím oddaným příznivcem a od 30. let sám sebe považoval za experta na tzv. problematiku přenárodnění (*Umvolkung*). Pomáhal rozvíjet a etablovat tzv. sociální antropologii nejen v období třetí říše, ale i ve vznikající Spolkové republice Německo. O pravdivosti svého základního badatelského zaměření i hypotéz, které rozvíjel ve 20. letech, zůstal přesvědčený až do své smrti.

Zdá se, že Müller nikdy nepochyboval o vědeckosti svých požadavků a metod. Ve 30. a 40. letech 20. století obohatil zásadní elementy „své“ vědy některými základními nacistickými názory a byl pevně přesvědčen o jejich výsledku. Ačkoli se jeho přístup k problematice dědičnosti a tzv. dědičné biologie setkal s kritikou a jeho koncept nadání byl považován za *petitio principia*, používal obojího coby teoretické báze svých studií o nadání i v 50. letech. Jeho obecný vliv na vývoj sociologického poznání byl omezen, avšak jeho koncept tzv. manželského indexu byl široce znám.

Müllerovo „pražské období“ let 1940–1945 představovalo základní bod zvratu v jeho akademické kariéře, který byl charakterizován úzkou spoluprací s klíčovými politickými představiteli okupačního režimu v protektorátu Čechy a Morava. Jeho aktivity se soustřeďovaly na studium a přípravu strategií *Umvolkung*, do nichž zahrnul své dílčí hypotézy. Přinejmenším od roku 1940 se přitom tyto hypotézy staly součástí dlouhodobého nacistického plánovaného tzv. řešení českého problému (*Lösung des Tschechenproblems*). Především v tomto kontextu ho lze považovat za jednoho z předních představitelů německých akademických kruhů, který se v úzké spolupráci s ostatními nacistickými institucemi podílel na formulování opatření, která vedla k rasově definované genocidě.

K. V. Müller se v přímé návaznosti na své aktivity v Praze soustředil na politiku, a to zejména v oblasti vzdělání, rovněž během své poválečné kariéry. Ačkoli byl v 50. letech demaskován jako přívrženec rasové teorie, byl – ostatně jako mnoho jiných nacistických vědců – schopen pokračovat ve své akademické kariéře.

V poválečném období se tak stal prominentním členem četných mezinárodních vědeckých organizací včetně Mezinárodního ústavu pro sociologii (*International Institute of Sociology*) se sídlem v Římě či Německé společnosti pro sociologii (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie*). Byl zakládajícím členem Historické komise Sudet (*Historische Kommission der Sudetenländer*) a Německé společnosti pro nauku o populaci (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*).

Český překlad: Mgr. Michal V. Šimůnek, Ph.D.

Doc. Dr. phil. Ursula Ferdinand
Institut für Geschichte der Medizin und Ethik in der Medizin
Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin
ferdinand-ursula@t-online.de