INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7908456

CROWLEY, CHRISTOPHER JULIAN
"LIBERTATEM DELENDAM EST": FRANZ HAISER,
AUSTRO-VOLKISCH ELITIST (1871-1945).

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, PH.D., 1979

University
Microfilms
International
300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

"LIBERTATEM DELENDAM EST": FRANZ HAISER, AUSTRO-VÖLKISCH ELITIST (1871-1945)

by

Christopher J. Crowley

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1978

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

18 Dec. 1978
date

William O. Shanahan
Chairman of Examining Committee

12/15/78
date

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his deep appreciation for the advice and painstaking efforts of Professor William O. Shanahan during the long gestation of the present work.

The author would also like to express his appreciation for the assistance in research for the present work by Professor John J. Haag of the University of Georgia and Professor Richard S. Geehr of Bentley College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		
I	WHY STUDY FRANZ HAISER?	1
II.	THE LIFE OF FRANZ HAISER	13
III.	REVOLUTION FOR THE SAKE OF AUTHORITY: THE RADICAL RIGHT	36
IV.	THE GERMAN SPECIES AND SUBSPECIES OF THE RADICAL RIGHT	45
V.	WHY FRANZ HAISER HAD A PUBLIC: ELITISM IN THE GERMAN-SPEAKING WORLD	51
VI.	VOLKSTUM AND ELITISM: FRANZ HAISER'S TWO STOOLS	58
VII.	THE FEAST OF PURE UNREASON: BARBARIC VITALISM	67
VIII.	FRANZ HAISER'S ORBIT: RADICAL RIGHT PUBLISHING	79
IX.	FRANZ HAISER'S LOGIC, CULTURE AND STYLE	129
X.	THE HEART OF HAISER: ELITISM	157
XI.	FRANZ HAISER ON RACE, SEX, WOMEN AND THE BEST USE THEREOF	207
XII.	FRANZ HAISER AND THE JEWS	277
XIII.	THE REVOLT OF THE MASTERS	286
XIV.	THE REASON FOR UNREASON: THE PHILOSOPHY OF FRANZ HAISER	332

XV.	FRANZ HAISER ON RELIGION	361
XVI.	FRANZ HAISER'S PUBLIC RECEPTION	381
XVII.	HAISER IN THE ARENA	413
	EPILOGUE	454
	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY	458
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	after page 469

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. Works of Franz Haiser

AI	Der aristokratische Imperativ
Anfang	Im Anfang war der Streit
Aufruf	Aufruf an die deutschen Hochschüler
FM	Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer
GFA	Das Gastmahl des Freiherrn von Artaria
JF	Die Judenfrage
Krisis	Die Krisis des Intellektualismus
MB	Moralbiologie
MS	Meine Schriften und die Presse
Skl.	Die Sklaverei
UK	Ueberzeugungskraft des "Beweises"

2. Periodicals

AfRGB	Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftbiologie
AHR	American Historical Review
DAP	Deutsche Arbeiter-Presse
DE	Deutschlands Erneurerung
DOeTZ	Deutschösterreichische Tagezeitung
JCH	Journal of Contemporary History
NL	Neues Leben
OR	Ostdeutsche Rundschau
PAM	Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift
SPB	St. Poltener Beobachter
WK	Der Weltkampf

3. Organizations

AAB	Allarischer Bund (Haiser's suggested organization)
ADV	Alldeutscher Verband (Pan-German League)

DHV	Deutsche Handlungsgehilfenverband
DVSTB	Deutsch-völkische Schutz- und Trutzbund
DVVA	Deutsch-völkische Verlagsanstalt
NDKBiO	Neudeutschen Kulturbund in Österreich
NSDAP	Nazi Party
SPD	Social Democratic Party

Franz Haiser, about 1920.

CHAPTER I

WHY STUDY FRANZ HAISER?

When you have nothing else to wear
But cloth of gold and satins rare
For cloth of gold you cease to care
    Up goes the price of shoddy.

In short, whoever you may be
To this conclusion you'll agree
When everyone is sombod-y
    Then no-one's anybody.

--W. S. Gilbert, The Gondoliers

The Nazi era and its antecedents (or as we will call it, the radical right) has been voluminously and minutely studied, but mostly from a negative perspective. They are readily described as anti-modern, anti-liberal, anti-western, etc., but rarely in terms of what they were for. The frame of reference is nearly always implicitly the culture area of the speaker, i.e., most often that of the western democracies that came out on the winning side in the Second World War. Yet is is clearly presumptuous to postulate that a few North Atlantic nations constitute a kind of Greenwich Meridian of history, by which all mankind is to be measured. The fact that the Nazi regime, and kindred governments and movements elsewhere, have been defeated and discredited does not make them "historically meaningless," or give the winners a monopoly of "significance."

A more insightful perspective (if less flattering to Anglo-Saxon liberal vanity) is to visualize recent history not as a kind of "Pilgrim's Progress" of bourgeois democracy, a single straight highway of wholesome development, deviations from which were glaring and unmistakable, but as tangled and paradoxical, an imposing front spread over a very divided, even neurotic interior self. The fabric of our times is, in short, a synergy of modernity and anti-modernity at once, each locality offering a different set of variations on the theme. Rather than stereotyping one place as "modern" and another as "anti-modern," we should see all of them as a mix of the two, each in its particular local way.

Germany and Austria were full and early members of western Christendom, and in the nineteenth century went through much the same course of development as the rest of continental Europe. The most momentous of the transformations of the period was the entry of the masses of the population to a central role, which transformed not only politics but directly or indirectly every other phase of life as well. Mass culture and mass politics inevitably came to the German-speaking world too, if somewhat later than to other peoples of a comparable degree of urbanization and education. Hitler was its first important national politician to rely essentially on popularity with the masses, analogous of Andrew Jackson and Lloyd George. However, the Teutonic world was

distinctive (and this was one reason why its age of mass politics came relatively late) in that the upsurge of mass power was combined with an unusually strong anti-modern nostalgia, a considerable factor in which was paradoxically an intense concern with distinctions of social rank, in good part of Old Regime origin. Thus--almost uniquely--nationalism and liberal democracy here became antithetical.

The issue, to be sure, is anything but clear in the utterances of Hitler and other radical right politicians. In forming an electoral coalition, he did not behave altogether differently from democratic office-seekers, especially in having fair words for everyone at once, and making as many as possible think he was on their side. Its ideological incoherence, for which Nazism is so often reproached, was in fact a tactical necessity, one of the ways in which Teutonic politics was brought up to date. In the process, and perhaps even more so than in democratic countries, discussion of public affairs became more or less opportunistic, vague, theatrical, and insincere. It was able to draw upon the almost limitless capacity of the German language for "philosophical" and "idealistic" rhetoric. Where elections have to be won, it is usually counterproductive to say that one is interested in governmental power in order to put more money in one's pockets, gorge one's vanity, and make one's enemies suffer. Particularly, those who want "the people" to give them political office must profess a high respect

for them, and always admit at least theoretically that someday "the people" might replace them with others. Such strained good manners are not necessarily hypocritical; most people like to make a good impression on their inner selves, as well as on their audience, and seldom find it comfortable to admit that they are really no better than they accuse their enemies of being. And like the rest of the western nations, the German-speaking world had been influenced, more heavily than it liked to admit, by the traditions of humanitarianism and "decency" of the Enlightenment and Liberalism, and of centuries of Christianity before that. For the educated (and not so educated) elements there was also the factor that their formal schooling encouraged them to take themselves desperately seriously, and indulge wholesale in professorial prudery--not about their bodies, but about their hearts and minds.

A conspicuous exception to this condition was the subject of the present work, Franz Haiser (1871-1945), an Austrian author who published voluminously from 1907 to 1932, with his greatest vogue in 1919-1924. Haiser displayed explicitly and nakedly the radical right's heritage from preindustrial society, and furthermore insisted that this was the only right way to live. He frankly avowed himself a "reactionary," and insisted that the only proper end of politics was to gratify the lust for unearned power and status for people like himself, by means of oppressing and

humiliating others. He advocated openly what most of the German-speaking radical right tried to cover with professorial rationalization and patriotic propaganda. His passionate conviction, repeated over and over, was the relentlessly dialectical proposition; "For anyone to be free, there must always be unfree!" For, "what becomes of privileges, when everyone has them?" Haiser applied this principle with ruthless consistency to all of civilization:

> Property always assumes, that there are also unpropertied, for where all alike have property, one can speak of property no more. Just so is it with power, which makes the assumption of subjection. Thus also poverty is necessary, for the state-impulse founds itself everywhere on inequality. Equalization brings death, only contrasts create life.[1]
>
> Whosoever equalizes, makes disorder![2]

In a book bluntly entitled Slavery: Its Biological Foundation and Moral Justification (1923) Haiser declared:

> I maintain: every culture, which removes the primeval separation of mankind . . . and now recognizes only citizens of equal rights, must sooner or later fall back into its uncivilized original condition, or go through a bloody process, in the course of which it completes a new separation of humanity into free and unfree.[3]

Shrewdly, he insisted that democracy made anti-Semitism impossible:

> Whoso speaks of general rights of man, must in consequence also extend them to the Jews, for all democratic-national sophistry thereon avails nothing.[4]

The general trashiness of modern society and culture demanded an "aristocratic" reform, on which topic Haiser out-Nietzsched Nietzshe:

> Away with this enlightenment! Yes away with this enlighten ment of the "many-too-many," which proceeds from the literary crowd and which has . . . handed over the intellect to the chandala! Why is the aristocrat the higher man? Because what we call "prejudice" is his judgment, because he has no eye, but only a feeling for morals, indeed he doesn't know there is such a thing as morals, because he is nonintellectual and despises the microscope [of rational analysis]. Modern culture needs prophets, who compel, but no professors and authors who enlighten, they are utterly played out. . . . The chaos of peoples of modern culture honors the geistig orientation of the half-breed, for democracy of the Geist rests on freedmen, but the aristocrat despises these schoolboys, who out of "curiosity" have taken the clockwork to pieces and now neither can nor want to put it back together. The moderns hold only to one "moral" principle, as if it were the first commandment of God, namely that there should be no privilege of blood. Freedmen know why the world has to be taught [the dignity of] humanity, it is their instinct of self-preservation. Morality is race.[5]

> The words: race, privilege, deprivation of rights, enslavement, human curs form the motto of my gospel![6]

Haiser was confident that modern civilization would before too long collapse of its own rottenness, and aristocracy would be restored. As the agent of this happy catastrophe, he visualized an international secret society (something like a Masonic order of the radical right), formed from the last remnants of sound Aryan race in this mongrelized world. Like Sulla's dictatorship in ancient Rome, the new regime would reestablish aristocracy on the basis of the spoils of the vanquished Jews, liberals, socialists, bourgeoisie, war profiteers and "human curs"[7] in general. As to the just privileges of the elite, he included an unearned income, monopoly of access to higher education, and polygamy.

It must be admitted at the outset that Haiser cannot

be called a "prominent" or "major" writer of the German-speaking radical right (although the usefulness of this category will itself be debated, below). Certainly he was not conspicuous for literary gifts, as even his warmest supporters had to admit, nor for erudition or intellect. He was never the leader or spokesman for any party or group, and for that matter but rarely and casually belonged to any. Haiser's works appeared in, and were reviewed by, leading publications on the anti-democratic side, so that a large number of readers, had they been interested, would have been acquainted with his ideas; yet it is hard to trace other persons, and especially people of political importance, upon whom he had any measurable effect.

As Haiser himself made clear, he functioned purely as an ideologue, not as a politician, organizer or editor, and cared nothing for popularity or "practical" success. He bragged that he was a "philosopher," discoursing sub specie aeternitatis, and indeed few authors show so little specific influence from their environment. His combination of opinions was peculiar to himself, and he can be included in no party, organization or school of the radical right. Various of his views were standard völkisch fare--his detestation of democracy and liberalism, anti-Semitism, anti-intellectualism, and male chauvinism. He subscribed to some specifically "Pan-German" views, notably his assumption that all "Germans" were of one nationality, his high opinion of Prussia, and his

hostility to the Habsburgs and the Roman Catholic Church; he symbolized the latter by joining the Los von Rom movement, changing his confession from Catholic to Protestant. He was an acquaintance and a personal admirer of Georg von Schönerer, yet cannot remotely be called a follower of his, or of anyone else. Indeed, although he resided in Austria for all but brief periods of his life (and probably never left it after 1913-14) it is difficult to discern in him any specifically Austrian influences, of whatever ideological stripe.

Yet Haiser is still worth studying, in part because of this very indifference to popularity and practical influence. He was far more open and sincere than the great majority of the radical right, advocating openly what most of it tried to camouflage. The radical right movement generally can be compared to righteously abstinent Victorian ladies, who nonetheless heavily consumed, for "medicinal" purposes, tonics of fifty percent alcohol. Haiser was like the town drunk, who loudly averred that the stuff was very good booze. His role was revealed, unconsciously, by a prominent "scientific" racialist, who complained that those who scoffed at the significance of race could cite him as "a striking example that the whole race-swindle in the end amounts to the wishful thinking of reactionaries."[8]

Furthermore, while far from a great intellect, our subject was dealing with significant issues. His independence

liberated Haiser's imagination, and he felt no obligation to "housebreak" his ideas, or direct them toward conventional applications. As a result we find in him instances of devastating boldness and startling juxtapositions of views. This prompts inevitably an analysis of what really did constitute the radical right. The present work finds that in spite of voluminous scholarly attention, the diversity and even self-contradiction of radical right views has not yet been fully appreciated. The case of Haiser especially focuses attention on the large role of elitism in the history of modern Germany and Austria; that is to say, the yearning of a large and strategically situated proportion of the population, mostly but not exclusively drawn from the well-educated, for a recognition of superior ascriptive status over their fellow citizens, that is to say one they would not have to earn on the latter's terms. This aspiration was however an anachronism in the modern world, and was especially contradictory to nationalism, which among Germans as elsewhere was quintessentially a mass phenomenon. The radical right was inwardly much divided by its desire to be elitists and patriots at once, and the case of Franz Haiser, whose elitism was unusually well-developed and passionate, is especially glaring. To call him, as in out title, a "völkisch elitist," is an oxymoron, and the key to why, in spite of his extensive circulation, he had so little impact.

In addition, apart from his specific content Haiser's

career, even including the fact of his ineffectiveness, reveals much about the pre-Hitlerian radical right. Despite their denunciation of the confusion and indiscipline of democracy, the same was if anything even more true of their own side. Until Hitler, they quite laced any common organization or program, being much fragmented into different groups and publications, often on prickly terms. This disunity meant that their practical influence was small in proportion to their numbers. Not until the triumph of Hitlerism did this situation change. The radical right like everyone else was then "coordinated," and forced into a uniform (and very dull) manner of thought and expression, always subordinate to the tactical needs of the Nazi regime. One can even call it the "industrialization" of Teutonic spiritual life, replacing a multitude of individual entrepreneurs with a single central works, turning out a standardized product. Actually the earlier disunity and temperamental individualism of the radical right had been very much in character, an aspect of its fundamentally antimodern mentality, and especially its antipathy to being absorbed into "mechanized," impersonal, "mass society." They preferred to let liberalism and democracy triumph by default rather than sacrifice their pre-industrial freedom from regimentation.

Thus while Franz Haiser's particular combination of ideas was unique, in his personality and style of controversy

--fierce independence, carelessness as to factual accuracy, screeching claims to infallibility, endless repetition, self-pity and affectation of martyrdom, lack of humor, inability to change--he is rather a stock figure of the movement. One may fairly say, that with such traits Haiser was bound to be merely a fringe eccentric, and ineffective as a mover of events; but this too was typical. Haiser may with reason be called one of the radical right's "minor figures," but except for Hitler himself it scarcely contained anything else. It originally arose not as a bureaucratic, totalitarian mass movement, but on the model of the sect, the literary clique, the Stammtisch, and most of its members were not "world-historical" figures, but frustrated, unsophisticated provincials. It was a movement of small men, and in important ways is better illustrated by its obscure than by its outstanding individuals. The study of Franz Haiser's career reveals a great deal of the texture and functioning of the radical right mind, and helps to explain why it found modernity so alien and intolerable, yet was so long ineffective in combatting it.

Notes to Chapter I

[1]FH, "Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 6.

[2]FH, "Die Wille zur Macht," PAM, XVI, p. 494.

[3]Skl., p. 4.

[4]JF, p. 20.

[5]AI, pp. 60-61.

[6]FH, Review of R. France, Wert der Wissenschaft, in NL, VII, p. 80.

[7]An approximate translation of Menschenköter, one of Haiser's favorite insults.

[8]Fritz Lenz, Review of Haiser's UK, AfRGB, pp. 490-93.

CHAPTER II

THE LIFE OF FRANZ HAISER

Concerning the life of Franz Haiser, few documents have survived, and published references to him are not abundant. However, he includes in his works a remarkably large number of personal references and reminiscences, which seem in the main reliable, or at least without intent to deceive. His references to himself are mostly casual asides, and in any case he is one of the least artful and calculating of authors. Manifestly, throughout his career he disdained to modify his opinions for the sake of popularity, or to take pains to please anyone but himself. While his autobiographical notes may be at times careless and boastful, they give a strong impression of sincerity.

Haiser was born in Vienna on January 5, 1871, the son of Karl Haiser, a "royal-imperial arms manufacturer," and Elizabeth Werndl, a member (says Haiser) of the famous Werndl armsmaking family of Steyr, Upper Austria.[1] There was at least one other child, a brother who died some time before 1924. Haiser's father originally came from Dingolfing, Bavaria, although the family name is nowadays unknown there.[2] The Werndls, on the other hand, were famous, especially Josef Werndl (1831-1889), the leading Austrian

armsmaker of his day. How closely Haiser was related to him or to other members of the family is uncertain.[3]

Of Haiser's education, we know that he entered Class I of the Gymnasium in September 1882 at the reputable Jesuitenkollegium at Kalksburg, near Vienna, as a day student. This school enrolled many sons of the aristocratic and wealthy classes, and was noted for inculcating a "feudal rigidity"[5] in its graduates, which certainly may have gone into the makeup of Franz Haiser. He is listed as having dropped out on account of illness on April 22, 1886, returning briefly, and then dropping out permanently on March 31, 1887, having completed the first half of Class IV. He regularly received high marks for morals and deportment, but his academic record was mediocre, averaging between "good" and "satisfactory." His strongest subject, ironically in the light of his subsequent career, was religion. He as a Sodale of the Marianischen Kongregation, a youth group, at the age of fifteen and sixteen, which in a Jesuit school was probably a matter of course.[4] In later years Haiser, like many another Jesuit pupil, denounced them bitterly, including the stock accusation of homosexuality: "Jesuits hold novenas to the Immaculate Conception during which they play with their pupils four-handed preludes in homoerotic four-four time."[6] For what such reminiscences are worth, he declared at fifty-five that already at fifteen he was "a free spirit, yearning for the gods of ancient Greece," who "held all professors and

prefects for fools, and nevertheless was a 'child of Mary' with the highest marks for moral conduct."[7] We may also suspect a personal reference in his denunciation of the way the academic treadmill values only the industrious, unhealthily one-sided A-student, makes a confusion of "knowledge and intelligence, of faster and slower comprehension, of likes and dislikes, which work as inhibitions to industriousness and paying attention," and "throws purely pathological sources of inattention into the same pot with laziness, bad hereditary constitution and moral inferiority."[8]

In September 1887 Haiser resumed his formal schooling, entering the V Class of the Deutsches Neustadter Staatsobergymnasium in Prague.[9] Presumably the family had moved to Prague at this time, although direct evidence is lacking. In his works Haiser never appears to refer to his life in Prague, and he is unusual among völkisch Austrians for the rarity of his contemptuous references to Czechs and other Slavs, whom most of them hated almost as much as Jews. His only reference to this period of his life is a mention of how he was enthralled by Tannhäuser at the age of seventeen, and became thenceforward a passionate Wagnerite, no doubt a common experience in that era.[10] In Prague he completed the Matura, the Austrian equivalent of the German Abitur, on September 27, 1891, being then nearly twenty-one, somewhat older than average. The next month he enrolled in the faculty of chemistry at Vienna University, where he attended lectures and did laboratory work for the next eight semesters.

His only reminiscence of his university days is to remark how much he enjoyed being a locomotive fireman, even in the heat of summer,[11] then an unusual and quite ungentlemanly acitivity for a university student, but quite in keeping with his later penchant for eccentricity. Another reference to this period of his life, in extremely doubtful taste, was to note that, "it is not true that every young man must have his venereal disease. I have hever had venereal disease in my whole life, and nevertheless was no saint Aloisius."[12] By July 6, 1895, he had completed a senior thesis in organic chemistry, "Karnin and Inosinic Acid" under Professor H. Weidel, which the latter considered adequate to certify him for the Rigorosen, or doctoral orals, for July 12. At the latter examination, Haiser suffered the indignity of being passed by two of the examiners in Chemistry, but being failed by Weidel, his sponsor. No doubt this was a factor in his later contempt for unimaginative dry-as-dust exactness and "objectivity." However, two out of three (plus a pass in his minor, physics) was sufficient to admit him as cand. phil.

Since Haiser noted that 1895 was his Freiwilligensjahr[13] (the special privilege of short military service then enjoyed by all Austrian secondary school graduates), he probably entered the army shortly after passing his Rigorosen, and served 12 months. The next several years are hard to trace. The chief information comes from Haiser's own imprecise and

probably exaggerated recollections. He claims to have carried on "work in physiology" in Vienna and Zurich sometime before 1907.[14] These years were significant for Haiser's ideological development, for he became an adherent of the "Los von Rom" movement. This was an expression of Austro-German nationalism which called for rejection of Roman Catholicism as a pro-Slavic and "un-German" outlook, and encouraged conversion to the Evangelical confession. The latter was "Bismarck's Church," a means of identifying oneself with the real German Reich and repudiating the flabby and treacherous Hapsburg regime. Los von Rom began in 1897; by January 1900 it had persuaded 10,000 to change their confessions, at which time the eminent Pan-German politician, Georg von Schoenerer, very publicly did so.[15] As Haiser claims to have been "one of the first" in Austria to change his confession,[16] probably he had done so by 1900. Haiser claimed to be acquainted personally with Schoenerer, and to have accompanied him on one of his pilgrimages to Bismarck's tomb at Friedrichsruhe in northern Germany.[17] He listed other extensive travels, including journeys to America and "deep into the interior of Africa," probably undertaken before 1907.[18] He mentions attending a lecture in Chicago not long after the Spanish-American War,[19] and elsewhere implies that he not only had visited "London, New York and Rome" but also could read their languages fluently.[20] This seems certainly to have been true of English, from internal evidence and

abundance of quotations.

The most important event of this period was Haiser's marriage in 1904 to Justine Mueller, the daughter of a wealthy dentist of Scheibbs, Lower Austria, a small town (population in 1971, 4400) about 92 kilometers southwest of Vienna. Through her he acquired a villa, Gut Marienheim, which remained his home for the rest of his life. Financially, he was quite well off; in 1925 he describes himself as being "very well to do" up to 1914.[21] From 1919 on, he liked to list his occupation as "proprietor of a private chemical laboratory in Scheibbs," but this was probably a euphemism for a life of gentlemanly uselessness on his wife's wealth. Probably this was also his father-in-law's opinion, for he considered him no asset, and a silly fool.[22] Haiser's more settled and wealthier circumstances may have been a factor in his finally finishing his doctorate, which apparently took place in 1908 (although he was already signing himself "Dr. phil." in February 1907).[23] His dissertation was a continuation of his earlier "Karnin and Inosinic Acid," done in collaboration with Franz Wenzel, later a professor at the Deutsche Technische Hochschule in Prague. It was published (see bibliography), and also delivered publicly at the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna, presumably by the authors themselves, on December 10, 1907 and February 10, 1910. Haiser claimed that it received a prize from this body, but the publication records reveal no evidence

of it. Inasmuch as this long-delayed dissertation was his sole publication in chemistry, although he possessed abundant leisure and even his own laboratory, one doubts that he attained much eminence in that science.

From Haiser's doctoral days stems a satirical article about the chemistry laboratories of the University of Vienna, then in notoriously dilapidated condition. The article is unusual for its wit, and even charm, and the absence of his usual vituperative partisanship. In summer 1908, he says, he met an Argentine who was entering a prize competition of his government for the best plan for a chemical institute, and thought the Austrian must be an excellent model. Haiser agreed to show him round. At the doorway the balustrade was broken, the result of an auto accident one and a half years earlier. "But all will be fixed; the building inspector has already given the order." Within, the porter seemed a very sick man; but "no hospital will take him anymore and he's too young for a place in an old-folks' home, so he's been given a state job." He does no work, but perhaps that's for the best, for often he has crazy fits and throws glassware in front of the professors. "Nevertheless he's a tremendous improvement over the one before. For that one 80% alcohol was too watered down, and he only went after absolute alcohol, so that now it's nowhere to be found in the house. However it will soon improve." They then go into the students' workroom, which is crowded "like the hind end of a

streetcar," and dilapidated, for inter alia clogged drains cause acid wastes to soak into the masonry. True, this sort of thing will discourage German students and attract only eastern Europeans, "but all is only a question of time." The workroom of a well-known professor is a chaos of half-unpacked material and useless old apparatus, for there is no proper storeroom. The professor has to take care of the unpacking himself, since the porter is incapable, and in addition not seldom must himself take a pipewrench to fix the decrepit old plumbing. "And his scientific work?" "Well, that consists of having to write up the inventory three times a month, and then it regularly comes back from the governor's office, because for example a Stockerl doesn't appear that was provided in the year 1876." The room is so dreary, that already two of the employees have committed suicide here with Prussic acid, "but that doesn't mean anything, it will all improve, for Hofrat von Kelle (a cavalier through and through, with charming graceful manners) has promised it."[24]

Never again did Haiser write in such a good-natured, and practical, vein. Even before finishing his doctorate he had commenced his völkisch publications, the first being a self-published fifteen-page pamphlet of 1907, Aufruf an die deutschen Hochschüler, a rather conventional anti-Semitic tract which was handed out cost-free by the porter of the University.[25] Apparently this was not his first effort to attract attention, for he stated that a clerical paper had

already referred to him as "one who was unknown in the widest circles."[26] This pamphlet was the start of a long career as a völkisch publicist, lasting twenty-five years and comprising a dozen books, about 200 articles and a number of lectures and speeches. For the rest of his life Haiser seems rarely to have gone far from Scheibbs. He was for a time active in an organization called the Neudeutsche Kulturbund in Österreich and on March 15, 1912 gave a lecture to its "Orplid" chapter in Vienna, later included in Krisis des Intellectualismus. He also attended this organization's general convention in the spring of 1913, but found it far too "left-cultural" for his taste.[27] In later years, he spoke twice to the prestigious Deutscher Klub of Vienna, on December 9, 1924 and October 26, 1926. He probably gave a number of lectures locally. In the spring of 1923 he gave at Scheibbs a "scientific" and "above-party" lecture on the Jewish question, specifying that he did not belong to the National Socialist or any other party. However, turmoil developed when there intruded into the gathering a Social Democratic activist, himself hardly more than a schoolboy, with some 15- and 16-year-olds, and insisted upon giving an insolent and very ignorant counter-lecture, which treated it as a Nazi manifesto. A Nazi paper commented indignantly, "seldom is it the case, that a man of advanced years, well known as a scholar in Germany and elsewhere, is attacked by a mere boy as rudely as happened here" and commended the

local Nazis for not retaliating in kind.[28] In spite of his rural isolation, Haiser apparently maintained a considerable acquaintance with other holders of völkisch opinions, carried on an "extensive correspondence"[29] and did extremely well at having his books reviewed by his friends. He continued to dabble in chemistry, proud of being a gentleman-amateur; he wrote in 1914, "I have been established in my private laboratory here in the country for nearly twenty years [surely an exaggeration] without earning a penny thereby."[30]

The First World War, although a shattering event for the German-speaking world, and for völkisch circles in particular, made strikingly little impression on Haiser. His writings before, during and after the war show a remarkable consistency, and criticisms of modern civilization, and proposals for its reform, were much the same whether the German speaking world was at peace, winning the war, or defeated. The publications for which he wrote bristled with articles on current political and military events, but amidst them Haiser's pieces, as befitted a philosopher, were mostly concerned with the long term. His chief wartime references to current events were a newspaper article endorsing the duty of informing the police about corruption,[31] and another complaining about insolent servants and food-hoarders,[32] both of which he characteristically turned to a denunciation of democracy and praise of a dictatorial regime. The war brought short rations on Haiser, as on most Austrians, but he remarks

that his health rather improved as a result.[33]

The immediate postwar period brought Haiser increased literary fame, but economic catastrophe, as the Austrian inflation wiped out his capital. He commented far more often about the postwar economic situation than about the war, and his tone was far more "real" than "ideal." In 1920 he said, quite commonsensically, that inflation was a means for some favored workers and businessmen to get rich at everyone else's expense, and that all Austrians had better wake up to the fact that they were now poorer than ever, and must work harder than ever. He included a proposal to do justice to war-profiteers by arbitrarily confiscating all increases of fortune since the start of the war.[34] In his subsequent writings he referred several times, with great bitterness, to his victimization; in 1925 he wrote

> I was once a man of means and lived on the interest of my capital (3 to 4%, not the 30-60% of the capitalist). I performed as a Privatgelehrter cultural labor without remuneration, which indeed cost me much money. For thanks, the crashed state through its banknote press robbed me as a Rentner of my whole capital, while every other property owner had a narrow escape, and the capitalist multiplied his capital tenfold.[35]

For the rest of his life Haiser abominated paper money, modern finance and banking in general, and that "Rascality Insurance Company," otherwise known as the modern democratic state.[36]

Apparently the inflation forced Haiser, for perhaps the first time in his life, to go to work. When in 1922 he first achieved the dignity of a listing in Wer ist's? (the German

equivalent of Who's Who) he noted that he was "compelled by the Austrian state bankruptcy to seek a position."[37] An article of October 1920 implies that he was then working, with great distaste, as a schoolteacher.[38] In a book published in 1923 he concluded with a self-pitying announcement that the need to earn a living forced him to abandon authorship, and that he hoped others would carry on the struggle that he had begun.[39] However the interruption, if any, was very brief, for his literary output was consistently high throughout this period. Nor did Haiser's misfortunes, however painful to his dignity, at any time compel him to give up his villa.

Franz Haiser enjoyed his greatest vogue from about 1919 to 1925, and we have a fair basis for delineating his personality at this state of his life. Physique and appearance were serious matters indeed in völkisch circles, and Haiser was careful to leave us in no doubt. He said in an offhand way that he placed scant value on the nordic physical type as a racial criterion, but added that "I belong to it myself (blue-blond, height 182 centimeters [6 feet])."[40] In controversies a völkisch author might be challenged to substantiate his race with a photograph, as Haiser himself does to one of his critics,[41] but on this score he seems to have had no fear of counterattack (see frontispiece). Apparently he was blessed through most of his adult life with personal energy and good health, as is suggested not only by his

prolific and steady literary output, but from his regularly engaging for enjoyment, he assures us, as well as from economic necessity, in manual labor and puttering. He was his own "locksmith, lumberjack, gardener, electrician [and] boiler stoker." Having known "heavy labor from my youth up," he had none of the exaggerated respect for the working class of most white-handed "literary gents," who "are seized with cowardly moral respect as soon as they hear a hammer and anvil."[42] Just as when he was a boy he threw himself enthusiastically into football, "as soon as I could afford it my first extravagance was . . . a steam boiler, which I naturally tended myself with the ardor of a lover."[43] He possessed and drove his own automobile by 1913, not then a common talent for the well-to-do. Haiser's appetite seems to have been hearty, and extremely particular and "un-Austrian." He disliked beer, "that democratic Spiesser-drink," which "has as much on its conscience as operetta and modern music."[44] But he heartily approved of red wine, "the drink of master-natures."[45] He preferred his meat spit-roasted to stewed, English mustard to French, vegetables one could taste and not mashed beyond recongition, and he dressed for dinner.[46]

About Haiser's marriage we know little. In a work finished in 1914 he acknowledged, very conventionally, his wife's encouragement and moral support,[47] but thereafter he was silent about her. Justine Haiser was herself an author (see bibliography). She wrote a poem for the first volume of the

magazine Deutschlands Erneuerung, of about equal mediocrity to its other verse, calling duty a "noble yoke" and freedom a "slut for hire." Her most substantial work was a book, Metaphysik der Liebe, under the pseudonym "Walter Hamann," which repeated a number of Haiser's own arguments in a less hectoring and rather more polished style. It concluded with a string of commonplaces about German philosophy and cultural life, of the sort that any more or less educated German gentlewoman could write, and about which the kindest thing one reviewer had to say was that she did not contradict Schopenhauer.[48] A more favorable review appeared in PAM,[49] no doubt as part of the normal exchange of favors of this sort of literary clique. Similar and equally trivial was an article of hers in Michel in 1920.[50] In spite of a minimal public appeal the Metaphysik was well-printed, on excellent paper, which considering the Austrian conditions of 1918 probably marks it as a vanity-press production, as perhaps were many of her husband's. The couple apparently had no children; none are recorded in the Scheibbs vital statistics,[51] and Haiser himself mentioned in 1913--after nine years of marriage--that he had no sons.[52] Sometime after 1920 Justine Haiser became mentally ill, sufficiently so to be put under legal guardianship until her death, sometime subsequent to her husband's.[53]

Haiser's relationship to the little town of Scheibbs was not happy. His reputation as an author and thinker made

no impression on his neighbors,[54] and he reciprocated with outspoken contempt for the place. Often in his writings there is no clear transition between a denunciation of modern civilization in general and of Scheibbs in particular. "One can hardly think of a more unspiritual, temperamentless and soully stuffier existence than the Spiesser of ostic[55] race. All other peoples and races stand nearer to my particular type." And, although the same book bristles with accusations that the Jews were the universal parasites of modern decadence and called for their expulsion or complete deprivation of rights, Haiser went on to say that he felt more kinship with the Jew, with whom at least one can conduct an argument on a spiritual plane, than with most of his neighbors.[56] He characterized the Scheibbs tradesmen as lazy and incompetent, trying to keep out strangers and monopolize business for the "hamlet-patriots."[57] The local politicians were like as not in cahoots with them, and maybe in business for themselves.[58] They placed even patriotism behind their itch for a higher position than they deserved: "Speisser circles still say, if we had been victorious in the war, the colonel would now count for everything at the Stammtisch, and I would not."[59] The people of Scheibbs spoke "the worst of German," enough to ruin the style of a literary talent among them,[60] and they had no respect for educated men. These Landspiesser expected the latter to lift their hats obsequiously, were offended if they did not attend social and public occasions; while the

local politicians were rude to them in the shops they owned, "a thing quite unknown in large cities." For his part Haiser claimed that he had learned more from "peasants, woodsmen, coachmen, lettercarriers, and most gladly from engine drivers," than from these stuck-up Philistines. The only person he could find to praise was "our present Bürgermeister, Markgraf Radinger von Bechelaren, who has decidedly raised our level of knightliness." "Whereas Ludwig von Schroder wrote a book, 'The Consummation of the Aryan Mystery in Bayreuth,' I could write a book 'The Consummation of Aryan Philistinism in Scheibbs.'"[61]

But if Scheibbs got on Haiser's nerves, the contrary was also true. He became famous as a local eccentric and also as a practical joker, and those who disdained him got as good as they gave. Once he had a deck of cards printed up in which the heads of local notables were attached to the bodies of naked women. On another occasion he broke up a political meeting not to his liking by driving around it in one of the first automobiles in the neighborhood, backfiring and otherwise making a maximum of noise. Still another time, he let a valuable platinum crucible lie on a rubbish heap for several days, observing with satisfaction that nobody recognized its value and took it. Cats were also his target; once he painted a woman's favorite cat bright red, terrifying her until she realized it was her own. To another cat's tail he attached a firework, whereby the fleeing beast

nearly burned down a barn. (These latter pranks comport oddly with Haiser's own statement that "only inartistic, stupid or rough men hate cats. I'm a great friend of animals and above all a friend of cats . . . for all cats are unendingly thankful and dependent."[62]) Fake messages also took Haiser's fancy, including one that announced a visitation by the local bishop, so that a great crowd came to meet him at the railroad station. Another was potentially downright dangerous. After World War I there was dwelling in Scheibbs a pensioner, a former resident of what had become Czechoslovakia. Haiser mailed a postcard to that country, signed with the other's name, to the effect that they should not start the uprising yet, since all the weapons were not ready.[63]

Haiser's literary output fell off sharply after 1926. This would appear to be less because of lack of energy on his part than because the völkisch press was tired of him. In April 1927 he said that the J. F. Lehmann Verlag of Munich was going to publish a further book of his,[64] but it never did. His last known publications appeared in 1932; his last book (perhaps the same one that Lehmann had turned down) was published on his own expense, just as his first one twenty-five years before. He was still appreciated in some völkisch circles as a sort of "grand old man" of the movement. A pamphlet of 1930 listed two of his publications as "books which every educated German should read and which

belong in every German library."[65] In what was apparently the last review of one of his books, in May 1933, the reviewer rejoiced that Haiser had lived to see the triumph of the völkisch cause, i.e., Hitler's coming to power, for which he and other pioneers had striven so long and arduously.[66] Franz Haiser survived until May 27, 1945, when in despair over Germany's defeat, he committed suicide by poison.[67]

Notes to Chapter II

[1]"Haiser, Franz" in H. A. L. Degener, ed., Wer ist's?, 1922.

[2]Letter to the author from Dipl-Ing. Fritz Markmiller, Archiv- und Museumspfleger der Stadt Dingolfing, July 12, 1974. In fact Franz Haiser is the only bearer of this surname to appear in publication indexes for his whole active life. Its only other occurrence is a scholarly work by one Karl Haiser, who does not seem to be a relation.

[3]Haiser cites an anecdote about Josef Werndl in UK, p.342. but does not claim personal acquaintance with him.

[4]Letter to the author from the Rev. Rudolf Rechlin-Meldegg, S. J., Rector of the Kalksburg Jesuitenkollegium, giving Haiser's school records.

[5]Oscar Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Hapsburg Monarchy (Chicago: 1929), p. 156.

[6]JF, p. 92. See also AI, p. 64.

[7]JF, p. 126.

[8]Aufruf, p. 3.

[9]Rigorosenakt of Franz Haiser at the University of Vienna, July 7-12, 1895. Haiser's Prague school records are not available to the author.

[10]JF, p. 90.

[11]MB, p. 59.

[12]Anfang, p. 116.

[13]JF, p. 86.

[14]"Unsere Mitarbeiter--Dr. Franz Haiser." Michel, January 27, 1924, p. 3.

[15]For the career of Schoenerer, see Andrew D. Whiteside, The Socialism of Fools (Berkeley: 1975).

[16]FH, "Die Links-kultur und der Deutsch-österreichische Rassenkampf," PAM, XII, p. 414; also AI, p. 101, and UK, p. 314.

[17]FH, "Erinnerungen and Georg von Schönerer," Alldeutscher Zeitweiser (Hammerjahrbuch), XXV, pp. 46-47, and "Schwarzgelbe Geschichtsklitterung," Michel, V, no. 22, p. 6. Schönerer made these pilgrimages annually from 1898 to 1913, accompanied by up to seventy followers. (Edward Pichl, Georg von Schönerer (Oldenburg: 1938), VI, pp. 341-46.) Haiser probably went on one of the later ones. Haiser does not claim to have known Schönerer very closely; he records meeting him at the Riedhof restaurant and at the Burgtheater, but not at his home. It is worth mentioning that Pichl's voluminous biography does not mention Haiser even once in its index, nor did Prof. Whiteside ever encounter his name. (Private communication to the author.)

[18]Degener, loc. cit.; Fritz Bleiber, "Dr. Franz Haiser 60 Jahre alt," Wiener Neueste Nachrichten, January 6, 1931, p. 6. Haiser seems to imply at one point that these journeys came after his doctorate, but his schedule of publications and appearances makes an absence abroad of many weeks, and perhaps months, very unlikely after 1906.

[19]FH, "An Amerika," Michel, January 14, 1923, pp. 2-3; UK, p. 192.

[20]FH, "Rassenaristokrat und Menschenköter," OR, January 31, 1919, p. 3.

[21]FH, "Antwort auf Porods Angriffe," Michel, June 7, 1925, p. 4.

[22]Letter to the author from Dr. Heinrich Jellinek of Scheibbs, Lower Austria, of June 4, 1974, giving reminiscences of Franz Haiser.

[23]Aufruf, p. 15.

[24]FH, "Österreichs wissenschaftliche Institute," OR, January 20, 1910, p. 4.

[25]Benno Imendoerffer, "Ein deutscher Kaempfer," Michel, November 20, 1921, p. 1.

[26]FH, Aufruf, p. 14.

[27]FH, "Zu Dr. Rösler's Aufsatz 'Nationalaristarchie,'" NL, VIII, no. 6, p. 93.

[28]"Von einem greisen Gelehrten und einem jugendlichen Ignoranten," SPB, April 15, 1923, p. 9.

[29]JF, p. 113.

[30]FH, "Schlusswort zum 'Aristokratischen Imperativ,'" Hammer, XIII, p. 191. See also Krisis, p. 53.

[31]FH, "Korruption und Anzeigepflicht," OR, September 12, 1917, p. 4.

[32]FH, "Volkskuchen," OR, September 20, 1917, p. 4.

[33]FM, p. 113.

[34]FH, "Sinkende Währung--zunehmende Teuerung," Michel, December 19, 1921, p. 2.

[35]FH, "Biologische Gesetze und seelische Gebote," WK, II, p. 124.

[36]FH, "Studenten!", Michel, February 24, 1924, pp. 2-3.

[37]Degener, loc. cit., 1922 ed.

[38]FH, "Die Bildung und die neue Zeit," Michel, October 3, 1920, p. 3.

[39]Skl, p. 71.

[40]FM, p. 49.

[41]FH, "Ludwig Porod und seine 'grundsätzlichen Bemerkungen,'" Michel, VII, no. 14, p. 1.

[42]FH, "Die Bildung und die neue Zeit," Michel, October 3, 1920, p. 3.

[43]MB, p. 59.

[44]JF, p. 27.

[45]FH, "Studenten!", Michel, February 24, 1924, pp. 2-3.

[46]JF, loc. cit.

[47]UK, Vorwort.

[48]K. Bruchmann in Archiv für Frauenkunde und Eugenik, V, pp. 328-29.

[49]PAM, XVIII, p. 480, by Wilhelm Marks.

[50]Justine Haiser, "Rasse und Weltanschauung," Michel, October 24, 1920, pp. 1-2.

[51]Letter to the author from Pfarramt, Scheibbs, June 12, 1974.

[52]AI, p. 92.

[53]Jellinek, op. cit.

[54]Ibid.

[55]"Ostic" was a vogue contemptuous term for the "non-Nordic" population of eastern and central Europe.

[56]JF, p. 26.

[57]Ibid.

[58]FH, "Eine hartes aber gerechtes Urteil," SPB, December 1, 1923, pp. 6-7.

[59]FH, "Rasse und Politik," in FM, p. 131.

[60]FM, p. 118.

[61]JF, pp. 116-20. See also "Angenehmes und unangenehmes Mensch," Norddeutsche Monatshefte, IV, pp. 68-72; "Judentum und Philistertum," Das Hakenkruz, I, no. 6, pp. 58-59; no. 7, pp. 70-71.

[62]JF, p. 101. See AI, p. 98 for a different view of cats.

[63]Jellinek, op. cit. for all of Haiser's pranks.

[64]FH, "Zum Warburg-Prozess," Hammer, XXVI, p. 216.

[65]Hermann Kaempfer, Heimatschutz und Judentum (Vienna: 1930), p. 2.

[66]Martin Otto Johannes in Hammmer, XXXII, pp. 132-33. See also Bleiber, op. cit.

[67]Pfarramt letter, as in note 51.

CHAPTER III

REVOLUTION FOR THE SAKE OF AUTHORITY: THE RADICAL RIGHT

No theory, no history.

--Werner Sombart

You can't go home again.

--Thomas Wolfe

To describe the ideas of Franz Haiser requires first some attention to setting, and to begin with to nomenclature. Nazism and its antecedents and congeners still have no generally accepted labels or organizing hypotheses. Haiser himself, so far as he bothered with a label, most often called himself a "new-national" or "new-German," terms then in common use in his circle. The present work will employ for convenience the term "radical right," which indeed Haiser sometimes used of himself, and was probably one of the first to do so.[1] The present work further finds it necessary within the radical right to distinguish two principal strands or schools, the "völkisch" or "populist" and the "non-völkisch elitists," as will be further explained below.

As to the definition of the radical right, it is often referred to as a "revolt against modernity," which is a useful

starting point. But "modernity" is itself a vague and polymorphous term; one could list as its opponents, e.g., Rousseau, the Luddites, Tolstoy, the Amish, and Wilhelm Reich, none of whom have ever been called radical right. Also, the term presupposes--although few of its users seem to recognize this--some definition of the "non-modern" which those opposed to modernity would presumably prefer. The present writer does not here pretend to exhaust the definition of "modernity," but finds it essential to establish an organizing hypothesis in this area. For on this issue Franz Haiser was a more honest thinker and more acute social scientist than most of his supposed "national comrades," and even at times than some liberal intellectuals.

Haiser was particularly impressed, indeed obsessed, by the levelling and fluidizing effects of modernization; that is, that it had destroyed the old ascriptive distinctions of rank and corporate hierarchies, and instead conceived of human beings as atoms of essentially equal moral value, among whom differences of power and status were ultimately justifiable only because of genuine personal merit and/or social usefulness. Haiser frankly avowed himself a "reactionary," and considered this condition odious. The obvious remedy was to restore the ancient form in all its stark inequality and rigidity, with of course people like himself in the top layer.

Very many, perhaps most, of the German-speaking radical

right considerably agreed with him on this point, but their feelings about it were ambivalent and not a little self-deceiving. At heart they too wanted a more hierarchical society, with themselves nearer the top than the bottom. But they were also usually intensely patriotic, and wanted to unite all Germans into a solid and harmonious Volksgemeinschaft. They like Haiser particularly denounced the liberal and democratic ethos, but wished to keep many of its social achievements, especially nationalism. Whether from political expediency, the remnants of a liberal and Christian upbringing, or simply the fear of looking silly, they rarely presumed to put on the airs of Old Regime aristocrats. Haiser declared, with excellent historical logic, that this deference to mass-mindedness meant to take over one of the central characteristics of modernity, a heritage of the despicable French Revolution, and was as good as surrendering to the enemy before the battle began.

In this line of argument Haiser curiously resembled a quite different section of the radical right, which otherwise had little in common with him, a group of anti-egalitarian critics of modern society distinctly more genteel and intellectually polished than he, for whom the author ventures to coin the term "non-völkisch elitists." This category stood in particular contrast to the radical right's more nationalistic, mass-minded, and sometimes socially radical side, with which anti-Semitism was closely associated.

For this latter "populist" element we will use the term völkisch (here taking it in a perhaps more restricted sense than is customary). The distinction of these two wings is essential to the present work, for Haiser's interest lies in the way he tried to straddle these positions, and be a "völkisch elitist."

Haiser's ideal was "pre-modern" society, that is the type that had prevailed in Europe up to about the middle of the eighteenth century. However, since "pre-modern" is a question-begging term, we will use the commoner label "pre-industrial society." The first "industrial society" arose in certain North Atlantic nations beginning about 1700, and was subsequently copied (with much variation) by other countries. All preceding societies, and all those not yet significantly affected by its influence and example, are therefore "pre-industrial." (The new form, be it noted, can be felt as both a new and a foreign intrusion, a factor of importance in shaping radical right opposition.)

Pre-industrial and industrial societies can also be distinguished as "closed" and "open" societies respectively. As is well known to anthropologists, among the former "community" means that the inhabitants all share in one blindly traditional, authoritarian lifestyle, even down to small details of behavior. (Haiser acclaimed this condition as "stylized.") Moral responsibility rests chiefly on the community, not the individual. Roles and stations in life

tend to be stereotyped and in large part hereditary; people do not become, they simply are. Furthermore, this lifestyle is interpreted as a holistic pattern; the compartmentation of life into political, economic, social and other aspects, as if they existed separately, is quintessentially modern. In psychological terms, pre-industrials experience life as a Gestalt. They have difficulty distinguishing the abstract value from the concrete practice, and the symbolic from the substantive. Their holism means that any considerable change acts like a crack in a glass bowl, rendering the entire traditional life-form swiftly unusable. As well-meaning westerners have often found, to introduce one element of "progress" into a pre-industrial society can soon disintegrate the whole.

Pre-industrial society is also limited in its capacity to form those more complex and differentiated lifestyles which we call "civilizations." Civilization requires concentration and discipline of manpower, especially when technology is ill-developed, but the natural communities of tribe and village virtually never form effective larger units on their own initiative. Nearly always "higher civilizations" were things exalted above and more less parasitic upon the common folk, where many had to drudge so that a few could enjoy. To keep the lower orders deferential and productive was the chief purpose of the social and moral order. It thus became doubly important to maintain the holistic

grip of the traditional lifestyle, and fuse social and political status with moral, religious, esthetic and uncountable other factors. Thus in medieval Europe, it was impossible to distinguish whether the nobleman was superior to his peasants because of his old family, his ownership of the land, his legal jurisdiction, his military tradition, his fine clothes, his hunting privileges, or his swaggering manners. Nobility was all of these at once, and the loss (or usurpation by non-nobles) of any of them diminished it. Whether the nobleman had character or ability was largely irrelevant; nobility was, in Ralph Linton's phrase, not an achieved but an ascriptive status.[2]

In a word, pre-industrial status depends not on what one does, but on what one is; and an essential attribute is that those who might become discontented are left with no standpoint from which to criticize. There is no reason for it, only a mystique. Pre-industrial society was, in Franz Haiser's opinion, the golden age of mankind.

Modernization shattered pre-industrial society in many and complex ways, but the radical right particularly objected to its changes in the nature of the community, and in the basis of status. We shall refer to this new lifestyle as the "open society," a phrase taken from Karl Popper. Its advantage over such terms as "liberalism" and "democracy" is to avoid their primal focus on politics, and to stress the changes going on in the whole fabric of life at once.

It was precisely a necessary party slogan of liberalism that one could compartmentalize politics apart from the rest of life; the radical right, like pre-industrial peoples, grasped that this was a fiction, and that all modernization was interrelated. They could be almost as angry at new artistic trends and freer social manners as at socialism; and from their view of freedom, not without reason.

The radical right originates, in the author's opinion, in a reaction against modernity, and a nostalgia for the pre-industrial lifestyle, in the following respects:

1. Modernity means that the community no longer possesses a holistic lifestyle to serve as an authority for belief and conduct. The various aspects of life are left to develop in separate compartments, resulting in pluralism and disharmony both in society and within the individual personality. Integrating his life into a meaningful whole falls on the individual, an unwelcome burden.

2. Modernity undermines community solidarity and promotes intra-group conflict. People are forced to take responsibility for themselves as individuals and as citizens.

3. Modernity's cold and narrow rationalism alienates man from the cosmos and himself. There is in Schiller's phrase an Entzauberung der Welt, a "loss of magic from the world," as the sphere of experience becomes simply a tool for man to use, rather than a branch of a higher existence in which to participate. Modernity downgraded feeling and

the esthetic sense relative to reason, and imagination relative to prosy factuality. Moreover, modernity makes rationality a party weapon, whereby its position cannot be contradicted, or even debated. The radical right always has a certain element of anti-intellectualism, for these reasons.

4. In the name of "usefulness" and individual rights modernity dissolves traditional ascriptive superior status. At heart, the members of the radical right do not accept the equality of men, or at least the loss of an inequality that they are habituated to enjoying. They visualize themselves as having been the definers of values in the community, and scarcely distinguish the loss of their special place in it from its moral collapse. The radical right is above all angry at having to face as equals those who but recently were its categorical inferiors.

Notes to Chapter III

[1]A "rechtsradikal" as early as 1913. He may not have been the first; Karl Kraus, the famous Jewish iconoclastic author called himself a "right-wing radical" (on of course very different ground) in July 1914. C. E. Williams, The Broken Eagle (New York: 1974), p. 196.

[2]See Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: 1936).

CHAPTER IV

THE GERMAN SPECIES AND SUBSPECIES OF THE RADICAL RIGHT

In delineating the specifically German and Austrian manifestations of the radical right, a principal problem is the overpowering impression left by the Nazi era. We have to remember that Nazism was in fact a late arrival, itself weak and undistinguished until the late 1920's, and that before that the radical right was fragmented, politically inept, and in general a failure. This was especially the case before 1914, when the German-speaking world seemed firmly set in the western open-society mainstream. Every party or cause that the radical right loathed seemed to flourish--the Social Democrats and Czechs in politics, the preponderance of the city over the countryside, the emancipation of women, the advance of big business (and organized labor) at the expense of the Mittelstand, "decadent" avant-garde art and literature, lack of forcefulness in foreign policy, and always and everywhere the Jews. As Franz Haiser himself put it, if before the war one preached the imminent collapse of the prevailing civilization, editors would show you the door, declaring that they refused "to risk having their windows broken on your account." Even "new-German

reformers" were discouraging, saying that they personally agreed with a condemnation of modern civilization but that it was unwise to say so publicly, and nothing could be done about it anyway.[1]

War, defeat, and depression were the catalysts that began to reverse this condition. A large part of the German people came to think of themselves as losers, and turned to the radical right as their solace and hope of revenge. But although fairly numerous, and very vocal, for years they remained disorganized and fumbling, and their political influence was slight. Hitler was the movement's first (and perhaps its only) competent politician; his vital role was to create a mass party, and then to cluster around it a tactical alliance of all the non-communist enemies of Weimar. But this agglomeration was only agreed on destroying the Republic, not on what to put in its place. The only real bond was Hitler's charisma, and he was uninterested in formulating a systematic program or ideology. His movement, and later his regime, was always an anthology of various anti-democratic opinions, despite its affectation of being "totalitarian." Nor for that matter did all of the radical right come to follow Hitler, although by their opposition to the open society they were consciously or not his allies.

Thus unlike Marxism, and even Italian Fascism, the German and Austrian radical right was never set in tidy ideological or organizational order. But that is not to

say it cannot be legitimately treated as a single entity. It had a common thread in the rejection of the modern open society, and its intellectual and moral corollaries, in favor of a different and essentially more primitive type of community and lifestyle, for the basic reasons mentioned above. The variety of opinions within the radical right by no means signified discord or antagonism. Groups or individuals might lay particular stress on certain issues, and show little or no interest in others' favorites, but rarely did they contradict them. Failure to harp on the Versailles Treaty, abstract art, or the Jews by no means meant taking the liberal view of them. One's overpowering impression on reading through radical right publications and pronouncements is their dreary sameness, their endless repetition of a limited stock of ideas.

We find fundamental cleavages only on a few issues, notably between (as we will call them) "populism" and "elitism." Elitism wished to maintain the existing social, economic and symbolic distinctions (or some equivalent), or in some cases to intensify them; populism wished more or less to level them, being fundamentally as anti-bourgeois as it was anti-parliamentary. Hitlerism indeed had much trouble balancing between the two viewpoints. The populist element in the NSDAP had to be rendered harmless by the bloody purge of June 1934. Elitist extremists were by contrast much less of a problem to the new regime; after 1933 they

tended to sink into obscurity, although some of them were later conspicuous in the anti-Hitler resistance.

Ideologically we can perhaps best visualize radical right opinions as an assemblage of overlapping circles on the same plane, each one weaker or more diffuse as one proceeds outwards from its center. Individuals or groups commonly were to be found in several such circles at once, in varying degrees of emphasis or commitment, but not necessarily in all, and the range of possible combinations was enormous. Nor (any more than in democracies) were individuals always consistent or clear, even in their own minds, as to what they believed. After 1918 the ideological picture tended to become simpler; so to speak the chauvinist and völkisch element became heavier than the others and bent down the plane, so that most of the membership flowed toward it, as into a sink. We here list the outstanding ideological components of the German-speaking radical right, without claiming this to be an exhaustive or the only possible arrangement.

1. Elitism.

2. Populism, or Volkstum.

3. Greater state control of the economy, especially for the purpose of protecting the Mittelstand; hostility to capitalism and to Marxist socialism (and labor unions).

4. Sentimental admiration of the peasantry and small-town life; veneration of the countryside and "nature";

dislike of large cities.

5. Racialism.

6. Anti-Semitism.

7. Barbaric vitalism (explained in a later chapter).

8. Anti-Christianity, sometimes going so far as attempting a pagan substitute for it.

9. Chauvinism and imperialism.

10. Veneration of the state, and releasing it from the sphere of ordinary moral obligations. (Actually not a sentiment characteristic of the radical right until after 1933; the radical right only worshipped the state when it controlled it.)

11. In regard to sexuality, Spiesser conservatism and prudery; a reaction against feminism and much of recent sexual "liberation."

12. Cultural traditionalism; rejection of disturbingly sophisticated and avant-garde productions, again according to Spiesser orthodoxy.

This model of the radical right mind is particularly useful for the study of Franz Haiser, for his choice from this list was unusually eclectic and idiosyncratic, and underlines how no single issue (such as chauvinism or anti-Semitism) is diagnostic for the whole movement. To elucidate Haiser, and place him in context, we will now turn to fuller coverage of three issues of the radical right, namely elitism, Volkstum, and barbaric vitalism.

Notes to Chapter IV

[1]FH, "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, p. 509.

CHAPTER V

WHY FRANZ HAISER HAD A PUBLIC: ELITISM IN THE GERMAN-SPEAKING WORLD

> It is a fundamental rule of human nature that the largest portion of the energy of the human race must be consumed in supplying the primary necessities of existence. . . . To put it simply; the masses must for ever remain the masses. There would be no culture without kitchenmaids. Obviously education could never thrive if there was nobody to do the rough work. Millions must plow and forge and dig in order that a few thousands may write and paint and study. It sounds harsh, but it is true for all time and complaining can never alter it. Moreover the outcry against it does not come from love of humanity but from the materialism and modern conceit of education. . . . We are told indeed that the innumerable inventions of a highly developed commercial community will make the supply of the primary necessities of life increasingly easier, but this is a delusion, for needs and desires lie so near the root of human nature that every material want which is satisfied generates another in endless succession. . . . Nor can anyone seriously wish that everybody should receive a highly intellectual education. We have already overstepped the limits of prudence in this direction. . . . The poor man should know that his lament: why am I not rich? is not any more reasonable by a hair's breadth than the lament: why am I not the German Crown Prince?
>
> --Heinrich von Treitschke, Politics

The above quotation, from one of the intellectual celebrities of Wilhelmian Germany, will serve to introduce our main point: That Franz Haiser's elitism was basically an intensified version of views then widely held, and deeply rooted in Teutonic history and culture. We must bear in mind not simply that Germany and Austria were

authoritarian and unequal countries, but also that this was in direct continuity with their pre-industrial past. The German-speaking world developed an urban-industrial society outwardly like that of other western countries, but in its social and moral consciousness remained relatively speaking in the late Middle Ages.

Up to the late eighteenth century the nations of western Christendom were socially broadly alike, being dominated by traditional ascriptive "privileged orders." These were not confined to the uppermost strata; also included were, e.g., military officers, clergymen, guild masters, and the members of state churches. Membership in them was not always hereditary, nor were all those even in the hereditary ones members of long standing. The creation of the modern open society consisted in the destruction (suddenly or gradually) of this estate-society by the bourgeoisie, assisted by the common folk. Once the rigid, arbitrary pre-industrial forms were repudiated, a more open society was bound to come into being, and eventually political and social democracy as its logical conclusion.

However, in the German-speaking world there was no bourgeois revolution. The privileged orders were not abolished, but reformed, and many able new men were admitted. The bourgeoisie did not constitute itself a separate and revolutionary class, but tended (especially after 1848) to merge itself into the established order. At the

same time egalitarian mass society was also unattractive to many persons of relatively modest wealth and status, who preferred to visualize themselves not as simply individuals in the mass, but as members of an "estate" (Stand) or "calling" (Beruf). Many such persons who were small entrepreneurs and low-ranking salaried employees were lumped into the pseudo-medieval designation Mittelstand.

The process of adopting this Old Regime heritage to the modern era was particularly striking in Germany. As is well known, in the late nineteenth century the Reich was dominated by a narrow oligarchy, chiefly consisting of those who had some form of government employment and/or secondary or higher education. Actually a large part of this group were "new men," but they were subject to two powerful archaizing forces, the Junker nobility and Bildüng. The former succeeded remarkably in "re-feudalizing" commoners who had been promoted to power and prestige, especially in the officer corps and government service. The model of manners for someone who had "arrived" was ultimately derived from the ethos of an eighteenth century serf-owner.

Bildung's effect was even more pervasive. Its power originated from the fact that in the Middle Ages men of humble birth could rise above their station chiefly through educated occupations, which were commonly of official or quasi-official status. To this were superadded in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the pretension that a

certain type of curriculum (especially in the classics) conferred special "spiritual" benefits, so that educated people were ipso facto morally as well as intellectually superior to the uneducated. The value of Bildung as a caste mark was greatly increased by the extension and standardization of education, so that in effect the gentlemen included all those with secondary school certificates, and none of those without. In fact, it was usual to describe the German-speaking bourgeoisie, or at least its more "decent" part, as the gebildete Stände, or "educated estates." Likewise significant were Bildung's "knightly" connotations; duelling played an important role in the universities, and furthermore all those with six years of secondary school had the privilege of shortened "volunteer" military service, and all reserve officers were chosen from their ranks. The Gebildeten further imitated the knightly ethos in their high respect for traditional "honorable" occupations, and disdain for mere moneymaking.

Philosophically, Bildung was a powerful force for elitism. It was extremely weak in civic sense, and gave its highest admiration to the genius in olympian detachment from ordinary mankind, notable Goethe. Bildung's texts included much in favor of elitism, and little to the contrary; for instance Schiller's

> Was ist die Mehrheit? Mehrheit ist der Unsinn!
> Verstand ist stets bei Wen'gen nur gewesen.
> Man soll die Stimmen wägen und nicht zählen.

> Der Staat muss untergehen, früh oder spät
> Wo Mehrheit siegt und Unverstand entscheidet.
>
> (What is the majority? Majority is nonsense!
> Understanding was ever found only among the few.
> One should weigh the votes, not count them.
> That state will fall, sooner or later,
> Where the majority rules and unreason decides.)

In a favorite quotation of Franz Haiser's, the same author explicitly endorsed the pre-industrial ideal of moral and social rank:

> Adel ist auch in der sittlichen Welt. Gemeine Naturen
> Zahlen mit dem, was sie tun, edle mit dem, was sie sind.
>
> (There also are nobles in the moral world. The common types
> Reckon by that which they do, the noble by that which they are.)[1]

It was indeed remarkable how Bildung formed a shell of elitist attitudes and manners around educated Germans, which could then be filled with a variety of intellectual contents even including passionate anti-intellectualism (Nietzsche is the best known example.)

Austria-Hungary before 1914 set perhaps an even stronger elitist example than Germany. Its social stratification was in general closer to the pre-industrial pattern, and in some features even invited comparison with ancient oriental empires. It had been created by a dynasty and a few hundred noble families, of cosmopolitan origin, and even in 1914 the latter still retained much of their influence and their hauteur. The other high-status groups--lower nobility, army officers, officialdom, clergy, the

Gebildeten--were broadly similar to Germany's, but intermingled less and retained more of a separate ethos, and Bildung as such was less of a status factor. The nobility had set a powerful example to the less privileged, so that a "spirit of snobbishness and social climbing emanated from them throughout the whole monarchy."[2] One could even say that this "aristocratic" insolence was copied on a national scale. Those of German and Magyar speech had the lion's share of wealth, office, education, and most of the other attributes of superiority, and they considered themselves in effect privileged orders among the Habsburgs' subjects, the "peoples of the state" in Old Regime phraseology.

Through most of the nineteenth century the ruling elites of Germany and Austria were generally adequate to their task and had an impressive record of achievement. However, they were quite unprepared for democratic aspirations, which became politically significant, relatively suddenly, about 1890. In Germany its chief protagonists were the urban proletariat, led by the SPD; in Austria the hitherto subject nationalities, especially the Czechs. Whereas in some western countries the dominant bourgeoisie had been able to make an accommodation with popular forces, the Teutonic ruling strata experienced democracy as a revolutionary threat to the state, indeed to civilization itself. The threat of a democratic open society called into being a counter-movement by those who felt threatened thereby, e.i., the radical right.

Notes to Chapter V

[1]Cited in FH, "Das stilisierte Leben," DE, I, p. 364; Anfang, pp. 21, 167; and elsewhere.

[2]Oscar Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago: 1929), p. 237.

CHAPTER VI

VOLKSTUM AND ELITISM: FRANZ HAISER'S TWO STOOLS

> In Germany bayonets do not terrorize a people . . . here a government is supported by the confidence of the entire people. I come from the people. In fifteen years I have slowly worked my way up together with this Movement. I have not been imposed by anyone upon this people. From the people I have grown up, in the people I have remained, to the people I return. My pride is that I know no statesman in the world who, with greater right than I, can say that he is the representative of the people.
>
> --Adolf Hitler (1936)

> What we want is a picked number from the new ruling classes: who . . . are not troubled by humanitarian feelings, but who are convinced that they have the right to rule as being a superior race, and who will secure and maintain their rule ruthlessly over the broad masses.
>
> --Adolf Hitler (1930)

The German-speaking radical right was motivated by far more than the hurt pride of threatened gentlefolk. It was of the greatest importance, that it also appealed to far broader discontents, indeed to many of the elements that elsewhere were enlisted in the liberal and democratic cause. These various anti-modern motives were not well sorted out in the protagonists' own minds, rendering the movement very complex and ambivalent.

First of all, the "gentlefolk" did not find it altogether easy to be also patriots. For as ought to be self-evident, those who object to modernity because it threatens their elite status will find nationalism (or any other mass movement) an uneasy bedfellow. Elitists by definition like to pick and choose their peers, and to assume that but few deserve that honor. Nationalism however presupposes that all members of a people are in certain essentials alike and equal (especially in their superiority to other peoples) and minimizes gradations of worth among them. Elitism is most comfortable in a cosmopolitan milieu, where political expediency cannot force unwanted comrades upon it, whereas nationalism is quintessentially mass-minded, tending if not to democracy to populism or Caesarism.

This ideological fault-line is clearly to be seen in the German-speaking radical right, especially in regard to anti-Semitism. This forms indeed the chief criterion for distinguishing what we here call the "non-völkisch elitists" from the völkisch. Teutonic anti-Semitism began, and until the 1920's mostly remained, an enthusiasm of the ill-educated and socially undistinguished; most of the gebildete Stände considered it ill-bred, especially by racial definition (although more so in Germany than in Austria). It implicitly emphasized that every non-Jewish German, from peasant to professor, belonged to the same Volksgemeinschaft, and was not interested in discussing the distinctions among them.

But those who considered themselves superior persons, especially on grounds of Bildung, did not enjoy having lesser mortals wished upon them as "national comrades" simply because of their alleged common Aryan blood. To gain rank relative to the Jews, while losing it relative to elementary-school teachers and Spiessbürger, was not an attractive bargain. Indeed Bildung itself originally contained a strong vein of aloofness toward nationalism. Late nineteenth century völkisch frequently accused it of valuing Greek and Latin culture higher than German, and encouraging the Abiturient to look down on his less educated Volksgenossen.

Accordingly, we find the non-völkisch elitists agreeing with the völkisch in disapproving of parliamentary government and many other aspects of the open society, but diverging in de-emphasizing, or even opposing, anti-Semitism and racialism, and sometimes nationalism too. Such of them as survived into the Third Reich were conspicuously cool to the new regime, and in some cases its active enemies. Included in this group are Ernst Jünger, Oswald Spengler, Stefan George, Hans Zehrer, Hermann Keyserling, Edgar Jung, Othmar Spann, Ernst von Salomon, and Nietzsche. This body of thought still awaits systematic study as a unit.[1]

The populist element naturally clashed with elitism, and also has its own internal contradictions. Even the name is somewhat misleading, for despite the talismanic value it gave to "das Volk" it might better be defined as an assemblage

of corporate elitists, of lesser social and educational pretensions than the preceding. (Otherwise, it would surely have adhered to liberal democracy or socialism.) This body of opinion first became significant in the 1870's. German nationalism became a mass movement just at the time modernization began to take hold. The new lifestyle imposed severe psychic stresses on a population largely brought up in old-fashioned villages and small towns, and unaccustomed to taking responsibility for themselves. Many became conscious of being Germans and being victims of modernity at the same time, and tended to consider their private grievances crimes against Deutschtum itself. Any innovation which they had not the sophistication and self-assurance to handle was branded as "un-German," be it parliamentary politics, the popular press, flat roofs, the emancipation of women, or the growth of Berlin. A dastardly conspiracy (especially by the Jews) had destroyed the ancient holy Volksgemeinschaft, but they dreamed, in their more cheerful moments, that it could yet be restored.

As "the German people" the völkisch had in mind particularly the Mittelstand, which was basically a survival of the mentality of the Old Regime's "privileged orders" at a lower-middle-class level. This group felt particularly ill-treated by modernization, being in effect squeezed between the big capitalists and gebildete Stände on the one hand, and the socialists and trade unions on the other.

Völkisch authors and spokesmen often professed sympathy for the Mittelstand, and proposed a number of economic measures, some of them quite radical, for their benefit. Indeed, owing to the peculiar development of the German-speaking world, many issues that elsewhere were the property of "progressive" or "radical" forces were here espoused by those who might in other respects be called "conservatives" or even "reactionaries." (For instance, the left-wing programs of Georg von Schönerer and Karl Lueger in Austria, and the considerable völkisch following of the economist Silvio Gesell.) Especially, most of the völkisch advocated strengthening of the peasantry, whom they romanticized as survivors of the primeval Germanic stock, from which the Volk might yet be regenerated. Besides these economic issues, we find völkisch advocacy of such usually "left-wing" causes as less rigid and more humanized schooling, anti-clericalism and religious unorthodoxy, and also flyers for franker sex education, temperance in alcohol, and reform of clothing and diet.

In its economic radicalism, and its willingness to take an "anti-establishment" stance on many issues, the völkisch had considerable political potential, and were certainly interested in influencing the public. But they suffered from a grave self-contradiction. They were trying to espouse an essentially modern concept for essentially anti-modern reasons. They wanted to be nationalist yet still elitist, to be popular without being democratic, to have

Gemeinschaft without equality, to have a Volk that was not a mass. They could identify with "the people" only to the extent that it, as they, was unsophisticated, unable to come to terms with the modern open society, and deferential to superior persons like themselves. Thus they ceaselessly praised the boundless innate worth of the German people, yet could not include in it the multitude that actually preferred to live in large cities, work in factories, read Jewish newspapers, and vote socialist. In a sense their problem was that they were trying to live an "ideal of the sublime life" like the noblemen of the dying Middle Ages[2] and were as pathetically anachronistic. At heart the whole idea of political agitation was too mass-oriented and modern for them. Hence the general ineffectiveness of the völkisch in politics, and the fact that when they did dispose of real power, their program was largely to make Hitler dictator and leave the rest to him.

The views of Franz Haiser sharply illuminate the radical right's ambivalences and incongruities. Unlike most of the völkisch he did not make a comfortable muddle of the issues, but insisted on pointing out contradictions. Haiser before all ached for the restoration of old-fashioned caste society, on strict racial lines. But the best race, the Nordics, were (as all "race-scientists" agreed), spread over many countries, and relatively few were to be found in Germany and Austria (especially around Scheibbs). He

therefore insisted that the restored elite be cosmopolitan, essentially more attached to its peers abroad than to its inferiors at home, and especially that the "high-race" elements of different countries not make war on each other.

Accordingly Haiser roundly denounced the populist (or as he called it, "left-völkisch") aspiration for a movement that would be popular and anti-modern at once, as a contradiction in terms. Only an idiot or a cheat, he maintained, would try to be an elitist and at the same time indulge in dreams of Volksgemeinschaft and aggressive foreign policy. Haiser however weakened his case by himself sometimes lapsing into expressions of German patriotism, and even praise of the uneducated common people.

Furthermore, an elitist should consistently have different manners and tastes from the common people, but Haiser was a thorough vulgarian. He yielded to few on the völkisch side in his general crudity and brutality of tone and manner, and in his outspoken contempt for the standards of polite learning that were such a large element in most Teutonic elitism. Aside from his special hobbyhorses, he generally agreed with the broad and uncouth völkisch majority, notably in his vituperation against democracy and liberalism, his anti-Semitism, anti-intellectualism, rejection of avant-garde culture, and male chauvinism. He had much in common with those he denounced as "left-völkisch," and virtually nothing with anyone outside their ill-bred ranks. In effect,

he was trying to be Edgar Jung and Theodor Fritsch at once, and it just could not be done.

Notes to Chapter VI

[1]See Bibliographical Essay.

[2]See J. Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER VII

THE FEAST OF PURE UNREASON: BARBARIC VITALISM

> I am beginning to feel an immense need for becoming savage and creating a new world.
>
> --August Strindberg to Paul Gauguin

"Barbaric Vitalism" is a coinage of the author's for a current of anti-intellectualism and "activism," in some respects an offshoot of Romanticism, which flourished in the western world from about 1885 to the end of the Second World War. Other names given to this phenomenon, or to certain aspects of it, are "heroic vitalism," "revolt against reason," "neo-romanticism," Lebensphilosophie, and trahison des clercs. Its main trend can be described as a lower esteem for objective, rational, impersonal and contemplative knowledge, and an increased stress on will, feeling, experience and intuition. Essential to it was a sense of frustration at a complacent, conventionalized, stuffy, "philistine" world, a resentment intensified by the participants' own difficulty in articulating their dissatisfaction, even to themselves. In a word, they were tired of being civilized; they wanted room to be again unfettered, imaginative, enthusiastic, even licentious and violent. They thought subjectivity and

arrogance signified "life" and energy, and rational inquiry and modesty of conclusions a mark of spiritual cowardice.

Barbaric vitalism denied man's essential rationality, and declared other, basically non-communicable qualities his highest good. Therefore, so far as it had a political application, it worked to the disadvantage of the open society. Only faith in man's rational capacities, in his ability to understand and agree with his fellows, makes a free society possible. No communication, no community; for essentially irrational beings, no social bond is possible save by means of arbitrary force and blind submission. Accordingly, those who desire to dominate and exploit others find it very useful to claim for themselves some inherent supra-rational superiority (such as descent or religion) which leaves the alleged inferior not even able to debate the matter. Barbaric vitalism was often a convenient weapon for the enemies of liberalism and democracy, especially on the radical right (and occasionally, on the anti-democratic left).

In the German-speaking world barbaric vitalism was particularly strong, and from an early stage closely linked to the radical right. Prima facie, it would not seem likely that late-Victorian civilization was significantly more oppressive here than elsewhere, but its iconoclasts, like its democrats, were for some reason more embittered. No doubt a large factor was the weak development of civic life as an outlet for passion, energy, and ambition, and the related

circumstances of strong inhibitions against challenging "order" in any way. Also, the experience of World War I, which served to drain off the barbaric-vitalist enthusiasm of other western peoples, here had exactly the opposite effect. After their defeat they felt more frustrated than ever by traditional "civilization," and considered it the spiritual weapon of the enemy, including its rationality and "humanity."

German and Austrian barbaric-vitalism was markedly preoccupied by "cultural" criticism, the area in which its educated people always had greater scope and confidence than in "practical" questions. Its chief target was university and secondary education, and to a lesser extent the state churches. This was largely because of their prominence and "establishment" connections, and the fact that they were safer targets for those who valued their respectability than the Kaiser or Mrs. Grundy. Anti-intellectualism was to be sure a frequent ingredient of anti-modern sentiments all over the western world, as far back as the Romanticist era. "Enlightenment" seemed to bring with it a dry, shallow, utilitarian rationalism, that deprived man of emotion, imagination and religion; as Schiller put it, there had been an Entzauberung der Welt. "Science," especially in the dogmatic positivist form so prevalent about 1880, seemed to be the spiritual counterpart and ally of ugly philistine "progress," and equally repugnant to more sensitive spirits.

Among Teutons this distaste was all the stronger because of the caste arrogance of academics. They tended to assume that everything taught in an institution of Bildung was a Wissenschaft, and therefore was significant and authoritative knowledge; and further, that a learned man was automatically a good and a wise one. This was all the more resented because of the way formal education, for all of the "spiritual" pretensions of Bildung, had become in fact wearisome cramming, for the specific purpose of careerism and status-seeking. The especial target of vilification was the Gymnasium, no doubt because a large proportion of the brightest and most sensitive youths attended it, at an impressionable age. It was denounced as a "barracks of the mind," or as Julius Langbehn put it, "the professor is the German national disease. Today's education of German youth is a kind of massacre of the innocents."[1] Appropriately, it was among secondary school students that there appeared the most visible prewar barbaric-vitalist protest, the Youth Movement. All in all, one can say that in German-speaking barbaric-vitalism "objectivity," and even reason itself, was experienced as repression.

German-speaking barbaric-vitalist authors offer an embarassment of riches. A popular slogan, almost equivalent to "barbaric vitalism" as used in this work, was Lebensphilosophie, "philosophy of life," with always the implication that "life" was something opposed to "thought," at least as

taught in the schools. By its nature it tended to be loose and amateurish, constituting in effect a protest against "philosophy" being a monopoly of the professors' guild. Besides anti-intellectualism, barbaric-vitalist opinions spilled over into elitism, imperialism, religious fads, Volkstum (as here defined) and other enthusiasms. It was basically opposed to the open society and to modernization in general, but might be quite anti-völkisch, especially on the issues of cosmopolitanism and anti-semitism.

This complexity and variety is well illustrated by Germany's (and the world's) best known barbaric-vitalist, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). We have particularly to remember that Nietzsche, however hard he struggled against it, was actually highly representative of his class and time. Especially striking is the fact that despite his frantic scorn of "establishment" manners and values, in particular those of Bildung, he retained the "spiritual" vanity and snobbery to be expected from a professor of classics and a pastor's son. Confessedly we here treat not the full thought of Nietzsche, but the use that the radical right, and especially Franz Haiser, made of him. Generally it took what Crane Brinton distinguishes as the "tough-Nietzschean" line, that is to stress his sneering, lurid, and "blond-beast" passages. (This work often refers to this approach as "vulgar-Nietzschean.") Particularly to be noted is the linkage of irrationalism, elitism and aggressiveness.

Nietzsche made not rationality or any traditional virtues the highest quality of mankind, but the "Will to Power," always with the assumption that only a select few truly possessed this attribute, and it gave them the right to lord it over the "herd-men" not so endowed. Modern civilization had become unspeakably decadent through interfering with this arrangement, especially via Christianity and democracy. Nietzsche hoped for redemption by the advent of a heroic minority of "supermen," who would restore the necessary "pathos of distance" between ranks and condition the lower orders once again to reverence for hierarchy and tradition.

> Much has been achieved when the sentiment has been at last instilled into the masses (the shallow-pates and boobies of every kind) that they are not allowed to touch everything. . . . In the so-called cultured classes, the believers in "modern ideas," nothing is perhaps so repulsive as their lack of shame, the easy insolence of hand and eye with which they touch, taste and finger everything. . . . [Even some peasants are better than] the newspaper-reading demi-monde of intellect, the cultured class.[2]

Intellectually, his main thesis was, as Thomas Hardy more succinctly put it, that thought was a disease of the flesh. The ruin of the human spirit had been the substitution of consciousness and rationality for "instinct," the basis of the will to power. The chief villains had been the intellectuals, most of all the university professors. "Objectivity" and erudition were the defense of the weak and cowardly.[3] This dismal situation could only be corrected by "free spirits" from outside the system.

> I insist upon it that people finally cease confounding philosophical workers, and in general scientific men with philosophers. . . . The real philosophers . . . are commanders and lawgivers; they say "thus shall it be!". . . Their "knowing" is creating, their creating is a law-giving, their will to truth is--will to power.[4]

As for realizing his aristocratic dreams, Nietzsche usually despaired of his own time, but often vaguely prophesied a regeneration through the emergence of a heroic elite, usually by a frightful catastrophe, something like the travail of the late Roman Republic, that gave birth to Caesarism.[5] This catastrophism too became a cliche of the radical right, Franz Haiser included.

All succeeding Teutonic barbaric-vitalists--indeed most of the radical right--were to some extent disciples of Nietzsche. But in certain respects he was, for most of them, an awkward founding father; notably in his cosmopolitanism, his low opinion of his fellow Germans, and very weak anti-Semitism. The reason, clearly, was the strength of his elitist scruples; it was of little advantage for the superman to transcend vulgar and philistine rationalism and positivism only to be enmired in equally vulgar nationalism and Jew-baiting. In these respects, we may call him the first of the non-völkisch elitists. Most Teutonic barbaric-vitalists herein diverged, managing somehow to be adherents of Nietzsche and at the same time of Volkstum (although never, of course, of democracy). Our interest however lies in those few who remained true to the master's cosmopolitan/elitist conclusions, as Haiser did. Among the most dedicated (and

pompous) of these was the poet Stefan George (1868-1933) and his circle. From George's poems, and even more so from the philosophizing of his followers, it is hard to tell whether objectivity or democracy is the greater evil.[6] But George specifically abominated nationalism, and was so un-völkisch that several of his closest collaborators were Jews.

Like Stefan George, but more widely read, was Count Hermann Keyserling (1880-1946), who in his combination of anti-rationalism, elitism and cosmopolitanism was perhaps the closest contemporary equivalent to Franz Haiser.[7] Keyserling was a thorough-going anti-modern and snob, but like George quite un-German in being no anti-Semite and a fervent cosmopolitan. His most original feature was a warm and eloquent enthusiasm for the supra-rational wisdom of the Orient; his ideal of human perfection was a crossbreed of the European nobleman and the Asiatic sage. He was insistent on the interdependence of the "mythical," anti-scientific type of wisdom and social inequality, and the unsuitability of modern times in both respects. Keyserling was nostalgic for the pre-industrial "culture of being," centered in "the irrational, the instinctive, the sensual, the alogical rooted in eros,"[8] and in which individuals passed all their lives in fixed social ranks, the Hindu castes being the most extreme example. Such cultures were "non-transferable," so outside influences did not disrupt them. Freed of the distraction of worldly change and ambition, people could

concentrate on their inner spiritual perfection. Unfortunately the western world had introduced a "culture of ability," which assumed that anyone could do anything, regardless of social or spiritual condition. The lower social ranks became insubordinate, and their crude and materialistic appetites became the norm. Even more deplorable, this culture was not uniquely rooted but "transferable," and was being rapidly adopted all over the world, even in the Orient.[9]

Keyserling was emphatic that adherence to strict rationality and factuality was a rather trivial accomplishment, and actually could get in the way of attaining wisdom.

> And what is valuable, what is essential, significance or facts? Significance alone; facts as such are totally irrelevant. . . . Significance is the primary, the eternal and the truly real force; that which is called fact is nothing more than its image, unreliable, like everything produced by Maya. . . . Legends are more substantial than history, because in them significance presents itself in the form of eternal symbols. . . . How your scholars have misjudged the heart of reality![10]

> On the whole, my aversion to the scholar was closely related to the typical hatred of the artist for the bourgeois. Scholarship is an essentially bourgeois affair. The kind of exactitude that it demands is psychologically almost identical to the ponderousness of the philistine, which the nobleman has despised from time immemorial.[11]

However, the wise man must be careful not to communicate his wisdom save to those able to grasp it. "He who throws away his prejudices prematurely does not gain his freedom, but rather bars his way to it," and failure to see this causes that "men are becoming more superficial and more evil from year to year. . . . Quod licet Jovi non licet bovi."[12]

Keyserling commented in considerable detail on the constitution of such a spiritual elite, and even on the prospects of restoring one, always of course on an unequal basis:

> As a matter of fact, one kind of perfection can flourish only at the expense of another. The miracles of Greek art have been uncreated without the disregard and violation of the lowly; the highest culture is possible only in an aristocratic community which, as such, is exclusive.[13]

> It is simply unjust to mankind not to see to it that creative spirits focused solely on spiritual values shall not have to give thought to material things. Those on whom all human progress depends really have no time for private business.[14]

The nearest approach to such an elite in Europe had been the nobleman, and its epitome had been the Magyar Grand Seigneur: "His special significance lies in the fact that in him the human element as such finds its highest expression."[15] However, Keyserling gloomily admitted that the type was dying out:

> the nobleman towers high above the types which irresistably take his place today; no one is his equal in moral courage, idealism, self-denial, loyalty, nobility of outlook and disregard of material advantages. Thus humanity suffers an irremediable loss through the extinction of the knightly spirit. . . . It requires an enormous innate culture, which even the bearers of the greatest names do not possess in our days of extravagant intermarriage. . . . Today the rich join hands; it was better when the noble-minded did so.[16]

However, at other moments Keyserling was remarkably optimistic, believing that the masses would before long comprehend the degeneration into which their delusions of equality were leading them and reestablish an elite of their own accord.

> Democracy, if it is not to destroy all value, can only amount to a passing phase for Europe--a phase which derives whatever meaning it has from the fact that it is laying a broader basis for aristocracy. It is ridiculous to see in the aristocratic view today a reactionary outlook; on the contrary, it represents the only progressive outlook.[17]

Franz Haiser outstandingly differed from Keyserling in that he hated Jews and was no gentleman; but put another way, it was only good manners, not fundamental principle, that prevented Keyserling from being as insolent and ruthless as Haiser. The juxtaposition of the two is rather comparable to the effect, in the old American south, on a light-skinned negro, who could pass for white, when a full-blooded black stood next to him.

Notes to Chapter VII

[1]Julius Langbehn, Rembrandt als Erzieher, cited in P. G. Pulzer, The Rise of Political Antisemitism in Germany and Austria (New York: 1964), p. 240.

[2]Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, # 263.

[3]Ibid., # 207.

[4]Ibid., # 211.

[5]Nietzsche, Will to Power, # 957, # 900; Twilight of the Idols, IX:38, Thus Spake Zarathustra, # 80.

[6]G. L. Mosse, The Crisis of German Ideology (New York: 1964), pp. 209-210; S. George, "Stern des Bundes" and "Brich nun. . ."; A. Kolnai, The War Against the West (New York: 1938), pp. 82, 185.

[7]Any borrowing however seems out of the question, if only for reasons of date. Both minds were fully formed in 1913-14, before either had a chance to study the other.

[8]Hermann Keyserling, Die neuentstehende Welt (Darmstadt: 1926), pp. 19-20.

[9]Walter Struve, Elites Against Democracy (Princeton: 1973), pp. 291-92.

[10]Keyserling, Travel Diary of a Philosopher (New York: 1925), I, pp. 110-112.

[11]Keyserling, Reise durch die Zeit, cited in Struve, op. cit., p. 288.

[12]Keyserling, Travel Diary, I, pp. 115-16.

[13]Ibid., I, p. 182.

[14]Keyserling, The World in the Making (New York: 1927), p. 58.

[15]Keyserling, Europe (London: 1928), p. 184.

[16]Keyserling, Travel Diary, II, p. 176.

[17]Keyserling, Europe, p. 214. See also ibid., pp. 288-89; Struve, op. cit., p. 293.

CHAPTER VIII

FRANZ HAISER'S ORBIT: RADICAL RIGHT PUBLISHING

> . . .the most powerful weapon of ignorance, the diffusion of printed matter.
>
> --Tolstoy

Franz Haiser was no more than a Randfigur of the German-speaking radical right, but he is worth studying because for a long time it consisted, in a real sense, of nothing else. Before the Hitler era, the number of its voices--authors, books, periodicals, organizations--was staggering, and it is arbitrary to single out one or a few as "typical" or "representative." This variety and individuality was the other side of the coin to its practical ineffectiveness; it talked with so many voices precisely because almost all it did was talk. Thus the chief evidence of the importance of any person or publication of the movement was the circulation, and so far as we can judge the impact, of the printed word.

So one may ask, why bother with Franz Haiser? What events took place, what laws were passed, as a result of his activities? But for the whole pre-Hitler radical right, so divided and ineffectual, the question is equally difficult to answer. The German-speaking world was in nearly all

tangible or measurable aspects, but far less so in spirit, a part of the urban-industrial western world; it is precisely in this area of the "spirit," a matter of quality and not of quantity, that the crucial questions must be asked.

Also involved is a question of scholarly method. In cultural and intellectual history, it is common for certain individuals to be emphasized as "typical" of their age, partly for convenience in handling the material. But this easily introduces a distortion, because there so-called "major" figures are apt to be those that for some reason transcend their time and place, and therefore are more apt to be reprinted, translated and commented upon by later generations. But while this is a valid scholarly endeavor, equally necessary is the study of material that does not transcend its place and time, that illustrates an era in its everyday warp and woof. So-called secondary or "minor" figures are in some ways more revealing than those whose reputations last, for in them the particular stamp of their day is more prominent. The ones that survive are less enmeshed in the tiresome, dusty details of their time and place (or, these are not wearisomely forced upon our attention). They are more read not because they are "typical," but because they are less tedious. But mediocrity is the norm of life, reputations that fade commoner than those that last, and we never understand a historical period in all its dimensions unless we take this into account. To take an example from the history of

literature, we understand Victorian England historically less well by reading the novels of Emily Bronte and Charles Dickens than from those of Thomas Prest, G. P. R. James, and Charlotte Yonge, although they are undeniably far inferior writers.

This principle also applies to the pre-Hitlerian radical right of Germany and Austria. Such works as Möller van den Brück's The Third Reich, Spengler's Decline of the West, and Hitler's Mein Kampf are commonly treated as its "major" expressions, in good part because for one reason or another they are still interesting to read, and are available in translation. But for completeness the secondary figures of this body of opinion must also be studied, and herein lies the value of a study of Franz Haiser.

Franz Haiser is illustrative of the German-speaking radical right in this sense. Clearly, from the number and wide appearance of his publications, he was saying things that a good many found congenial, but only for a relatively few years; the fact that his content fluctuated so little, but his audience so much, is itself revealing. Furthermore, his relations with his corner of the radical right world--editors, readers, reviewers, opponents in controversy--are also of value, for they reveal it so to speak in undress, unscreened by its company manners. Indeed, Haiser is seldom inhibited by the latter at any time, and for that reason particularly well illustrates (or perhaps, gives away) the

foibles of the movement.

In pursuing a career as a man of letters (although it brought him no worldly advantages), Franz Haiser was following a fashion common not only among the radical right, but in the German-speaking educated population in general. Numerous, ambitious and energetic, it craved a chance to distinguish itself, but the "established" channels for doing so were rigid and exclusive, offering limited prospects to the imaginative and unconventional; in this category, be it remembered, belonged virtually all educational and church positions. Most Gebildete would probably have liked a university post, but these were difficult to obtain and their total number minute. Furthermore the less convenient personalities (and also the Jews) were especially likely to be passed over. A further motivation was the aforementioned barbaric-vitalist resentment of scholarly thoroughness and "objectivity," as repression; they yearned to be prophets and "philosophers," Fausts not Wagners. Political parties were a more open possibility, but their practical power and reputation was low and their leadership was mostly mediocre. Entrepreneurial careers were widely available, but (in sharp contrast to the USA at this time, or even to Japan) their prestige was lower still. Hence there was great allure in careers as authors and journalists, even if they brought little return (or even a loss). In effect, as university students commonly felt that they had to duel to prove their knightliness, so fringe

intellectuals had to publish to prove their "spiritual culture," at least in their own eyes. Many liked to style themselves "private scholars" (Privatgelehrten), rather than merely "writers." Houston Stewart Chamberlain was the best known example of the type, but we meet many on these present pages, including Franz Haiser.

Such an attitude was favored by the fact that in the German-speaking world publishing flourished as probably no where else on the globe from the late nineteenth century until the Hitler period. This was true for both periodicals and book publishers, both of which existed in remarkable profusion. To begin with periodicals, there were 3536 known to exist in 1892, a number that steadily rose to 6896 in 1914. World War I saw a drastic cutback, but afterwards the trend resumed. As of 1923 4802 periodicals are listed as in existence, and 7475 in 1931. As might be expected, many were short-lived, and circulations were small. For 1890-1933 it was a rare German-speaking journal that exceeded 5000 circulation, and most had from 500 to 2000. (Hans Zehrer's Tat, which rose from about 1000 in 1928 to 30,000 in 1932, was gigantic.) There was a paper for every special interest and viewpoint imaginable, and even pocket-sized organizations might produce one (sometimes the journal was the real focus of the organization). Usually a large factor was the enthusiasm of the editor and a small group of kindred spirits; those with strong financial backing or commercial acumen were

in the minority.[1]

Book publishing followed a similar pattern; many firms, many titles issued, small individual sales, a large admixture of personal taste and sense of mission. For a work of non-fiction, successful sales were counted in the hundreds. Even more than the periodical press, book publishing suffered severely from the war and its aftermath, but the number of new titles in 1919-1923 seems scarcely to have fallen off.

However, German and Austrian book publishers, like many of the backers of periodicals, professed to consider making money a quite minor concern. For they too were an affiliate of Bildung (and in fact, discerning publishers were a large cultural influence in the Enlightenment and early nineteenth century), a special Stand with a Beruf to be educators of the nation. Their wares were not mere trade goods, but treasures of Geist, indispensable to the survival of German Kultur. The head of a Verlag was apt to take his "spiritual" responsibilities very seriously indeed, and its list to reflect unmistakably his personal views. Sometimes a publisher commissioned books he thought the public ought to have, and incurred losses for books he believed in (with due care to be sure that his self-sacrifices should not pass unnoticed).[4] Sometimes publishing houses also sponsored periodicals, chiefly as "house organs" to further their books; they rarely seem to have been profitable in themselves.[5] To a lesser extent, periodicals also engaged in book and

pamphlet publishing, mostly of reprints of their articles.

Therefore, in a large part of German-speaking publishing (and not all of a single ideological tendency) it is misleading to speak of response to a "market." Its publishers and authors were producing essentially to please themselves and a small circle of kindred spirits (or as they would probably prefer to say, out of "idealism"). These considerations particularly apply to the pre-Hitlerian radical right. Periodicals and to a lesser extent publishing houses were vital foci of it, largely because it had so little else. Beyond a doubt these publishing ventures were rarely profitable, and had to be supported by ancillary commercially viable lines, or by "angels" of some kind. (Thus Eugen Diederichs relied on his art books; J. F. Lehmann on medical publications; Theodor Fritsch's Hammer on his trade paper Der Deutsche Müller; and the Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt on the large resources of the DHV.) Likewise authors and editors could rarely make a living from radical right authorship (sometimes having themselves to contribute toward the costs) and had to have some outside means of support.

The most important radical right propaganda vehicles were the monthly magazines. It was not well provided with daily newspapers (although Franz Haiser, we may note, wrote in at least four[7]). These were necessarily larger, more impersonal and more expensive enterprises, and belonged too much to urban mass society to be congenial to it. It issued

a larger number of weeklies, often neighborhood papers, whose character and approach were more akin to the monthlies. The large number and small circulation of all of its periodicals was a serious handicap, but really the radical right would not have wanted it any other way. Essentially, until quite late the movement was in a real sense "unpolitical," an attempt to get away from modern society rather than to refashion it. To be effective in large scale agitation and propaganda they would have had to compromise with modernity, disciplining and organizing themselves factory-fashion, like their opponents. Hitler was unique in the capacity to appreciate and accept this fact, which made him the first (and perhaps the only) successful all-German radical right politician. But for most of those in the movement, until at least the late nineteen-twenties, this step seemed like gaining the world at the cost of their souls. In the spiritual as the social sphere, they felt at home only at the pre-industrial level--in villages of the intellect, one might say--in small associations or clubs, where they could imagine themselves as a little sect of initiates, and see their aura reflected in its periodical. If one was willing to do the work (and probably, contribute material resources) it was not difficult to become the leader or editor in such an undertaking, and such formation on a one-man nucleus was perhaps the commonest pattern. Such figures tended to take their mission very seriously, and resist amalgamation. As

one would-be consolidator of the 1920's found, "leaders grew up like columns, standing in no regular pattern, and over which no roof could be fixed."[8] A leading anti-Semitic politician, Otto Böckel, wailed in 1901 that

> The antisemitic deputies are divided not into two but into four parties. None would wish the other a crumb. It is really enough to discourage anybody. Every single one wants to be a ruler without subjects.[9]

Acrimonious quarrels and splits were frequent, and few groups became very large, usually counting their enrolled members in the hundreds, or even the dozens.[10]

In fact the closest contemporary parallel in the western world was not to be found in any political or in any way publicly-oriented bodies, but in the cliques that founded "little magazines," exotic religious sects and experimental theaters, or indeed the small knots of "cafe intellectuals" so characteristic of antebellum cultural life. Radical right groupings fully shared in their sophomoric self-importance, fickleness and proneness to squabbling. To overcome the pluralism and disharmony of the modern world the radical right proposed restraints on individualism and restoration of the authority of the Gemeinschaft, but apparently not for themselves.[11] Orders were a thing more blessed to give than to receive.

There is however a noticeable general change in the tone and emphasis of radical right periodicals after 1918. The range of interests became narrower and more bigoted, and

they concentrated more attention (and animus) on foreign affairs, as well as attacks on democracy and Jews. Under the Nazi regime (and in some cases earlier, when they enrolled in the Hitler camp) these publications became homogenized, and far duller, as they were obliged to parrot a single party line. The Hitler regime imposed a drab, plebeian "industrial" conformity not only on its liberal and left wing opponents, but also on the right, which had mostly supported its accession to power. It became obligatory not only to oppose the liberal-democratic open society, but to do so in the prescribed orthodox way. Some uncongenial radical rightists were executed or imprisoned (not a few were conspicuous in the anti-Nazi opposition) and a larger number were unable to publish. Calling on Hitler to protect them, as they hoped, from the consequences of mass society, they found they had been healed of the disease but were nearly as sick from the cure.

To relate Franz Haiser to this world we must first give the chronology and geography of his writing career.[12] He wrote at least 13 books and pamphlets, and probably 200 periodical pieces, in at least 20 different publications. He received from others at least 130 reviews, critical remarks and rejoinders. The datable items of his output, and material by others referring to him, were distributed as follows:

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION IN TIME OF PUBLICATIONS BY OR ABOUT FRANZ HAISER

	1907	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Books and pamphlets*	1					1	1	1		1			1	1
Datable periodical pieces**		1	1	5	2	1	5	5	1	8	19	7	25	17
Number of periodicals in which FH appeared in a year		1	1	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	5	3	5	4
Datable reviews, comments, rejoinders to Haiser***						2	22	15		1	5	1	6	21

	1921	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
Books and pamphlets*	1		1	1	1	1	?1					1	
Datable periodical pieces**	17	16	17	10	9	2	1	3	1	1		2	
Number of periodicals in which FH appeared in a year	3	3	2	4	8	2	1	3	1	1		2	
Datable reviews, comments, rejoinders to Haiser***	7	8	4	4	10	7	4				1	3	1

*Counting separately second editions, but not including reprints of magazine articles.

**Counting separately each appearance over his name, including repeats, selections from his books and polemical rejoinders.

***Counting separately each review, review article or evaluation, and likewise each polemical rejoinder.

TABLE 2

Periodicals in which Haiser appeared four times or more, and the time span therein; these contained 166 pieces, or over 4/5 of his output.

Periodical	Times Appeared	Time Span
PAM	51	1913-1922
Michel	43	1919-1925
OR	28	1908-1919
DE	18	1917-1929
Hammer	7	1910-1927
Hakenkreuz	6	1924-1925
NL	4	1923-1925
SPB	4	probably 1919-1924

To sum up: something of Haiser's appeared in print every year from 1907 to 1930 inclusive, and some notice of him nearly as continuously--a remarkable record for any writer. The distribution however is very uneven, and follows the general fortune of radical right and especially völkisch opinions. Haiser's style and content are scarcely a factor, for both varied remarkably little throughout his career. His prewar books apparently were not attractive to publishers; according to Benno Imendoerffer, a well-known figure of the Austrian radical right and a close friend, until 1919 he had to publish in "Selbstverlag oder Kommissionsverlag,"[13] the latter presumably meaning that the author had to bear the financial responsibility. The pamphlet Aufruf. . . . of 1907 and Meine Schriften. . . . of 1914 are marked "Selbstverlag" so probably Krisis (1st ed. 1912), Aristokratische Imperativ (1913) and Überzeugungskraft (1916) fell into the Kommissionsverlag category. Haiser himself certainly believed in his star, for Meine Schriften was simply a collection (very well produced) of the reviews his few works so far had received, including the uncomplimentary ones.[14] (This uniquely convenient evidence accounts for the odd peak of reviews for 1913-1914; had Haiser's vanity (or finances) only been as strong in later years, very likely the number for his subsequent books would be much larger.)

Haiser's periodical output rose sharply late in World

War I, chiefly in PAM, OR, and J. F. Lehmann's new DE, this being in step with the rising fortunes (or at least, wider circulation) of völkisch opinions. With defeat, and for several years thereafter, they became more attractive still, and Haiser's hour had struck. His Krisis received a second edition in 1919 from J. F. Lehmann, the most important völkisch house, and in the next six years it published four more of his books (one going into a second revised edition) and several of his articles in DE. He also received considerable exposure in other publications. However, as the Weimar Republic's situation took a turn for the better, in the Stresemann era, extreme radical-right opinions fell off in appeal, in the press as well as at the polls. As the German (and Austrian) republics seemed not likely to collapse of their own accord in the near future, its organs noticeably moderated their tone, and became less interested in apocalyptic manifestoes.

Haiser was one of the casualties of this shift. His material was as good (or one might say, no better) than ever, but he had nothing new to say, and clearly editors were tired of him. He did not make things easier for himself by an explosive quarrel with one of the chief figures of Michel, by now his chief outlet, but this was really provoked by the other party, who roundly denounced Haiser's "aristocratic" extremism as a drag on the völkisch cause. Reviews and mentions of Haiser's works suffered a similar

slide. His disappointment was patent in Judenfrage (1926), which is unusually vituperative even for him. The appeal of völkisch opinions surged upward again with the depression and the crises of the Weimar Republic, probably accounting for the final slight flurry of Haiser-related activity at the end of the table. However, by now the parade was marching to quite another tune, and after 1933 we cease to hear of him.

For convenience, we may take up each of the relevant periodicals or organizations in the order in which Franz Haiser first became involved with them. It must first be said, that while he seems to have had considerable acquaintance with other persons of the radical right, he was one of the world's worst "joiners" and rarely was officially enrolled or affiliated with any group. One of the few he mentions was the Suedmark, an organization for promoting German land-settlement and schools in "threatened" (i.e., part-Slavic) regions, in rivalry with clerically-backed efforts of this type.[15] Haiser prints a speech he made at a "Suedmark-festival" sometime before August of 1914, and lists himself in August 1917 as still connected therewith.[16] Additionally he made other casual mentions, but these are the sum total of his references to it.[17] Haiser was more closely connected with the Neudeutsche Kulturbund in Österreich, a body founded in 1910 by Dr. Rösler of Reichenberg in "German Bohemia."[18] It was committed, in typically

vague and highminded fashion, to "elevation of the bodily, spiritual and moral fitness of the German people. . . . Today inner culture, improvement of constitution and character is especially necessary," but did not wish to engage in rivalry with other völkisch groups. Dues were 5 Kroner a year (then equivalent to $1.25 US, or $12.50 today), which included subscription to its official organ, Neues Leben: Monatsschrift für deutsche Tüchtigkeit. This journal antedated the NDKBiO, having been founded in 1905 under the aegis of the Eden commune, originally a vegetarian sect but by now unmistakably in the völkisch camp. Its editor, Dr. Ernst Hunkel (1885-), was also active in anti-Christian "Germanic" paganism, organizing the Deutschgläubige Gemeinschaft in 1911,[19] and played a role in several other organizations and publications, with a due share of quarrels and rifts.[20]

Neues Leben had several pet causes, including the ideas of Silvio Gesell (1862-1930) for currency inflation and land reform. It devoted much attention to various health and dietary fads, including the praise of Simonsbrot, the invention of its publisher, Gustav Simons (d. 1914) which was hailed as beneficial for constipation, stomach ailments, and diabetes.[21] It especially denounced alcohol, which received rather more space than anti-semitism.

At the inception of the NDKBiO Rösler had proclaimed,

> Away from alcohol, away from Rome! . . . Both hinder and

> diminish the clarity and energy of human thought, on which in the end all progress rests.[22]

It seems to have been quite successful, for in less than two years it had eight Ortsgruppen, with several more in formation,[23] and by January 1913 637 "ordentliche Mitglieder."[24] The Vienna chapter was called "Ortsgruppe Orplid."[25] It reported a membership of 45 as of June 1911, and an average attendance at meetings of 13 to 27; its address (probably not untypically for those times) was a café.[26] Late that year, its meetings were especially concerned with the problem of Schundliteratur.[27] We also find it circulating a questionnaire among its members on their use of alcohol and tobacco, and the pros and cons of vegetarianism.[28] As part of these endeavors for the salvation of true-German mankind, it heard on March 15, 1912 a lecture by Franz Haiser, later published as Krisis des Intellectualismus.

As far as Haiser was concerned this connection did not develop very far. The next year, in the course of an extremely complicated row arising out of remarks by one of Haiser's reviewers (covered in detail in a later chapter) and also (more harshly) in AI, he virtually wrote off the organization, for the usual Haiserian reasons. In the spring of 1913, he said, he had attended the main convention of the NDKBiO, "to find like-minded people, and to my disappointment heard Herr Simons speak." While Haiser stresses that he attacks only ideas, not persons, yet

emphatically "his system signifies to me nothing else but a preeminent exercise of left-culture."[29] He has not read Silvio Gesell, and does not intend to, just as an internist who does not believe in appendectomies does not bother to steep himself in their literature.[30] But it is sufficiently obvious that the Gesell-Simons approach would reward Tüchtigkeit, "fitness" [a characteristically liberal slogan at the time] and industriousness, exactly the qualities in which modern cur-dom excelled, and work against creation of a hereditary, racially select caste-state, and especially to the disadvantage of that pillar of all true civilization, the Rentner.[31]

In the "Aristarchy" proposed by Simons, Rösler et al., "if my inner feelings don't deceive me, here thinks and purrs again the socialist idea. For what is it but socialist, to give a hand up to everyone, howsoever formed, from the mass, to place 'success' before the value of birth?"[32] Haiser also lamented that at the convention he saw leaflets aimed at workingmen, for such attempts to compete in demagogy with the Social Democrats was trying "to drive out the devil with Beelzebub."[33] The controversy revived in 1917, particularly over Haiser's insistence on an unearned income for the elite; this time Hunkel added his mite to the effect, that he'd never felt degraded or had to compromise his principles by having to work for a living. Haiser and Hunkel both took pains to say that they

disagreed only with each other's ideas, and this did not affect their friendship and respect,[34] but in fact it was Haiser's last appearance in this paper.

The loss of this contact however mattered little, for by now Haiser was appearing quite widely. We may conveniently first mention three daily newspapers of Vienna. He appeared once[35] in the Deutsches Volksblatt, its largest (and vilest) anti-Semitic sheet,[36] which claimed a circulation of 26,000 in 1910. He appeared at least four times in another leading radical right paper, the DÖTZ (20,000 in 1926), probably all of them after 1918. Most important in terms of quantity for him was the OR, which printed at least 28 of his pieces from 1908 to June 23, 1919. This journal was merged with another to form the Deutsches Tageblatt-Ostdeutsche Rundschau in 1912, but was usually referred to by the latter name; it listed a circulation of 12,000 in 1914-15.[37] However, after the war it apparently did poorly, for in August 1919 it changed from a daily to a weekly, and eleven months later was merged into another paper, facts which probably with a bearing on the disappearance of Haiser's name from its pages.

The newspapers were relatively impersonal publications, and give no additional information on their relationship to Haiser, nor did he comment on the matter himself. But it is quite otherwise with the radical right magazines, in which editor, authors and readers commonly resembled a printed

counterpart of the "regulars" of a tavern. The heaviness and "objectivity" traditionally ascribed to the German-speaking educated world is seldom in evidence. Their articles, reviews, letters and even advertisements are richly spiced with personal asides and crossreferences, birthday greetings and obituaries, compliments and quarrels. Editors and contributors frequently took the opportunity to puff their own works, give their side of the latest spat, or reminisce. Haiser's personal references, extensively drawn on in previous pages, are unusual in degree rather than in kind.

Different radical right journals and groups might squabble with each other, but probably more frequently they constituted friendly overlapping circles, sharing many authors and probably readers. In almost every one of Haiser's publishing outlets we find the same names recurring. The periodicals showed little enthusiasm for mergers (save when in dire financial straits) but gladly ran announcements of each other's meetings, contents of the latest issue, changes of editorship, etc. Probably most important, they reviewed the books (and even the brochures) of other members of the movement, nearly always warmly, and frequently somewhat vaguely; radical right book reviews were apt to be rather like cheerleading. This clubbiness is well illustrated by the fact that on the cover of PAM for November 1919 to March 1920, in the space normally occupied by

an advertisement for his Hammer, Theodor Fritsch instead made an appeal ("Ein gutes Werk!") for funds to succor an unnamed old fighter in the cause, now in great need; he will keep all contributions anonymous.

For Haiser, four periodicals are particularly important. In the order of his first appearance in them, they are Hammer, PAM, DE, and Michel.

The semimonthly (later a monthly) Hammer was the creation of Theodor Emil Fritsch (1852-1933), one of the leading figures of radical right journalism, and especially of its anti-Semitic side.[38] An engineer by training (and who relied on his trade journal Deutsche Müller to finance his "idealistic" ventures), from 1885 he had been active in anti-Semitic parties and publications. He withdrew from the field in 1894, in disgust at their intramural squabbling and futility, but returned in 1902 with the founding of Hammer, and in subsequent years also wrote and/or published many anti-Semitic books and pamphlets, including Henry Ford's The International Jew. Fritsch was in addition a compulsive organizer of more or less secret "orders," such as the Hammer-Gemeinden, formed around the magazine's readers, but with not much more practical success than Franz Haiser's airy schemes to the same end. (Although, after they were out of Fritsch's hands, the Hammer-Gemeinden were among the precursors of the Germanen-Orden [one of the antecedents, apparently, of the NSDAP] and the DVSTB, described below.)

Fritsch became an adherent of Hitler after 1926, and served as a Nazi member of the Reichstag. At his death he received a lavish state funeral from the Nazi regime.

Hammer was perhaps the first organ of gutter anti-Semitism to gain a significant permanent place in Germany (they were older in Austria). It had about 2000 subscribers by 1903, and claimed 5000 in 1910, 6500 in 1914, 11,000 in 1924, and 8000 in 1926.[39] Its blatant anti-Semitism meant it was difficult to get distributors to take it, or even to give it away free, and it certainly did not pay its way until the late 1920's, if then. Yet it must be admitted that (if one can stomach its subject matter) Hammer possessed considerable journalistic flair, well above that of most radical right publications. Its staple was "the Jewish menace," down to and including white-slaving and ritual-murder accusations. It was sufficiently consistent to denounce the bad taste of Ernst Lissauer's enormously popular war poem, "Hass an England," because Lissauer was a Jew.[40] It was so gross and provocative that it inspired many legal actions, one of which resulted in Fritsch--then in his seventies--having to serve a prison term, a martyrdom that was of course duly acclaimed.

But Hammer also gave space to many other radical right interests. In the year 1913 it also treated "racial science," the pernicious effect of women's work outside the home, the decline of agriculture, middlemen, over-intellectual education

of youth, liberal evangelical theology, the fate of the Austro-Germans under the Hapsburgs, the emigration of Germans to the Americas and immigration of Poles into Prussia, the "anti-Aryan" conspiracy of the Jesuits, the "heroic" (and anti-Semitic) virtues of duelling, the socialist conspiracy, the symbolism theory of Guido von List, and (quite un-völkischly) the role of Crete in the development of civilization. Fritsch was early attracted to the English-inspired "garden city" idea as a corrective to the evils of industrialization. However, he developed greater enthusiasm for agricultural resettlement, giving especial support to the work of Willibald Hentschel (1858-post 1943), one of the chief völkisch racialists and back-to-the-land advocates.[41]

Haiser entered the pages of Hammer in 1910, when he was as yet very little known. The article[42] was a diffuse, unfocused and by Haiser's standards relatively mild-mannered production, taking up the themes (such as the need for a "gradient of worth" between classes to maintain the energy of civilization) that were to dominate his works to the end. The journal was shortly the scene of a far livelier episode, a controversy arising over a review of Haiser's AI, which was running in Hammer, NL and PAM at once in 1913-14, and received a remarkable amount of Hammer's limited space. During this time another article in Hammer took as its starting point a thesis of Haiser's in a PAM article,

to the effect that healthy primitive peoples don't think about religion, they just pray to the gods.[43]

However, Haiser wrote little more in this publication (two letters to the editor in 1920, and a last article in 1927), for a reason that is easy to find. For him, evil was to be found pervading the whole of the modern open society, and his anti-Semitism was therefore given to qualification and anti-climax. In his first article in Hammer he attached a certain present day "spiritual oligarchy," but went on "we add these are not only Jews."[44] Given his elitist world-view, Haiser's enemies were in large part good "Germans" as Hammer saw it, and the Jews a secondary target, which rendered him of scant use to this publication. However, there was no overt quarrel; his books received fulsome reviews (even his last, privately printed pamphlet) and in 1916 it used a quotation from him as one of its epigraphs.[45] Haiser's last participation in Hammer came in 1928, when he took part in a petition protesting the excessive protection given to the Jews by the libel laws.[46]

The most important of Haiser's publishing outlets was the Politisch-Anthropologisches Monatsschrift (originally known as the Politisch-Anthropologisches Revue[47]), founded in 1902. Its founder and editor up to his death was Ludwig Woltmann (1871-1907), a leading racial theorist, author of Political Anthropology (1909). Woltmann's

method of research was about normal for the day--inspecting the portraits of eminent Renaissance Italians, he concluded that the great majority were of nordic-German blood--but he was quite unique in hoping to win over the working class to racialism, so as to undermine the SPD (of which he had once been a member), and put socialism on a sound Darwinist basis. However, after his death such aims were discontinued, and by the period covered in the present study it was virtually a monthly version of Hammer, but intended for a better-educated and more genteel audience.[48]

The dominating force of the PAM was its editor since October 1911, Otto Paul Schmidt-Gibichenfels (1861-post 1935). The son of a pastor at Nietleben, near Halle, he received a Ph.D. in physics at Halle, and taught in various "higher schools," including the Technikum in Mittweida. After 1903 he listed himself as "author and private scholar." In the radical right cause he had as early as 1889 written The Aristocratic Principle in Nature and Human Life and altogether published in the field at least as much as Haiser.[49] When he took over the editorship of the PAM its editorial address became his home in Berlin, and he changed the subtitle from "Monthly for the Social and Spiritual Life of Peoples" to "Monthly for practical political education and training and education [Bildung und Erziehung] on a biological basis." More

graphic was the shift from Roman to Fraktur (i.e., Gothic) type from April 1913, a völkisch manifesto in itself. At the same time its listed publisher was changed from the Thüringische Verlagsanstalt in Leipzig to its own Politisch-Anthropologische Verlag in Berlin-Steglitz.

The PAM listed its circulation as 2000 in 1908-10, 1200 in 1912, and 1800 in 1914.[50] Like all such self-reported figures, they may be over-optimistic. There were twelve issues a year, of 56 octavo pages each, and annual subscription was 12 Marks, at that time equal to $2.88 US. This was certainly not cheap (the equivalent of perhaps ten times as much in 1976) but the PAM was, as Schmidt-Gibichenfels proudly maintained, "no commercial undertaking in the usual sense."[51] It carried very little advertising, and most of it for other publications and organizations in the same cause. The editor frequently addressed the readers directly to express how well the magazine is overcoming its difficulties, and exhorting them to proselyte for it. (A trial issue would be sent free for the asking, a common custom at the time.)

During World War I the PAM echoed the prevailing super-patriotic and imperialistic tone, and was glad to note that it had "many readers at the front."[52] But as to its own fortunes, there was steadily less and less good news to report. It was cut from 56 to 48 pages in September 1916, presumably because of the general paper shortage,

and suffered some delays in delivery. The post-war period brought severer hardships; the editor apologized in April 1919 for having to raise the price per year from 12 Marks to 15, but added that, if anyone thought it too much, "such mammonistically minded readers I gladly renounce." Continued inflation forced further raises to 20 Marks in 1920, to 30 in 1921, to 60 Marks in January 1922, and to 120 the next May, three months before its collapse. Schmidt-Gibichenfels sadly informed his readers in June 1920 that the economic burden was becoming, despite his willingness, just too much for him (adding with some bitterness that many new and not very necessary journals had been founded since the war, and that the Jews certainly never let one of their papers go under). He therefore was casting about for some "national-minded" publishing house to take over the business side, leaving him as merely an editor. Perhaps the readers can give him some advice on this point, and maybe even there are Aryan friends in foreign lands, susceptible to "the holy bond of racial common feeling, that binds all Germanics [i.e.] Aryans of the earth, or should bind them."[53]

To his great relief, by September 1920 he had found such a benefactor, the Deutsch-völkische Verlags-Anstalt of Hamburg. The DVVA was the publishing arm of the Deutsch-völkische Schutz-und-Trutz Bund, an organization formed at the end of 1919 by a union of several pre-existing bodies.

It had close ties to Fritsch, the DHV, the ADV, and J. F. Lehmann, and its leader, Alfred Roth, was a former DHV official.[54] It grew rapidly, having 45,000 members in February 1920, and at least 160,000 in June 1922. Its program however was only disorderly gutter anti-Semitism, and it was constantly in trouble with the law for libel and inciting to riot; by July 1, 1920 Roth himself had been indicted 18 times.[55] Prohibitions by the authorities, and internal dissensions, caused it to decline even faster than it had grown. It had largely ceased to function by August 1922, and after January 1923 it was dead.[56] During its period of prosperity, the DVSTB's principal periodical was the Deutsch-völkische Blätter, a paper whose history (under several names) went back to 1885, but which was only a purely provincial (and very dull) four-page Hamburg weekly, with scarcely 7000 circulation at its peak. It was moved to acquire the faltering PAM (which was down to barely over 1000 paying subscribers in July of 1920) in order to assure "an organ, which enabled it to have an effect on a circle, which was very racially minded, but quite averse to the Bund's vulgar antisemitism," and to give the organization a touch of intellectual distinction.[57] (That anyone should consider the PAM refined or scholarly is a staggering revelation about himself.)

The takeover made little apparent change in the PAM, save that the address of its Verlag was now shifted to that

of the DVVA's headquarters in Hamburg; Schmidt-Gibichenfels continued to edit it from his home in Berlin, and it was still printed in Hildburgshausen. The only change in its content was the coverage of some of Roth's antics. It also apparently took over the unsold stocks of its other publications; Haiser's Aristokratische Imperativ was still being advertised in the Deutsch-völkische Blätter in late 1923. However, the circulation of the PAM did not improve, and the DVSTB would not--or, by mid-1922 probably could not--provide significant assistance. Schmidt-Gibichenfels' exhortations to his readers became ever more anxious. They could still affort PAM, he announced in June 1922, if they would drink or smoke a little less, or shave themselves; if one paid five Marks for a shave and fifteen for a haircut, ten marks was not too much. It would be criminal to give up the struggle when success might be right around the corner. "So head high and unbroken determination until final victory!"[58] But two months later, he had to announce that with contributions of only 37,805 Marks (at 1500 Marks to the dollar) and the August bill for printing alone being 27,751 (three times the July figure) publication had to be suspended. He especially appealed to friends in hard-currency lands, who at a small sacrifice could do great service "for fatherland, truth and right in the best sense of the word."[59]

Lacking association with a commercially viable

publication, or some other source of revenue, the failure of the PAM is not surprising. The postwar period was anything but a healthy time for any "idealistic" periodicals, and many died. We may note that the "scientifically" racialist counterpart of the PAM, the Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftbiologie, became highly irregular during the war, and managed to put out only three issues in 1918-21. It probably survived only because of the backing of J. F. Lehmann, who took it over in 1922, not expecting to make money out of it. The PAM was at least able through its entire twenty year existence to publish every issue, on time and full size. For some time there were hopes that it would revive. Schmidt-Gibichenfels, although by now over sixty, continued active as a radical right publicist, and became in 1925 the editor of a new magazine, Die Sonne, in which Haiser also appeared.[60] However, his tenure was brief, although he continued to publish, at least down to 1933. By 1928 he had moved from Berlin back to Nietleben, where apparently he died, sometime after 1935.

Thanks to its long continuous existence under the same editor, the PAM built a definite corporate mentality around itself. It resembles a literary cafe[61] within covers; there is a steady round of "regulars" in its authors, and also its ideas and advertisements. In the years 1913-14 we find it treating:

Descent of man, anthropology, and archaeology, especially

as bearing on ancient Aryans.

Contemporary eugenics, including questions of mortality, birth rate and nutrition.

Power politics, from basically a pan-German viewpoint; including the situation of the Germans in Austria-Hungary, and brutal sneers at the Poles and Czechs. (It printed the manifestoes of the Deutsche Vaterlands-Partei in 1917, and that of the Deutschnational Volkspartei in 1920.)

Finance and economy, in an anti-capitalist vein; lamentation at the decay of the peasantry.

Pernicious effects of woman suffrage, where it has been introduced.

Psychology.

Monism, favorably treated.

Unnecessary use of foreign words in German, and the virtue of keeping "Gothic" handwriting.

Opposition to instituting the same primary school for children of all classes.

The USA, in particular its racial problems.

The virtues of duelling, especially as a means of racial differentiation.

Damnation of liberalism, socialism, democracy and parliamentary government, praise for hereditary monarchy and a repristinated nobility.

Jews, always unfavorably.

Fervent endorsement of temperance in alcohol.

The covers of the PAM were a kind of bulletin board for the movement, which in 1918, to take a year at random, bore references to:

Vorposten, journal of the Verband gegen Überhebung des Judentums

Germanen-Zukunft

Deutsche-Erneuerungs-Gemeinde

Heimland

ADV

Verlag Kraft und Schönheit

Deutschheil

Hellauf, published by the Mimir-Verlag für deutsche Erneuerung

Neues Leben, and other enterprises of Ernst Hunkel

Hammer, and various publications of the Hammer-Verlag

Freia Bund

Deutschbund

Sis-Verlag

Deutscher Volksverlag

Adolf Bartels, Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart [the leading völkisch literary critic and scholar; very anti-semitic.]

Arier Verlag

The first appearance of Haiser's name in the PAM was an advertisement for Krisis on its cover for volume XI (April 1912 to March 1913), continued in the next year with an extract of considerable length, quite a favor considering the very limited space available. Subsequently it accorded Haiser many such notices. His first article appeared in it in July 1913, and also was issued as an offprint.[62] His next article, in November, prompted Schmidt-Gibichenfels to append (as many editors were later to do) that

I have gladly allowed to the spirited and temperamental

> author completely free speech. One must let foaming new wine . . . settle down quietly. It will with time clear itself. Accordingly I hardly need to state that the views here expressed do not agree with mine in all points.[63]

Schmidt-Gibichenfels developed a very high regard for Haiser over the next eight years, and went out of his way to provide chances to express himself to "my old and cherished collaborator."[64] How far the two were in personal contact is unclear. Haiser may have met the other on his travels before the war, but from mid-1914 it seems most unlikely that he ever traveled as far as Berlin. Their friendship (unlike some of Haiser's) seems to have been unclouded throughout, and Haiser several times refers to him with admiration.

The cessation of the PAM did not by any means silence Haiser, for by now he had attracted the patronage of by far the largest and most important of radical right publishing houses, J. F. Lehmann of Munich. The firm very much bore the imprint of the personality of its founder, Julius Friedrich Lehmann (1864-1935). He had founded his publishing house in Munich in 1890, originally as the publisher of the eminent scientific journal the Münchener mediziner Wochenschrift, and medical textbooks, and it became one of the foremost establishments in the field (and it still carries on this business today). These sources provided financial support for his heavy involvement in radical right publishing and politics. A fanatical nationalist and anti-Semite, he was prominent in the Alldeutscher Verband from its

founding in 1890. He also played a role in the ouster of Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg and the overthrow of the Bavarian Soviet Republic in 1919, and was an early member of the Nazi Party, and close to its abortive 1923 putsch.[65]

Lehmann was of undistinguished intellect and education but took very seriously his "educational" mission, and his "idealistic" publications were strongly marked by his forceful and highly unpleasant personality. He was prone to paranoia, and constantly feared assassination; he habitually carried a revolver, to which in later years he added a stick, a blackjack and brass knuckles.[66] He could be extremely dictatorial--even changing published copy without notifying the editor or the author[67]--but also could be stubbornly loyal to those he believed in, which certainly was to the advantage of Franz Haiser. Beyond a doubt he did not stint on material sacrifices for his beliefs. In 1890-1915 his firm published about 65 titles, of which 60 percent were medical and scientific, and the rest "idealistic" propaganda; in 1890-1933 it put out 16 periodicals (not all at once), nine of the first category and seven of the second.

The house particularly specialized in "race science," a natural outgrowth of its medical line. Lehmann was obsessed with threats to the Nordic race, and was a strenuous advocate of racial legislation, on the lines of the later Nuremberg laws.[68] In his radical right output Lehmann took

little interest in theoretical and highbrow books, so dear to the heart of publishers like Eugen Diederichs, and preferred a more popular, if not demagogic tone. No doubt this broadened their appeal, but it did not make them as a group profitable. He himself declared in a letter of 1905 that for ten years he had lost money steadily on his ADV material, and for the last eight years his patriotic publications had been costing him one-fourth of his income. In the 1920's, while such books as Wichtl's Freimauerei and those of H. F. K. Günther sold many thousands, Lehmann lost heavily on such endeavors as the AfRGB and Franz Haiser.

The monthly Deutschlands Erneuerung became "the most important organ of völkisch thought"[69] and gave Franz Haiser his widest exposure. Lehmann founded it in April 1917, in consultation with Heinrich Class (head of the ADV), Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Wolfgang Kapp, Arthur Dinter, and other leading radical right publicists.[70] Its editor up to April 1925 was Dr. Erich Kühn (1878-after 1930) an East Prussian by birth, who was a prominent anti-Semitic literary figure in Munich. He was an early member of the Deutscher Arbeiter Partei, forerunner of the NSDAP, and spoke at the meeting of October 16, 1919, where Hitler made his first public speech. Later he held card #587 of the NSDAP. However, the leading personality of the journal was always Lehmann himself. By German standards it had a large circulation: 6500 copies at its inception in 1917, and 9000

from 1918 through 1923. Thereafter, as the Weimar Republic stabilized and völkisch extremism declined in appeal, it fell to 2000-3000 in the late 1920's.[71] It seems never to have made money; in the late 1920's Lehmann said it was costing him 12,000 Marks ($2880 US) a year.

Franz Haiser appeared in DE in its first volume, in October 1917,[72] and in the next five years placed in it ten articles (one of them being an extract from his Gastmahl) and three book reviews. Thereafter he was absent from its pages until one more article, in 1925, followed by three brief book reviews in 1926-1929. One suspects that the falling-off after 1925 came because the editor found he had nothing new to say; it is worth noting that his last article in DE appeared under a new editor, and showed some slight freshness of literary imagination. Certainly Haiser could not complain that the journal did not give his ideas a full hearing. The J. F. Lehmann Verlag did him still greater service in the publication of his books. In 1919 it re-issued his Krisis of 1912 (listing it as "Heft 1" of a new series, of which however no more appeared). Next it issued Gastmahl (1920), far and away the most readable and successful of Haiser's books. It went to a second printing in 1922.[73] This was followed in rapid succession by Anfang (1921), Sklaverei (1923), Freimaurer (1924) and a second, revised edition of Gastmahl in 1925. It seems most doubtful that this last series of books was a success for the firm;

Sklaverei, one supposes because of its unnecessarily tactless title, was reviewed by only two periodicals. In 1927, Haiser expected the firm to publish yet another work of his, Die Biologie des Staates, but it never appeared from Lehmann, if at all.[74]

Besides publishing Haiser's books, Lehmann was fairly generous in advertising them on the covers of DE, and in other publications. In the endpapers of Sklaverei the house was even kind enough to list Haiser's (and his wife's) books by other publishers, and his chemistry dissertation. After Lehmann's death in 1935 the house still advertised stocks of Anfang, Freimaurer, Gastmahl and Krisis, at reduced prices. In the view of the chief student of the Lehmann Verlag, such long retention of unsold books was unusual, but radical right publishers are not to be judged by conventional standards, and certainly not Lehmann. It is doubtful that Lehmann felt any strong personal attachment to Haiser, but rather was attracted by his principles, and accordingly paid no attention to the commercial logic of the situation.[75]

While he was appearing in DE, Haiser became one of the major contributors to Michel: Unabhängige Wochenschrift für alle Deutschen, a periodical published at Graz, Austria, from 1919, but as its title implied intended for a wide, all-German audience. A tabloid-sized sheet of up to eight pages, it claimed in 1926 a circulation of 10,000 and in

1927 25,000. Its chief editor was one Hans Kipper (1889-after 1964), under whom Ludwig Porod served for a time as editor. While Franz Haiser was writing in it, it was in ideology, interests and manners hard to distinguish from other völkisch, antidemocratic periodicals. In 1923 it was forbidden for six months by the then SPD government of Prussia, which was of course considered a battle honor.[76]

Unlike the somewhat more impersonal DE, Michel had about it (at least in the years here under consideration) a chatty and club-like atmosphere, with a set of articles (with pictures) on "our contributors," lively exchanges in the letters-to-the-editor column, and passionate undergraduate quarrels. Especially notable was a savage denunciation of Haiser by Porod (extending over five issues) and his answer in kind, which even stopped to insinuations about Porod's war record and racial ancestry. (A rare lapse for Haiser.) Hans Kipper further engaged in a most complicated row with other eminent radical right figures, including Erich Kühn of DE. Kühn found himself with regret obliged to explain the matter to his readers, for Kipper's reckless slanders and insults were a threat to the whole völkisch movement. "I have better and more important things to do than to answer endless insults from a man listed twice by an Ehrengericht [court of honor] as not a man of honor. It's pointless to scuffle with such men. I note finally that a man with his shady past . . . does not belong

in the völkisch movement."[77] Kipper was apparently a rather quarrelsome type, for not long after he had an almost equally ferocious quarrel with Ludwig Porod, after which not surprisingly the latter's name was no more to be seen on Michel's masthead.[78] Hans Kipper later moved to Hollabrunn, near Vienna, and engaged in other periodical ventures. He managed however to live down his völkisch and pan-German past, becoming proprietor of a spring, the Michelquelle, which so encouraged the local tourist trade that the town of Gams ob Frauenthal made him an honorary citizen at the age of 75.[79]

Haiser entered the pages of Michel in 1919, its first year of publication, with three selections from his forthcoming Gastmahl.[80] Subsequently he made seven appearances in 1920, five in 1921, six in 1922, fourteen in 1923, four in 1924, and three in 1925, the last set being chiefly taken up with the angry exchange with Porod aforesaid. (There was also one article by Haiser's wife.[81]) While his articles in DE were relatively impersonal, those in Michel were full of auto-biographical asides, requests to publicize his books, and digressions on his favorite hobbyhorses. Many writers who had appeared with him in other periodicals recurred here, and gave him some fulsome reviews. Haiser's disappearance from Michel seems only secondarily a matter of personalities. From 1924 it was becoming a somewhat less sectarian sheet, with broader and better balanced (though scarcely impartial) news coverage, and its claimed rise in circulation was very

likely connected with this fact. The times it seemed no longer offered as much of a public to Haiser's type of authorship. It is noticeable that after he ceased to appear in it he found no comparable outlet to take its place, and his appearances in print became fewer and mostly in very obscure publications. Haiser apparently believed in Haiser as much as ever, but he found fewer to agree with him.

Another factor, or perhaps another way of stating the preceding one, was that his particular circle of friends and supporters was getting old, and not being replaced. From the frequency and warmth of his references to persons, Haiser seems to have been while fiercely individualistic in his convictions not by temperament unsociable or a "loner." He mentions, in his normal off-hand way quite a number of like-minded persons, and several of them also appeared as reviewers of his books. Sometimes this acquaintance only seems to have been by correspondence, and in some cases Haiser said so. Perhaps the earliest of such acquaintances was Dr. Benno Imendörffer (1867-1945), whose encouragement Haiser acknowledged in the introduction to Überzeugungskraft, composed in 1914. Imendörffer taught geography in secondary schools, and wrote textbooks in that field, and children's stories. Apparently on the strength of that career he was given the honorary title of Regierungsrat i. R. in 1925. In the radical right field he wrote

almost no books, but voluminous articles, especially in Michel.[82] Imendörffer wrote three very laudatory reviews of Haiser, and was in the chair (and almost certainly responsible for the invitation) when Haiser addressed the Deutscher Klub in Vienna in 1924 and 1926. Even more beneficial to Haiser in respect of reviews was Hermann Gustav Holle, another retired secondary schoolteacher (1852-(?)1926) who treated no less than five of Haiser's books, and also mentioned him favorably in his Allgemeine Biologie.

One, Wilhelm Schölermann (1865-1923), primarily a painter and writer on art, made Haiser well known, if not notorious, in radical right circles with reviews in 1913-14, already referred to, wherein he took swipes at several other figures in the movement. Haiser was also acquainted at least by correspondence with one of the best known racialists and enthusiasts for strengthening the peasantry, Willibald Hentschel (1858-after 1943), who reviewed Haiser twice (the second time however not to his liking).[83] Naturally Haiser did his share of backscratching, and he reviewed Hentschel and at least two other persons who also reviewed him. He also mentions with commendation the views of Heinrich Pudor (1865-after 1941), a voluminous völkisch author,[84] and also the less well-known Dr. Adolf Harpf of Graz (1857-1927). He also strongly commended the very obscure All-Arier Bund of Karl R. Petter of Danzig, which

certainly he knew of only by report.[85] One source lists Haiser as a principal figure in a periodical Neues Land, founded in 1921, but the present writer considers this dubious.[86]

Franz Haiser had an ample share of personal eccentricities, but his career as a publicist reveals characteristics widely found among the pre-Hitlerian radical right. Above all, despite a passionate concern with politics and public issues, there was almost no contact with practical political efforts, or at least with any that showed any sense of realism. Radical right authors were first and foremost "literary gents," having more in common with the esthetic affectations of the Left Bank, Greenwich Village and Bloomsbury than with the politicians of those countries, and their financial backers acted less in the character of businessmen than in that of rich patrons of the arts. The financial returns were slim for all--losses were probably the rule--but they were richly repaid in ego. The same psychological factor explains why radical right organizations and political parties were usually so fragmented and ineffective; each proclaimed its mission to be the redemption of the German spirit, but a more compelling motive was to be the biggest frog in the local puddle, however small.

Ideologically there was a large degree of consensus; the present-day reader is readily struck (and soon bored) by the similarity of themes and convictions throughout the

radical right printed word. Differences over basic issues, and large potential contradictions (such as Haiser made it his tactless business to point out) were certainly present, but not noticeably greater than those overcome by many successful political parties and movements (including the Nazis, a few years later). Organization, subordination and regimentation were certainly not alien to the German or Austrian national character when they saw a purpose in them.

Thus for many years the German-speaking radical right presents a paradox; considerable numbers and passionate intensity of conviction combined with almost complete futility. The explanation undoubtedly is, that they were too devoted and consistent in their anti-modern convictions; especially, they would not relinquish the sense of their special "spiritual" identity and mission, which they owed in large part to their heritage of old-regime social attitudes, and the saturating ethos of Bildung. It was apparently impossible to combine these conceits with effective modern-style discipline and concentration to a purpose. United, they might have had a potential for at least diminishing the success of the socialists, Jews, feminists, liberal newspapers, and their other pet hates, but only by surrendering to the "materialistic," "mechanistic," and "unspiritual" modern world that these villains had created.

Only by means of Hitler's political skill and charisma

was this reluctance overcome; he offered sufficient compensation for most of the radical right to forgo its "aristocratic" pretensions and accept blending into mass society. Part of the price they paid was the extinction of individuality and colorful eccentricity in their books and periodicals, which suffered a fate precisely parallel to that of "fellow-travelers" after communist regimes are instituted. Haiser's writing career was all but over by the time Hitler became important, but had it lasted longer there can be little doubt that he would have been silenced too. (Only under democracy are its enemies really safe.)

Notes to Chapter VIII

[1]Stark, Entrepreneurs of Ideology, pp. 148-54, citing inter alia H. Hüttig, Die politische Zeitschriften der Nachkriegszeit in Deutschland (Magdeburg: 1928); Sperlings Zeitschriften-Adressbuch (Stuttgart). The latter, a trade directory, is the source for the over-all numbers of periodicals, and most circulation figures. Some very temporary or obscure publications did not appear in it, and some even if in existence for a long time did not bother. Its circulation figures are the publications' own (often they give none) and are probably to be taken with a grain of salt. Unfortunately, this work did not appear between 1915 and 1923, the years of Haiser's greatest activity.

[2]Stark, Entrepreneurs, p. 253n.

[3]Ibid., pp. 28-30.

[4]Ibid., pp. 90-107.

[5]Ibid., p. 144.

[6]Ibid., pp. 146-47; Lebovics, p. 180; Mosse, Crisis, p. 150; Armin Mohler, Die Konservative Revolution (Darmstadt: 1972), p. 285.

[7]Deutsches Volksblatt, Österreichische Rundschau, Deutsch-österreichische Tagezeitung, all of Vienna, and Völkischer Beobachter, of Munich.

[8]Richard Höhn, Arthur Mahraun (Rendsburg: 1929), p. 35.

[9]Cited in Pulzer, Antisemitism, p. 192.

[10]For instance the Artamanen, well the largest of the land-resettlement groups, had at its peak 1500 members. Ernst Hunkel's short-lived Donnershag of 1919-23 never had over 50 (Mosse, Crisis, pp. 119-20), yet among the völkisch was probably quite well known, thanks to his extensive publishing activity and quarrelsomeness. For that matter the NSDAP numbered at most 1500 in the putsch of 1923; only after its failure did Hitler systematically set about making it a mass organization. These groups however also attracted so to speak a large corona of sympathizers and contributors, who did not care to become formally committed. Mosse (Crisis, p. 150) further notes that they were effective far beyond their numbers because of their enthusiasm, and their concentration in the teaching profession.

[11]It was an index of their indiscipline, that the völkisch press could not even agree on a uniform set of old Germanic names for the months.

[12]See Bibliography and Bibliographical Essay.

[13]B. Imendörffer, "Ein deutscher Kämpfer," Michel, Nov. 20, 1921, p. 1.

[14]The copy in the Austrian National Library is marked "gift of the author."

[15]Pichl, Schönerer, VI, pp. 157-60; Deutsch-völkisches Jahrbuch, 1921, 1922.

[16]FH, "Zur Mittgartfrage," PAM, XV, p. 273.

[17]Also mentioned in FM, p. 89; UK, p. 214; "Die Linkskultur . . . ," PAM, XII, pp. 413-21.

[18]NL, V, p. 94.

[19]Paul B. Means, Things That are Caesar's, (New York: 1935), p. 165.

[20]See e.g., Der Türmer, XXV (1923), endpaper.

[21]Simons has been associated with several anti-Semitic groups, including Lanz-Liebenfels' exotic "Order of the New Templars." Lanz-Liebenfels acclaimed Simonsbrot as "bread fit for heroes." Pulzer, Anti-Semitism, p. 231; Wilfried Daim, Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab (Munich: 1958), pp. 120-21.

[22]OR, Aug. 28, 1910, pp. 3-4.

[23]NL, VI, no. 9 (Mar. 1, 1912).

[24]NL, VII, no. 7 (Jan. 1, 1913).

[25]"Orplid" was the name of a mythical island in a play by E. Mörike of 1823, widely used a cultural sobriquet.

[26]NL, VI, no. 2 (Aug. 1, 1911), pp. 27-28; no. 5 (Nov. 1, 1911), p. 76.

[27]NL, VI, no. 6 (Dec. 1, 1911), p. 90.

[28]NL, VII, no. 2 (Aug. 1, 1912).

[29]FH, "Zu Dr. Rösler's Aufsatz 'Nationalaristarchie'," NL, VIII, p. 93.

[30]FH, "Meine Antwort an Herrn Grill," NL, VIII, pp. 165-66.

[31]A Rentner is one who lives on private means, without having to work, especially on securities; the American slang word "coupon-clipper" is a fair equivalent.

[32]AI, p. 83. See also AI, pp. 18-21, 72-85; UK, p. 330.

[33]FH, "Meine Antwort an Herrn Grill" as in note 30, above.

[34]See bibliography, "Series 3." See also FH, "Die LinksKultur . . . ," PAM, XII, p. 420n, wherein Haiser commends a "Geheimbund" then being sponsored by Hunkel, perhaps one of his anti-Christian organizations.

[35]FH, "Mittelstand und Nationalitätsbewusstsein . . . ," Deutsches Volksblatt, Oct. 14, 1909. Reprinted in Krisis, pp. 69-73.

[36]Jenks, Vienna and the Young Hitler, pp. 47, 63, 97, 125-33.

[37]All circulation figures from Sperling, op. cit.

[38]As yet there is no modern biography of Fritsch; one treatment is R. H. Phelps, "Theodor Fritsch und der Antisemitismus," Deutsche Rundschau, LXXXVII (May 1961), pp. 442-49. See also Uwe Lohalm. Völkischer Radikalismus (Hamburg: 1970), pp. 58-61; Pulzer, Antisemitism, p. 53.

[39]Phelps, op. cit.; Sperling.

[40]Hammer, XIII, pp. 668-69.

[41]Mosse, Crisis, p. 112.

[42]FH, "Deutschtum, Modernismus und Hebräertum," Hammer, IX, pp. 314-18; X, pp. 263-67.

[43]Karl Konrad, ". . .und beten zu den Göttern," Hammer, XII, pp. 603-05.

[44]FH, "Deutschtum . . . ," Hammer, IX, p. 316.

[45]Hammer, XV, p. 430, citing FH "Okkultismus," PAM, XV, pp. 189-94.

[46]Hammer, XXVIII, no. 618, 621 (March and May, 1928).

[47]The name was changed for patriotic reasons at the start of World War I, along with many other Revues. For convenience, it will be called the PAM throughout.

[48]Pulzer, p. 236 gives PAM credit for some work of intellectual value; if so, it appeared well before the period here studied. H. G. Zmarzlik, "Social Darwinism in Germany," in H. Holborn ed. Republic to Reich (New York: 1972), constructs an elaborate hypothesis subdividing German eugenic-darwinist racialism into two schools, with the PAM as the principal focus of one and the AfRGB of the other. In the present author's view, this distinction is mistaken or at best trivial. See the Bibliographical Essay.

[49]Degener, Wer ist's; Kürschners deutscher Literatur-Kalendar.

[50]Sperling, op. cit.

[51]PAM, XIV, no. 7 (Oct. 1913), rear leaf.

[52]PAM, XV, no. 1 (Apr. 1916).

[53]Schmidt-Gibichenfels, "Die Zukunft der P. A. M.," PAM, XIX, pp. 111-13.

[54]Lohalm, op. cit., pp. 58-89; 123-26; Stark, op. cit., p. 424.

[55]Lohalm, op. cit., p. 240.

[56]Ibid., pp. 255-57.

[57]Ibid., pp. 124-26.

[58]"An Unsere Leser, " PAM, XXI, p. 97.

[59]"An unsere Leser," PAM, XXI, pp. 241-42.

[60]H. G. Holle in Michel, Sept. 30, 1923, p. 2.

[61]For the role of the cafe in cultural life generally in prewar Germany and Austria, see Walter Mehring, Lost Library, pp. 136-48.

[62]FH, "Weltanschauung und Religion," PAM, XII, pp. 197-202.

[63]FH, "Die Links-Kultur und der deutsch-österreichische Rassenkampf," PAM, XII, pp. 413-21.

[64]FH, "Geist und Judentum," PAM, XXI, p. 30. See also "Diplomatie," PAM, XV, p. 254.

[65]Stark, Entrepreneurs, p. 510.

[66]Ibid., pp. 51 ff.

[67]Ibid., pp. 163-69.

[68]Ibid., pp. 346 ff., 417.

[69]Mosse, Crisis, p. 224.

[70]Stark, op. cit., p. 158; Melanie Lehmann, Verleger J. G. Lehmann (Munich: 1935), pp. 43, 137-38.

[71]Stark, op. cit., p. 173.

[72]FH, "Das stilisierte Leben," DE, I, pp. 357-67.

[73]FH, "Zur Alcoholfrage," Michel, July 16, 1922, p. 3.

[74]FH, "Zum Warburg-Prozess," Hammer, XXVI, pp. 216-17.

[75]Letter of Dr. Gary D. Stark to the author May 16, 1975. Unfortunately the surviving archives of the firm contain no mention of its relations with Haiser, nor of the sales of his books. Letter from the same Feb. 27, 1974.

[76]Deutsch-völkische Blätter, July 7, 1923, p. 2.

[77]Erich Kühn, "In eigner Sache," DE, VIII, p. 386. See also Hans Kipper, "Meine Abrechnung," Michel, Feb. 3, 1924, p. 2; "Die entlarvten Lügner- ein Schlusswort," Michel, July 6, 1924, p. 4; Alfred Rosenberg, "Der unkühne Dr. Kühn," Michel, May 18, 1924, p. 4.

[78]Michel, July 25, 1926, p. 3.

[79]Südost Tagepost, Dec. 19, 1964.

[80]Published in Michel from Nov. 16, 1919 to Jan. 11, 1920. See Bibliography.

[81]Justine Haiser, "Rasse und Weltanschauung," Michel, Oct. 24 and 31, 1920.

[82]Kürschner op. cit., 1922 et seq.; "Unsere Mitarbeiter: Dr. Benno Imendörffer," Michel, May 18, 1924, p. 2.

[83]FH, "Für und gegen Hentschels Mittgartplan," PAM, XVI, pp. 164-65.

[84]Mohler, op. cit., pp. 358-60.

[85]FM, pp. 31, 121; Deutsch-völkisches Jahrbuch, II (1921); All-Deutscher Zeitweiser, 1932, p. 50.

[86]According to Mohler op. cit., p. 289 there was founded a journal Neues Land in 1921, in close association with the Kultur-Arbeit of Ludwig Fahrenkrog, a principal figure in anti-Christian völkisch paganism. The chief figures of Neues Land are given as Fahrenkrog, Hans Surén, Ernst Wachler and Franz Haiser. Surén (1885-) was an active figure in völkisch athletics; Wachler specialized in open-air forest theaters for ritual plays, founding the first of these in 1907. (Mosse Crisis, pp. 80-81) The author has been unable to locate a file of Neues Land (if one is still to be found). But since Haiser is silent on the matter and unmentioned in the periodical indices in this connection, and further the other individuals named seem to have had interests utterly divergent from his--especially Wachler, who wanted to spread völkisch edification to a broad public, an ultimate abomination to FH--it seems advisable to omit this assertion, until documentary evidence comes to hand.

CHAPTER IX

FRANZ HAISER'S LOGIC, CULTURE AND STYLE

The style is the man.

--Buffon

Franz Haiser took very seriously his vocation of a "philosopher," and considered himself qualified to pronounce on a wide range of questions. Taken as a whole he was sui generis, but if we take his various aspects separately, we find many resemblances to others on the radical right. This factor is indeed a chief reason for studying him. But to begin with, it is necessary to orient the reader to Haiser-as-a-whole. The present chapter therefore begins with a synopsis of his principal ideas, to be followed by a discussion of his sense of mission and his style, both as a writer and as a person.

We may conveniently classify Haiser's ideas into three main divisions.

1. Elitism as a law of civilization.

The making of civilization was the destiny of mankind, but it was by definition an exhausting and "endothermic" process, absorbing far more from human beings than it would ever give back. Therefore its fruits could be enjoyed only by a few, and the great masses must always produce much and

consume little. To compel their service, the favored few had always to rule arbitrarily, and maintain a "gradient of worth" (Wertgefälle) between the two, just as to drive a turbine there must always be a head of water. Erosion of the landscape to a plain means energy-death, and levelling of social ranks civilization-death. The cultured minority must by definition constitute an "idle rich" exempted from any obligation to do "useful" work of any kind, and furthermore should be protected against the depletion of its vital energies, especially by the intense mental demands of modern life.

In his opinion, the oldest and best such source of gradient was a difference of race, with rigid separation of classes into hereditary castes. However, this tended to be weakened by miscegenation, by the highest caste's depletion through warfare, and the subtler wear and tear of civilized creativity itself. As the gradient of race-difference weakened, there was resort to more or less unsatisfactory substitutes, such as wealth and education. The vilest and most contemptible of these alternatives was the wealth-gradient of modern liberalism and capitalism, which was precisely an invention of the worst "curs" to circumvent their inferiority. The life-style sponsored by this would-be elite of "freedmen" was a sink of every kind of immorality, bad taste, and falsehood in general. However, this regime was not respected by the masses, who clamored for

more rights and benefits for themselves. But granting them diminished the gradient, and chaos loomed. As a measure of desperation, a tyranny soon had to be installed, but since by definition racially suitable master-material was no longer available, it was bound to be far harsher than the old aristocratic caste.

The best race (although some other stocks had good qualities) was, of course, the Aryan or Nordic. Haiser's definition and discussion of race was crude, inconsistent and self-serving, but intellectually no more preposterous than that of the well-known and respectable names of this "science." In some respects Haiser was more logical than they, notably in his contention that the racially best male specimens should be polygamous, and his insistence that "high race" was altogether distinct from German-speaking nationality. He classified his fellow-deutsch as just as trashy and mongrelized as the other nations of modern Europe. The remnants of good Aryan blood were scattered about many countries, and Haiser hoped they would unite in a "white international," or "All-Aryan Union," which would seize power in the several nations by revolutionary (or rather, counter-revolutionary) conspiracy. He therefore largely disapproved of the modern mass-based state, even in radical right hands. It led to catastrophic wars, which were racially dysgenic, and by having to enroll the masses for compulsory military service made it unavoidable

to grant them rights and power as well. Instead, in every land the Aryan counter-revolution should see that its chief enemy was the great majority of its racially inferior countrymen, and make fellow-Aryans elsewhere its friends.

These views put Haiser at cross purposes with most of the völkisch, who in effect wanted to be elitist and populist at once. Haiser himself was inconsistent on the issue, for he too retained a residue of German patriotism. Even more self-contradictory was his combination of these views with the standard vulgar-Nietzschean maxim that strife and violence were a law of life. The elite could only establish and maintain itself by constant struggle, but Haiser insisted that it might contend only with its equals, never with its inferiors. It was apparently vital for the elite to be devoted comrades and mortal enemies at once. In both Haiser and his "left-völkisch" critics there was a generous quota of deadly earnest muddlemindedness.

2. As a philosopher senso strictu Haiser professed a crude and simplified barbaric-vitalist anti-intellectualism. He held that reason could not really convince anyone; scientific theories were a matter of fashion; "objectivity" was a guild rule of the learned. Instinct was a reliable and fully sufficient guide to belief and action, and specifically the instinct of one's "species." All morality and values were relative. Haiser however insisted upon retaining the distinction between "ideals" and the

conclusions of mere experience, for unprovable as they were they were indispensable to man's innate upward-striving. Nietzsche's "Man is something that is to be surpassed" was a quotation that he could not use too often. He found dualistic contrast an absolute necessity in thought as well as in society, and savagely scorned those who found that "to understand everything was to forgive everything." Haiser also valued the dualism of the real and ideal as the basis of the freedom of the will, which he always firmly maintained. He loathed all philosophic materialism, notably that of the Monists, as enervating, and supportive of a host of modern evils.

Haiser gave high praise to religion, although he detested contemporary Christianity, which in his view was riddled with all the up-to-date vices, and virtually a branch of liberalism. Properly, religion should be like that of primitive peoples, serving to reinforce patriotism and tradition, and totally unintellectual.

In his philosophical and religious views Haiser belongs in the school then called Lebensphilosophie, and was not significantly original. There was not necessarily an interconnection between his "philosophical" flights and his social and political opinions, and there were plenty of inconsistencies in all directions. Certainly his basic philosophical skepticism never extended to the bases of his own convictions. There was of course a fundamental congruence

(explained in the chapter on barbaric vitalism) in that the rejection of mankind's essential equality undermines its rationality as well and vice versa. Haiser recognized this, and was clearer than many of the radical right in repudiating both, as the platform of liberal modernity.

3. Haiser was also fully equipped with strong opinions on many other topics, loosely if at all related to the first two categories. Some of these were the standard prejudices of the radical right, as for instance his views on city life, Bildung, modern music, and youth. He also had a number of crotchets about diet, medical practice and various other subjects, which defy systematic arrangement. These issues do not bulk large in his works, and they have been included where they can be conveniently related to the first two categories of Haiser's thoughts.

As to Haiser's literary and intellectual technique, there can be fewer more vivid illustrations of the proverb, "the style is the man." Every page he wrote is marked by his passionate and cantankerous personality, and his supreme confidence in his own wisdom. As he often bragged, he did not serve any party or orthodoxy: "The philosophical writer . . . ought to stand beyond reward and ambition, he serves God and not mankind, he is a priest."[1] Haiser dealt, he averred, with questions of ultimate truth and the fate of civilization itself, and was above mere everyday events. As a crowning example of this self-confidence, he remarked

in one of his books, published in 1916, that at the moment he finished the manuscript the present war broke out, but this event (which in fact he had been expecting for ten years) did not cause him to change a word. "The world conflagration has not changed my convictions and my essential purpose, for it concerns mere temporal experiences and my eye looks on eternity."[2] He admits that, as an innovator, his works are but sketches, and need to be filled out by others,[3] and it is not surprising that the petty-minded can easily find contradictions.[4] In good Nietzschean fashion, Haiser stressed that a true thinker is isolated from the world, and writes not in the common alphabet, but in hieroglyphics.[5]

By his own definition of a philosopher Haiser should not have greatly cared what other people thought of him, but here he protested rather too much. Others, he says, have to fear the censorship and vindictiveness of liberal demagoguery,

> But . . . I am a quite independently living private person, who is permitted to say a great deal because he has no 'colleagues' to consider. I have never been frightened nor made ill nor lost my temper, when one newspaper after another, the most völkisch of the völkisch not excepted, has rejected my manuscripts, when I had to go begging from house to house for a publisher, although my spiritual property was always given for publication without compensation.[6]
>
> I personally for example cannot at all grasp how one could feel injured by the attacks of enemies. The more they scream and storm, the more one laughs, for that is the surest sign that one has struck a fatal blow . . .[7]

However, he frequently lapsed from this tone of patronizing disdain, and said more nearly what he probably felt:

> [The insolent liberal dogmatists] hate me because I am a heretic, throw a shroud over me to suffocate me by dead silence, close off to me all editors, publishing houses, lecture halls. They call me a fool, who wants to stand the world on its head. Yet I say, who wants to stand the world on its head, they or I? Who wants to swim against the current, the current of biological law?
>
> Many say, Haiser is difficult to understand. . . . [But] didn't millions think in my sense in Antiquity? Others maintain the contrary: there is not a single new thought to be found in Haiser! From uneasiness, anger or hatred, to muffle the reading of my words they stoop to meanness. . . . Who of these limp-dishrag cowards or sufferers from liberal brain-rot would have had the courage to further extend Nietzsche's thoughts and direct them to a firm goal? It will do them no good, the future belongs to us right-radicals. . . . Here I stand, God help me, I can do no other![8]

Lastly, Haiser the philosopher of morals and history was the same person as the practical joker of Scheibbs; he brags of how his attacks on "temperance-fanatics" brought him a flood of angry letters,[9] and notes that the general abhorrence of polygamy "is ground enough for me personally to befriend a thing!"[10]

Franz Haiser's manner of writing and thinking precisely reflected his sense of his mission, for few authors have cared so little to adjust themselves to the tastes of their public, or had so little desire to please. To take his literary style first, he was a vivid but exasperatingly disorganized writer. He was often striking in his imagery, and seldom fell into the indirection, vagueness and

labyrinthine syntax so common in German prose. But he could not keep to the point. Haiser was very apt, even in a short article, to veer off abruptly at a tangent, and rarely kept consistently to a theme for more than a few pages at a time. In the present work, sometimes three different sentences from the same paragraph are cited in three different chapters. (Indeed, the reader must always bear in mind that the present exposition of Haiser presents him far more coherently than he appeared to his original reading public.) However, clearly this lack of order represents a lack of will rather than skill, for in this respect our subject's works vary greatly, for no apparent cause. Sklaverei is fairly well put together, but it comes between the very disjointed Anfang and Freimaurer, and even his articles in successive issues of the same publication show a similar variability. Haiser gives every impression of having written as the spirit moved him, revising seldom and with little or no editorial oversight. We can often virtually see the thoughts running through his head, as in several pieces close together in date he repeats the same figure of speech in mention of an author. Haiser also had a characteristic and not overlarge vocabulary, and seldom took much trouble to vary his expressions. He was, however, unusual among völkisch authors in his indifference to their phobia about foreign words, using a considerable number of French and (especially) English ones, which was consistent

with his vision of an international aristocracy. Haiser's reviewers, even when they praised him, seldom had much good to say about his style. His old friend Benno Imendörffer had to admit in 1921 that he had not divested himself of "small crudities of expression, false constructions and to be sure genuine Austrian errors of grammar, which have been present since he started to write."[11] Another reviewer, after having got through Haiser's longest and probably most tiresome book, remarked that "somewhat less 'freedom' and somewhat more 'style' would well serve Haiser's book."[12]

Haiser's self-esteem and self-righteousness are even more graphically illustrated in the remarkable constancy of his views, and his indifference to learning from anyone else. His major and most of his minor ideas show negligible change or development in more than twenty years. As he says himself, "there are many friends who will say, Haiser writes the same thing in every book."[13] Outside events affected him very slightly; as noted above, he wrote much the same way whether the German-speaking world was peaceful and prosperous, in desperate war, defeated and humiliated, or anticipating a Nazi dictatorship. He usually referred to contemporary events, if at all, after the manner of his hero, Cato the Elder, as a lead-in for his own perennial enthusiasms. He is perpetually going off on tangents, but they are always the same tangents; every one

of his books or any random dozen of his articles would give a good idea of the whole.

Changes are to be found in Haiser's output over the years, but they are very slight, and more a matter of tone than of substance. His earlier works, such as Krisis des Intellektualismus (1912) and Der aristokratische Imperativ (1913) are less vituperative, and even occasionally good-humored, while the later ones (especially Judenfrage of 1926) contain considerably more savagery and sense of personal grievance, especially toward the "left-völkisch." Some of his themes are necessarily topical; e.g., his philippics against paper money appear only after the post-war Austrian inflation, which had destroyed his fortune. However, save for such incidental clues Haiser's writings would be impossible to date from internal evidence, and a paragraph of 1912 could be readily interchanged with one of 1932. Therefore the present work does not attempt to treat his output opus by opus, but topically, according to his main themes.

As is hardly surprising, our subject likewise felt no compulsion to defer to scholarly standards of accuracy or depth of information, or to acquire much literary culture. He had a thorough vulgar-Nietzschean contempt for professorial research and objectivity.

> [There are also] the poor in spirit, who are but sparsely endowed by nature with spiritual goods, but nonetheless are consumed with ambition for fame. Even in their

> schooldays they seek to replace this lack with industriousness, become A-students, get three doctorates and write one scholarly work after another, but in spite of it their empty heads become not a hair wiser, indeed their overabundant fog of knowledge has obscured their last remains of spiritual independence. Therefore they look with hatred upon the great spirit, who needs but to set foot in an area of knowledge to create something new. . . .[14]

As a philosopher of civilization he often appealed to history, especially that of ancient Greece and Rome, but with gross superficiality and distortion, always blithely assuming that it supported his views. His descriptions of the contemporary scene are long on prophetical vitriol but very short on facts; he conveys a strong sense of observation of the here and now chiefly in his descriptions (mostly highly unfavorable) of the people around Scheibbs. Haiser did indeed mention or quote quite a number of authors, including not surprisingly such staples of the radical right as H. F. K. Günther, Adolf Harpf, Willibald Hentschel, Madison Grant, Otto Hauser, and others less well known, and also referred to popularizations of history and travel books. He mentions few authors of the opposite camp; a principal target of his scorn was Hans-Otto Henne am Rhyn (1828-1914), the author of several popular works on history, whom Haiser calls "a Hanswurst and falsifier of History."[15] Haiser also was easily roused to anger by persons who, in his opinion, misinterpreted Nietzsche.[16] On the whole, he gives the impression of not having studied very carefully even the publications of his own side.

In broader areas of culture, the story is much the same. Haiser discussed such philosophers as Kant, Hegel, Schelling, and Schopenhauer, but mostly very obtusely, and certainly not beyond the limits of knowledge of the ordinary Gymnasium graduate. Even his hero Nietzsche seems only superficially known to him. In the area of natural science and mathematics, wherein he had earned his doctorate, he showed more competence, and when he touched upon such material one notices immediately a more commonsensical and less agitated attitude. (His "scientific" racialist conclusions are however no better than the völkisch average.) In literature, thanks to his Jesuit education he was well acquainted with the Latin classics, and with Goethe and Schiller, the latter being his confessed favorite.[17] Grillparzer and Hebbel are also quoted, with approval, and likewise Charles Dickens (whom he could probably read in the original). Of contemporary authors, he had some acquaintance with Galsworthy and Ibsen, of whom he approved, and with Peter Rosegger and George Bernard Shaw, of whom he did not.

As far as the scope of his reading and formal schooling were concerned, Franz Haiser was a tolerably well-educated person. And in the present author's estimation, he had an above average intelligence. But these attainments seem to bear no relation to what he wrote. Haiser never could find in others' views or outside information anything

but a confirmation of his own convictions, frequently via sweeping and even comical distortions and omissions. Given his self-righteousness and hermetic absorption in his own wisdom, it would scarcely have mattered whether he had read ten times more books, or only one-tenth as many. His opinions were remarkably single-minded and static for twenty years of authorship, through some of the most calamitous events of modern times, and it is hard to imagine that he could not have gone on for another twenty in exactly the same way.

However, we must judge Franz Haiser as a thinker and writer by the standards of his own day; and surely, if he had fewer readers than some other radical right authors, the reason was not to be found in his limitations of style, sense, learning or emotional maturity. For this reading public, one can hardly imagine what would be an excess of subjectivity, lack of facts, failure to keep to the point, repetition, fantasy, and "philosophical" pretensions. The carping, fantastical, know-it-all and prophet of Götterdämerung was in fact a stock figure, and Haiser was essentially a cruder analogue of writers like Arthur Möller van den Brück and Oswald Spengler, whose literary vogue arose at about the same time. Also worth bracketing with our subject was the most influential of radical-right intellectuals, namely Adolf Hitler. Hitler's dilettantism mixed with insolence, his addiction to pontificating on anything that took

his fancy, were fairly normal for the bohemians of prewar Vienna and Munich. A conspicuous parallel to his older fellow-Austrian was the way he came to a set of "philosophical" convictions fairly early and thereafter held to them with dogged fanaticism, never showing the slightest sign of growth or development. (Lanz-Liebenfels, another Austrian, was similar.) No doubt this vulgarized authoritarianism in part at least stemmed from the barbaric-vitalist "Jacksonian" attitude to intellectual life. Spiritual depth and ex cathedra finality should no longer be "establishment" monopolies, but were rather instinctive natural talents, needing no laborious research or diplomas, at least in a certain favored few.

Haiser as a thinker and stylist also resembled others on the radical right in his use (although to a relatively moderate degree) of a high-flown "philosophical" rhetoric. This manner of discourse, where "one can understand every word, but never a sentence," was widespread among educated Teutons, but was especially useful to opponents of the modern open society. In effect, by taking an "idealistic" point of view they could denounce it as "unspiritual" without meeting its arguments. It is characteristic of the movement's publications that although supposedly dealing with pressing political and economic problems, they are very thin in treatments of fact; to make a mathematical analogy, they luxuriated in the theory of equations but could not do long division.

This jargon began as a creation of Bildung, but was readily vulgarized, and is even found in outspoken anti-intellectuals like many Nazis and Franz Haiser.

This manner of speaking started from the presumption that real understanding was not to be sought in the mere facts of experience, but only by grasping the spirit or Geist behind them, i.e., through "idealism." Schiller's "it is the Geist which builds the body for itself" was a favorite motto. Conveniently, the role of Geist need not--indeed could not--be tested empirically, and attribution of events to one or another Geist was a matter of taste. Thus Max Weber saw a "puritan" spirit behind the development of capitalism, while Werner Sombart was equally certain of a "Jewish" one. Indeed the anti-Semites, since there were never enough flesh and blood Jews to go round, would have been lost without a "Jewish Spirit" for which to blame all their pet hates.

A convenient polemical opposite to "idealism" was "materialism." This meant in effect anything one found unpleasant in the modern age, basically in the spirit of Emerson's "things are in the saddle, and ride mankind." City

life, parliamentarism, natural science, liberal journalism, the new rich, popular culture, all could be lumped with it. "Materialism" at root stood for the resentment of the Gebildeten, and other traditional claimants to respectability and deference, that the energies of life were being devoted to newer, mostly "practical" activities, in which their kind played a diminished role. Another favorite antithesis, often linked to the foregoing, was that of "culture" versus "civilization," whereby the former contained all that was "profound," "higher," "spiritual," "organic," etc., and the latter by contrast the merely worldly, superficial, utilitarian, unrefined, and so on. This antithesis was almost endlessly adaptable, and the anti-modern party had little trouble assigning all "culture" to itself and all mere "civilization" to its adversaries. (Curiously, Franz Haiser was apparently indifferent to the point, despite its potential usefulness to his philosophy of history, and used Kultur and Ziviliza-tion with little distinction.)

This "philosophical" rhetoric was used in myriad ways to defend the established order against the incursions of a more open society.

> Resentment against modernity--and against the West as the source of it--was an essential part of German nationalism before 1914.
>
> The upper classes in imperial Germany were anti-democratic--as their interests and inclinations prescribed. . . . The rhetoric of anti-democracy in Germany was full of Vulgaridealismus, an effort to justify authoritarianism and social privilege by invoking Germany's philosophical traditions and literary ideals. Kultur and democracy were antithetical, they said and believed, though usually these same men complained that Kultur had already declined, without democracy.[18]

The attitude to contemporary politics was crucially affected.

> The emphasis was always upon the ultimate purposes of government [and] . . . these theoretical objectives were generally stated in moral and intellectual terms. The analysis of political realities was neglected. . . . Indeed the suggestion was that the details of everyday politics were ethically as well as intellectually beneath the notice of the cultivated man. . . . [This was partly from inexperience] but his distrust of "interest politics" was also a reflection of his own interested preferences. He correctly assumed that he would be threatened in his elevated role if the pragmatic politics of group competition and numerical compromises were allowed to come to the front of the stage.[19]
>
> As a matter of fact, the yearning for an escape from interest politics helped to lead many educated Germans into the pseudo-idealistic world of anti-semitism and aggressive nationalism.[20]

The practical advantages of keeping discussion on this high moral plane was immediately apparent in debate with the SPD. The latter, being also Germans, claimed to base themselves on the propositions of Marxist philosophy, so an educated

opponent could dismiss them as "materialistic" without having to discuss whether the working class had any real grievances. Such a position was also facilitated by the assumption that anyone who had Bildung had acquired some degree of superior moral insight, and therefore was entitled to be patronizing towards unschooled proletarians.

But particularly interesting for present purposes was the way this intellectualist manner of argument was actually stood on its head, and used by even the crudest of anti-intellectuals. This resulted from the decline of confidence in traditional rationality and objective knowledge itself, yet without a corresponding decline in the elitist pretensions of more or less educated persons. Bildung ceased to provide for them a claim to spiritual superiority, but by no means were such claims abandoned. A notable sign was the very loose and colloquial use of the central terms "idealism" and "idealist." An idealist was almost anyone who took himself very seriously, was indifferent to material rewards, and determined to have his own way. It was applied by their admirers to Nietzsche, Lagarde, and Hitler, and by the same standard would be equally suitable for Franz Haiser.

> In a very real sense the Hitler movement was idealistic, and that was the condition of its success. Did it not

> inveigh against materialism and selfishness, defy reality, promise the end of fratricidal conflict and the establishment of social harmony, of unity and leadership, power and confidence? To make it appear that his party's nihilism was really idealism, its resentful and cowardly brutality, virility and strength--that was Hitler's greatest propaganda success.[21]

Consequently, whereas in most countries the aspiration to intellectual profundity usually required a great deal of work and considerable credentials, in the German-speaking world few things were easier. With a string of the right phrases and a smattering of learning picked up from textbooks and popularizations, anyone could pose as a "philospher." It is particularly striking how many books labeled as "philosophy" appeared soon after World War I which were basically radical right attacks on the Weimar Republic. The best known of such intellectual contributors was Arthur Rosenberg, later hanged as a war criminal, who was the Nazi Party's chief house intellectual. One of the most egregious of the type was Franz Haiser, because of his outspokenness and lack of deference to polite pretenses. His shabby-genteel gripes are the sort of thing one might hear in the U.S.A. from the oracle of the local tavern; we find it grotesque that he should call himself an "academic" and a "philosopher" (and was actually so listed in a reputable "Dictionary of Philosophers" in 1937[22]). But certainly the responsibility rests on the German-speaking educated world in general, which by inextricably mixing caste interests

with educational tradition, had rendered it difficult to draw the line.

Franz Haiser's use of this code language will be readily apparent in succeeding chapters. We may note however that like Austrians in general he was less prone to wallow in ponderous metaphysical abstractions than were Reich-Germans, and in fact his own style is remarkably plain and concrete. For this reason his prose, while often inelegant, poses few problems of translation, and the present work gives the German original only in the few places where there is no convenient English equivalent.

As a further factor in the style and mentality of the German-speaking radical right, which is significantly relevant to the career of Franz Haiser, we may note its considerable affinity to the literary movement known as Expressionism, whose vogue (approximately 1912-1924) coincided with the most active years of Franz Haiser. Expressionist authors held a wide variety of political opinions, and only a few of them can be classed as radical right, but there were many resemblances in tone and theme. Expressionism like the radical right was rooted in the peculiar German experiences of modernization, and especially to the development of more literary talent and ambition than there was a social, and especially a civic arena in which to express it. By the mid-eighteenth century French and Anglo-Saxon literary men were fairly well related to their societies, playing

an important role in forming public opinion, and often being received in the highest social and political circles. They therefore put a premium on lucidity, smoothness, sophistication and naturalistic description, qualities not easily acquired by the writer in isolation. But the German-speaking world tended to leave its literati ignored and alone amid the riches of their minds. The Storm and Stress school (e.g., Goethe's Werther) shows this clearly; for all its talent it is apt to be shrill, exaggerated, and weak in observation, pre-occupied with the author's expression of his own usually rather unhappy feelings.

Expressionism was quite consciously a late offshoot of Storm and Stress. Its predominant mood was alienation and bitterness, and its literary techniques were deliberately not realistic and "unnatural" (naturalism was their pet hate), so as to jolt Philistine complacency. For instance, all the characters in a work might talk in an identical, very artificial diction, and even be labeled simply as the Young Man, the Girl, the Billionaire's Son, etc.[23] In lands where authors were on better terms with their public, they also commonly had a didactic or propagandistic purpose, but pursued it rather by making their characters and situations (George F. Babbitt, Emma Bovary, Oliver asking for more) vivid and believable, to mesh with the public's conventional sensibilities. For the Expressionists, this was to surrender before the battle began. Their choice of subject-matter was

self-consciously iconoclastic, full of deliberate ugliness: mass madness, rotting corpses, and calamity in general. In a way Expressionism was a more sophisticated parallel to the prewar Youth Movement, also a movement of protest and frustration.[24] This strained attitude and style is no doubt a chief reason why it was so soon forgotten; Franz Kafka was the Movement's only figure to do first-rate work (that is, while writing as an Expressionist).

The Expressionists shared in the common habits of educated Germans, of philosophical pretentiousness and taking themselves too seriously. Authors of the school can be as repetitious and indifferent to the reader's sensibilities as Franz Haiser himself. To an English-speaking reader, or to someone grounded on earlier German literature, much of Expressionism seems hardly literature at all, but hectoring sermons and tracts.[25] It is more concerned with humanity than people. Expressionists had a more than generous share of the conceit, born of Romanticism and Bildung, that the literary genius was called upon to redeem the whole world, and was above the ordinary obligations of morals and manners; as George Kaiser maintained in his sensational trial for larceny.[26]

In the 1920's political writing, of both right and left, shared in the alienation, and hence the style, of Expressionism. The following would not have been out of place in Haiser's circle, but it was in fact written by Karl von

Ossietzsky, later to become a famous left wing editor of the Weimar era, for a Monist magazine:

> No! It is better to be like the erring Faust on the Blocksberg, swaying between remorse and desire in the midst of the infernal chaos of the witches' sabbath; better to be like the wandering knight, alone in the horrible wilderness, threatened by devil and death, than to conclude a pact with that Philistine adroitness of emotions and thought, that greasy correctness, that dull and flat single-mindedness which sees only the next step but is unable to grasp the essence of things. Thus must be the man of our days: the Man who builds the house in which the generations of the future will live.[27]

Not many Expressionists ever professed clear-cut radical-right opinions, but they often shared some of its basic attitudes, notably a resentment at being outsiders to modern society, and barbaric vitalism. The movement was much influenced by Nietzsche and Stefan George. They generally loathed the "establishment," including the family (parental repression and parricide were favorite themes), and protested the tyranny of age over youth, especially in the school system.[28] In some cases they cursed conscious rationality itself as the enemy of all life and "soul," and yearned to regress to the primitive and instinctive, even to the unconscious level:

> O dass wir unsere Urahnen waren
> Ein Klümpchen Schleim in einem warmen Moor.
>
> (O that we might be our ancestors' ancestors.
> A little ball of slime in a tepid moor.)[29]

They abominated the isolation imposed by modernity on the private person; they yearned for community, but with much the

same immaturity as the völkisch: their poetry was "a desperate attempt to relate to society, but on the terms of the self, not on the terms of the group."[30]

The Expressionists, also like the radical right, avowed the blackest pessimism about modern times alternating with fervent hopes for a better world, but these latter were scarcely better related to present experience than the equally fervent dithyrambs of Lanz-Liebenfels or Haiser. This literary movement arose out of the same soil of bewilderment and frustration, the combination of intelligent sensibility and feelings of practical powerlessness, the sense that nobody was even listening, as the anti-modern protests of the radical right (and to some extent, the different protests of the radical left). An unhappiness which in Storm and Stress days had afflicted a few literary men was now shared by a large part of the educated population, and the popularity of a kindred literary movement should be no surprise.

In a broad sense we might call Franz Haiser an Expressionist. Certainly in his absorption in his own sense of wrong, his isolation (though it was in good part self-chosen) from any group or community, his hostility to all "establishments," and his unyielding stridency of tone and manner, he bears a strong resemblance. The rather abstract and bloodless enemy he depicts also resembles that common to Expressionist plays (other völkisch, concentrating on Jews,

Marxists, and other nationalities, expressed their hatreds more concretely). Indeed, it would be quite easy to write Haiser's favorite scenario of modern history--the calamitous replacement of the old aristocratic "gradient of worth" by the modern open society, and its overthrow by a counter-revolutionary international conspiracy by the remnants of Aryan blood, as an Expressionist play.[31]

Notes to Chapter IX

[1]FM, "Arbeitsloses Einkommen," NL, XI, p. 185.

[2]UK, p. 360.

[3]FH, "Ludwig Porod und seine 'grundsätzlichen Bemerkungen,'" Michel, April 5, 1925, pp. 1-2.

[4]JF, pp. 65, 68-69.

[5]Anfang, p. 165; UK, p. 210.

[6]UK, p. 361.

[7]Anfang, p. 143.

[8]FH, "Dogmen des Liberalismus," Michel, Nov. 5, 1922, pp. 2-3.

[9]SKL, pp. 64, 71.

[10]FM, p. 114.

[11]Benno Imendörffer, "Ein deutscher Kampfer," Michel, Nov. 20, 1922, p. 1.

[12]Fritz Lenz, Review of UK, AfRGB, XII, p. 492.

[13]FM, p. 43.

[14]Anfang, p. 168.

[15]Anfang, p. 6.

[16]FH, "Offener Brief an Karl Heckel," Michel, March 11, 1923; "Ein Jünger Nietzsches?" Michel, Nov. 8 and 25, 1923.

[17]UK, p. 204 ff.

[18]Fritz Stern, Introduction to The Path to Dictatorship (Garden City:1966), p. xii.

[19]Ringer, Mandarins, p. 121.

[20]Ibid., p. 135.

[21]Fritz Stern, The Failure of Illiberalism (New York: 1972), p. 23.

[22] Werner Ziegenfuss ed., Philosophen-Lexikon (Berlin: 1949-50). (The first volume, containing Haiser's name, was issued in 1937.)

[23] Walter Sokel, The Writer in Extremis (Stanford: 1959), pp. 14-21, 50-51, 61.

[24] Laqueur, Weimar, pp. 110-15.

[25] See the unfavorable opinion of Egon Friedell, Cultural History of the Modern Age (New York: 1954), III, p. 470; and also Laqueur, Weimar, pp. 143-44.

[26] Sokel, op. cit., p. 66. Kaiser had misappropriated the furnishings of a house he was then occupying.

[27] Cited in I. Deak, Weimar Germany's Left-Wing Intellectuals (Berkeley: 1968), p. 54.

[28] See e.g., Hanns Johst, The Young Man; Georg Kaiser, Pupil Vehgesack's Case.

[29] Gottfried Benn, cited in Sokel, op. cit., p. 91.

[30] Ibid., p. 20.

[31] The drama Gas I by Georg Kaiser, a leading Expressionist dramatist, has a quite different ideology from Haiser's, but is scarcely less fanciful or melodramatic than he in its treatment of modern economic and social problems. See Ibid., pp. 193-95.

CHAPTER X

THE HEART OF HAISER: ELITISM

The princes of the realm would leave the realm,
The noble comes and battles with the princes;
Then want, the daughter of extravagance,
Subjects him to the burgher, merchant, broker,
Who values all things by their weight in gold.
He flaunts his pride and hears with scornful smiles
Of fools acclaimed as heroes in the war,
Of wise men, wise in all except their purse,
Of things that yield no interest and no gain.
Until at last from out the lowest depths
Appears a monster horrible to see,
His shoulders broad, his mouth split open wide,
For all things greedy, but by nothing filled.
Such scum of human kind now wins the day
To lose the day again at eventide,
Because he lacks intelligence and will.
My share, he cries; still better, give me all!
In greater numbers, we; the stronger, we!
Are human just as you, give us our rights! . . . .
I tell you: no barbaric fabled hordes
Who razed the splendor of the ancient world
Hold danger for our times, no foreign foe;
From our own loins will spring barbarians,
Who once the curb is loosed, will seize things great,
The sciences and arts, the state and church,
And topple them from their protective heights
To level them to their own common plane
Till all are equal, yes, for all are low.

--Franz Grillparzer,
Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg

Any discussion of Franz Haiser's ideas must begin with his elitism, for without it they are like a Welsh rarebit without any cheese. Often he only repeats commonplaces of his milieu, but he is original and probably unique in the way he derives the necessity for them from "laws of

civilization," based on certain aspects of pre-industrial society (and not altogether stupidly, assuming this condition of life to be inevitable and inalterable). As mentioned above, Haiser was not unique among educated (and not-so-educated) Germans in his addiction to "cosmic" explanations and pretentious professorial language, nor in using them loosely and colloquially, and seldom bothering to define his terms.

A key word is Kultur, which as with most of his compatriots he took to involve a certain elaboration of the size, organization and lifestyle of a society, as for instance that of the Egyptians, Chinese, Greeks and Romans. Inherent in the idea (and most of the fun) was the notion of a scale, whereby some peoples or parts of peoples had far more Kultur than others. Haiser was obsessed by this contrast, and the need to maintain it by inequality and exploitation. The popular antithesis of Kultur and Zivilisation, which was notably elaborated by Oswald Spengler at just this period, interested him very little. He used the term Zivilisation infrequently and loosely, often scarcely differently from Kultur. (In the present work, both are usually translated simply "civilization," although Kultur sometimes as "culture." Haiser's prose quite frankly cannot bear very great fastidiousness in translation.)

Why should man strive for civilization? Haiser considered it simply a part of human destiny, although in almost

a Schopenhauerian tone he admitted it did not bring happiness, indeed the contrary. Man follows a "dark natural drive . . . which makes him a tool available for the higher goals of creation."[1]

> One will now ask: why compulsory labor for the Moloch civilization, which gives pleasure to a few with refined technical luxuries, why drudge for observatories, concert halls, when the effort involved, transformed into beer and sausage, would taste better? This question is silly, for does nature ask us whether she may create suns, volcanoes, planets, earthquakes, storms, lions, tigers, illnesses, age and death? She creates them and we must endure them. She regards us lifeforms on the whole only as transition and destruction [Übergang und Untergang] as bridges plastered with corpses, over which development assaults. Well paid are the leaders . . . of Kultur and Zivilisation, but the real beneficiary of slaves' sweat is nature, with its unrecognizable, distant transcendent goals. . . .[2]

Integral to this natural drive was constant struggle and competition, to avoid which was grossly immoral and an offense against nature herself. Haiser never tired of citing from Heraclitus, "Strife is the father of all things." For one of his books he coined the colorful title "In the beginning was strife,"[3] a reminiscence of the biblical, "in the beginning was the word," and undoubtedly intended to recall Faust's famous wrestling with this passage.[4] To this Haiser added the complementary idea, that without death and destruction there could be no new life. Using a favorite figure of speech from Hinduism, he declared that Vishnu the Creator, Brahma the Preserver, and Shiva the Destroyer were all necessary to keep the cosmos going.[5]

This stress on struggle was by now a standard cliche

of social-Darwinist and vulgar-Nietzschean writers, but Haiser gave it a somewhat novel "philosophical" twist. Strife was the very essence of creation, and all-encompassing unity and harmony, instead of differentiation and conflict, would be a kind of heat-death of the spirit.[6] Even so-called altruism was really only a modification of it.

> If I wish to be happier than another, I must create a gradient, must either take happiness from him or make him unhappier than I am. On this indeed rests the happiness of evil men. . . . Indeed those good deeds seeming to us the noblest and least self-serving are basically at others' cost, for while I help the suffering I congratulate myself on his looking up to his benefactor. . . . Insofar as I am more moral, do more good and less exploitation than the others, I have indeed less of life's pleasures, but my self-esteem is increased, and that richly makes up for material enjoyment. I am more than the others. I congratulate myself on their inferiority. . . . If we want to be sincere, we must admit, that the charm of chastity. . . . only exists as long as there are the immoral, on which [the chaste] can look down. There would be no virtue if there were no vice.[7]

Kultur itself depended on the energy created in harsh and drastic times, as steam engines burn old organic energy in coal.[8] The contemplative, world-denying types in effect think the very process of creation was a mistake.[9] Especially bad were the peace-on-earth crowd, including Freemasons, "atheistic-Christians," cosmopolitans, pacifists, and all Jews but the Zionists, for they tried to level down the differences between peoples that made history move.[10]

However, this idolization of struggle led Haiser, like most vulgar-Nietzscheans, into severe contradictions. Prima facie the idea points directly to unending anarchy, assuming

that all contending parties stand on an equal footing. There is no criterion of differentiation, save an individual's success in competition, and this is valid only until he in his turn is defeated. If, however, one distinguishes between better and worse kinds of success, or kinds of individuals, then after the best have achieved superiority their victory may not be undone. Struggle is then obliged to cease, or drastically change in quality. If one sees the chief creative factor in the gifted individual, and especially in his one-sided effect on the lives of the less gifted, then his success must not be overturned by them. His freedom dialectically depends on their unfreedom; he is an anarchist in regard to himself, but a totalitarian in regard to others. Strife and contention are cosmically necessary as long as the high-quality side is not victorious, but to the same degree is a great crime afterwards, save insofar as the truly best goes on to further triumphs.

A central element in barbaric vitalism is a ruthless egoistic contempt for all other individuals. If one is obliged to respect other persons, then strife must be considered an evil, or at least strictly kept within certain limits, binding on <u>all</u> competitors; which is to say, that it cannot be a final end in itself after all. These paradoxes are found widely in the radical right, and not only in the German-speaking world. Franz Haiser as so often illustrates them so to speak in bright primary colors, like a

child's painting.

In Haiser's characterization of "civilization," the authoritarian results of the cosmic struggle receive the chief attention. In a favorite scientific analogy, he declared that just as the individual cells give up their freedom to become part of an organism, so must men be regimented into society. The very chemical elements that make up organisms do not combine together freely, but require an infusion of binding energy from outside. With death this binding energy dissipates, and they revert to simpler forms.[11]

> Civilization is a child of man, accordingly related to him as a child to the mother: much trouble and no material usefulness, but joy and contentment at fulfillment of duty and motherhood.[12]

The state, the chief agency of building civilization, is necessarily

> an exploiter in the grand style, for it returns to the creative part of the population hardly one-half of the energy it receives from them. The conventional handworker hands over more energy to the state through his work, than he gains back in another form through protection, food, clothes, pleasures, old age pensions, etc. The higher the condition of civilization the more oppressive must this relation become, and it is ultimately only to be mastered through slavery, for the slave surrenders 90 percent of his production and receives back only 10 percent.[13]

> The people would never comprehend that it must perform surplus-labor for the state, from which it personally gets nothing. . . . An organism can only grow if its cells work only for it and sacrifice themselves. Toward the state one has duties, but very few rights; thus says the healthy biological worldview of Antiquity. . . . The brain of this organism is formed by the nobility; its material needs of luxury create civilization [Zivilisation], its spiritual science [Wissenschaft], religion and

> art. The people would never drag stones for pyramids, temples, churches, universities, observatories, palaces, monuments, railroad stations, etc., if an upper stratum had not commanded it, through their superior status or the reward of gold. . . . Where no energy-gradient is available, confessedly also no work is possible. Every machine demands a high and a low-pressure, that is something toward which the high pressure can flow, if it is to perform work. It is exactly so with the state. . . . The high-born is the worth, the people the unworth, and their gradient performs work. Were there only high-born, the state would be without energy. . . .[14]

The Marxist contention that capitalism can survive only by exacting "surplus value" from the workers was perfectly correct, and liberals were stupid to deny it.[15] But the Marxists failed to see that not capitalism, but civilization itself was the reason for it:

> Most of human work is consumed in the pyramid-building of Kultur, pharaohs and tithe-extractors, which at one time were feudal lords, at another capitalists and at a third bolshevik tyrants.[16]

The whole liberal-democratic social and economic ethos was even more mistaken, being contrary to history and to nature:

> If we fix our eyes on the civilization of the Greeks, we find that but a few drew happiness from it. For one free person there were at least ten unfree. . . . Unless a few powerful and spiritually superior men had desired this civilization, it would never have been created. And today we have no slaves any more, but only free workers. . . . But even these will disappear, because they become constantly fewer and more expensive, indeed there are even preachers nowadays who praise this abolition of servants. . . . How shall true culture be advanced, if we revert to pile-dweller cultures, where everyone must build his own hut and there are no commands beyond the need to eat? The proposals of [Silvio] Gesell also amount to lowering all men alike to the level of potato-farmers. To call such a small-proprietor situation a civilized state! But these Messrs. humanitarians will not so easily do away with the will of all-powerful creation, which demands ascending life and mercilessly sweeps away all contrary to its will. Ascension

> [Aufstieg] and Kultur again mean the same thing as the happiness of a few but hard work for the mass. This wild clamor for the happiness of all stems from a slave-rebellion, which constantly broadens.[17]

> If the spiritual power of the upper layer is extinguished or the worth-gradient weakened by spiritual or racial promotion of the underlayer, the constructive process will run backwards and the people consume the surplus-labor [Mehrarbeit] of its ancestors. . . . The whole formation of civilization is an endothermic process, which consumes energy.[18]

So-called humanitarianism was in fact cruelly deceptive, for if one generation was not hard enough their successors had to pay for it, "at interest upon interest."[19]

Technological advance would not change this situation, for man's wishes were insatiable, and satisfying one would only lead to more.[20] Haiser was fairly well informed about modern technology, exceptionally so for a radical right author, and rather admired great inventors. But generally he found more to blame than to praise in modern technology. Its worst evil was the way it afforded financial opportunities for low-born upstarts, who had really created nothing, to gain great wealth and social promotion. Also technology had made war horribly destructive, and debased it morally, as dull masses replaced small bands of aristocratic heroes. Haiser considered that modern technology had in no way altered the basis of civilization, and the laws of development of past ages still applied to the twentieth century.

For Haiser, the essential endothermy of civilization meant that an arbitrarily privileged oligarchy was inevitable. If this elite lost its power, another had openly or

covertly to replace it, else civilization itself would collapse. A hereditary nobility of superior race was the oldest and by far the best method. In its absence there had been tried monarchy, bureaucracy, mandarinism, theocracy, militarism, plutocracy and a Bolshevik party, with more or less inferior results, especially in the case of the last two.[21]

The proper reconstitution of this happy few was for him the heart-problem of civilization, and he discussed it voluminously. He refers to the elite by a variety of terms: nobles (Adel, vornehm), aristocrats, upper stratum (Oberschicht, Führerschicht), master caste (Herrenkaste, Herrennaturen), or sometimes those living on unearned income (Rentner), and others, without any significant difference of meaning. Haiser was convinced that in this area there was nothing new under the sun, and his first stipulation (hardly unusual among the radical right) was that the elite be drawn only from the best racial material, and never mix its blood with that of inferior races. More originally, and perhaps uniquely, he demanded to the point of mania that it must never perform any "useful" or "productive" work of any kind, and be supported by hereditary and not earned wealth. (Erbe nicht Erwerbe.) He defined it as ultimately resting always on its spiritual qualities:

> At the very least I understand by the concept [of aristocrat] a collector of spiritual goods. Whether one accumulates money or knowledge, is to me indifferent, everyone [who] has first earned it is an usurper. The

> aristocrat does not earn, he only inherits, he is the race. Also I do not understand thereby the mere genius, for spirit alone is not nobility, first blood ennobles it. A weatherhardened stubborn seaman, of iron character, of old and unmixed race, whose life-views are as carved in stone, is for me a far nobler aristocrat than many of our present-day "individualized" mongrel-savants and obscure poetasters.[22]

For Haiser the self-made-man [sic], was an especially vile and dangerous type, who should never be allowed to rise to power and influence. He also especially abominated the modern adulation of "work" [Arbeit], which was one of his favorite swear-words, precisely because it allowed this to happen.

> "Work ennobles" [Arbeit adelt] is the slogan of our day, coined by the Christian puritanism of the Anglo-Saxons, and in our modern democratic states one is unfit for polite society who has not become in his occupation a day-laborer or usurer. For deeper spiritual life, for art and noble life-style, this factory business of modern Zivilisation has neither understanding nor time, and if also the "many-too-many" of our spiritual laborers [geistige Arbeiter] knock off art and science, they do so only with the intention to make capital of them through tradesmanlike mass-production. But spirit, art, noble lifestyle and sentiments are killed by tradesmanlike work and with them ascending life. The spirit desires quiet, leisure, independence and freedom, it needs the care of the free and noble and does not want to be grabbed by the rough hands of work-slaves. High-race antiquity well-recognized, that the care of the spirit is a privilege of those highly placed and propertied by birth, for the freedman immediately makes a trade for himself from the holiest goods of mankind. But we live today in a world of newrich, upstart, educated and even learned freedmen, so that the whole spirit of modern times is mobified [verpöbelt] and industrialized. . . . To a nobleman eager for knowledge, . . . on whom there is no pressure to turn his studies into a means of earning money, who is obliged to pass no exams, which in the end breed up only a spiritless and irresolute crowd of A-students [Vorzugschüler] and parrots, to him will Geist always remain true to its essence: a luxury. . . . As

> Nietzsche says, industriousness and spirituality [Fleiss und Geist] exist at each other's expense, and where there is much Fleiss there is mostly little Geist, and vice versa.[23]

> The liberal state makes spiritual goods a business . . . while the social-democratic degrades the men of the spirit to petty officials and journeymen. . . . But the spirit cries for independence, it wishes to unfold its wings freely, in order not to suffocate in the swamp of our completely materialized world. Can you "moderns" offer to the poet, thinker or artist a substitute for the support . . . which they found in earlier times in the much-denounced "unearned income" of the noble?[24]

This was not to say, that the elite had a right to be lazy and vicious. Haiser could be as harsh as any socialist concerning idle and luxurious modern highlife [sic], and in it he included the bulk of the contemporary titled nobility, which he considered racially and spiritually no better than the Spiesser and the mob.[25] But the elite should perform only special roles, such as government, military service, and the creation or patronage of culture, a "keeping-busy" [Beschäftigung] but not Arbeit.[26] Arbeit (which will hereafter be usually translated simply as "work") was harmful not so much for consuming the elite's time and energy as in its spiritual exhaustion[27] and compromise of its independence.

Haiser offered an abundance of arguments and figures of speech on these points. His favorite was an organic analogy, that the different ranks of society resembled the cells of the body.

> Our bodies possess specific organs, which nourish it, arms and legs, which serve for labor, movement and defense, and finally a head, which leads all and to which its subjects

> must be subordinated. Every organ is built of cells of its own type, obliged to a quite distinct purpose. They are all alike born to their calling, they did not first learn it, and it would be quite unthinkable that cells from the pancreas, which produce an important digestive material, be transplanted to the brain, to take over leadership. But what does our contemporary social order do? Without attention to class and origin it lets the son of a shoemaker be a minister of state or a baker's apprentice a savant.[28]

In the evolution of life, progress meant that individual cells joined together into one organism and became more elaborately specialized and subordinated; the higher the life-form the less freedom for the individual cell.[29] For the cells to escape this subordination and pursue a more independent existence constituted biological regression, and the death of the organism.[30] If the benefits seem unequally distributed among them, "there is in biology no symbiosis, whose aim would be a so-called 'just' division of labor."[31]

Another favorite argument was that, as Schiller said (quoted in an earlier chapter), the truly noble doesn't have to do, he simply is; as the conductor's sense of rhythm leads the orchestra, so simply by his life the nobles stimulate the world they live in.[32] They were like a catalyst in chemistry, which causes reactions without taking part in them.[33] On this master-caste ultimately depended the vital energy of the whole people, so it must not wear itself out.[34] As every peasant knows, "the stud doesn't work."[35] Indeed, such was the risk of its exhaustion, especially spiritually, from the effort of civilization, that there should be held available a reserve to restock it, if need be. This should live

in the countryside, not the city.[36]

As a practical matter, the idle-rich elite were the only possible source of statesmanlike political leadership, being above selfish interest politics, but of course

> it goes without saying this does not include the rascally unearned income, sneaked in through common speculation, of racketeers [Schieber] as of upstarts in general, but the family property inherited for generations by rich bourgeois and noble families.[37]

They were also necessary in the cultural sphere, because first-rate creations never paid their way, and the commercially successful was always spiritually inferior.[38] Likewise only idle-rich patronage could establish a really independent press,[39] and give "right-culture" the public voice it so lamentably lacked heretofore. Newrich plutocrats could not perform this function however lavishly they might spend, for their taste was bound to be as vulgar and corrupt as the mongrel mob from which they sprang. This was glaring in the showy benefactions of American millionaires, whom Haiser particularly detested.[40]

Only a select high-race minority could be culturally and morally properly "stylized;" letting everyone take part led to a general scramble, all in bad taste.[41] At the same time (the contradiction never bothered Haiser) an outstanding advantage of idle-rich cultural contributors was that they were not bound to professional and scholarly conformism; true "free spirits," the giants of philosophy, had particularly to be freed from the fetters of "calling."[42] The much-criticized "dilettante" was uniquely valuable because of his freedom

to pioneer, without need to impress colleagues or an "establishment," as the development of "race-science" especially showed.[43] Not least, those with unearned incomes had freer choice to marry, and thus could choose only the racially best women.[44] The socialists, those arch-apostles of modern decadence, well understood that a hereditary, unproductive, racially select class was their worst enemy; they damned the Rentner utterly while they had some good things to say about the upstart self-made entrepreneur.[45] It was a great pity that so many "new-nationals" held the same view.[46]

Haiser never thought it in the least irrelevant or in bad taste to make plain his former membership in this idle-rich class, or to comment on the howling injustice of his loss of this position as a result of the Austrian postwar inflation. Beyond counting are remarks like this comment of 1932:

> The workers condemn the small number of "idle," the Adel and Rentner, in spite of the fact that these "idlers" are culture-bearers, but to the incalculable army of those who are only a burden to the state, the treasury is gladly opened. If the Rentners lose their money, admittedly through a state bankruptcy, that gladly open state treasury is immediately closed. State morals obey mob instincts! The "idle" are regarded as loafers and holy work is ennobled. For loss of wealth and demotion into the lowest caste of men the bourgeoisie has besides no heart.[47]

He adds that the Rentner having been wiped out by the machinations of democracy in the worker's favor was now glad to see the workers go the same way.

Historically, Haiser believed that his ideal of civilization had been the rule for the great epochs of antiquity,

especially those of Greece and Rome, although miserably neglected in modern times. Indeed, he mentioned the ancients perhaps more often, and in greater detail, than the recent past of modern Europe, including that of Germany and Austria. Factually, he had undeniably a solid grounding in the classical past, but as usual everything came out agreeing with Haiser. He warmly praised the Greeks and Romans for being free of the modern drivel about equality and humanity,[48] and assumed that in their best days they had maintained the proper social (and racial) separation between superiors and inferiors, and were as obsessed with the issue as himself.[49] Especially fine was their understanding of the need to restrict military service to the aristocracy, for to use the lower orders as soldiers necessitated giving them citizen rights too. Even their so-called civil wars were fought only by the upper classes, for all factions never forgot that the common people were their common enemy.[50] Haiser also warmly commended Alexander the Great for having crucified most of the inhabitants of Tyre for having been mostly rebellious slaves, whereas he was never so cruel to conquered freemen.[51] As is no surprise, the views of Aristotle on caste differences and slavery pleased him greatly.[52] Particularly, he could not praise enough how antiquity let noble types contend only with their equals, never with their inferiors, and hence relegated trade and other sordid competition to the lower classes.[53] The freeman got a prize of

laurel, the slave of gold.[54]

However, Greco-Roman antiquity was not all of a piece and Haiser had his likes and dislikes within it, on fairly predictable grounds. He had a low opinion of the Periclean regime in Athens, which was altogether too much like modern fashionable liberalism, and suffered the calamity it deserved.[55] The early Roman Republic, on the other hand, earned his unstinted admiration, for its supposed caste attitudes and rigid "stylization." Even as a boy, he says, he rather unfashionably preferred Rome to Carthage.[56] Slaves were kept strictly in order, and freedmen and their descendants sharply marked off from the old citizen race.[57] On the other hand slave-traders were forbidden to traffic in the free-born, whereas (in a quintessentially Haiserian aside) after the recent war one saw many of the noblest stock thrust into the (wage-) slavemarket and told to earn their living "honorably."[58] However, racial decay ruined the Roman Republic, and made a tyranny inevitable.[59] Lucius Cornelius Sulla, far and away Haiser's greatest ancient hero, made a valiant attempt to restore the aristocratic republic, but the population was by now far too far gone to the dogs [<u>verkötert</u>] to save the situation, and the Caesarean tyranny was inevitable.[60] The late-Roman upper class was in fact even more decadent than the modern one.[61] Like-wise Rome's much-criticized Byzantine successor did as well as could be expected, considering its racial material.[62] When the occasion

arose, Haiser also could praise the Greco-Roman world inter alia for its freedom from modern faults concerning religion and sexuality. Whereas we today treat sexuality with same and prudery, or more recently analyze it in disgusting clinical detail, the ancients could bestrew it with garlands.[63] Likewise, they never quarreled over theological questions.[64]

Haiser referred to the successors to the Greeks and Romans, and to non-western civilizations, sketchily and casually. He rarely mentioned the ancient Germanic tribes that had overthrown Rome, in which most of the völkisch enthusiasts had a warm interest. He did feel called upon to insist (as usual) that they practiced a rigid separation of castes,[65] and were much healthier in their (non-Christian) religious attitudes. Of the Middle Ages he said scarcely more, although here too he assumed they agreed with him about the endothermy of civilization[66] and rigid social stratification. He added a slightly original note in his depiction of the important merchant families, unlike the ones of today, as themselves proudly aristocratic[67] and forming with their employees a patriarchal feudal community, like the landed nobility.[68] Among non-western civilizations, Haiser most admired ancient India, because of its caste system. Indeed, quite frequently (especially in Freimaurer) he described a truly civilized societal order in its vocabulary (Kshatriya, Vaisya, Sudra, Pariah, Chandala; he had little to say about Brahmins, and ranked them as at best auxiliaries

to the Kshatriya). Above all he described with relish whereby the Chandala, the offspring of caste mixture, were the lowest of the low, and had to walk ten paces behind a man of higher caste, and drink out of puddles.[69] Haiser also found good things to say about the Chinese, especially their restriction of literacy, and hence social privilege, to a tiny minority.[70] But otherwise he found their civilization too utilitarian and earth-bound, lacking in aspirations towards a higher goal.[71]

However, Haiser's real concern was always the contemporary world, and his own unhappiness in it. Bracketing himself with Cato the Elder had some logic, for the latter was not more obsessed with Carthage than Haiser with the abominations of "left-culture," nor more addicted to diverting any discussion whatever to denouncing it. He vituperated against the liberal-democratic open society tirelessly and endlessly, up hill and down dale, using more epithets than an Arab has names for a camel, and was as indifferent to the reader's patience as the Ancient Mariner toward the Wedding Guest. So to speak he carried on a continuous offensive against modernity on all fronts, and at one time or another mentioned virtually every radical right objection to it. But very Germanically, he was not content to simply describe its faults as facts, but traced them back to fundamental crimes of cosmic significance, and interconnected them all as manifestations of a single protean conspiracy.

Whether the subject under discussion was economics, religion, sexual life, parliaments, music, education or anything else, he saw the same Köter at work, and could with the most exiguous of transitions see a connection to any other of his gripes. An example is his denunciation of modern "atheist-Christianity" (the oxymoron is typically Haiserian):

> the "enlightened" Christianity, the Christianity without a head, without a God, the "human-all-too-human" of free-thinkers, liberals, Monists, humanists, world-reconcilers, Jew-protectors, pacifists, feminists, levelers, demagogues, and social democrats. . . . Nietzsche chiefly went after god-fearing Christianity, I however the world-view, the morality, in short the whole direction of thought of atheist Christianity and its final consequential demands of the present time, which can only end in Bolshevism.[72]

Beneath his pretentions of intellectuality, Haiser's tone and manner is much like that of an aggrieved adolescent, accusing the whole world of a conspiracy to make him miserable. But this is by no means to dismiss his arguments as simply silly. Many of the interdependencies which he ascribed to characteristically modern ideas and institutions were indeed real, and important. His analysis of the modus operandi of preindustrial civilization (which has been described in a previous chapter) and the way modern society contradicted it, made many valid points, which persons of less reactionary opinions were inclined to ignore or gloss over. Particularly prone to this were the more or less populist (or as Haiser commonly calls them, the "left-völkisch") branch of the radical right, which wanted in effect to throw away its modern cake and eat it too. Haiser was quite correct

in branding them as inconsistent, but found that he was dealing with people who would not listen to reason.

A useful introduction to Haiser's social and political ideas is one of his more systematic definitions of his "right-cultural" ideal, as opposed to the "left-culture" with which modern times was sick unto death.

Right Culture	Left-Culture
Aristocratic republic or aristocratic monarchy. Oligarchy by descent, domination of the ancient race [Urrasse], the conquering people, the old nobility.	Democratic republic or democratic monarchy. Increasing domination of capital until outright plutocracy.
A constitution based on estates [Stände], quality-suffrage, centralization, predominance of the original home soil.	So-called "representative constitution," quantity-suffrage, decentralization, autonomy.
Citizen rights cannot be purchased or earned.	Citizen rights easily earned, extended to the collectivity of state subjects.
The ancient race reserves for itself collective privileges in the enlarged state. Hence privileges of nobility and bourgeoisie are blood and birth privileges.	The privileges go over to the capitalists, to the upstarts; rule of the demagogues, domination of race mixture.
State offices in the hands of the ancient race, the nobility and the bourgeoisie.	Elective officials, hence venality of office, corruption if a republic, incipient tyranny if a demagogue, absolute monarchy.

Right Culture	Left-Culture
The monarch in the hands of the estates.	The monarch supports himself either on the mob or on his mercenary troops.
Military service an estate privilege, bearing arms a duty of birth, the lower classes excluded from military service, war is regarded as honorable.	General military service or a mercenary army, military service relies more and more on the lowest classes, is modified; the rulers, the plutocrats, being unfit for bearing arms, they come more and more into the hands of the mob; dissolution of the army's discipline, war is regarded as dishonorable.
A man is born a slave, the lot of a slave can only be improved by emancipation. Contentment and good treatment of the slaves by the nobles.	The man who is not fit for the most ignoble struggle for domination, the finance struggle, is thrown into slavery. Creation of the most unhappy men. Rough treatment of the subjugated by the upstart, the emancipated slave, the self-made man.
Talents of noble blood, of the conservative, pure race for bearing arms, hunting, landlordship, higher state service (through experience of inherited talent for government, constructive quiet spiritual work, aristocratic [edle] noble [vornehm] (national) art.	Talents of the cur-man for finance-economy and industry. City-lifestyle overpowers that of the countryside; the means of supporting life are only obtainable through importation. All reform plans revolve around money economy; disruptive cosmopolitan spiritual life; unbridled raw hedonism.
Natural instinct, law, honor, forbid misalliances with lower, impure estates and races, hence strict separation of blood.	The human curs being naturally without blood-instinct, they restamp it as as "prejudice" that the "enlightenment" has to set aside. The drive of self-preservation of the cur must necessarily be a common one.

Right Culture	Left-Culture
Spiritual treasures are a privilege of the noble. Bildung and Erziehung only within national paths. "Onesidedness" and "mediocrity" as the deepest wisdom, as preserver of the ancient race, of the state. The spiritual and political Resultierende is a straight line.	Spiritual treasures become common property, are vulgarized. A massive influence of alien elements into Erziehung and Bildung. The stylization of the people is lost. Complete lack of a Resultierende in political respects. Wanders into a maze.
The doctrine of the gebildete mob has an effect on the ancient race. Feminism becomes prominent, children become a burden, dissolution of the family, retrogression of the race. Faith-religion changes into reason-religion.	Feminism and weakness in all areas, complete equality of women. One-child system or childless, dissoluble marriage. Birth-rate declines. Increase of population through immigration of alien races, and preservation of the sick and those unfit for normal life among the ancient race.
A part of the ancient race still holds fast to ancestral customs, to religion and national views, but is already in the minority; the noblest are in the opposition.	Racial chaos at the head of the government. The sword and the spiritual treasures in the hands of the mob. Complete transvaluation of all national values; what was previously judgment [Urteil] is now restamped as "prejudice" [Vorurteil]. Flourishing overgrowth of alien (semitic) parasites, which prosper best on a sick body. Highest development of human-curdom, ruin of civilization, of the state.
	The dying state-organism of a great civilized state infects with its sickness the greater part of the world; regression, decadence (of Europe), of Kultur in general.

Right-Culture	Left-Culture
	The so-called "educated" [gebildete] anarchy breaks up into banditry and robber gangs; complete domination of all disintegrative powers; the mold, which sweeps away the cadaver as rapidly as possible, becomes a progressive element.
There arise conquering peoples.	
New founding of states.	
Formation of new aristocracies and so forth.[73]	

For Haiser, from the Middle Ages up to the beginning of the so-called Enlightenment, the western world had been a true, high civilization. There were fixed hereditary classes, separated by a proper worth-gradient, so that the privileged few could carry on their essential role of culture-creation, and maintain their own racial and spiritual apartness. Under traditional patriarchy, the difference of ranks and classes was accepted by all,[74] the inferiors were not resentful of their superiors, and in fact it was an extremely mild and humane system, far more so than its modern successor.[75] (He did not bother about the apparent contradiction with his insistence that high civilization is necessarily harshly exploitative.) However, this gradient had been obliterated by so-called "progress," and it had been all downhill ever since. As to who originally perpetrated this foul deed, or how they could get away with it, Haiser was not too clear; he seemed chiefly, like Metternich, to blame a small group of scheming intellectuals and sentimental humanitarians. Certainly, the common people did not initiate it, for they had preferred (and many, God be praised, still did) the rule of their traditional aristocratic masters, until "progressive" agitation made them discontented.[76] Nor, Haiser was explicit, did the Jews, who could only exploit the situation after others had made the first breach, as bacteria infect a wound.

Once the villainous modernizers had destroyed the old racial-aristocratic gradient of worth, they were of course

obliged to find a substitute. Their chief reliance, the very fabric of the liberal and capitalistic world, was on the capacity to make money, with appalling results. Those who had business talent tended to be otherwise the scum of the earth, precisely those whom earlier ages had been careful to keep strictly in their place. They possessed industriousness, and a certain superficial cleverness, and a great deal of low cunning, but otherwise were devoid of morals, taste, foresight, and all important virtues of any kind. Possessing total control of the modern western world, they had crowded it with one abomination upon another such as large cities, stock exchanges, bad music, immodest women, parliaments, psychoanalysis, pedantry, mass warfare, and paper money. The one bright spot was that their whole social and political order was by very definition weak, unstable and despised by all, so that its collapse could not be far off.

As was frequent among well-educated Germans, Haiser gave "spiritual" factors a large role in this sorry story. In a sentence that only a German could write, he declared that it was common ownership of Geist, not of property, that was the essence of socialism.[77] Almost as often as Nietzsche he damned the educated classes as the chief agents, or dupes, of every liberal vice and crime, and ascribed to them an almost unlimited power.[78] Their "errors of 1848" were the great disease of modern times.[79] Especially, their control

of education and publication made it possible to manipulate the German mind almost at will.[80] They were able to impose a censorship on nearly every "reactionary" author, although no one was more righteously indignant about the Roman Catholic index.[81] But they themselves consulted only their own dogmas, and knew nothing about human nature.[82] The liberal Gelehrte thought he had an answer for everything; one could be thankful for the present depression [1932] at least for showing that up.[83]

Haiser was convinced that the liberal and gebildete instigators of modern decadence had thoroughly understood what they were about, and had discredited all the sound old values and manners so as to establish their own wretched level as the norm. A principal target had been the "stylization" which was at the heart of all real civilization, but in which their inferiority was impossible to conceal. Therefore they made their lack of it into a merit, by undermining all established and traditional authorities (God, nobility, "good taste," marriage, etc.) and the principle of stylization itself, making the raw natural individual the measure of all things. The educated men of the Enlightenment accepted the Kantian limits on knowledge and declared final truth unknowable because they did not want to acknowledge any higher power over themselves.[84] Kant was in fact but the first of a long chain of modern thinkers promoting the vile idea of "freedom;" he led directly to Marx.[85]

Modern men of reason resisted racialism on the same tactics; they refused to admit that Homo sapiens contained individuals who were constitutionally inferior lest they diminish their own divinity[86] (which, whatever Haiser's motives, was a shrewd hit).

For Haiser individualism (save for the few real "master-natures") was inseparable from mongrelization, indiscipline, confusion and lack of purpose. To anticipate his racial views he defined the essence of the mongrel dog (Köter) from the purebred (a figure perhaps borrowed from H. S. Chamberlain):

> The formed, the stylized is ever the higher and nobler type, he is the aristocrat, the race. That the many-sided mongrel is perhaps more gifted than the one-sided man of race, is of no weight, indeed it is precisely a sign of his Chandala-nature, of his conglomerate of hereditary traits. The more fit, the more constructive he certainly is not. The pure-bred dog always remains superior to the street-Köter, even if he is the "stupider."[87]

> We have no "aristocracy," we have through and through only a democracy of the spirit. The aristocrat, the pure race, is born to his morality, his education [Erziehung] is as easy as with a purebred hound, who needs only to be taken into the field a few times to be "ferm." The Köter who brings with him as heredity only a hodgepodge of different moralities, I can beat to death and he becomes nothing else. . . . The chaos of peoples of present day civilization honors the spiritual orientation of the half-breed [Mischling], for democracy of the spirit consists of freedmen; the aristocrat on the other hand despises these schoolboys, who out of curiosity take a clock to pieces [but] whose gearwheels they cannot put back together, nor do they want to.[88]

> The pure race hound obeys his master at a word, only the clever, "enlightened" Köter goes his own independent way and pisses on all the doorposts.[89]

One of the most effective expedients of the modern open society, and the target of Haiser's bitterest accusations was that the Köter had artfully shifted the arena of competition to those fields where they did best, and honorable men poorly. These included especially making money, but also plodding professional and scholarly "objectivity," party politics, journalism, cultural novelties, and everything that was shallow and popular. The Jews, being clever but essentially uncreative, did especially well in these circumstances, although Haiser never made them the original or principal culprits.

With his habitual lack of subtlety, one of Haiser's favorite swear-words was the liberal slogan "Freie Selbstbestimmung," or "free self-determination," which in his view meant encouraging everyone to wallow in his bad heredity and worse upbringing, and leave the world slightly more degraded than he found it.[90] Free self-determination led straight to anarchy;[91] Haiser also noted, with his usual sense of proportion, that thanks to it nowadays servant girls could not even dust.[92] Another favorite and frequent Schimpfwort was the common phrase "Freie Bahn den Tüchtigen," "a free path for talent,"[93] that is to say free competition in all occupations and careers, with no privileges whatever on grounds of ancestry or background. Predictably, Haiser declared that

> Our men of university chairs with hat in hand continuously make low bows to the socialist and democratic streams of

> thought and pathetically announce "Freie Bahn den Tüchtigen," that is so much as to say that everyone, whatever his origin, can attain the highest places, if he only shows industry and perseverance [Fleiss und Strebsamkeit]. That from such a mob-brawl only the lowest become the highest, apparently so far has not occurred to them.[94]

Those who succeeded by such means were to Haiser "upstarts" [Emporkömmlinge] and "freedmen" [Freigelassene], words much much also pepper his pages frequently and angrily.

This manner of argument could be used, and was, in almost everything Haiser discussed, but it was especially central to his analysis of modern politics, economics and social structure. Historically (and for once with some foundation in fact) he thought the liberal bourgeoisie had made the mistake of the Sorcerer's Apprentice:

> The German bourgeois constantly fought against the power of monarchy, the nobility, the military, indeed he even . . . called on the lowest classes of the people as his sworn comrades. . . . Now he has drilled the lower classes in ideas of freedom; the masses are always deaf and blank if one does not stir them up. The bourgeois has enlightened them, overloaded them with knowledge, incited them against all ruling powers. But exactly as he set aside those powers which stood above him, the mob now overturns his domination. The Jew recognized his unfitness to rule and enslave the masses, and today rules and enslaves the whole people, including the bourgeoisie. The German bourgeoisie also freed the Jews. He constantly stormed and screamed against all the powers that held the Jew in check. . . . The German bourgeois and especially the German learned man is an ideologue, he lives in another world, which has never existed and never could exist, for he holds a state to be possible, in which there would be nothing but free citizens. . . . Only Nietzsche . . . saw the truth, and spoke in the spirit of antiquity: if there are to be free, there must also be unfree. And there must be free, because otherwise there would be no development of the human spirit, which would cast down the scheme of creation.[95]

The bourgeoisie had preached freedom for everyone, but

really wanted it only for itself. Thus it maintained that other principles were subject to change, but the rights of property were eternal and inalienable. But the lower classes did not for a moment respect such a claim to supremacy, especially from the mouths of squalid rascals who but yesterday were no better than themselves. If that was all it took to be a master, why should they not become so?

> The robber can under some circumstances be noble, the thief never. Today capital enslaves the masses, for some kind of replacement for the eroded worth-gradient of knightly old times must finally be found. Obviously the worth-gradient of wealth as the only power principle cannot for long compel slave-masses, as I prove in my books, for the Jews and new rich cur-freedmen as a rule cannot say: "I am more than you!" but merely "I have more than you!", because they lack nobility. The worth-gradient of wealth must be bought, and that is a contradiction. . . . The capitalist must ever raise the wages he pays, so as to remain master, must buy his mastery anew, for he does not bear weapons himself but hires others to fight for him. Only he has a right to possess who can defend his possessions . . . for to be a possessor is an office, which only the worthiest may exercise. Such is the will of creation.[96]

Thus liberal-capitalist society was riddled with constant strife for supremacy (a very bad thing when the wrong sort of people did it) the subjects always trying to pull down the men at the top.[97] The bourgeoisie, having destroyed the old arbitrary authority, now wailed for its restoration.[98]

To appease the restless masses, the leaders of liberal-capitalist society gave them higher and higher wages, but this diminished the worth-gradient, the only means by which they could be compelled to work, and cultural "heat-death" threatened. One result was imperialism; mass-dominated

nations (as, Revolutionary France and Bolshevik Russia) needed to attack and exploit other peoples, to re-establish the gradient of wealth and power they no longer possessed within. "Ruling assumes ruler and ruled; rule by the people without colonial slavery or wars of conquest is unthinkable."[99] When peoples had been governed by kings, they had not marched out in a whole body, nor committed such atrocities, as in the twentieth century "age of freedom."[100]

The characteristic political form of liberalism and capitalism was democracy and parliamentary government. Not surprisingly, they too received very low marks. The best form of government was traditional patriarchy, where the superiors had a sense of responsibility toward their inferiors, and the latter truly respected them, and wanted them to rule. The introduction of ideas of equality by Rousseau and his ilk led to endless hatred and dissension.[101] (Haiser made no attempt to reconcile this to his general theory of civilization as necessarily exploitative, nor his general denial of all virtues to the lower classes.) Certainly parliaments were introduced by the upper class, especially the degenerate gebildete, and not the Volk. However, all modern society and politics had in fact become democratic whatever the official label in use.[102] In some other countries, the damage was limited by the upper class being able, by various subterfuges, to hang onto the substance of

power, but in the German-speaking world the masses ruled unchecked.[103] They were bribed and flattered by the authorities like spoiled children, and as one would expect soon lost all respect for them.[104]

Concerning parliaments, Haiser wrote (in a piece far superior to his usual intellectual level) that

> The masses as well as Bildung . . . swear by the dogma that the parliamentary form of government is the best adapted to protect the people from the exploitation of self-seeking holders of power. Exactly the opposite is the case. . . . There are a multitude of different powers within the state . . . resembling parasitic growths. Thereto belong for example all Stände which follow selfish interests, and in addition foreign races and relations, international groupings, etc. . . . Against such enemy coalitions no state form is so powerless as the parliamentary. All those who throw about the slogan of "German freedom" and the ancient constitution of our forefathers, seem to forget that formerly one had a racially unified people to deal with. . . . The era of the enlightenment . . . found it good to . . . discredit and weaken state power with all its force. It was exactly the Mittelstand which took the largest part in this process. . . . But today its work recoils upon itself, for it senses most clearly, how necessary was a single power standing above all parties, which could defend it against self-seeking power holders from below as well as from above. . . . The bourgeois has deprived his nobility of rights, robbed the state-authority of all power, but it happened to him as to the peasant, who wanted to hit a ghost with his axe, but cut off his own leg. . . . Our present election system is particularly inclined to help the Köter to victory over the noble. Who elects pays and he who is elected receives. . . . All that is lacking is that we get, on grounds of universal suffrage, an elected officialdom and an elected officer corps, and the spirit of corruption would be perfected. . . . Had we today a class system of voting [Ständewahlrecht] in my opinion the situation would not be much better. Capital too is a Stand, and indeed the most powerful one, and the state would become its plaything, as it was for the princes when they had reduced the Holy Roman Empire to a shadow.[105]

Each interest group tried to shove public burdens on to others

and treat the state as a milch cow for itself.[106] It must be admitted, for those who had not organized themselves into a powerful pressure group in Germany and Austria, this picture of how politics operated was far from unrealistic. In one of his wittier passages, Haiser made an observation often directed at parliamentary governments:

> The parliament has become a music hall, in which clowns fight each other on stage, and go out arm in arm to study new roles over their beer, seeking the best and quickest way to extract their hard-earned money from the people.[107]

The most cheerful thing Haiser had to say about parliamentary government was that it was too weak and wicked to last. He was pleased to note that the Communists and the far Right at least agreed on their detestation of Spiessbürger politics root and branch.[108] (But on another occasion he retracted this, and declared that if 300 Communists were elected as deputies they would soon be as crooked as the rest.[109])

For a political solution, he always referred back to the fundamental principle of society and ethics, that only an unlimited power could stand above the various contending interests and factions, and secure a moral community. Without it, all stood in an ultra-Hobbesian primaeval realtion of hostility each to all, and the supposed development of intellect and civilized morals could not change this.[110] Haiser's discussions of politics (and many other problems) seldom go on for long without an exhortation for the

imposition of dictatorship, and his favorite twist upon Cato, "Ceterum censeo, libertatem delendam est." [Furthermore I recommend, liberty must be destroyed.]

> If we read history, we see that democracies always skid further to the left, then suddenly swing to the opposite extreme. The people itself calls up despots and tyrants. Volunteers flock to his army, for the whole people wants a dictatorship to get them out of this witch-kettle. All who formerly bellowed for "freedom" now kneel down and pray, Lord free us from this freedom.[111]

Usually he reasoned that it was the predominance of the mongrel mob, and the unavailability of a race-aristocracy, that made dictatorship inevitable. Yet he also argued that a dictatorship could and would actually be an aristocratic restoration, by his cherished international Aryan conspiracy, and would result in a proper caste society. These discrepancies (to which Haiser himself paid scant notice) will be treated further in later chapters.

Concerning economic affairs, Haiser was chiefly concerned--and very passionate--about the way the modern world helped the bad people to get ahead at the expense of the good ones. As we would expect, he disliked free enterprise as ipso facto anti-caste, and favorable to selfish individualism. It was not economically necessary, or useful (especially in wartime) and should be replaced by government regulation of prices.[112] He noted that one of the advantages of dictatorial government was how easily it could prevent "freedmen" from accumulating large fortunes.[113] Similarly

but more mildly he criticized the modern hypertrophy of technology, for the way it gave the low-born advantages over their natural masters.[114] Very conventionally, he also disapproved of the way man became the slave of machines, rather than vice versa.[115]

He had very little to say about industry, and mentioned but cursorily the industrial worker, although of course he disapproved of his addiction to socialism and bad breeding in general. But to the Mittelstand and agriculture he devoted a great deal of attention, with a vividness that conveys a high degree of personal observation and involvement. He was quite unmoved by the common sentimentality of the "left-völkisch" toward the peasant and small tradesman, and in some respects was clearer-headed than they.

In regard to farming, contrary to views held by many "new-German reformers," Haiser favored large propietors, like the Prussian Junkers. This was the only way for the German-speaking peoples to produce enough to feed themselves, and in this respect be independent of the world economy.[116] Austrian agriculture (and here Haiser was talking considerable sense) by contrast had performed lamentably. The rich Austrian nobles, he said, were mostly profligate and idle, and preferred to live off industrial or financial investments rather than develop their land. In fact, country estates were largely cherished as a means of showing off, especially

by hunting parties; often for the very "useful" purpose he adds in a quite witty passage, of making crooked deals with officialdom.[117] Equally useless for farming were refugees from the city seeking a bit of independence and security, such as pensioners, and also the smaller peasants, who were mostly a shiftless, unhealthy and very inefficient lot. The chief Austrian producers were the larger peasants, whom Haiser praised for their traditional (and racial) antipathy to "left-culture," but strongly criticzed (writing in May 1918) for their exploitation of the city folk, now that food was so short. The peasant as a type was inveterately suspicious, selfish and mean, susceptible only to the (highly undesirable) influence of the priest, and not even to him against his own interests.[118]

In subsequent years (one suspects, after he had been much hungrier) Haiser was far more vitriolic. He now classed the Austrian peasantry as racially rotten beyond redemption, needing to be replaced by better race-material, who could be kicked out of their farms if they weren't efficient.[119] Left to themselves most of the peasantry would produce only enough to feed themselves, and let everyone else starve.[120] Postwar they had become disgracefully rich, for mortgages in gold had been paid off in paper, at the Rentner's expense.[121] Haiser had only contempt for the way educated liberals sentimentalized over the worker and peasant:

> Our histories of civilization cannot shed enough tears of joy on the abolition of serfdom. . . . But we hungry German-Austrians have another idea of the "human dignity" of our free peasants, since they became millionaires and sit on their high horse. . . . If one has seen the true face of the "folk-soul," one thinks in Nietzsche's sense: you go to a peasant? don't forget your whip! It is very similar with the worker. . . . We authors, artists and private-scholars, who are dependent on a fixed income [Rente] know how "socially" the worker thinks of us. . . . If [the liberal academic] also had to sell his last shirt, maybe he too would abandon his "faith in humanity," although that would be somewhat too late. The Roman Senate knew immediately how it had to deal with Spartacus and his followers. Some maintain, that there were so many crucifixions there was a shortage of timber in Sicily.[122]

Haiser had no higher an opinion of the non-peasant tradesman and Mittelstand, and especially those around Scheibbs. In previous chapters we have cited his remarks on their incompetence and profiteering, their scheming to protect themselves from competition outside the village, and their general bad manners, especially towards educated gentlemen. He praised the United States, ordinarily anything but a favorite of his, for its laws to maintain freedom of competition, which would be able to upset the "Orts-Trust" of Scheibbs.[123] He especially loathed the Landspiesser, which seems to include any small-towner who had improved his position during the war. They had long resented the Gebildeten, and the imperial official, who was very careful to keep his distance from them. But during the war they did very well out of supplying the peasants with scarce goods, and buying up for a song the impoverished Rentner's property ("not caring if it was stealing"). Now they were cock-of-the-walk, and said in so

many words how lucky it was that Austria had lost the war, for otherwise the state-officials and retired generals would outrank them.[124]

Haiser also was incensed (and here he voiced the thoughts of probably most Austrians, of all political shades) at the enormous gains of war profiteers (Kriegsgewinner, or more pungently Schieber, "racketeer") who could "make hundreds of thousands simply by one telephone call." These people had no roots or property in the country, they were mostly "nomads" (although, he specified, only some of them were Jewish) and they concealed their wealth in foreign lands, safe from taxes. Said Haiser, they have driven us to hunger, handed us over to the enemy, robbed us of our honor, and stand to drive us to communism.

> Our prettiest and healthiest girls, the only hope for a better new generation, are in his hand, he only brings them degradation and disgrace. He fills the loges of our theaters, where the Adel of Geist and birth used to sit. . . . It nauseates our artists to confront this Geist-less Köterfratzen, grinning at them from upholstered seats.[125]

To redress matters, he suggested a property tax that would leave people what they had had in 1914, but assess them 90 percent on all over that. "Admittedly, a government cannot achieve this, which is itself supported on a legion of upstarts."[126] He cited profiteers' wealth as an outstanding example of the inadequacies of "objectivity" in legislation (as well as in scholarship), for it was grossly unjust to tax them at no higher a rate than those who had lost heavily

in the war, especially the Rentner.[127]

The economic issue about which Haiser screamed loudest and oftenest was paper money, "this work of the devil, which has made the propertied poor and the unpropertied rich."[128] It was the perfect means for transferring wealth from the good old blood to scummy upstarts, of making wealth so easily acquired that the lower orders easily became ambitious, and jealous of the rich, of putting power in the hands of the Jews. If states had only specie to spend, war would not be so destructive and unheroic.[129] He anathematized the scheme of Silvio Gesell for a currency (Schwundgeld) deliberately depreciated from week to week, but noted that almost all the states lately waging war had in effect done exactly this. Haiser deplored that some of the "left-völkisch" approved of Gesell's schemes, or for that matter any compromise with the only proper currency, a pure gold standard.[130] To insure against misfortune, whether for the individual or the state, gold should simply be stored in the treasury (and for that matter, important raw materials should be stockpiled as well).

> I asked a great financier twenty years ago if one should not put one's money in platinum in unsure circumstances. "Stupid peasant," he said.[131]

Haiser's economic ideas were even more idiosyncratic than most of his other opinions, and it is difficult to find links or trace comparisons to those of others. Yet he was probably representative of many millions of Germans and

Austrians (still countries in good part pre-industrial in outlook) in his unsophisticated bewilderment at the way his world had been turned upside down by paper manipulations, and especially his sense of outrage that his tidy Rentner security had been as if robbed from him overnight.

If he had become much poorer while others had become much richer, it was because of conspiracy and aggression on their part. Hitler was later to come to power in good part on a wave of naive indignation at the Depression very like Haiser's, and to make political capital of his contempt for polite economic "science." The German-speaking radical right was indeed correct to see the abstraction of a factor called "economics" from the total matrix of life as a party plank of the Enlightenment, to overthrow pre-industrial society. This was an advantage if one had thereby no significant rank or status to lose, but the contrary if one did; the radical right recruited from the latter.

All of Haiser's social, economic and political thinking was ultimately concerned with his main conclusion, which he could not repeat too often, or with any shame at the personal reference, that competition should take place only between equals. The superior person should never be required to contend on the same terms with an inferior person. He insisted that this did not contradict his insistence on strife as the spiritual mainspring of creation, rather it was the only way to make it productive. The men of left-culture had a will to power, but it was a bad will to power[132] (an argument

already used by Nietzsche).

> If the stronger has the right, to push the weaker aside . . . the pressing question is: which weapons are to be employed in this struggle? What rules of combat are to be applied? . . . . Are the laurels due to him who bears noble weapons and serves a noble manner of struggle, or shall they crown those whose manner of contending must be called common, from the ethical as much as the esthetic standpoint? For struggle too has its beauty and morality. . . . Strife can be morally exalted, and also appear as a sign of decadence, and as we find ourselves in an era of degeneration, so war like peacetime competition is appallingly decadent. . . . Strife is the father of all things, as Heraclitus says. . . . [Today] the most powerful factor of civilization and progress is corrupted! That is the curse of our much praised Freie Selbstbestimmung, which discards the whole stylization of life, to replace it with a lawless, senseless and chaotic individualism. The basis for it is easy to see [namely] in our modern day mingling of classes, which lets the common compete with the noble. . . . The Chandala, the mob-born, or the mongrel with mob blood . . . has no style in his blood, which is bound to a definite law of life and struggle, he lives and struggles licentiously, like an animal, all is permitted to him, nothing forbidden. He may [rightly so] contend with his own kind, . . . but should not be allowed to poison . . . the noble type. Sharp class separation is thus necessary, for nothing is more pernicious to preservation of type than "general competition" and "general military service." . . . Either the noble must finally also use the battle-style of the Chandala, or he must succumb to him and become his slave.[133]

In a favorite figure of speech taken from the animal kingdom,

> Lion, eagle and hornet are a kind of nobility of their type. They are robbers but royal robbers. . . . All rests on robbery, all rests on slavery, it is only a question of who is robber and exploiter, the lion or the rat, the eagle or the sparrow, the hornet of the flea.[134]

> The good old law of competition ran through the whole universe: as nobles contested, the strongest became king. In a contest of rats, so the rat who best undermines buildings and rules the dark kingdom of the sewers best climbs the throne and forces on his subjects a similar morality of competition.[135]

Still closer to Haiser's heart was another biological metaphor, which he never tired of using:

> For does a fruit-breeder plant his salad-varieties in a bed of weeds and select the best example from this hodgepodge? No, certainly not! These fine fruits need a quite different ground, a fertilized seed-bed, the mere presence of wees hinders their development. Selection must make the beginning, but its continuation is breeding; outsiders are excluded from the group.[136]

> The Germans especially demand from their sons and daughters that they not be "lilies of the field," but work, work, and again only work. . . . [Truly] the children of upstarts have no justification to be "lilies of the field" for they are by their origin fit only for work. The genuine aristocrat on the other hand is not only permitted, he must be a "lily," indeed not in the field, for there belong wheat and rye, but in the flower-garden and the conservatory. As the peasant roots out the lilies from the field, because they diminish his harvest, the gardener destroys wheat and rye in his flowerbeds as weeds, because they offend his sense of beauty.[137]

In another variation, he made a comparison to dog-breeding. A liberal or capitalist dogbreeder would simply throw the food into the middle of the kennel, so the most ruthless and greedy would be best fed; a communist would give all the dogs the same food and free love, so the randiest cur would sire the most pups; but the feudalist would have the sense to favor only the best specimens in the kennel, in feeding and in breeding.[138]

These views led Haiser to make many detailed objections to modern institutions involving free competition, and their reform in an oligarchical direction. His detestation of capitalism was an obvious consequence, but equally or more dastardly, in his view was its open field in cultural and

intellectual life. His denunciations of the careerism and dreary pedantry of the prevailing educational system were integrally linked to the advantage free competition gave to the merely industrious trash.[139] His suggestions for improvement always included proper racial pre-selection of students (necessarily, he was at pains to say, by a subjective process). He reasoned similarly in regard to scientific research, claiming that the proper Geist was an Aryan birthright, and all others should be arbitrarily excluded.[140] He considered that such measures should be extended to all cultural activities; the theater and publications of Rechtskultur could not possibly compete on the open market, and so their competitors must be arbitrarily suppressed.[141] Leaving no doubt as to the identity of at least one individual in this category, he advocated that "a recognized talent should immediately be made independent by a life-income which would oblige him to no sort of piece-work."[142]

Notes to Chapter X

[1]*MB*, p. 27.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 62.

[3]"Im Anfang war der Streit." He had hit on the phrase earlier, in *Krisis*, p. 42.

[4]*Faust*, I, v., pp. 1210-37.

[5]FH, "Erhalten, Schaffen und Vernichten," *PAM*, XXI, pp. 78-82; *FM*, pp. 41, 53, 65; *MB*, pp. 39-40; *JF*, p. 105.

[6]*UK*, pp. 199-201; *Anfang*, p. 44.

[7]*Skl.*, p. 39.

[8]*Krisis*, p. 43.

[9]*Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

[10]*MB*, p. 15.

[11]*Ibid.*, pp. 27, 47.

[12]*Ibid.*, p. 29.

[13]*Skl.*, p. 22.

[14]*Anfang*, pp. 163-64.

[15]*MB*, pp. 59-60.

[16]*MB*, p. 30.

[17]*Anfang*, p. 136.

[18]*MB*, p. 65.

[19]*Skl.*, p. 54.

[20]*Skl.*, p. 47; *FM*, p. 82; FH, "Ein Jünger Nietzsches?", *Michel*, November 18, 1923, pp. 1-2; November 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[21]*FM*, p. 77 ff.; *MB*, p. 56; *Skl.*, p. 63.

[22]*Krisis*, p. 45.

[23]*Anfang*, pp. 51-53.

[24]FH, "Das geistige Leben der Völker und der sogennanten arbeitslose Einkommen," DE, III, pp. 720-21.

[25]Ibid., p. 720; Krisis, p. 34; FM, p. 30; Anfang, p. 60. This sentiment was frequently found among the völkisch.

[26]Anfang, p. 147.

[27]MB, p. 56.

[28]Anfang, p. 52.

[29]FH, "Duldsamkeit," PAM, XIV, pp. 519-24; "Apostelbriefe," PAM, XVI, pp. 143-50.

[30]FH, "Der Staat als sittliches Bewusstsein," PAM, XV, p. 534.

[31]FH, "Der Widerspruch der neuzeitlichen Entwicklung," DE, III, p. 117.

[32]Anfang, p. 166.

[33]MB, p. 30.

[34]Anfang, p. 58.

[35]FM, p. 16.

[36]JF, p. 72; Anfang, p. 113n.

[37]FH, "Partei und Staatspolitik," Michel, December 18, 1921, p. 2.

[38]Skl., pp. 33-34.

[39]FH, "Partei und Staatspolitik," Michel, December 18, 1921, p. 2.

[40]FH, "An Amerika," Michel, January 14, 1923, pp. 2-3; UK, p. 192; Anfang, p. 83.

[41]FH, "Trieb und Hemmung. . . ," PAM, XVIII, pp. 261-62, 264.

[42]FM, pp. 35-37.

[43]JF, p. 83.

[44]Anfang, p. 145.

[45]FH, "Das geistige Leben. . . ," DE, III, pp. 720-23; "Apostelbriefe," PAM, XVI, pp. 143-50.

[46]FH, "Der edle und der gemeine Streit," PAM, XVII, pp. 193-98.

[47]MB, p. 67.

[48]AI, p. 104; Anfang, p. 120.

[49]FH, "Der Wille zur Macht," PAM, XVI, pp. 491-92.

[50]Skl., pp. 17-18.

[51]AI, pp. 102-103.

[52]UK, pp. 197-99.

[53]Anfang, pp. 11-22; FH, "Der Staat. . . ," PAM, XV, pp. 530, 535.

[54]FH, "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, pp. 3-9, 109-118.

[55]FH, "Antike Demokratie," PAM, XIV, pp. 638-41.

[56]AI, pp. 58-59.

[57]FM, p. 91; Skl., pp. 33-34n.

[58]JF, p. 89.

[59]FH, "Der Wille zur Macht," PAM, pp. 448-49; AI, pp. 28-30.

[60]AI, pp. 31-40.

[61]Anfang, p. 124.

[62]FH, "Byzantinismus und Alleinherrschaft," Michel, May 6, 1923, pp. 2-3.

[63]FH, "Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben," PAM, XV, p. 424.

[64]FM, p. 109.

[65]Skl., p. 20; "Thor oder Wodan?," PAM, XVI, pp. 251-53.

[66]MB, p. 70.

[67]FH, "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, p. 112; MB, p. 31; FM, p. 78, and Vorwort.

[68]FM, p. 81.

[69]FM, pp. 10, 76; "Ein Jünger Nietzsches?," Michel, November 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[70]JF, p. 129; Review of R. Francé, Der Wert der Wissenschaft, NL, VII, pp. 180-81.

[71]Anfang, p. 112.

[72]Anfang, p. 5.

[73]AI, pp. 21-24.

[74]FH, "Bildung," PAM, XIV, p. 481.

[75]MB, p. 37.

[76]JF, PP. 33, 113; MB, p. 34.

[77]FH, "Die Links-kultur und der deutsch-österreichische Rassenkampf," PAM, XII, p. 417.

[78]Anfang, p. 98.

[79]FH, "Spiessertum und achtundvierziger Liberalismus," DÖTZ, November 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[80]FH, "Duldsamkeit," PAM, XIV, p. 523.

[81]FH, "Gedankenspäne," Michel, March 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[82]Anfang, pp. 157-60; FH, "Dogmen des Liberalismus," Michel, November 5, 1922, pp. 2-3.

[83]MB, p. 45.

[84]UK, p. 132.

[85]Anfang, p. 123.

[86]Krisis, p. 12.

[87]Krisis, p. 28.

[88]AI, pp. 60-61. See also Ibid., p. 97 ff.

[89]FH, "Der deutsche Artgeist," DE, IX, p. 620.

[90]UK, p. 190; "Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben," PAM, XIV, p. 421; "Die Links-kultur. . . ," PAM, XII, p. 417.

[91]FH, "Der Weg der 'freien Selbstbestimmung,'" Michel, May 16, 1920, pp. 2-3.

[92]FH, "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, p. 514; FM, pp. 86 ff.

[93]Attributed to Bethmann-Hollweg, 1916, and a phrase in common use. R. H. Samuel, Education and Society in Modern Germany (London: 1949), p. 33.

[94]Anfang, pp. 70-71. A rather similar sentiment is to be found in a very popular völkisch book, HFK Guenther's Ritter, Tod und Teufel (Munich: 1920), p. 36.

[95]Skl., pp. 16-17.

[96]Skl., p. 27.

[97]FH, "Democratia Corrupta," SPB, March 15, 1925, p. 1; "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, p. 111; "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, pp. 509-517; "Apostelbriefe," PAM, XVI, pp. 143-50.

[98]FH, "Rasse und Politik," reprinted in FM, pp. 127-37.

[99]FH, "Adelskriege und Volkskriege," Das Hakenkreuz, II, pp. 16-19.

[100]MB, p. 52; JF, pp. 77-78; "Democratia Corrupta," SPB, March 15, 1925, p. 1.

[101]Anfang, p. 109; JF, p. 113; "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, pp. 516-17.

[102]FH, "Demokratie, Monarchie, oder-Caesarismus?," Michel, November 21, 1920, pp. 1-2; Anfang, p. 98.

[103]Skl., p. 17.

[104]Krisis, p. 14.

[105]FH, "Volksvertretung und Rassengemisch," DE, II, p. 567.

[106]FH, "Democratia Corrupta," SPB, March 15, 1925, p. 1.

[107]FH, "Rasse und Politik," in FM, p. 133.

[108]FH, "Gedankenspäne," Michel, March 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[109]FH, "Judentum und Philistertum," Das Hakenkreuz, I, pp. 58-59.

[110]UK, p. 130.

[111]FH, "Democratia Corrupta," SPB, March 15, 1925, p. 1.

[112]FH, "Freihandel," PAM, XV, pp. 26-30.

[113]AI, p. 52.

[114]FH, "Okkultismus," PAM, XV, p. 192.

[115]FH, "Ein Jünger Neitzsches?," Michel, November 8, 1923, pp. 1-2; FM, p. 82.

[116]FH, "Die Verketzerung der Reaktion durch die roten Pfaffen," PAM, XIX, pp. 261-67.

[117]"[But] if one wants also to idle about and show off, one manages to make a handsome hunt out of [the land], which lends one a good front, which draws elegant and influential guests to the house, who can be for a big businessman of incalculable usefulness and is permitted to replace the wastefulness of mere passive hunting ground [instead of cropland] one-thousand-fold. State councilors, chiefs of sections, ministers, professors get invitations to the hunt, the forest-master leads the elegant city folk, who usually appear in an outfit such as they would wear to central Africa, to a brace of birds. The bird is naturally lacking, but on the next day just as naturally they are "found" by the forest-master and sent as trophies to the great gentleman. The proprietor of the hunt makes a congratulatory visit, confirms his pleasure at the excellent birds with a packet of 1000-kronen notes, and asks as a quid pro quo an "indulgence" in regard to the next state-contract tender. The great gentleman nods benevolently, and murmurs softly "Herr commercial counselor, we will surely do it.'" FH, "Das † † † Junkertum," PAM, XVII, pp. 65-66.

[118]Ibid.

[119]JF, pp. 74, 110-11; FM, p. 65.

[120]Skl., p. 24; FH, "Die Auferstehung des Abendlandes," PAM, XXI, p. 124.

[121]FM, p. 22.

[122]Anfang, pp. 157-58.

[123]FH, "Ein hartes aber gerechtes Urteil," SPB, December 1, 1923, pp. 6-7.

[124]JF, p. 118.

[125]FH, "Kriegsgewinner und Demokratie," Michel, April 13, 1920, pp. 2-3.

[126]FH, "Sinkende Währung-zunehmende Teuerung," Michel, December 19, 1920, p. 2; "Volksvertretung. . . ," DE, II, pp. 567-71

[127]FH, "Demokratie. . . ," Michel, November 21, 1920, pp. 1-2; "Gesetz und Willkur," Michel, July 8, 1923, pp. 2-3.

[128]FH, "Deutschösterreichs Todeskampf," Michel, April 30, 1922, pp. 2-3.

[129]Anfang, pp. 161-63.

[130]FM, pp. 114-15; MB, p. 33.

[131]JF, p. 38.

[132]FH, "Der Staat. . . ," PAM, XV, pp. 526-38.

[133]Anfang, pp. 14-15. See also FH, "Der edle und der Gemeine Streit," PAM, XVII, p. 193; "Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, p. 115.

[134]JF, p. 129.

[135]FM, p. 10.

[136]AI, p. 83.

[137]Anfang, pp. 60-61.

[138]MB, p. 26.

[139]FH, "Der Staat. . . ," PAM, XV, p. 535; UK, pp. 186-87.

[140]FM, p. 101.

[141]FM, pp. 93-96; JF, p. 41.

[142]Anfang, p. 147.

207

CHAPTER XI

FRANZ HAISER ON RACE, SEX, WOMEN AND THE BEST USE THEREOF

> So the brain of the Huron Indian contains in undeveloped form an intellect which is absolutely the same as that of the Englishman or the Frenchman! Why, then, in the course of the ages, has he not invented printing or steam engines? . . . [Why has] his tribe never produced a Caesar or a Charlemagne and . . . his bards and sorcerers . . . in some inexplicable way neglected to become Homers and Galens?
>
> --Arthur de Gobineau

Franz Haiser's racialism was less idiosyncratic than his theories of civilization and elitism. His most original contribution was his unusual frankness as to how self-serving was his racialism, and indifference to the customary pose of "scientific" objectivity. Thereby he made plain what an essentially mean and shoddy product racialism was. With minor exceptions, the motive of racialists was to rationalize an arbitrary social superiority for their own side, for which other grounds of justification were lacking, or losing their power to convince. No one ever defined a "superior race" to which he did not claim to belong.

Racialism was an all-western development, actually a somewhat late arrival in the German-speaking world, and its basic structure is most conveniently explained without

reference to national distinctions. This is particularly appropriate as an introduction to the racialism of Franz Haiser, for his insistence upon an international vision of race was really a survival of an earlier approach. In the present chapter racialism will be treated supra-nationally, until there is specific mention of a shift of focus to the German-speaking world.[1]

Privileged groups of any kind have probably always boasted of their supposed superior "blood," but systematic doctrines of racialism were not current until the later nineteenth century, and especially after 1890. Not until then did middle class whites find themselves thrust into contact with large populations, whether foreign colonial peoples or newly promoted elements among their fellow citizens, whom they did not wish to treat as equals, and felt impelled to find a rationalization for not doing so. By no means were all members of this class strongly moved by these feelings (as is further treated below). But the anxieties of the German-speaking gebildete Stände in regard to "mass society," described in an earlier chapter, had analogues among the more or less genteel of all industrial countries. They had not experienced any noticeable constriction of their wealth and life-style, but they had lost some of their differential. As Franz Haiser put it, "You don't know your own clothes are clean unless you see others whose are dirty."[2] Moreover, pretensions to some degree of

gentility were sometimes to be found not only among the well-to-do, but also quite widely among middling or even relatively poor people, such as the "redneck" whites of the American south and the German and Austrian Mittelstand.

However, these would-be elitists of the bourgeoisie (or petty bourgeoisie) found few respectable ways to rationalize their claims. The old qualifications for ascriptive status--religion, long residence in the neighborhood, ownership of property, white-collar occupations--had lost a great deal of their power to impress. Racialism was therefore attractive as an up-to-date and "scientific" means of assigning an inherent and fixed worth to human beings, which superiors could not forfeit nor inferiors improve upon. It was also almost endlessly plastic, allowing even slight differences between two populations to be interpreted as one of race. It was a perfect excuse for treating some people unequally, yet did not contradict the liberal principle of equality among those whom one chose to count as equals. For this reason, racialism could be employed to assist a wide variety of political and ideological positions. If the line dividing superior from inferior race was drawn high up, it operated like old-fashioned distinctions of nobility, as in the cases of Nietzsche and Franz Haiser; if drawn low down it could buttress mass nationalism, as for most of the völkisch of the 1920's, and of course under Hitler. Racialism was used in the American south (on the negro issue) by

the right, to maintain the existing interests in power; at the same time in the north (on immigration) it was the recourse of the left, especially to assist organized labor.

Racialism was an international ideology, frequently citing evidence from mother countries, and its leading works were often translated into foreign languages. (It was further remarkable for the literary skill of many of its expounders, beginning with the earliest, Gobineau.) However, the strength of the movement, and its targets, varied from place to place. Probably the great majority of western whites felt an "instinctive" superiority to the colored peoples of the world, even if their nation possessed no colonies. But domestic stimuli were probably more powerful. The most racialist country in the world, at least up to the 1920's, was the United States, where the "Anglo-Saxon" stock (a conveniently vague term) felt threatened by the negroes, Chicanos, Amerindians, and undesirable immigrants, the latter being especially those from Asia and the more backward parts of Europe. Among Europeans, the racially inferior were defined in terms of the less pleasant side of the working class, plus those of locally objectionable ethnic groups--in Britain the Irish, in France the Jews, in Germany and Austria the Jews and Slavs, in northern Italy the Sicilians and Neapolitans. Italian racialism is here mentioned chiefly for the record, for it was very weak. For all practical purposes, overt racialist doctrine was a phenomenon confined to France

and the English- and German-speaking worlds. Even in those places we must be careful not to exaggerate its strength. While racialism and eugenics were very widely discussed, it is problematical what proportion of the population took them seriously. The frequency of casual racialist remarks in print, or for that matter of "ethnic" jokes in popular entertainment, are scarcely proof of deep racialist convictions. Outside of the U.S.A., and the overseas colonies of Europe, before 1914 racialism had negligible practical effect on legislation or governmental policy. Loud scoffers at the whole project were always to be found, and at least outside the U.S.A. seem about as strong a party as its commited advocates.

For those whom it did ~~not~~ convince, racialism had to appeal not only to social but to intellectual pretensions. It reflected the remarkable ideological fertility of the nineteenth century, its enthusiasm for sweeping world-explanations, which has immeasurably diminished in the present western world. Far from being dominated by philistinism and stodgy orthodoxy, the intellectual life of the period appears in retrospect remarkable for its imagination and fancifulness, and the luxuriance of its final answers to ultimate questions. Probably in no other age were there so many persons who, having read a few dozen books (and sometimes much less) serenely assumed that they were appointed to proclaim a new <u>logos</u> to mankind. Racialism was if anything

one of the soberer products of the period. It was for instance less fanciful then a "biological" predecessor, phrenology, which claimed to deduce the differences among human beings from the bumps on their skulls. Nor did it exceed some of the higher flights of Freudianism. Freud's theory of the origin of culture, in the sons' ganging up to murder their father because he was monopolizing the women, makes his compatriot Franz Haiser seem almost pedestrian. Indeed, the greatest minds of the century could be penetrating and preposterous almost on alternate pages. Prime examples are Hegel's nature-philosophy[3] and Comte's theory of history which culminated in a "religion of humanity," with his deceased mistress as its madonna.

The best-known and today the chief survivor of these adventures was Marxism. For the German-speaking world, where from 1890 to 1914 Marxism had its greatest strength, racialism was virtually its dialectical counterfoil. Marxism prided itself on its "scientific" basis, especially its dogmatic materialism and eschewal (or so it claimed) of everything smelling of "idealism" or metaphysics. Racialism made a similar claim to intellectual respectability, and on stronger grounds, for it cited a wealth of backing from anthropometry, statistics, I.Q. tests, and archaeology, which were constantly being added to. Racialism like Marxism profited from the decline of the influence of organized Christianity, for the latter's precepts on the brotherhood

of man (whatever their race, or class) and a universal moral law could be rejected as part of its "superstitious" and metaphysical rubbish. As Marxism saw man as driven by blind economic and historical forces, not his conscious rational will, so likewise racialism assumed blind hereditary forces. (Racialism thereby served, although Marxism did not, as a congenial adjunct to barbaric vitalism.) Both Marxism and racialism were confident of their own completeness and infallibility of method, and that all important wisdom was to be found in their own scriptures. Racialism was the more modest of the two, for it was far more ready than Marxism to admit that new evidence (for instance, a verified case, it if could be found, of Lamarckism) could force it to alter its views. Just as Marxism claimed all wisdom and insight into history, so did racialism (in its völkisch form) for the radical right; on grounds of reasonableness there was little to choose between the two. Because of external circumstances, it is customary to refer to Karl Marx as one of the greatest minds of the western world, and (for instance) Houston Stewart Chamberlain as a crank; but if Hitler had been victorious we would believe the reverse.

Racialism is commonly described as an offshoot of Darwinism, but they should be distinguished. This whole area of thought was beset by loose and careless thinking, not entirely corrected to this day. A chief aim of Charles

Darwin was indeed a "housecleaning" of the subject, and its establishment on a strictly biological basis, without philosophical or moral interpolations. As he defined it, evolution was a materialistic and rather fatalistic explanation of the development and diversification of life, referring all changes to the mechanism of natural selection of variations within species, which led to new species. He took the variations as simply a given. This gave scant support to any ideology or cause; by definition those who had survived were the fittest, and in nature's eyes whatever is, is right. In the hands of responsible biologists, Darwinian evolution gave no special place to the human species, nor did it express an opinion as to its nature or destiny. It made no claim that life had <u>any</u> meaning.

However, in the nineteenth century, few were content with such a modest program. The appeal of biological evolution was precisely that it could be readily annexed to notions of "development" and "progress" of all kinds. From late in the eighteenth century such views had become virtually a cult of the educated (and the half-educated) of the western world. The remarkable flowering of historical scholarship in this era would have been unthinkable without such a bias, for the past would not have been nearly so interesting unless it gave a flattering comparison to the present. Strict Darwinian evolution--"the law of higgledy-piggledy," as Carlyle called it--was rather depressing. The

age preferred a grand cosmic drama with mankind as its culmination, and giving him an active and central role. As Emerson put it,

> Aspiring to be man, the worm
> Mounts through all the spires of form.

Evolution could be applied to almost anything one thought important, and was enlisted to support inter alia capitalism, socialism, imperialism, liberal theology, Jim Crow laws, and Prohibition. Much of so-called Darwinism reflects rather the views of Lamarck, Spencer, Haeckel, Hegel, Emerson, Huxley and others, and is unrelated and even contradictory to the opinions of its supposed founder.

This widespread sloppy-mindedness makes it expedient at this point to define several terms. Darwinism is here used, as is customary (and despite the unfairness to Charles Darwin) to describe the whole broad subject of biological evolution, and the inferences drawn from it for human affairs, sensibly or not. Natural selection refers to Darwin's particular scientific contribution, the thesis that evolution takes place by the competition among species, and variations within species. Weismannism means the thesis, maintained by all post-Darwin responsible biologists, that genetic variations took place only by changes in the hereditarily transmitted material, the "germ-plasm," and no other modifications were of the slightest effect. Lamarckism signifies the contrary view, formulated well before Darwin, that acquired characteristics can be inherited. It was

anathematized by all responsible scientists, but would not die. Eugenics means the improvement of the human species by breeding and rearing more babies of good heredity, and fewer of bad. It presupposes significant genetic differences, and hence fitness as parents, among individuals, but not necessarily along racial lines. Some eugenicists scoffed at racial theories, especially at Nordicism. Eugenics is in a sense, counter-Darwinian, for it appealed to artificial rather than natural selection. Racialism refers to the proposition that mankind is composed of a number of separate and distinct stocks of descent, of different value, and that differences in racial ancestry are the chief determinant of the qualities of individual and groups. Racialism is older than modern evolutionary biology, and not necessarily dependent on it. Gobineau, the first systematic modern racialist, published his Essay on the Inequality of Human Races in 1855, before the Origin of Species, and later expressly repudiated natural selection. Racialism was very attractive to dilettantes, because defining the different races was always a matter of opinion, and it was easy to add a large admixture of Lamarckism. A racialist might be a eugenicist, but many were uninterested in the matter. In Germany and Austria racialists and eugenicists were frequently also anti-Semites, especially after 1920, but not inevitably. In the German-speaking world eugenics was usually referred to as race hygiene (Rassenhygiene), a term

which by the 1920's usually carried strong völkisch overtones and was associated with anti-Semitism and chauvinism. The Nazi racial and eugenic legislation went under this title.

Probably the best known of the ideological offshoots of Darwinism was "Social Darwinism," a view that the supposed jungle-law of all existence justified ruthless capitalism and power politics. This form of Darwinism was especially congenial to barbaric vitalism, for it gave a supposedly "scientific" backing to insolent, bullying machismo; those who could not retaliate were by definition lower forms of life. (Yet others used Darwinism to an opposite conclusion. They pointed out that cooperation and mutual affection among members of a species also had a high survival value. Therefore humanity's progress lay rather in the direction of greater harmony and peace, possible through socialism. Alfred Russell Wallace and Ludwig Buechner were notable protagonists of this view.)

The machismo variety of Social Darwinism usually found racialism congenial, and it became the fashion to ascribe success or failure, whether of nations or of classes, to their "race." But just what was "race"? It was the essence of racialism that it could never really answer this question. Its evidence comprised first, the indisputable genetic transference of certain traits in individuals, such as physical features and certain medical conditions; and second, the

large-scale correlation often to be observed between the average physical type of populations and their cultural attainments, both of which could often be measured statistically. Racialism assumed the second to be as genetically determined as the first, and defined "races" to suit. It was constitutionally incapable of distinguishing the effects of heredity from those of environment. Yet since offspring uusally grow up beside their parents, it was (and still is) equally difficult for opponents of racialism to refute it. If nature cannot be distinguished from nurture, neither can nurture from nature. On its face, racialism was intellectually quite plausible, and many of the chief "truths" of mankind have been less supported by factual evidence.

In this loose and casual sense a large proportion of English- and German-speaking persons, and a smaller percentage in France, were "racialists" in 1890-1914. "Good" racial characteristics were always defined in white-western and usually male-bourgeois terms. The gross distribution of easily distinguishable racial types favored such assumptions. Among historians, citing Juvenal as their authority, it was virtually the norm to explain the decay of the Roman Empire in that

> As the old families which had been the mainstay of the Roman state died out, new stocks came to the front, some of them sound and wholesome, but the greater number bearing little resemblance either in character or mentality to the men who fought in the Sabine or Punic

> wars. . . . The admixture did not help to preserve a high standard of public duty.[4]
>
> This orientalizing of Rome's populace [is significant for] why the spirit and acts of imperial Rome are totally different from those of the republic, if indeed racial characteristics are not wholly a myth. . . . the lack of energy and enterprise, the failure of foresight and common sense, the weakening of moral political stamina [stemmed from diminution of the original racial stock] . . . One after another of the emperors gained popularity with the rabble by erecting a shrine to some foreign Baal, or a statue to Isis in his chapel, in much the same way that our cities are lining their park drives with tributes to Garibaldi, Pulaski, and who knows what -vitch.[5]

In their own times, it was an indispensable fact that the European-descended whites had acquired most of the wealth and power of the world, and in large part at the expense of the far more numerous colored races.

The whites themselves seemed to be differentiated culturally along racial lines (although this was far more useful for Anglo-Saxon than for German and Austrian racialism). As Linnaeus had pointed out, Europeans showed three marked geographical types:

1. The Nordic (also loosely called "Aryan," "Germanic," and "Teutonic"). Light skinned, often blond, relatively tall and slender, and dolichocephalic.[6] It was found concentrated on the north European plain between Poland and Spain, and also in the British Isles and Scandinavia.

2. The Alpine. Also light skinned and often blond, but relatively short and stocky, and brachycephalic.[6] It was especially concentrated in the highland area that extends from southeastern France to the Carpathians and Balkans, and

also was widely found on the plains of eastern Europe and Russia.

3. The Mediterranean (sometimes in Germany called Westic). Of dark skin and hair, relatively short and slight, but dolichocephalic like the Nordic. It was found especially around the Mediterranean basin, and as far east as northern India.

By the standards of bourgeois civilization, the peoples with the highest percentage of Nordic types, and their overseas descendants, were self-evidently the most "advanced." Furthermore, racialist research disclosed that even within one nation, such indices as wealth per capita, education, urbanization, and [sic] bicycling varied statistically from place to place in accord with average skull-index, and other characteristics. The only conclusion was, there must be a higher proportion of Nordic genes in the more advanced districts.[7] The aim of this kind of research was bluntly summed up in the title of a book by a distinguished Italian social scientist, Alfredo Niceforo, The Anthropology of the Unpropertied Classes (1909). He proved as conclusively as statistics could that at least in Italy poverty was also accompanied by inferior physique, intelligence and morals, no doubt for hereditary reasons. Racial Darwinist stereotypes were a readymade argument against inconvenient social reforms; it was obviously a waste to give negro or slum children schooling beyond the limits of their genes.

On the face of it, racial Social Darwinists should have been cheerful and confident. If the process of natural selection had brought the best race to the top, why should it not continue to do so? But in fact racialists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and especially the principal writers on the subject,[8] were often gravely anxious about the survival of the racially superior element, and full of suggestions for protecting it. It is this party which is the concern of the present work, and to whom the label of "racial darwinist" should hereafter be understood as applying. Clearly its motivation was the domestic anxiety (for it is hard to believe that before 1914 any "colonial" colored peoples were considered a serious threat) over the advance of mass society, and in particular the apparent gains of the hitherto inferior orders at the expense of those who had considered themselves something special.

Thus racial darwinism tended to be curiously schizophrenic, describing the same race as very strong and very weak at once. On the one hand, the good old stock ("Aryans," "Nordics," "Anglo-Saxons," etc.) were unequaled for their energy, boldness, intelligence, integrity, etc., etc., whereby they had been able to create the glories of modern civilization. Yet at the same time they were extremely vulnerable to the competition of inferior stocks, and in danger of dying out. Modern conditions, especially those of

industry and urbanism, seemed to favor cruder, uglier, but tougher races. The principal evidence cited was the recent sharp drop in the birthrate of the well-to-do and well-educated, while that of the lower classes declined little or not at all. This was a perfectly explicable result of city life and higher life-expectations, which made children more of a burden, and the decline in infant mortality. A self-assured middle and upper class would be confident of educating and assimilating the ascending lower classes, and would not worry about the trend of its birthrate; but for those anxious about preserving their gentility this seemed "race suicide." Racial darwinists furthermore incessantly warned that in modern society biological natural selection had virtually ceased to operate because of the advances of modern medicine, social legislation and humanitarianism in general, and the erstwhile "unfit" were now enabled to survive and reproduce. They conjured up lurid visions of future generations swamped by the descendants of tuberculars, "neurotics," vagrants, petty criminals, and the feeble-minded. (The "unfit" were somehow seldom found in middle-class ranks.)

People of this cast of mind were therefore intensely interested in eugenics. Society should take active steps so that the superior persons would contribute relatively more children to the next generation, and the inferior less. Its chief preoccupation, indeed obsession, was that

the best people should have larger families. (One prominent author went so far as to include a photograph of his five children, lest anyone accuse him of slacking.[8]) The same suggestions crop up again and again in eugenicist authors; the well-educated should be encouraged to marry, and early, perhaps by shortening and cheapening preparation for careers; they should raise their children in less luxury; rates of taxation should be lowered for larger families; venereal disease should be lessened in frequency. Eugenicists in the process were staunch antifeminists, insisting that motherhood was the first duty of middle and upper class women, far before higher education and careers. They cited with especial horror the abysmally low birthrate among graduates of leading American women's colleges, the best stock in the country.

> There seems to be no other prospect, if the full feminist ideal be realized, than the entire extinction of British and American intelligence within the next two of three generations.[9]

Such an attitude was of course a very convenient public-spirited cover for the secret fears and anxieties of eugenicists (who were nearly all middle-class males). And, quite contrary to the general drift of social-darwinists, eugenicists considered war an evil, for it slaughtered the best and left the worst to breed. As Schiller had put it, "Patroclus lies buried and Thersites comes back."

Equally obvious, but far more gingerly approached, was the necessity for negative eugenics, i.e., the

restriction of propagation by the less fit. Eugenicists did suggest confinement or sterilization for the feeble-minded or habitual criminals, and restriction of undesirable immigration (and in some places, a Jewish numerus clausus.) There were a good many suggestions that the weak and unfit were coddled too much, and humanitarianism carried too far was really no kindness. One well-known author went so far as to suggest that the afflictions that struck the weak but not the strong should not be alleviated; for instance, prohibition was probably dysgenic, for that sort of people should be allowed to drink themselves to death, before they had any children.[10] But most of them stopped short of the obvious further step, that if eugenicist biology was correct, all those of inferior heredity (not just the ones in asylums and jails) should be barred from reproduction, if need be by deportation, compulsory sterilization, or liquidation. If human beings as such had no intrinsic value, but only their racial qualities, how would this be wrong? Generally eugenicists were too squeamish and concerned for their respectability to talk in such terms, and only raffish dilettantes like Haiser or Lanz-Liebenfels had the moral courage to carry eugenics to its logical conclusion.

A biologist might well declare that this was standing natural selection on its head. If indeed certain elements of the population were enjoying a reproductive advantage over others, were they not by definition the fittest to

survive? And if this so-called master race, now in decline, had been so stupid as to create an environment in which it was at a disadvantage, how was it worth preserving? In fact racial darwinism was not "naturalistic" at all, but a scheme for manipulating nature in the interest of the old-stock white middle and upper classes.

The foregoing description of racial and eugenic darwinism applies very generally to the western white world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; we now turn to its specifically German and Austrian manifestations, and Franz Haiser's place among them. In these lands racialism acquired a vogue quite suddenly after 1890, later than among the French and Anglo-Saxons. Its first notable author was Wilhelm Schallmayer (1857-1919).[11] His main work was Heredity and Selection, which in 1900 won a prize on the subject offered by the industrialist A. F. Krupp, and went into four editions. Schallmayer wrote from the same bourgeoisie-in-danger perspective as many earlier non-German authors, such as Francis Galton and Georges Vacher de Lapouge, and made similar suggestions for encouraging its fertility and discouraging that of the "unfit," e.g., by confinement in asylums. He severely criticized modern selfish individualism which made possible erotic pleasure without procreation[12] and which led women to neglect their first duty in life.[13] Of a similar but more outspoken class viewpoint was Otto Ammon (1842-1916). In a number of points

he strikingly anticipated Franz Haiser, and one strongly suspects the latter had read him. Quite like the Frenchman Lapouge, Ammon employed skull-measurements and other statistics to prove that higher class went with different race. Ammon held that the existing social order generally worked very well in advancing the best blood, and engaged in a running polemic with the SPD on its desire to change it. He suggested favoring the bourgeoisie still more, using Haiser's favorite analogy of protecting the crop against having to compete with the weeds.[14] Like him Ammon endorsed (less noisily) the cultural value of an idle-rich class.[15] As a practical step Ammon strongly favored the idea of segregation of school children according to their social origin[16] and disapproved of basing political power on universal suffrage, considering the Prussian three-class system eugenically admirable.[17]

It is well worth noting that these two bourgeois elitits were not <u>völkisch</u>. They were uninterested in any supposed "Aryan" or other ancestral races--indeed Schallmeyer, who was a careful scientist, scoffed at the whole idea of different European races[18]--and likewise ignored anti-Semitism. This is a further illustration of the point made earlier, that there is a fundamental divergence between the elitist and populist elements of the radical right. A eugenicist wishing to single out the well-to-do and well-educated as a special breed would not be drawn to classifications that

emphasized their kinship to their less distinguished countrymen, and likewise a völkischer would not care for statistics correlating income and cephalic index that did not separate Jews from non-Jews, to the latter's advantage.

More fanciful but more widely read (probably for this reason) was Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927), whose Foundations of the Nineteenth Century appeared in 1899. By 1914 this expensive two-volume work had sold 100,000 copies, a stupendous figure for the period, and had admirers in the highest circles, including Kaiser Wilhelm II. Chamberlain was an Englishman by birth, but became a German by adoption, and a prominent member of the Wagnerian coterie. The thesis of the Foundations was that race was the chief factor in history, and that everything of value in the western world had been created by the "Teutonic" strain.

> The theory of the essentially one and uniform humanity stands in the way of all correct insight into the history of our time and of all times. . . . Our present civilization and culture are specifically Teutonic. . . . This is the great central and primal truth which the history of the last thousand years teaches us on every page.[19]

Contemporary civilization was in imminent danger because this elite faced being swamped in a "race-chaos" like that of ancient Rome.[20] Chamberlain vigorously denounced cosmopolitanism and formulations of universal values, especially where they were harmful to Germany. On this account he severely criticized Christianity, especially the Roman Caholic Church. The Foundations is in considerable part a "liberal"

anti-clerical tract, in the Kulturkampf tradition. Chamberlain considered the internationalism of capitalism and socialism further branches of the same despicable tree.[21]

Many of the evils in Christianity, especially its rigidity and arid formalism, he traced back to the Jews, whom he characterized as strong-willed but essentially uncreative and unspiritual. Chamberlain's anti-Semitism was broad and conventional, and save for its erudition and parlor language not significantly different from that of the Vienna gutter-press. On this isssue and many others (parliaments, a more open society, imperialism, "national regeneration") Chamberlain, like most Wagnerites can be placed squrely in the völkisch camp. In his last years, he expressed a high opinion of Hitler.

On the all-important definition of "race," Chamberlain was unabashedly subjective and loftily indifferent to orthodox natural science.[22] Chamberlain treated race as a self-evident fact, and the scientists and liberals who questioned it as willfully ignorant.

> Nothing is so convincing as the consciousness of the possession of Race. The man who belongs to a distinct, pure race never loses the sense of it. The guardian angel of his lineage is ever at his side, supporting him where he loses his foothold, warning him like the Socratic Daemon when he is in danger of going astray, compelling obedience, and forcing him to undertakings which, deeming them impossible, he would never have dared to attempt. Weak and erring like all that is human, a man of this stamp recognizes himself, as others recognize him, by the sureness of his character. . . . What is the use of detailed scientific investigations as to whether there are distinguishable races? whether

> race has a worth? how is this possible? and so on. We turn the tables and say: it is evident that there are such races; it is a fact of direct experience that the quality of the race is of vital importance; your province is only to find out the how and the wherefore, not to deny the facts themselves in order to indulge your ignorance.[23]

> The hieroglyphs of nature's language are in fact not so logically mathematical, so mechanically explicable, as many an investigator likes to fancy. . . . It frequently happens that children who have no conception of what "Jew" means, or that there is any such thing in the world, begin to cry as soon as a genuine Jew or Jewess comes near them! The learned can frequently not tell a Jew from a non-Jew; the child that scarcely knows how to speak notices the difference.[24]

Human races, he contended, had been created in the same way as dog breeds; starting from an unspecified and nondescript stock, they were differentiated by selection over a long period of time, a cultural as much as a biological process. Far from depending on a pure ancestry, all good races had benefited from crossing with compatible and complementary stocks. "Only quite definite, limited mixtures of blood contribute towards the ennoblement of a race or . . . the creation of a new one."[25] But once formed, it was disastrous to mongrelize a race with a disharmonious or inferior breed:

> Horses and especially dogs give us every chance of observing that the intellectual gifts go hand in hand with the physical; this is especially true of the moral qualities: a mongrel is frequently very clever, but never reliable; morally he is always a weed.[26]

Half-breeds were always worse than the better side of their parentage.

However, Chamberlain scoffed at the idea of classifying

human races by anatomical variations--"What would we say of a botanist who wished to class plants in families according to the length and breadth of their leaves?"[27] He made merry of the quibbles and confusions of the experts on the subject.[28] It was particularly misleading in the case of the most excellent Teutons, for they had been particularly richly crossbred, and showed wide variety in both physical and psychic type.

> If we recognized the obvious original similarity of the peoples that have arisen from northern Europe, and discovered that their diverse individuality is due to the incomparable plasticity which is still a feature of the race, to the tendency of Teutonism towards ceaseless individualization, we at once understand that what is at the present day called European culture is not in truth European, but specifically Teutonic.[29]

However, with a blithe indifference to consistency, he could cite cephalic indexes and other anatomical markers when it suited him.[30] Nor would Chamberlain admit that in every case the physical dominated the mental:

> nothing is more dangerous than the attempt to construct history from a single principle; nature is infinitely complex; what we call race is within certain limits a plastic phenomenon, and just as the physical can affect the intellectual, so too the intellectual may influence the physical.[31]

Given such a versatility of definition, it was not difficult to distinguish inferior and superior races throughout human history. Towards the Jews Chamberlain was ambivalent, sometimes rather admiring their fidelity to their narrow but strong breed (especially among the Sephardim) but at other times calling them arch-mongrels, the general trash

barrel of every race, and inevitably disharmonious and parasitical.[32] The nobler aspects of Christianity were not of Jewish but of Aryan (and especially Teutonic) inspiration, such as the Trinity.[33] Origen because of his pessimism was undoubtedly of "Indo-European descent."[34] The epitome of these arguments was his contention that Jesus Christ was by race obviously not a Jew.[35] All good Europeans had been unmistakably of Teutonic type, including the original Celts and Slavs, although self-evidently the modern speakers of Slavic languages had little of this blood left.[36] So likewise had been the Italians who had made the Renaissance.[37] Chamberlain was even able on the basis of ancient Egyptian paintings of red-haired Amorites, and the fact of King David's red hair, to rhapsodize that here too were examples of that same magnificent stock.[38]

Chamberlain reminds one of the scene in which Don Quixote encounters a flock of sheep and thinks it an army, and reads off to Sancho Panza a long list of the noble knights whose coats-of-arms he thinks he sees. But he seems downright prosy compared to (as he called himself) Georg Lanz von Liebenfels (1874-1954). He was obsessed with the notion of a cosmic struggle between the blue-eyed blond race (asisch, or asing, from the old Germanic term for the gods) and the dark evil "Chandala" (also known as "Apelings," "Bolshoi-Jews," "satyrs," etc.) who had been sempiternally their enemies. On this subject he wrote literally bales

from 1903 to 1935.[39] Lanz had a feverish cabalistic imagination, describing his "ariomantic" philosophy under such titles as Theozoology, or the Report of the Apelings of Sodom and the Elektron of the Gods.[40] He wrote a Bibliomystikon in many volumes, claiming that Christianity had been intended as a racial cult, that had been perverted by Jews, Jesuits and other secret villains.[41]

Lanz was very visibly driven by sexual anxieties; while others at the time were partisans of human rights and women's rights (Menschenrechtler, Frauenrechtler) he specified himself as the only one for the man's rights (Mannesrechtler).[42]

> Ostara is the only and first magazine for asisch Artung and master-right, which wants to bring the findings of race-science actually into operation, to combat socialist and feminist subversion and secure the asisch noble race through pure breeding before its downfall.[43]

He both idolized women and feared them, believing that they started all evil by their lust to couple with bestial, inferior men.[44] (One of his favorite works of art was a sculpture of an ape carrying off a naked woman, a presentiment of King Kong.[45]) Therefore high-race women were to be secluded and kept in tutelage to men, especially to insure their virginity at marriage, for their first coitus affected women ever after.[46] However, for the man promiscuity with inferior women (if it did not produce children) was beneficial.[47] Lanz suggested polygamy for the best men, and if the husband of a high-race woman proved not virile enough, calling up reinforcements (Ehehelfer). His positive

eugenics included various special privileges and encouragements for the blue-blonds, and a revival of race-cult religion.[49] He also advocated various negative measures against the Chandala, virtually licking his lips as he suggested for them birth-control, castration, deportation, abolition of social-welfare legislation, and perhaps plain massacre.[50] Quite justifiably, the underman could be made to work for the asisch:

> Yes, freedom from . . . the dog's life of wage-work for the Asing, to subjugate again the old ape-man and put him under the yoke of civilization, that he has stubbornly cast off! It will not go all too badly for him. For the higher man is a friend of animals, and will not overstrain the inferior out of his own interest, and in any case will not be so oppressive as today our midlandish and Mongolian speculators and great rascals exploit and steal from the asisch spiritual worker.

In relation to the present work, Lanz is especially interesting because of his vision of a "patrician dictatorship" to institute the rule of the true race-aristocrats,[52] and also of an "ario-heroic" world revolution to this end, composed of the radical right of all countries:

> Already there appear the outlines of a new, ariosophic, ario-christian international: Fascism in Italy, the awakening Hungary, the Spanish fascists, the North American Ku Klux Klan, and the directly ariosophic-inspired swastika-movement [Hakenkreuzler] in Germany.[53]

These views closely resemble those of his fellow-Austrian and close-contemporary Franz Haiser, but in the author's view any cross-influence is unlikely. Haiser might have read Lanz (he mentions him once or twice), but makes no acknowledgement of their shared views, although he does so

readily in the case of several other radical right publicists. Lanz's sexual preoccupations and his overheated cabalistic imagination seem totally alien to Haiser, and it is difficult to imagine the sage of Scheibbs reading through an author as obsessed as himself, but in such a different way. It is equally hard to visualize Lanz picking up Haiser's works, especially given the latter's total lack of sympathy for Lanz's kind of mysticism and fancifulness. Both authors arrived at a set of fixed and very idiosyncratic convictions at an early age (Lanz at least by twenty-five, Haiser by thirty-six) and repeated them again and again for more than twenty years, with minds almost hermetically sealed gainst criticism and new ideas. Their resemblances are possibly to be explained by their shared Austrian background, especially the great emphasis of the Habsburg regime on its supra-national mission, and the fact that its social elite often had a cosmopolitan (or at least imperial) rather than a national self-image.

To advance his own views Lanz (a renegade Roman Catholic monk) founded his own "Order of the New Temple," devising his own service books and an elaborate ritual, being one of the first on the radical right to use the swastika as an emblem.[54] He did not lack for friends and supporters, some of them well known. He was on close terms with Guido von List (1848-1919), an Austrian who in effect interpreted ancient history after the manner of Freud's Interpretation

of Dreams, with much admixture of cabalism, theosophy, and "life-forces."[55] The most famous member of Lanz's order was the Swedish dramatist Strindberg ("Fra August") and it also included several eminent Austrians.[56] Lanz also enjoyed the esteem of Carl Peters, the explorer[57] and even of Karl Kraus.[58] Lanz possibly influenced Hitler, and may have met him in his Vienna days.[59]

Polygamy for the best men was a self-evident corollary of eugenic racialism, but few were bold enough to advocate it. Apparently the first to do so was Christian von Ehrenfels (1859-1932), Professor of Philosophy at the University of Prague, and a brilliant and many-sided intellect (the inventor, among other things, of Gestalt psychology). Ehrenfels was not at all a member of the radical right, still less of the völkisch party (he bragged of having Jewish ancestry[60]) but simply drew the inescapable conclusion from the existence of genetic differences, and that some parents were inherently more fit than others.[61] The best-known exponent of polygamy was Willibald Hentschel (1858-after 1943). One of the best known of völkisch authors, he was particularly associated with back-to-the-land enthusiasms and anti-Semitism. He viewed history spiritualistically, thinking it had proceeded by the release of energy potential built up by gifted races. Therefore to build and maintain a high civilization racial selection was necessary, including a caste system. But the modern population was so race-decayed that

it needed a "crash program" to restore it. To this end Hentschel proposed a rural colony (Mittgart) to be composed of one thousand women and one hundred men (all of course selected Nordics) with rotating marriage. As soon as a woman was pregnant, the marriage was to be dissolved, and so to speak the deck reshuffled and redealt. The girls born to the community would remain there, and the surplus males (i.e., those beyond the 1:10 ratio) would be sent out to re-seed the German nation. The radical right tended to be very queasy at this suggestion, and to say that while in principle it had merits, it simply wasn't practical, at least for the foreseeable future.[62] Haiser, out of honesty or lack of sophistication, was one of the few to persist in the idea.

But by the 1920's, such extravagances as Mittgart and Lanz-Liebenfels' schemes were uncommon in German-speaking racialism. It had mostly become the property of the völkisch, and was harnessed to their chauvinism and anti-Semitism. Indeed, a reviewer of the first edition of H. F. K. Guenther's best-selling Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes objected to the way he gave away so many points to the Jews and east Europeans, and relegated so many fine Bavarians and Austrians to the category of Asiatic barbarians.[63] The usual völkisch approach broadly resembled Chamberlain's but omitted many of his flights of fancy, and placed more confidence in the putative measurable characteristics of race. It definitely

tended toward the populist rather than the elitist aspect of the radical right, and therefore sought to define the whole German-speaking population (excpet for the Jews) as preponderantly of superior race, especially as compared to Jews and Slavs. Völkisch racialism had to accept that nearly all populations, and especially that of Europe, was racially mixed, and that it was not easy to correlate anybody's behavior and achievement in his genes. But by singling out certain stocks as "preponderant" in a given race, and discovering subtle distinctions of race, racial classifications were brought closer to "experience."

Perhaps the most widely read racialist author of the 1920's was H. F. K. Günther (1891-1968), an especial protege of J. F. Lehmann.[64] Günther said the standard things about Nordic virtues:

> We may take judgment, truthfulness, and energy to be the qualities which are always found marking out Nordic man. It is by a certain mastering of his own nature that he comes by his power of judgment and keeps it, standing as a free man over against himself, and still more over against the influence of others. . . . He is distinguished by a highly developed sense of reality, which, in combination with an energy that may give rise to boldness, urges him on to far-reaching undertakings. Together with this he has a decided sense for competitive achievement, and develops a characteristic passion for the real, while passion in the usual meaning of the rousing of the senses or the heightening of the sexual life has little meaning for him.[65]

The Nordics alone had created the glories of western civilization, but were losing ground to inferior races under modern industrial and urban conditions.[66] The French Revolution had denounced the notion of racial differences for an obvious

party reason:

> The French Revolution was a very thorough denordization of France. At that time it was often enough to be blond to be dragged to the scaffold. The French Revolution must be read as an Alpine-Mediterranean rising against a noble and burgher class of Nordic race.[67]

Günther strove subtly to combine populist nordicist arguments with elitist ones, maintaining that at least in northern Germany a large part of the population was Nordic, and had in earlier times been recognized as of as good blood as the nobility. He warmly recommended that persons of wealth and family should abandon snobbery about rank and intermarry even with peasant girls of good Nordic stock; nobility should not be a matter of class but of race.[68]

However, Gunther and other völkisch racialists were faced with an embarrassing problem in that Europe's German-speaking population was actually weakly supplied with Nordics, especially in Austria and Bavaria. He therefore devised a short-headed "Dinaric" race for the latter area, as tough and lively if not quite as intelligent or handsome as the Nordics. They were to be distinguished from the also short-headed "Alpines," a peaceable but unenterprising lot who dominated Switzerland and much of France, and also from the short-headed "Ostics" further east, who were virtually hypostasized Czechs: attached to the soil, industrious, good servants, but ugly, dull, and utterly lacking imagination or idealism. In Ostics

> The skin is fair, but not rosy; it does not let the blood glimmer through, so that it never looks to have the

> life or brightness of the Nordic skin. . . . The [ostic] hair is fair, but more inclined to be ash-blond than gold-blond. . . . That brightness, or even radiance, which belongs to many Nordic eyes, is lacking in the [ostic] eye. Its expression is often sullen, not seldom it is gloomy, but withal stronger or at least harder than in the Alpine race.[69]

Likewise to be distinguished were the "Near Eastern" Race, which though externally hard to distinguish from the Dinaric was "psychologically quite different." It was cunning, often cruel, and especially good at trading and acting; it was a large component of the Armenians, gypsies, and of course the Jews.[70] Like other racialists, Günther was fond of selected pictures of well known persons to make his points, e.g., that Napoleon and Bismarck were of Nordic stock, and even General Haynau, the "butcher" of Hungary in 1849. But Benedek, the loser of 1866, was "dinaric-nordic," with perhaps a smidgin of ostic, and Metternich (as liberals would undoubtedly agree) was "nordic-Near Eastern."[71]

Contemporary with Günther were the professors Erwin Baur (1875-1933), Eugen Fischer (1874-1967) and Fritz Lenz (1887-) whose Human Heredity went through four editions in the 1920's and 1930's. They prided themselves in being more scientifically thorough than the "unsolid" Günther,[72] but any comparison of their works soon reveals the hollowness of such a distincion. Lenz makes the standard opening:

> I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that in respect of mental gifts the Nordic race marches in the van of mankind. . . . the Nordic race owes its leading position in the world, not only to its high intellectual endowments, but also to its character traits. E. Fischer

> writes: "The mental endowments of the Nordic race are great energy and industry, vigorous imagination, and high intelligence. Conjoined with these are foresight, organizing ability, and artisitc capacity . . . and also the unfavorable qualities of strong individualism, a lack of community sense and of willingness to obey orders, . . . [and] a dislike for steady and quiet work."[73]

The Nordics were selected by the rigorous northern climate of the late Ice Age, but it had to have something to work on:

> The Mongoloid races, like the Nordic races, have been adapted to the northern climate by selection. But whereas in Nordics the power to cope with the inhospitalities of the northern climate has been obtained by an increase in the intellecutal capacities, among the arctic Mongoloids natural-selection has picked out those who had the fewest wants.[74]

The Nordic was brilliant at war, technology, exploration, scholarship, statesmanship, etc., etc., but unfortunately was not gifted at impressing other peoples, who mistakenly thought him wooden and cold.[75]

Lenz sneered at the "Dinaric" and "Ostic" races as mere hobbies of Günther,[76] but took most seriously a "heavily-built blond race," to account for the less elegant members of the German population.

> . . .populations in which the heavily-built blond race predominates are distinguished psychologically from those in which the slender blond race [i.e., Nordics] predominates. . . . The heavily-built blond human being is less mobile than the slender type; he lacks the impulse towards the remote; he clings to home and the traditional. On the other hand, he excels the Nordic in trustworthiness. What we speak of as "German fidelity" is especially characteristic of him. . . . [This race] is mainly responsible for the German earnestness and depth of character.[77]

(The psychologist L. F. Clauss called into being a "Fälisch" race for the same duty.[78])

Lenz also took as self-evident the existence of a special Jewish racial type, although they too were of mixed ancestry and diverse appearance. (In fact, he argued ingeniously, there was a selective pressure in favor of those marriage partners who looked like the host-peoples among whom the Jews were scattered, so no wonder the Jews look like their non-Jewish neighbors.[79]) He admitted that Jews had considerable talents, but mostly for the rather low arts of persuasion and manipulation, and for merely abstract thought.[80] He as convinced that they were more inclined to crime than the statistics showed.[81]

Defending the honor of materialistic biology, Lenz scorned the idea that mind was a "spiritual" (and hence environmental) thing, instead of an attribute of body, and as hereditable as any other feature.[82] Races differed in mind as surely as in physique.[83] Yet with the usual heads-I-win-tails-you-lose reasoning of racialism, the "spiritual" constitution of individuals might not necessarily be indicated by their outward appearance. It was of course possible that in a mixed population

> that a man with light-colored eyes and fair hair may have a mental constitution which properly belongs to a dark race. With somewhat more probability, on the other hand, than from such bodily characters, we can infer from a man's origin what his mental racial endowments will be. Thus, a small, short-headed, dark-haired peasant is rare in lower Saxony, but all the same, it is far more probable that a Lower Saxon will have a Nordic mental constitution than, for example, that a tall blond, longheaded Italian will be of this type.[84]

Franz Haiser's racialism bears an outward resemblance to the völkisch racialists of the 1920's just cited, but his central concern, here as everywhere, was elitism. An elitist application of racial thinking was the direct descendant of the age-old snobbery of the European nobility; notable earlier examples were Gobineau and Nietzsche. (It was in character that Gobineau [probably with no right whatever] called himself "Count," and tried to trace his ancestry back to a vassal of Charlemagne, and Nietzsche affected a descent from the Polish nobility.) Like the old nobility, elitist racialists were apt to be cool to nationalism, and even explicitly cosmopolitan. Like Frederick the Great, they esteemed foreigners whom they considered of equal rank more highly than the lower orders of their own countrymen.

However, while in Frederick's time elitist pretensions could be based upon "noble blood" and family trees without people laughing, by a century later it was of very limited use. Any biological definition of race, especially by physical markers, tended inevitably to cover large groups, membership in which could not conveniently be restricted; it was more useful to populist, than to elitist branches of the radical right. Therefore anyone wishing to use racialism for elitist purposes had to define "high race" very elastically and arbitrarily, with a high quotient of Lamarckism. In the German-speaking world, this sort of racialism was very congenial to the elitist traditions of Bildung, especially

Schiller's principle that "the spirit builds the body for itself." A late example of this tendency was Erich Vögelin, who deplored the racialism of the 1920's as materialistic, a "mass-ideology analogous to liberalism and socialism."[85] He repudiated eugenics as "mechanical." He doubted the claims made for "Nordics," and also noted (as did Franz Haiser) that if such a race existed, an all-Nordic community would logically have to be a democracy; thus no spiritual hierarchy would be possible, a bad thing for culture. Vögelin considered rather the community's belief in itself as being of one blood as the vital "life-idea," which thus became an instrument for interpreting the life of the individual and the group. He put no stock in cranial indexes and suchlike, saying that a far better guide was our instinctive reaction to an individual's speech, gestures and manners.[86] It is doubtful if one could call this racialism at all; certainly Vögelin illustrates how racial definitions that were congenial to the elitist strand of the radical right were virtually useless for the populist and völkisch one, and vice versa. This was a fact of the greatest importance for the career of Franz Haiser.

Haiser had read some of the völkisch racialists aforesaid, and he used many of the same definitions and rhetoric. But his purpose was elitist, while theirs was populist, although he himself never completely grasped how little they had in common. The result was as if the same words had

been fitted to widely different tunes, rather as Beckmesser in Die Meistersinger tries to sing Walther's Prize-Song to his own wretched music. Yet in one sense Haiser's was a superior production, for he was blunt and honest about who should benefit from racialism, and at whose expense, where the well-bred "racial scientists" were evasive or silent.

Haiser's racial thinking was accompanied by little claim to originality. He acknowledged a debt to several authors, including Günther and Chamberlain. He also read Lenz, but in large part disagreed with him. His exposition of race was slapdash, and he assumed that his readers were familiar with the topic. His basic sentiment was

> Why should science on the one hand have the justification to treat man as a higher animal, but on the other must anxiously fall silent before the question, whether there are not superior and inferior men, that is aristocrat and cur?[87]

Like most eugenicists, Haiser considered "high race" a rare and fragile thing. Like comparable domesticated animals, the best human breeds required special life conditions, and especially protection against careless interbreeding.[88] Like Chamberlain, he insisted that mongrels had perhaps a shallow and unscrupulous cleverness, but no real "character," as we have quoted in a previous chapter, and the Jews were the worst example.[89] Unfortunately mongrels now dominated the world. This was why it lacked "stylization" and was riddled with diversity and confusion.[90] As usual with Haiser, this was a reason dictatorship was

indispensable; a community all of one race might possess enough community spirit and mutual understanding to govern itself, but without it only compulsion would serve.[91]

Yet as with most racialists Haiser did not consider the situation hopeless. Granted, that all populations were mixed, there still remained enough good genes here and there from which a superior type could be regenerated. As we would expect, he considered attempts at persuading the modern cur-world to practice eugenics utterly useless, and the job could be done only by strong dictatorial personalities.[92] As to racial classifications and ratings, he began from a conventional basis, but introduced many new touches of his own. He assigned "Nordics" (or often loosely "Teutons" or "Aryans") the usual preeminence in character, intelligence, enterprise and other "heroic" qualities, but also added (as some reputable "racial scientists" allowed) that they were gullible,[93] and extremely stiffnecked and quarrelsome; so that (as usually happened when one played with Haiser's dice) they needed a dictator to make them behave.[94] As for good qualities in other races, Haiser at one point criticized Günther for allowing so many virtues to non-Nordics,[95] but frequently did the same himself.[96] He allowed that Mediterraneans and "noble Semites" like the Bedouins were also worthy stocks,[97] and in his Gastmahl one of the most attractive characters is a Sephardic Jewess. He also expressed respect for the civilization-building

talents of the Chinese (at least in the past)[98] and greatly praised the Japanese.[99]

Concerning the other colored peoples of the world, especially those in European colonies and the American negroes, Haiser expressed contempt and some anxiety, as was conventional among the völkisch. As was not uncommon, Haiser affected the tone of a co-trustee with the Anglo-Saxon peoples for the white race. He made the standard criticism of English and American materialism and hypocrisy, but never doubted that they were as high-race as anyone, and abhorred the thought of war with them. But he deplored the way they (and other white nations) had mismanaged their colonies. In a mournful I-told-you-so tone, he declared that before the Europeans came these peoples had been perfectly satisfied with their patriarchal and feudal society, including its slavery, polygamy, human sacrifice and other things offensive to liberals. The introduction of the west's so-called reforms had earned the mother countries no thanks, and the colored peoples had found capitalist wage-slavery far harsher than their traditional form. Extending western-style education and liberal political ideas to the natives only made them "uppity." The whites had also taught the colored peoples their industrial and military techniques, and now these were being turned against them.[100]

However, the reestablishment of an elite among European whites was always Franz Haiser's main concern, and he

harnessed his racialism to his thesis of the necessity of inequality. Repeating Aristotle, he claimed that all human life depended on a symbiosis of master and servant. Far from advocating racial homogeneity within the state, like the völkisch, he stressed that to maintain the "gradient of worth" the upper classes and the masses must be of different races. (The only exception was when the state had colonial inferiors abroad to exploit.[101]) Historically, Haiser claimed (and here he could cite the prevailing racialist version of history) the Nordic had done no work [Arbeit] but had conquered other peoples and made them work for him, reserving for himself the nobler occupations.[102] The secret of European civilization had been the combination of a Nordic master-class and non-Nordic lower class.[103] In a land of all Nordics civilization would be impossible, for lack of a gradient.[104]

As for the prospects of reestablishing a Nordic upper-class, Haiser contended--again, with strong support from contemporary racial science--that the remaining good specimens were to be found in many lands, and not just in Germany and Austria. Furthermore by any tangible evidence the German-speaking peoples contained a large proportion of non-Nordics (in Austria, the majority), some of them of very low-rated stocks. Haiser contended, as was central to his argument, that they were the great majority of the German-speaking world, hence the impossiblity of any improvement

save by a dictatorship of the racially select. In an amusing and quintessentially Haiserian adaptation, he took Günther's term "Ostic," which its author had introduced precisely to distinguish the Czechs, Poles and other undesirable brachycephalics from the "Dinarics" of Austria, to apply to Austrians. The type-specimen of the Ostic was the "fat-bellied Spiesser," who seemed to be especially common around Scheibbs, and it was unimportant whether they were of German or Slavic speech.[105] In more relaxed moments Haiser spoke of Ostics as white southerners used to do of negroes, saying that they made excellent servants, who should be treated kindly but firmly, and never encouraged to rise above their station.[106] The Ostic was an indispensable complement to the Nordic, if European civilization was to be maintained.[107] Haiser was emphatic concerning the distinction between race and nationality. He denounced nationalism as a liberal idea, which implied the detestable licence of "free self-determination" to all peoples as such, regardless of their race.[108] He repeatedly denounced trying to Germanize neighboring inferior racial stocks, as simply adding water to the wine. Clearly, his low opinion of his fellow-countrymen virtually forced Haiser to stress an international counter-revolutionary elite, if he was to believe in racialism at all.

Concerning eugenics, Haiser made many suggestions, hoping that his cherished all-Aryan counter-revolution would

institute them. Unlike those concerned for their gentlemanly reputation, he was brutally frank that negative eugencis were as necessary as positive. The best race could advance only at the expense of the worst. For convenience we may take Haiser's positive eugenics first (including his views on polygamy, and on women in general) and then the negative. The latter will be followed by a chapter on Haiser's opinions of the Jews, who were naturally to be a prime object of the latter.

Haiser was quite unlike most völkisch racialists in the brazen way he took a Lamarckian or a Weismannian position, as it suited his argument. Sometimes he preferred to muddle the issue, as Nietzsche and Edgar Jung did:

> In general . . . the stylized intelligence of the pure race is hereditary, if not by birth yet through family tradition, carried over into flesh and blood, in upbringing [Erziehung] and furthermore segregation from the less distinguished. The quality of Geist is a privilege, that the creation bestows upon the aristocrat. He is a spiritual noble in his whole manner of thinking.[109]

But sometimes he attacked the Weismann thesis head-on. Certainly all through history the natural instinct of peoples, and wise statesmanship, had always considered that a constantly bad phenotype must lead to a bad genotype. Assuming that superior race is the secret of a high civilization, how could Weismannism account for the transformation of the crude and savage invading Hellenes into the "Apollo-figures" of Greek civilization, in a few centuries? Or are we to ascribe the improvement to an admixture of Mediterranean blood,

which Lenz and other scientists thought so inferior?

Furthermore, Haiser declared, from a moral point of view was not the denial of any inheritance of acquired characteristics a new form of the dogma of predestination, and like it bound to cause despair? That an inferior race cannot be improved by environment "is true, and the doctrine is full of blessings, for it hinders its ascent into the higher layers of society," but it discouraged upward-striving by the noble-race. "Whosoever kills the will to development in man preaches death instead of life."[110] Haiser declared for a middle ground; he rejected the strict Weismannian rigidity of race, for with it nothing new could ever be created, and also the contrary extreme that environment was everything, for thereby an immigrant Russian Jew could be readily transformed into a gentleman, even a baron.[111] It was essential to start with good genes, but "high breeding" was needed to make anything out of it.[112] But at times Haiser is even more Lamarckian, and can interpret race as "idealistically" as any gebildete. The genotype should not only be preserved, but improved;

> Geist will prevail over the dead cycle of mechanical events; to use electrical language, man is only a transformer or relay for divine Geist. A divine energy whose nature is unknown to us is transformed into life-energy.[113]

Lastly, pursuing another of his favorite quarrels, Haiser scoffed at the contention that Weismannism was correct because all the scientists believed in it.

Don't dogmas of scientists change like women's fashions?

> All these scientific systems seem to have been founded firm as a rock, yet at one blow they collapse.[114]

There was no need for an "absolute monarchy" of any one view in race-hygiene, nor for dismissing as mere "dillettantes" all those not belonging to the academic guild. Haiser pointed out (with perfect accuracy) that it was amateurs like Gobineau, Hermann Burte (author of Wiltfeber), Richard Wagner, Nietzsche, Treitschke and P. Muckermann who had pioneered in such views, in the teeth of the "respectable" academic world, long before it became "salon-worthy."[115]

But Haiser was a thorough Weismannist in regard to the Jews, here disagreeing with a party on the radical right (such as Arthur Trebitsch, an anti-Semitic Jew) which held that somehow they could be Germanized. Haiser contended, that Jews could not at all be changed by environment,[116] nor even by selective breeding within their own stock, any more than selection among oats would change it into wheat. Exceptional individuals among Jews, and other inferior races, were to be explained as "idiovariants," inexplicable individual deviations that had no genetic effect. He thought this the best explanation for Jesus Christ, rather than guessing at a non-Jewish ancestry for Him.[117]

As for concrete eugenic measures, Haiser had a great deal to say. He was quite positive that persons of good race could be found collected into a group, and enabled to prosper and multiply, at the expense of their inferiors. As for the genes to be favored or disfavored, he was careless

about labels, calling the best stock indifferently "Nordic," "Aryan," "Germanic" or simply "high-race," and the inferiors likewise "Ostics," "Alpines," "Asiatics," or more often simply "curs" [Köter], his all-purpose term of contempt. As for the method of classifying individuals by their race, he was explicit that outward appearance was quite unreliable as a guide, for in the mongrelized modern world fine appearance could go with the vilest character, and the reverse.[118] A subjective or "artistic" viewpoint was absolutely essential in classifying persons by their race, and the "objectivity" beloved by the learned was worse than useless.

Haiser's indictment of the modern world, and especially its social mobility for "curs," had nearly always a racial and eugenic bearing. His chief expedient for genetic improvement was of course the "All-Aryan" counter-revolution itself. Here he avoided questions of racial definition and selection by saying that it would be essentially self-selected. A properly directed recruiting-drive would appeal to those who felt themselves to be of the master race, but whose present situation was far below their deserts. Thereby it would collect together those who were spiritually superior, which was the important thing. Once in power it would maintain itself by monopoly of all important positions and privileges, and would segregate itself from its inferiors socially and sexually. The inferiors, one way or another, would not prosper. (The manner of operation of this elite

will be more fully discussed in a later chapter.)

Haiser also spoke of eugenic measures which apparently might be put into operation without necessarily waiting for such a drastic and difficult step. Among these were proposals for education and marriage, and adjustment of reproductive rates in favor of the more fit and against the less so.

Haiser devoted a great deal of attention to educational questions, a subject that will be treated again in connection with his anti-intellectual opinions. He saw it as a pivotal factor in most of the evils of the day, for the "curs" infiltrated it for the sake of both practical and spiritual domination over the decent people. Therefore, admission to secondary and higher education should be only on a racially select basis, using the subjective standards aforementioned.[119] He furthermore stressed that selection according to school performance, at least as schools were now, was usually dysgenic, for in fact those of high race learned rather slowly and were not star pupils.[120] He also wished to reserve all scholarly and scientific research to those of good race, as mentioned above.[121] In line with his overall passionate anti-intellectualism, Haiser added that human beings had mistakenly selected themselves into a hypertrophy of intellect, as extinct animals had disastrously overdeveloped certain organs.[122] He opined that the world-weary over-intellecuality of Buddhism was a result of

princely inbreeding.[123]

Like any eugenicist, Haiser was much concerned with sexuality and the proper role of women. Here his basic assumptions were quite like those of other eugenicists, and for that matter of the völkisch in general. But many of his arguments, and his detailed proposals, show a remarkably luxuriant and exotic imagination. Haiser professed that sexuality ought to be directed only toward reproduction, and that marriage was not for the erotic pleasure of the two partners, but a duty to the race.[124] Antiquity had understood this, and commemorated and ennobled sexuality, but

> the modern world view has not the slightest motive to play the role of protector of love, for Eros was never so nasty as under its rule. [The degeneration began under the Roman Catholic Church, which] made Eros an immoral devil Asmodeus. . . . The dirtiest Ashtaroth and Moloch cults of the Phoenicians were poetry compared to the devil-literature of the Christian West. Protestantism indeed freed Eros from his frightful devil-shape, but designated as his dwelling no temple, but only the utilitarian marriage bed. . . . Arbeit adelt, procreation is a duty, the more the better, and there is no question of race, says the lawbook of puritanical Manchesterism. Making money and babies came into the same category. . . . Finally, what has the last stage of Christianity, the atheistic and "enlightened," freethinkerdom, made of love? A world-bordello, in which thousands of Jewish doctors, "specialists in skin diseases," are appointed high priests.[125]

In good society sluttishness had become accepted, and even justified and admired, a fashion begun by the novels of Alexandre Dumas. Present day "advanced" authors perhaps did not commit sexual vices but they defended them, and even worked to make them interesting; or perhaps, added Haiser in a flash of wit, modern permissiveness had gone so far, that

this was necessary to make them piquant again?[126] Modern materialistic, clinical sexual "enlightenment" (an especial Jewish invention) in its way had made sexuality as disgusting as had Christianity.[127] As a pendant to his view that sex was primarily for reproduction, Haiser strongly disapproved of homosexuality, although he was opposed to harsh penalties for homosexuals who did not bother others. It was obviously a disadvantageous mutation, and an individual could not be blamed for it. It would be a grave mistake, however, to try to convert homosexuals to a sexually normal way of life, for obviously nature intended those genes to die out.[128]

Like most of the radical right, Haiser was an emphatic male chauvinist, and used his eugenic and other arguments as a reason for keeping woman in her place.

> Our feminist age gabbles about the "free self-determination" of women; we do not yet have the legal right to vote for women, but the women already rule much longer than we men want to understand. . . . There has never been a primitive people which has ever spoken [in favor of such a free self-determination] for women, and which has regarded [the distinction of] race and caste, [and] the exclusion of the sick and degenerate from reproduction as prejudices. . . . Today we should think rather of a subjugation of women before a liberation of women, which already has long existed.[129]

However, sexual anxieties bothered Haiser far less than many other grievances, and he was not nearly as sex-obsessed as e.g., Lanz-Liebenfels, Arthur Dinter or Julius Streicher.

Haiser's basic tactic--not of course a new one--was to put women on a pedestal, to serve as a kind of jail. He accepted as self-evident the eugenicist view that women's

first duty was childbearing and homemaking, and supported his case by an adaptation of his "endothermic" principle of civilization. Modern civilization, he claimed, was spiritually so exhausting that it quickly wore out the men, and women had to be maintained as a reserve of "seed-force" [Keimkraft], the "blood-refreshing drone,"[130] like the idle rich. Therefore females should not have the same jobs and education as males. Perhaps, as liberal schoolmasters said, they could do as well in school as males, or even better ("what ten thousand philistines can learn, women can too"[131]), but their special and indispensable qualities would be ruined thereby. In other left-handed compliments, Haiser averred that woman's power to attract and manipulate men, even geniuses--as Christiane Vulpius did Goethe, or his child-bride Aisha Mohammed--depended not at all on schooling. To remedy philistinism men needed not "well schooled marionettes and knowledge-robots" like "our mechanized sex."[132] Using a figure of speech out of Indian thought, Haiser typed man as Shiva, the destroyer, and woman as Vishnu the preserver, both roles absolutely necessary, and any blurring of the distinction led to a bastard and harmful cross-mixture. With a nod to the postwar political situation, he added that today there was especial need not for sentimental madonna-types, but for vengeful Kriemhilds,[134] who would inspire them to heroic action.[135] And as usual, Haiser found the "gradient" a useful argument. A marriage required inequality

to work; if the husband and wife were equally proud and strong-willed (as was especially likely among Nordics) there would be only strife, never love.[136] To provide "just equality" of rights for women would actually give them superiority, for nature knew nothing of equilibrium in such matters.[137]

Still further to substantiate his anti-feminist case, Haiser cited a book by an author not at all of his school, Sex and Character (1903) by Otto Weininger (1880-1903). Even fin de siecle Vienna had few characters as "far out" as Weininger. Intellectually brilliant, enormously conceited of his wisdom, he was also highly unstable, and a prime example of the "self-hating Jew." Shortly after the book's publication, he committed suicide, in the house where Beethoven had died. Weininger's main thesis was that male and female characteristics were dispersed through the very protoplasm of all individuals (an idea partly borrowed from Freud) but that the male was the only creative and intelligent element; women were sexuality incarnate, and could be only mothers or prostitutes. He added that Aryans were inherently a "masculine" race, Jews a "feminine" one, and therefore utterly worthless.[138] His book had gone through twenty-six editions by 1925. Many völkisch authors esteemed it, and noted with approval that Weininger's conclusions about the Jewish race left suicide as the only honorable course. Haiser considered his Jewish ancestry a triviality, and thought his thesis to

be to a large extent common sense.[139]

Haiser was far from being as much of a woman-hater as Weininger or Lanz-liebenfels, but still was ambivalent about them. Sometimes he praised them for their capacity to recognize a real man[140] and says "only women with a damaged race-instinct are taken in by Jewish sexual-freedom propaganda."[141] But more often he deplored their attraction to inferior males. They preferred the interesting to the manly man,[141] and the clever to the strong one, which was a cause of modern hyper-intellectuality.[142] German women even had a zest for blacks and other inferior races.[143] Essentially (like cats) they wanted a master they could respect, but modern free self-determination gave them an exaggerated idea of their rights, and only "masochists" (a favorite term of Haiser's, none too carefully used) could satisfy them.

> So most marriages are unhappy, because woman seeks a master and gets at most a slave-cur, whom consciously or not they despise. Hence: erotic general strike against masochists. Wipe out these muck-souls![144]

The general state of marriage was deplorable:

> Philistines marry cooks and housekeepers, aristocrats rich Jewesses, the educated tubercular A-students, pastors pious child-fabricators, masochists masculinized and sport-crazy women, but who marries the <u>beautiful</u> woman? New-rich freedmen, yellowed and mangy curs, leprous Jews, old roués, in order to poison with their pestilential seed the small remainder of divine origin, which our race still possesses![145]

Haiser's discussion of racial or sexual themes rarely went on for long without turning to one of his favorite and most idiosyncratic enthusiasms, the right of a polygamy for

the best males. He was here drawing an obvious, indeed an unavoidable corollary of racialism, but it was a question that the völkisch, who were drawn largely from the most "Victorian" part of the German-speaking population,[146] were most reluctant to face. They must indeed have blushed and squirmed when Haiser not only artlessly and incessantly advocated it, but cast himself as a Martin Luther of the cause:

> For twenty years I have served up the "reactionariest" of dishes to the left-culturists, as slavery, blood sacrifice in religion, polytheism and polygamy, not to satisfy my "sadism" as many say, or to indulge a whimsical monomania, but to amuse myself at the hypocritical indignation, spiritual powerlessness, weasel-words and unctuousness of these nauseating weak sentimentalists. No "reactionary" demand stirs up such epilectic convulsions of indignation as advocating polygamy. The holiness of the German woman has been abandoned. Men who agree in theory on polygamy for high-race nobility enlighten to me that a "noble" character would never permit it to himself. So far has masochism rooted itself today![147]

Haiser advocated not so much polygamy as polygny, for he emphasized that the superior man should always have his options open. He was explicit that polygny was only for men of the highest race (and should not become merely a privilege of the rich).[148] The Spiesser was obviously destined only for monogamy and the Köter should as far as possible be excluded from reproduction entirely. His arguments ran on two levels at once: the public-spirited and eugenic, and a more "philosophical" version of the thoughts usually ascribed to the bourgeois married man.

In the high-minded vein, Haiser gives the following

"Reasons against general monogamy":

1. Limitation of the chance of increase of the racially most desirable men.
2. Increased opportunity of the racially inferior. . . .
3. Feminism, oppression of hero-dom, Spiesser predominance, masculinized women and carpet-slipper heroes.
4. Impossibility for a woman to give contentment from conception to the end of nursing. This leads to perversions or abstinence-insanity. Marriage and a cloister are not to be confused.
5. Decay of marriage through unlawful polygny and polyarseniky with frightful increase of sexual diseases.
6. Chance of prostitution because of the oversupply of women.
7. Possiblity, even necessity of female gain of wealth for the same reason, with the results: rapid race decadence, for every specialized activity has decay as its result.

To these considerations he appends, that kshatriya-type men should have abundance of choice, so that few women would be left available for the pariah. Arguing that the purpose of sex ought to be only reproduction, polygny was an obvious step if the wife of a high-caste man was barren. (In a further ingenious adaptation of the same principle, he argues that women whould not have sexual intercourse after menopause; which of course made monogamy an unthinkable strain upon the husband.[149]) The master-man, as in antiquity, should be allowed to father children outside of marriage, but modern "emancipated" sexuality, that sought mistresses and not mothers, was wrong.[150] Furthermore, this assumed homogeneity of race; any miscegenation with inferior women was an abomination.

But elsewhere Haiser engages in glaring contradictions,

saying that such fornication between master-men and lower-class women was common among the ancient Romans and Germans, and a good thing too. It "refreshed the blood" of the lower classes, and did no race-damage, for it was strictly forbidden to seduce free-born women.[151] (Elsewhere he qualified this statement, saying that this is only justified to prevent the decay of the lower strata, and must not go so far as to level the gradient between aristocrats and common people.[152]) In truly aristocratic societies, the ius primae noctis was not a vice and a scandal, but a sign of the possession of noble-race in the community, and the people, far from being resentful, were proud of the custom.[153] (Lanz-Liebenfels made the same contention.) In the hoped-for "right-cultural" restoration, the new Caesar would reject the women's rights nonsense of today, and mothers would rejoice if he chose to sleep with their daughters; his semen would be holy.[154] (Whether private-scholars would be any good as Caesars is not discussed.)

Haiser devoted also much space to the "spiritual" side of the question, arguing that the sexual double standard was written in the laws of nature. Any sincere and consistent Nietzschean, he argued (with reason) would have to agree.[155] The Baron von Artaria, the central figure of his best book, states the case at length. One of the other characters declares, that there had to be love in a marriage, for the sake of well-brought-up children, and women could never love

a man unless she were the only wife. Responds the Baron,

> You don't understand the bringing-up force of a man's love. The first child of monogamy may be conceived in love, the rest less so in arithmetic progression. What is idealism to the wife is materialism to the husband. Kisses come on a time schedule, the marriage bed becomes a factory. I have been told by married men, who trusted me, that the only way to stay in love with their wives was to go on repeated trips with other women. The love for the favorite wife never fades, rather the polygamous man ever carries her in his heart and is happy as a child when he is again at home with her. . . . Especially for the great man is monogamy limiting, for he in effect has so much he wants to bestow. The great man belongs really neither to his family or his woman, but to his whole work and goals. If the love of the woman is wholeheartded . . . she is not shocked by a competitor, for the truly loving wife surrenders herself, indifferent to what she receives in return. The whole business of feminism would drop its unnatural arrogance about master-rights of the woman, if the husband was again the husband, and that is best done by polygamy. Property is exclusively the man's right, the woman has no right in him, save the right of surrender.[156]

More briefly (and without any intention of being funny) Haiser says "in a harem one can furnish oneself with specialties, but in monogamy one must be content with a single 'maid of all work.'"[157]

But Haiser admitted that, in sexuality as in civilization, the true way might be hard:

> It is woman's nature to cleave to one man and repel or ignore others, but man's is otherwise. So we should not expect a woman to tolerate adultery by her husband. We encounter here a contradiction of nature, built not upon harmony but upon strife, and we must bear with it. There will always be dramatic life-scenes. A genuine woman cannot ever grasp how her husband can be unfaithful and yet really love her. . . .[158]

(One wonders if Haiser had acquired any of his tragic vision from "life-scenes" within the walls of Gut Marienheim.)

The foregoing describes Haiser's positive eugenics.

His negative eugenics, in a broad sense included the general program of what the coming all-aryan revolution was going to do to the disadvantage of the "curs," but he also made specific biological suggestions. His basic position falls within the conventional eugenic framework, but was unusual in the outspoken emphasis that the increase of good genes dialectically required the decrease of bad, and that the latter could never be accomplished by a policy of laissez-faire or peaceful persuasion. Properly the unfit should not reproduce at all, and as one might expect Haiser considered them numerous. One could with an easy conscience pack off half the modern males into the desert, with no genetic loss whatever.[159] The low fertility of big cities, and especially that part of their population that frequented nightclubs (a sort of modern equivalent of the cloister) was all to the good. For such types "a certain rubber article" should be distributed free.[160] Likewise, as aforesaid, he favored leaving homosexuals uncured, so that they would die out.

But most of the unfit were all too addicted to breeding, and modern science and humanitarianism was too efficient in preserving all their offspring indiscriminately. Wrote Haiser in 1912:

> Admittedly we must care for the ill, but we would have far fewer of them if we were race-hygienists. . . . It is an incomparably greater cruelty . . . to create a life full of unhappiness than to extinguish the dim twilight glow of childish consciousness, if it bears within itself all indications that it is unfit for the struggles for existence. I do not say that I propose this system; I speak only theoretically [at least until our ethical

> sense has much changed]. . . . But we can demand and must demand the negative procedure, that one namely in quite clear cases at least passivly refrain and let nature decide, as in former times.[161]

But postwar, his opinions were harsher:

> Enemies of [ascending] life are for example also those altruists who indeed believe in no God of love-thy-neighbor, but not thereby less in altruism and the care, preservation, and reproduction of all the sick, inferior and degenerated as the highest moral attainment of the so-called "modern" world. . . . Whoever raises up sick children with such expertise, as modern science brings to hand, is not only an enemy of ascending life, but also the greatest enemy of true love of one's neighbor. Later generations, which suffer being broken down under the burden of sicknesses of all kinds, will one day only curse our . . . "progressive" scientific institutes and artificial infant care.[162]

> Every species procreates waste examples, but under natural conditions they perish; man however . . . preserves exactly the weakest examples at any price while he lets the healthy go to ruin in the harshest struggle for existence. That is counter-selection. A people is healthy if it has <u>many</u> children and <u>unrestricted</u> infant mortality. But among us it is the other way round, we have <u>few</u> children and prevent infant mortality.[163]

Haiser's <u>Freimaurer</u> of 1924 gave especial attention to negative eugenics. He went even so far as to say death was not all that terrible;

> Achilles chose a short but famous life, rather than growing old as a comfortable philistine. . . . If many were aware that there awaited them a sad old age in poverty, or a series of hospital operations, they would not fear war, disease or murder so much.[164]

He repeated his earlier views on the over-attention to preservation of unfit offspring, and added suggestions to prevent their being born. If the family tree indicated that the offspring of an individual were likely to have grave afflictions, as tuberculosis, malaria, mental disease and sexual perversions,

reproduction should be forbidden. Marriage could be allowed only if both parties were hereditarily defective, and both suffered themselves to be sterilized beforehand by X-rays. Haiser was aghast at the way sodomitical perverts increased, and the way modern civilization, rather than racial defects, were held to blame for it. Individuals with relatively "permissible" abnormalities need but be rendered "unfruitful," but in cases of behavior contrary to law and morals, "quite impotent." Early appearance of the sexual drive, combined with masturbation, was a sign to make that person "incapable of propagation, as quickly as possible."[165] The doctors themselves (especially the Jewish ones) did very good business out of preserving the unfit, and had made it synonymous with "medical science" itself. He therefore strongly advised that the medical profession be transformed into a state service, with a miltiary character, which could if need be "act against the patient's wishes," for it would represent "only the interest of the species" in deciding whether certain individuals should propagate, or survive at all. We should "tear off the mask that humanitarianism and Jewry put over conscience."[166] Haiser did not advocate in so many words massacres of the grown-up racially inferior, save perhaps to some an extent as byproduct of the introduction of the all-Aryan dictatorship. But clearly there was nothing in Hitler's eugenic or racial measures that would have shocked him.

In his racialism and eugenics, it must be admitted that crude and clownish as he was, Haiser in important ways was more profound and had more integrity than those who were concerned for their respectability and scholarly reputations. The race hygienists wanted to claim a special inherent and inalienable virtue for their own side, based upon an up-to-date materialistic and "scientific" view of man, but in large part they were still late-Victorian bourgeois, who did not want to discard all its pretensions to decency and humanitarianism. Eugenics of a rough but practical kind had after all been well known to the pre-industrial world:

> The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, [had] not separated themselves from the people of the lands doing according to their abominations. . . . For they have taken of their daughters for themselves . . . so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the peoples of those lands; yea, the hand of the rulers and the princes hath been chief in this trespass. . . . O our God . . . Thou hast commanded . . . give not your daughters unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons . . . that ye may be strong, and eat the good of the land, and leave it as an inheritance to your children for ever. . . . Now therefore let us make a covenant with our God, to put away all foreign wives, and such as are born of them. . . . And they made an end with all the men that had taken strange wives.[167]

However, most eugenicists did not care to see the continuity. They desired so to speak to go off on a naturalistic debauch, without taking off their "idealistic" frock coats and wing collars. Haiser however had sufficient acuteness, and indifference to what people thought of him, to point out, as the German proverb says, that he who says A must also say B. If one was to take a naturalistic view of mankind, and see

the chief value of an individual in his genes, was not polygamy justified, even called for? and where was the immorality of negative eugenics, up to and including making sure that the unift perished? And considering how racial definitions somehow always placed the person who drew them up in the top category, it is refreshing to encounter a writer who openly calls them subjective, disdaining the rigamarole of cephalic indexes and statistics. Haiser was basically no more snobbish and insolent than other racialists and eugenicists, and at least not a hypocrite. Fritz Lenz unwittingly paid him a compliment, and uttered a judgment on his own school, when he complained, in a review of one of Haiser's books, that this sort of thing would make people think "that the whole race-swindle in the end amounts to the wishful thinking of reactionaries."[168]

Notes to Chapter XI

[1]Racialism as an international ideology has not yet received comprehensive treatment. For the United States it has been well summed up by Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of an Idea in America (Dallas: 1963). For other countries, and for racialism in the western world as a whole, this has not yet been done. For the French- and English-speaking world, representative authors on the question, especially the eugenic side, are: W. C. Dampier Whetham and C. D. Whetham, Heredity and Society (London: 1912); Francis Galton, Hereditary Genius (London: 1869); Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race (New York: 1916); John Berry Haycraft, Darwinism and Race Progress (New York: 1895); S. J. Holmes, The Trend of the Race (New York: 1921); William McDougall, Is America Safe for Democracy? (New York: 1921); P. B. Popenoe and R. H. Johnson, Applied Eugenics (New York: 1918); T. L. Stoddard, The Revolt against Civilization: The Menace of the Under Man (New York: 1922); Arthur de Gobineau, Essay on the Inequality of Human Races (1855); Georges Vacher de Lapouge, "The Fundamental Principles of Anthropo-Sociology," Journal of Political Economy, VI (1897), pp. 54-92.

[2]FM, p. 29.

[3]Including such remarks as "Diamond is quartz having become fully self-conscious."

[4]H. A. L. Fisher, History of Europe (London: 1936), p. 96.

[5]Tenney Frank, "Race Mixture in the Roman Empire," AHR, XXI, pp. 689-708.

[6]Skulls with a breadth-length ratio of less than 0.8 are called dolichocephalic, of more than that brachycephalic; 0.8 exactly is called mesocephalic.

[7]See Georges Vacher de Lapouge, "Fundamental Principles of Anthropo-Sociology," Journal of Political Economy, VI (1897), pp. 54-92; Carlos C. Closson, "Social Selection," pp. 449-66. Lapouge went so far as to claim that university professors had lower cephalic indexes (i.e., were more Nordic) than magistrates, who as everyone knew were drawn from law graduates who could not find a better job.

[8]William McDougall, Is America Safe for Democracy? (New York: 1921), Appendix v.

[9]S. M. Halford, "Dysgenic Tendencies," cited in McDougall, op. cit., p. 150.

[10]J. B. Haycraft, Darwinism and Race Progress (New York: 1895), pp. 54-83.

[11]He published a pamphlet on the subject in 1891, which was the first eugenic-darwinist work in German. It had been written five years earlier, but editors would not accept it. Hedwig Conrad-Martius, Utopian der Menschenzuechtung (Munich: 1955), p. 74.

[12]Wilhelm Schallmayer, Vererbung und Auslese (Jena: 1910), [2nd ed.], pp. 175-79.

[13]Ibid., pp. 422, 435-77, 227-27.

[14]Otto Ammon, Die Gesellschaftsordnung 3rd ed. (Jena: 1900), p. 12.

[15]Ibid., pp. 29, 87-91, 190.

[16]Ibid., pp. 33, 78-82.

[17]Ibid, pp. 144-47.

[18]Schallmayer, Vererbung und Auslese, pp. 371 ff.

[19]Houston Stewart Chamberlain, The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century (New York: 1911), II, 207-208.

[20]Ibid., I, pp. 290, 526, 576-78.

[21]Ibid., I, pp. 160-76.

[22]Yet he was well-informed on the subject, having a doctorate in botany from the University of Vienna. It is worth noting that while natural science is often optimistically imagined as making people less bigoted (and by implication, more liberal) many of the German-speaking radical right besides Chamberlain had a natural-science university education: Willibald Hentschel and Haiser in Chemistry, Alfred Ploetz, Ludwig Woltmann, and Ludwig Wilser in Medicine, Schmidt-Gibichenfels in Physics, and Theodor Fritsch and Otto Ammon were engineers. Nor did many exceed in anti-Semitism Philipp Lenard, who had won the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1905.

[23]Chamberlain, op. cit., I, pp. 269, 271.

[24]Ibid., I, p. 537.

[25]Ibid., I, p. 283. See also I, pp. 293-95.

[26]Ibid., I, p. 261.

[27]Ibid., I, p. 533.

[28]Ibid., I, pp. 528-34.

[29]Ibid., II, pp. 208-209.

[30]Ibid., I, pp. 290, 518-22.

[31]Ibid., II, p. 372.

[32]Ibid., I, pp. 387-90.

[33]Ibid., II, pp. 24-30, 198-110.

[34]Ibid., I, p. 252.

[35]Ibid., I, pp. 202-211.

[36]Ibid., I, PP. 257, 498-511; II, p. 197.

[37]Ibid., I, pp. 538-39; II, pp. 197-96.

[38]Ibid., I, pp. 379-386, 396.

[39]Wilfried Daim, Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab (Munich: 1958), p. 273.

[40]Ibid., pp. 88-90.

[41]Ibid., pp. 55, 69, 177-81.

[42]Ibid., p. 139.

[43]Lanz, Ostara-Heft #18 (December 1907), cited in Daim, op. cit., p. 114.

[44]Daim, op. cit., p. 115.

[45]Ibid., p. 91.

[46]Ibid., p. 265.

[47]Ibid., p. 125.

[48]Ibid., p. 183.

[49]Ibid., p. 181.

[50]Ibid., pp. 184 ff., 137, 156-77.

[51]Ibid., p. 264.

[52]Ibid., pp. 267-68.

[53]Ibid., p. 160. See also pp. 22-23, 165, 156, 188.

[54]Ibid., pp. 56-64.

[55]Ibid., pp. 83-85; Mosse, Crisis of German Ideology, pp. 93-94.

[56]Daim, op. cit., pp. 92-97, 260.

[57]Ibid., p. 120.

[58]W. A. Iggers, Karl Kraus (The Hague: 1967), p. 179.

[59]Daim, op. cit., pp. 20-34, 191-210, 138.

[60]Max Brod, Steitbares Leben (Munich: 1960), pp. 326-29.

[61]Christian von Ehrenfels, Sexualethik (Wiesbaden: 1907), pp. 68-71, 82-97.

[62]E. G. in Schallmeyer, op. cit., pp. 411-414. The chief works of Hentschel were Mittgart (Leipzig: 1904); Varuna (3rd ed.), (Leipzig: 1920); Vom aufsteigenden Leben (Leipzig: 1910). See also Conrad-Martius, op. cit., pp. 78-79; Mosse, Crisis, pp. 112-17.

[63]AfRGB XV (1923), pp. 66-67.

[64]Mosse, Crisis, pp. 208-209, 302-303.

[65]H. F. K. Günther, The Racial Elements of European History (London: 1927), p. 51.

[66]Ibid., pp. 239-52.

[67]Ibid., p. 219.

[68]Ibid., pp. 233-38, 262-68; Günther, Adel und Rasse (Munich: 1927), pp. 79-117.

[69]Günther, Racial Elements, pp. 50, 96 ff, 111-13.

[70]Ibid., pp. 66-67.

[71]Günther, Adel und Rasse, pp. 102, 108.

[72]F. Lenz, Review of Gunther, Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes (3rd ed.), AfRGB, XVI (1924), pp. 99-111.

[73]F. Lenz, in Bauer, Lenz and Fischer, Human Heredity (New York: 1931), p. 655.

[74]F. Lenz, op. cit., p. 656.

[75]Ibid., pp. 660-61.

[76]Ibid., pp. 646-67, 666, 639-40.

[77]Ibid., p. 665.

[78]L. F. Clauss, Die Nordische Seele, 7th ed. (Munich: 1939).

[79]F. Lenz, op. cit., pp. 667-68.

[80]Ibid., pp. 668-76.

[81]Ibid., pp. 678-81.

[82]Ibid., pp. 601-605, 688-90.

[83]Ibid., pp. 623-66.

[84]Ibid., p. 685.

[85]Cited in Kolnai, War Against the West, p. 447.

[86]Ibid., pp. 191, 315-16, 478, 487.

[87]FH, "Rassenaristokrat und Menschenköter," OR, January 31, 1919, p. 3.

[88]AI, pp. 43, 45-46.

[89]Krisis, p. 70; "Mittelstand und Nationalbewusstein," Deutsches Volksblatt, October 14, 1909; AI, pp. 61, 97 ff.; JF, p. 11.

[90]SKL, p. 55.

[91]FH, "Der Wille zur Macht," PAM, XVI, pp. 488-89.

[92]Anfang, p. 148; "Trieb und Hemmung im Menschen- und Völker-Leben," PAM, XVIII, pp. 261-65.

[93]JF, p. 84.

[94]JF, pp. 29, 101 ff.

[95]FH, "Die ostische Rasse," Michel, January 22, 1923, pp. 3-4.

[96]FM, p. 76.

[97]FH, "Dillettantismus und Wissenshaft," PAM, XXI, p. 178.

[98]SKL, p. 36.

[99]FH, "Japan und die Rechtskultur," PAM, XIX, pp. 329-332; AI, p. 80.

[100]JF, pp. 108, 130; MB, pp. 38, 72-74, 88; "Japan . . . ," PAM, XIX, p. 329.

[101]Anfang, pp. 68, 72, 74.

[102]JF, p. 75.

[103]MB, p. 9; "Judentum und Philistertum," Das Hakenkreuz, I, pp. 83-84; SKL, p. 38.

[104]JF, pp. 81-82.

[105]JF, p. 108; "Rasse und Politik," in FM, p. 129.

[106]FM, p. 75.

[107]FH, "Die ostische Rasse," Michel, January 22, 1923, p. 3.

[108]FH, "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, p. 7.

[109]AI, p. 71.

[110]FH, Review of F. Lenz, Menschliche Auslese und Rassenhygiene, PAM, XXI, p. 238.

[111]FM, p. 73.

[112]The word Zucht and its derivatives conveys in German the same ambiguous combination of heredity and environment as in the English expressions "good breeding," and "well-bred."

[113]FH, "Der Wille zur Macht," PAM, XVI, p. 490.

[114]FH, Review of Lenz, Menschliche Auslese. . . , PAM, XXI, p. 238.

[115]Ibid., p. 239.

[116]Anfang, pp. 130-31.

[117]FH, "Geist und Judentum," PAM, XXI, p. 33.

[118]FH, "Die ostische Rasse," Michel, January 22, 1923, p. 3; FM, pp. 48-49.

[119]FM, p. 31.

[120]FH, "Der Staat als Sittliches Bewusstsein," PAM, XV, pp. 534-35.

[121]JF, pp. 48, 51; FM, p. 101.

[122]Krisis, pp. 19-20, 22.

[123]Krisis, p. 10.

[124]Krisis, p. 23; AI, p. 62; "Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben," PAM, XV, pp. 421-26.

[125]GFA, 2nd ed., p. 172.

[126]Anfang, pp. 90-92.

[127]FH, "Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben," PAM, XV, p. 424.

[128]FH, "Biologische und liberale Rechtsauffassung," Michel, September 2, 1923, pp. 2-3.

[129]Krisis, p. 47.

[130]FM, p. 66; "Ein Jünger Nietzsches?" Michel, November 18, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[131]JF, p. 51.

[132]JF, pp. 100-101.

[133]FH, "Erhalten, Schaffen und Vernichten," PAM, XXI, pp. 78-82.

[134]A character in Norse mythology.

[135]"Erhalten. . . ," PAM, XXI, pp. 78-81.

[136]Anfang, p. 101; JF, p. 96.

[137]UK, p. 169.

[138]A. Janik and S. Toulmin, Wittgenstein's Vienna (New York: 1973), pp. 71-73; Mosse, Crisis, p. 215; William M. Johnston, The Austrian Mind (Berkeley: 1972), pp. 159-62.

[139]FH, "Das maskulierte Weib," PAM, XVI, pp. 27-28.

[140]MB, p. 22.

[141]JF, p. 129.

[142]Krisis, p. 17.

[143]Anfang, p. 153.

[144]JF, p. 101.

[145]SKL, p. 61.

[146]Hans Peter Bleuel, Sex and Society in Nazi Germany (New York: 1974), pp. 1-29, 73-93.

[147]JF, p. 81.

[148]FM, p. 59; UK, pp. 265-77.

[149]Anfang, p. 91n.

[150]Anfang, p. 51.

[151]Anfang, pp. 93, 152.

[152]FM, p. 66.

[153]FM, loc. cit.

[154]JF, pp. 60-62.

[155]Anfang, p. 92.

[156]GFA, pp. 167-68.

[157]Anfang, p. 151.

[158]JF, p. 98.

[159]FH, "Bewegung des menschlichen Koerpers und ihre Rasseneigentumlichkeiten," PAM, XVIII, p. 417.

[160]UK, pp. 152-53.

[161]Krisis, p. 32.

[162]Anfang, p. 48.

[163]SKL, pp. 14-15.

[164]FM, p. 65.

[165]FM, pp. 63-64.

[166]FM, pp. 67-70. See also "Für und gegen Hentschels Mittgartplan," PAM, XVI, p. 165.

[167]Ezra 9:1, 2, 11, 12; 10:3, 14, 17.

[168]Lenz, Review of Haiser, UK, AfRGB, XII, pp. 490-93.

277

CHAPTER XII

FRANZ HAISER AND THE JEWS

Franz Haiser's anti-Semitism may logically be appended to his discussion of racialism and eugenics. But, although he would probably be the last to notice it, his anti-Semitism is really an obiter dicta among his thoughts, like a part designed to fit some other machine, and all his other opinions could stand as well without it. This awkwardness stems from his odd and probably unique hybridization of viewpoints, being essentially an elitist who imagined himself also as völkisch. As explained in an earlier chapter, anti-Semitism was necessarily a populist issue; by defining Jews as such as bad, one ipso facto defined non-Jews as such as good, or at least never as bad as Jews. Effective anti-Semitism required minimizing the failings, or even the diversities among non-Jews, and stressing instead that the Jews were to blame for all serious evils, and except for them things would have gone right.

Franz Haiser however always divided his fire, vituperating against the Jews as fiercely as any völkischer, yet time and again anti-climactically adding that the real culprit was the liberal open society, and the Jews only exploited its weaknesses. "Bugs stay out of clean homes."[1]

The Jew was only a parasite by nature, and it was pointless to be morally indignant that he took advantage of the opportunity that "Left-culture" gave him.[2] Anti-Semitic readers of Haiser must have experienced a constant disappointment and frustration, as passages of colorful and pungent Jew-baiting veer off into denunciations of capitalism, professors, Christianity, Spiesser, etc., and laments that "high-race antiquity" did things so much better. Haiser's anti-Semitism, like his other ideas, showed no significant change from his Aufruf of 1907 to his Moralbiologie of 1932, although after 1918 it was more frequent and more intense. As with most anti-Semitic authors, he did not cite any traumatic experiences with actual, concrete Jews. In his earliest pamphlet (written when he was a prosperous Rentner) he specified that he wrote "objectively" and not out of personal resentment:

> Up to now I have never experienced in my life the slightest unpleasantness from a Jew. I remember but one time a Jew picked a quarrel in genuine Hebrew fashion. I could however not blame him, and wrote him, that I must forgive his behavior, for this was a case of a specific racial peculiarity, for which I could not hold the individual responsible.[3]

As was usually the case, Haiser's hatred of the Jews was a projection of his own unhappiness, and a means of blaming it on someone other than himself.

Völkisch anti-Semitism was generally a dreary and monotonous product, and Haiser added nothing original or noteworthy to it. He attempted no systematic description of the "Jewish question" but only fired at them as targets

of opportunity, associating them with whatever evil of the modern world he happened to be discussing. He was as indifferent to consistency as to fairness, and often one accusation contradicted another. In certain passages he distinguished among categories of Jews: the old stock Jews (and more recently, the Zionists[4]) who strongly wished to remain a separate distinct people, were honest and worthy; the villain was the "emancipated" and mongrelized modern Jew, who tried to assimilate and push his way in everywhere.[5] Yet the Jews were more often described as one people throughout (although put together from the scrapings and leavings of every race[6]) and their success lay in having remained tenaciously true to their type.[7] They well appreciated the essential endothermy of civilization, and were careful not to let themselves be used up in warfare or creative work, but lived as parasites on the efforts of others.[8] They started and spread the corrosive skepticism and insincerity of modern life, but were too clever to take it seriously in respect to their own cause.[9] Yet they were also the very paradigm of the low and un-selfcontrolled modern type; far from being as reputed crafty and disciplined they wallowed in the idea of unlimited freedom.[10] They were diabolically clever, but also very foolishly had taken the "enlightened" side in helping to destroy the power of the church and the upper classes, for these, especially modern "atheist-Christianity," were actually their chief protectors.

Now they had no protection against the vengeance of the Volk.[11]

The Jews could only succeed by trickery, to which noble types would not stoop;[12] in war they were cowards and spies for the enemy,[13] and in spiritual matters utterly without honor.[14] They were accordingly prominent among the destroyers of the good old aristocratic values, and the advocates of the so-called modern enlightenment and progress. They had connived to promote capitalism, and also socialism.[15] They tried to stir up war between classes, and also between nations, especially those of superior race.[16] But some, hoping to avert Nordic vengeance, pushed the contrary vice of pacifism.[17] The Jews privily manipulated parliaments, the press, and avant-garde culture. They infiltrated science and scholarship, to use them as a means of gain, and were chief agents in making petty accumulation of facts rather than imaginative discoveries the only respectable academic end.[18] They even to Haiser's especial fury tried to appropriate Nietzsche.[19] Naturally they also promoted women's rights as part of their scheme of revenge; in perhaps his only original remark on the Jews, he declares that while normally the thought organs were above and the sexual parts below, the Jew thought with his sexual parts and begat with his intellect.[20]

But his sincerity and lack of artifice drove Haiser at times to admit virtues in Jews in certain respects. As

mentioned above, he cited with approval Otto Weininger's views on women, and regarded his Jewish ancestry as of no importance. Likewise he strongly approved of Spinoza's remark, "anyone has only as much right as he has power," whatever the author's race.[21] Most contradictory were remarks to the effect that compared to certain non-Jews, they were not really so bad, especially those in the neighborhood of Scheibbs. "Remarkably, even the Jew, whom I attack so ruthlessly, stands to me in a more friendly and understanding relationship than the Austrian Spiesser."[22] Since the Jew feels a threat to his world-rule, he at least argues on a spiritual plane, "but the Spiesser's highest wisdom is to be socially agreeable." Likewise, Jews compared well with "objective" and "impartial" intellectuals:

> Philistinism, stupefied with gabble about objectivity, is the most dangerous pest which our people has to meet; the philistine is--biologically speaking--a criminal, for attack is never a sin, the guilt lies in abandoning the defense. The Jew as attacker thus stands morally higher than the German intelligentsia-philistine.[23]

As for what to do about the Jews, Haiser generally lumped them with his other enemies, and rarely describes measures directed specifically against them. As with most social and moral problems, he ultimately left the matter to his hoped-for international Aryan counter-revolution. The wrong sort of people would then be deprived of property and power, barred from the most important types of education and employment, humilitated by caste restrictions, and at

least in some cases executed with appropriate barbarity. The victims would include capitalists, liberal professors, Jews, "upstarts," "freedom," "curs," and everyone else Haiser couldn't stand, which gave his venom rather a to-whom-it-may-concern quality. (A similar tone is to be found in Lanz-Liebenfels.) With his usual Catonian versatility, Haiser cites the Jewish question as a reason for international radical-right solidarity, especially with England. The Jews were by definition an international threat, and could not be countered on a purely national basis, any more than a gardener could clean out the vermin from his plot if his neighbors' remained infested. The English were beginning to recognize the Jewish danger, and the Germans should forget their recent enmity and clasp hands with them.[24]

But certainly when Haiser did get down to cases on the Jewish question, no one could accuse him of excessive humanitarianism. He himself reproached the other völkisch for not having the guts to treat them as in the old days. "We are frightened of employing open force against them, to render them unequal and without rights, as [did] our ancestors. . . ."[25] He specifically mentioned barring them from science and scholarship, which were German property,[26] and at one point says they should have no schools at all, even Jewish ones.[27] In one passage Haiser calls abortion and sterilization by X-rays conspiracies by Jewish doctors to exterminate Aryans, being especially directed at the prettiest

and racially best girls. Rather than permit it, the law should say, "Jew, if you want to stay here you must X-ray your testicles ten years, under penalty of a flogging."[28]

Yet when it came to overt anti-Jewish action in the here and now, Haiser too moderated his tone. After weighing the anti-Semitic pros and cons (itself odd fare for a Nazi journal, edited by Arthur Rosenberg) he declared that beyond a doubt Aryans had a right not only to defend themselves from Jewish aggression, but also to attack them directly, as one did vermin and microbes. However, a mark of the true aristocrat was self-control, and concealment of one's inner feelings until the appropriate moment. Therefore there ought to be no overt acts against Jews until "the day," when it would be legal.[29]

Notes to Chapter XII

[1]MB, p. 23.

[2]FH, "Erhalten, Schaffen und Vernichten," PAM, XXI, p. 79.

[3]Aufruf, p. 15.

[4]MB, p. 41.

[5]FM, p. 76: "Rassen-aristokrat und Menschenköter," OR, January 31, 1919, p. 3; "Sombart und die Juden," DE, VI, p. 422.

[6]MB, p. 11.

[7]FH, "Der deutscher Artgeist und ein deutscher der Gegenwart," DE, IX, p. 621.

[8]MB, p. 11.

[9]FH, "Geist und Judentum," PAM, XXI, p. 32.

[10]FH, "Trieb und Hemmung. . . ," PAM, XVIII, p. 263.

[11]MB, pp. 11, 21.

[12]FH, "Biologische Gesetze und seelische Gebote," WK, II, pp. 121-27.

[13]JF, p. 20.

[14]Anfang, p. 65.

[15]FH, "Rassenaristokrat. . . ," OR, January 31, 1919, p. 3.

[16]FH, Review of G. E. Winzer, Die Judenfrage in England, PAM, XIX, pp. 476-77.

[17]FH, "Ein Jünger Nietzsches?" Michel, November 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[18]FM, p. 100; MB, p. 20; "Das Relativitätsprinzip," PAM, XIX, pp. 495-502; "Deutschtum, Modernismus und Hebräertum," Hammer, X, pp. 263-67.

[19]FH, "Offener Brief an Karl Heckel," Michel, March 11, 1923, pp. 3-4.

[20]MB, p. 22.

[21]JF, p. 47; MB, p. 44. But elsewhere he sneers at some of Spinoza's views. UK, p. 207.

[22]JF, p. 26.

[23]FM, p. 27.

[24]FH, Reviews of G. E. Winzer, Die Judenfrage in England, in DE, V, p. 545 and PAM, XIX, pp. 476-77.

[25]FH, "Antwort auf Porods Angriffe," Michel, June 7, 1925, p. 3.

[26]JF, pp. 48-49.

[27]FM, p. 89.

[28]FM, p. 91.

[29]FH, "Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung," Der Weltkampf, II, PP. 3-4, 8.

286

CHAPTER XII

THE REVOLT OF THE MASTERS

> You common cry of curs! Whose breath I hate
> As reek o' the rotten fens. . . .
> Let every feeble rumor shake your hearts!
> . . .Have the power still to banish your defenders;
> till at length
> Your ignorance . . . deliver you as most
> Abated captives to some nation,
> That won you without blows! Despising
> For you, the city, thus I turn my back:
> There is a world elsewhere.
>
> --Shakespeare, Coriolanus

Franz Haiser was in agreement with the rest of the German-speaking radical right of the 1920's on the unworthiness of the prevailing liberal and democratic order, and the need to replace it by a more authoritarian regime. But as to what form the new order would take, and who should gain what benefits from it, the sage of Scheibbs stood alone. Most of the radical right were also German nationalists, and viewed the end of liberalism and democracy as complementary to their people's regeneration; by this they usually understood a stronger sense of community, and an increase in national prosperity and power, and probably also territory. Their field of concern was usually the whole Volk, excepting only the Jews and the incorrigible left-wingers. As discussed in a previous chapter, nationalism inevitably

has a populist and anti-elitist bias. To claim that all Germans as such were superior to non-Germans, made it awkward to argue at the same time that certain Germans were superior to their compatriots, especially on such subtle grounds as "spiritual" preeminence. Therefore the elitism so congenial to the radical right (including many of the völkisch) never sat altogether comfortably with nationalism.

We find that most of the non-völkisch elitists--such as Jung, Spengler and the Tat-circle--were also nationalists (if not so crude and blatant in this respect as the Nazis or ADV). But they were not eager to explore the relation of the two concepts. Commonly they contented themselves with saying that of course the elite of a regenerated Volk should be recruited from all classes of the people. However, who ought to be excluded, or other questions in which there might be conflict between the elite and the mass, were not issues that they cared to discuss.

But Franz Haiser was too sincere and consistent in his elitism to reconcile it with nationalism. Taking his works as a whole, clearly his internationalism and his elitism were complementary, like the tension and compression members of a truss, and nothing more was needed--indeed was undesirable--to provide a strong and stable ideological structure. However, he could not maintain this position consistently. For one thing, however hard he tried to be a philosopher, he had a homeland too. Also one cannot help

thinking that despite his professed disdain for popularity, he inwardly yearned to have more reputation and influence among his fellow "new-nationals." Therefore we find him conceding that the Germans had special virtues, or at least a greater elite-potential than other peoples, and a great world-historical role to play. Likewise he recognized the reality of patriotism in other countries, and its particular strength in the elements most promising as recruits for the new radical-right master-caste.

Therefore, Haiser attempted to establish that his projected elite could somehow reconcile these loyalties, and be both national and international at once. In the process he mitigated his ususal outspoken savagery and self-righteousness, and used arguments of practicality and common sense. But from Haiser's mouth, these were an instant giveaway. His attempts to compromise internationalist elitism and national patriotism were the most ambivalent and contradictory aspect of his entire corpus.

However, save for the faintheartedness of his nationalism, Haiser's enthusiasm for a secret, select few was hardly unique. As noted in an earlier chapter, the gebildete Stände always had a weakness for visions of very clever little cliques managing things from behind the scenes. After World War I, confronted by civic responsibilities for which they were quite unprepared, the idea became even more attractive. It is revealing how many of the radical right

groups called themselves "Orders" on the model of the Jesuits and Templars, such as the Germanen-Orden of Munich (a precursor of the NSDAP), Lanz-Liebenfels' "Order of the New Temple," and the "Young-German Order" of Arthur Mahraun, which attained perhaps 100,000 members. An illustrative effusion of this affectation was

> A silent host is arming here, known to none. To each one is assigned the task, the object suited to his peculiar character. The men of the Circle find one another everywhere. Their neighbors know nothing of them; yet they are themselves well aware of their mission.[1]

Closely connected with the idea of a secret elite was a susceptibility to apocalyptic visions of deliverance, with some resemblance to those of religious sectaries of former ages. (Indeed, the title of Möller van den Brueck's The Third Reich was taken from Joachim of Flora.) It became a commonplace that the current stage of history was played out, and ripe for the revenge of destiny. Its best known expression was Oswald Spengler's Decline of the West. Apocalyptic visions almost inevitably suggest secret more or less revolutionary elites to bring them about, or at least to build the new age out of the chaos following the destruction of theold. From the twelfth through the seventeenth centuries governments commonly assumed apocalyptic sects were cells of conspiracy and subversion, frequently with reason.[2]

Worth mentioning in this connection is the Deutsche Gemeinschaft of Austria, on which Franz Haiser may have had

some influence. Haiser's scheme of a secret league of all the men of good race and Geist, on the model of the Freemasons (especially elaborated in his Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer) bore considerable similarity to the DG in its organization, ideology and goals. Benno Imendoerffer, an old friend of Haiser's, was one of its leading figures. He reviewed Freimaurer enthusiastically in the Mitteilungen des Deutschen Klubs, and (as noted in an earlier chapter) secured invitations for Haiser to speak before that organization, a prominent forum for his views. One author calls Haiser "one of the spiritual fathers of the DG."[3] However, Haiser himself apparently never belonged to it, and he does not mention it anywhere in his works.

Our subject himself first suggested a radical-right secret elite in 1912[4] and for the remainder of his writing life it was never far from his thoughts. He took no practical steps toward forming one, but had great confidence that, given sufficient determination, the project would be victorious. Critics might say that he was

> a utopian. One can't turn back the wheel of time. . . . I know these slogans well enough, one hears them from educated as from uneducated. The whole world has learned them by heart and rattles them off as children the catechism. . . . [But] the will moves mountains and has always moved them, we see that best in the Jewish world-domination. What is utopia? Something impossible of accomplishment, we say. So? Didn't the spirit of Christianity seem to the Romans as a senseless and never workable idea, as a utopia? Exactly so stands socialism today, which our ancestors considered utopian and so didn't fear it. In life we stand up against an unalterable destiny only if a great counter-will is lacking.[5]

As we might expect, Haiser abominated anything smacking of popular appeal or recruitment. He wanted a secret league with a "military structure," as he supposed the Freemasons to have. As the latter had privily insinuated the whole complex of "left-culture" into a dominant position, so would the new group for "right-culture," and only reveal itself publicly when the time came to take full power. He was however emphatic that it must be a revolutionary body, owing nothing to existing institutions or interests. He explicitly repudiated the present so-called right wing, which had become

> mere petty conservatives, unknowing Junkers, flattering tame and fawning monarchists, saccharine and hypocritical clericals, and so forth.[7]

Obviously it had been no match for the forces of left-culture. The decline of clericalism however favored the rise of a strong and genuine radical right, which

> fastens far more back upon ancient and heathen thought-forms, as it did in the time of the Renaissance. . . . There arises a truly inspired and strong-willed master-man, there comes into being a radical right, a right-in-itself, which does not paper over the frightful harshness of the old-aristocratic world order either with Christianity or royal paternalism, but builds only on biological principles, [and] openly, sincerely, and without pretense presents it to the crowd.[8]

Like many of the radical right, Haiser sneered that the traditional so-called left ("the liberal schoolmasters") had become tired and timid, and the real radicals and progressives were now on the opposite side.

> We counter-masons are proud to be called "reactionaries" by the Jew-press, for what today still calls itself

> progressive, liberal, freethinking or democratic is already sinking with the rays of the setting sun of an exhausted development.[9]

Accordingly, Haiser insisted that the new elite would have to be recruited with utter indifference to present social ranks. This notion was commonplace among German-speaking elitists of the 1920's, but as usual the sage of Scheibbs added a special spice of crudity all his own. The present social order, he fulminated

> lets the racially inferior rise but thrusts down the noble race. . . . It is to be broken only by a revolution on a racial basis, a blue revolution, thus an emancipation of the Aryan warrior race. Class, titles, and Bildung here matter not at all, for the last remains of our noble-race are now to be met with everywhere, in the lowest as in the highest layers of the people. The man of noble race in the lower classes must come to the conviction: I am quite something else, I am more than the mob of my environment, I belong in the master caste! And the man of noble race in the upper classes must return to his master-morality and confidently say: I am more than the rich curs in my environment, who belong in the lowest mob.[10]

As a source of recruits, Haiser was particularly attracted to youth, especially university students. It so happened that for various reasons German and Austrian middle-class youth of the 1920's was a highly alienated group,[11] and very susceptible to radical right propaganda. Radical right publications and organizations were fond of prating that youth would lead the way to regeneration, notably Hans Zehrer's Tat.[12] However, only the NSDAP was able to make significant practical use of the younger generations' discontent.

Haiser's acclamation of the radical right revolutionary

potential of youth was mostly conventional, although naturally harnessed to his particular crotchets. He addressed two manifestoes entitled "Students!" to them, in which inter alia he exhorted them not to sell out their youthful idealism for the sake of philistine occupational success, nor to drink beer.[13] He thought students especially valuable because they had not yet been corrupted by liberal orthodoxy, and could see through its nonsense of human rights and "objectivity."[14] In an article in a well-known newspaper, Haiser especially commended Austrian students for defending Aryan Deutschtum so much better than their professors. The students, he warned the politicians, were determined that liberalism must be annihilated. As in 1848 higher education was the point of departure for one transformation of civilization, he hoped it would be again for a counter-movement. "Youth, do it better! Away with the old Spiessbürger liberal thickskulls!"[15] In his most emphatic pronouncement in this area, Haiser denounced the way that the timid bourgeoisie complained that the violent tactics of "national socialist youth" were unproductive and self-defeating.

> Only radicalism can save us Germans. If there is a lack of mature, prudent and energetic men who know how to manage things, obviously they slide into the hands of youth, for the desperate condition of the fatherland cries out for deeds! We Germans need men with boiling blood not muck in their veins. So I say, who am no youngster, but a man of fifty-three! [16]

But as to how the new elite, once recruited, would actually seize and exercise power, Haiser was vague and

inconsistent. Sometimes he spoke of its opportunity as arising from a Spenglerian Götterdämerung of all western civilization. He was fond of the medical image of a disease needing to proceed to its "crisis" before a cure was possible.[17] At his most lurid, he envisioned Christian and liberal civilization as collapsing of its own rottenness before a "new Prussianism" from the east. As in late-Roman days

> One will be able to buy western educated men on the slave-market, . . . [and] the schoolmasters who preach "equality" . . . will be doing maid's work for the children of their new masters. But we hope in the last hours of direst need a master-humanity will be born from the west's own womb, which will set up a properly differentiated world purged of the nonsense of love-thy-neighbor and equality.[18]

However, more frequently Haiser expected developments to be less shattering. His favorite image was of a "Sullan" revolution, in which the victorious "white" (or sometimes "blue") army would be rewarded with the spoils of the vanquished "curs," and constitute themselves as a new master-caste. Sometimes he visualized this force as being formed out of the "mercenaries" of the cowardly and frightened bourgeoisie, when they realized their strength and overthrew their masters.[19] However, Haiser also took pains to say that "propertied Nordics" should be assured that they had nothing to fear, and that indeed this was the only way to preserve their position.[20] On occasion, he could even address "my dear, good, stubborn bourgeois," that he should take the step of handing over to them in his own interest.[21]

Haiser however introduced serious confusion into his

schema by advocating with equal fervor Caesarean dictatorship, and an all-powerful state, which seem to contradict both his elitism and each other. His argument for Caesarism, standing alone, was quite clear and consistent. A Caesar--or as Haiser frankly calls him, a "tyrant"-- was necessary when a society's racial master-caste had died out, and only this drastic step could re-establish the vital "gradient of worth." This was the case in ancient Rome and Byzantium, and again in modern Europe.[22] However, in more optimistic moods (and sometimes in the next paragraph) Haiser assumed that there still existed, although scattered and unrecognized, sufficient remnants of good race to revive a master-caste. If the latter did exist, a dictatorship was unnecessary; if it did not, everything Haiser wrote was an empty dream.

At times our subject seems to envisage the restored master-caste as the tyrant's governing apparatus, but normally he noisily acclaimed his arbitrary power over everybody, the elite included. He was explicit that the Caesar was totally unlike constitutional monarchy:

> A people, that can no longer avail itself of a master-stratum, of a pure-race seed cell, can only be led by an absolute ruler. . . . A tyranny can also serve as a transitional form to a more permanent and again free constitution. To this end it is far more suitable than a monarchy, which founds itself on hereditary succession and thus must beg for the love of the people. The tyrant can rule quite ruthlessly . . . for on his death he leaves no inheritance, [is] perhaps hated by the people but esteemed by history. If he is a genuine autocrat, he is in fact proud of this hatred. . . . All thoughtful Germans hope for such a ruler.[23]

The very arbitrariness and "subjectivity" of tyranny were precisely among its chief merits. It was always the Köter who best took advantage of formal protections, whether of the constitution, Christianity, or "humanity," or for that matter property rights.[24]

Equally extraneous to his other political ideas was Haiser's exaltation of the state.

> The state in my view is a contrivance whose true purpose consists neither in mere ca e for the individual, nor for the collectivity, but far more in striving for an ideal, and therefore is concerned mostly with itself. Indeed all its organs and cells must be healthy and fit for life, but the state is not created for their sake, and far more must they subject themselves to is service, because it promises to become itself a new, powerful moral consciousness.[25]

The state was permitted, even obliged, to unlimited egotism, and if need be could sacrifice its individual subjects as did the ancient Aztecs.[26]

The idea was of course basically not new, being a cruder version of a frequent theme of German and especially Prussian political thinking. This line of thought, at least until the Hitler era, was not particularly characteristic of the radical right. Authors of the movement were often sharply critical of the existing government, for (as is too often overlooked) it had been the chief agent for establishing and protecting liberal trends. Haiser himself was usually scornful and abusive toward the government-- monarchial or republican-- that he was living under, and certainly never allowed that states that he disapproved of were entitled to such sweeping rights.

His admiration for "the state" was essentially a rhetorical flourish, probably suggested by his "endothermic" theory of civilization.

However, when he addressed himself to the conduct of the projected elite regime, and especially its attitude toward its inferiors, Haiser became far clearer and more consistent. He considered the chief task of politics to be the preservation of the proper "pathos of distance" between ruler and ruled, and in fact scarcely mentioned any other function of government. He always assumed that the new regime would come to power without the consent of the majority, and after civil strife, but left unspecified how much bloodshed and cruelty it would inflict. His most extreme remark on the subject was

> The Caesar knows how to handle men . . . as loyal obedient servants or as rebellious mob, who need halter, whip and hunger, and his heart won't feel a twinge of moral anxiety when he rides through a forest of crucified slaves and criminal gallows. Mob of Vienna . . . I call to you: the whole Prater will be stiff with crosses and gallows, if once a Sulla and his white army marches on us![27]

However, most of the time Haiser was not so bloodthirsty, and emphasized rather the symbolic and educative effects of brutality and ruthlessness. The elite must make it plain that it believes in its own right to rule, and despises equality and "human rights." "He who has conquered in theory has conquered in practice." Simply make it plain that any rebellion will be met with the whip, chains and even crucifixion, and the unruly slave will lose confidence while in the same proportion the masters will gain it.[28] More subtly, Haiser

specified that instead of the liberals' cherished "Freie Selbstbestimmung," the masses must be subjected to a "deprivation of the sense of self" [Entselbstung]:

> A few outstanding individuals should attain a sense of self, but the masses deprived of it [entselbstet]. A clever ruler of himself will know exactly whom he has to raise and whom to abase. He will create a new nobility and will have to thrust back into poverty and obscurity many in possession of undeserved wealth, as Sulla did. Indeed the modern west needs rest and peace, for the biological equilibrium, which consists in the [proper] relationship of strife to peace, is destroyed, there is too much strife, strife of all against all, because a unified . . . and stylized will is lacking. Rest can only be attained by a forceful power arising from chaos, and again that is only possible from strife.[29]

It was indeed a duty to subject to slavery those who were unfit for freedom, just as the other organs of the body must be ruled by the brain.[30] Anyway, the low-grade mass of mankind inwardly realized its inferiority to the noblest specimens, and really felt happiest when it was dominated by rulers it could sincerely respect.[31] To this Haiser added the incongruous argument, that a genuine racial elite, ruling in the manner of an old-fashioned patriarchy, was inherently milder and more popular than present-day liberal and capitalist regimes.

Haiser's most elaborate description of the working of the new elite is to be found in his Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer of 1924. The Freemasons were a favorite bogey of the völkisch (and of the radical right of other countries, notably France) as a diabolical left-wing international conspiracy, in cahoots of course with the Jews.[32] Haiser however was interested in

them only as an organizational model for his All-arischer Bund or "All-Aryan League," which is here abbreviated AAB.

The restored oligarchy was of course to be racially select, but Haiser emphazied that one must use subjective standards, for in the present mongrelized age there was scant correlation between an individual's essential spiritual qualities and his external attributes, whatever the "race-hygiene" experts tried to say.[33] The elite's first generation was to be selected by the simple factor of having taken part in the "white" counter-revolution. Once in power, it was of course to interbreed only with its racial equals. The sons of the elite would be educated in special boarding schools, from the age of seven, to "stylize" them into "Kshatriya" caste values. The institutions would stress discipline and the military virtues.[34] As to curriculum, Haiser repeated many of the standard patriotic and anti-intellectual complaints against Bildung, but was more conservative than most; he wanted to retain a role for classical languages, as monuments of "a high-race past of genuine Nordic spirit." Athletics and healthy outdoor life were always to be included.[35]

Haiser was adamant that individuals receive an education appropriate to their station in life, and especially that low-ranking persons not be overeducated (as was, he thought, a crying scandal in Germany and Austria) lest they become discontented.[36] It was also vital that at the topmost level the very few really creative minds, the "free spirits," be

distinguished from the mere "spiritual workers," as the modern world so damnably failed to do. The free spirits should of course have the positions and opportunities suitable for the full use of their gifts, in politics or in cultural life, while the spiritual workers might have no more than executant roles.[37] Indeed, Haiser allowed that even the educational system he suggested might not discover all the superior persons, and provided for a special process to find and promote [sic] "self-made men of the spirit," who had not earned the conventional diplomas. (The English epithet, ordinarily a favorite curse-word, is here used in a very favorable sense.)[38]

The reconstituted Kshatriya caste would of course have a monopoly of all important positions, in political and in cultural life, would be shielded from the indignity and spiritual exhaustion of Arbeit, and enjoy a special privilege of polygamy.[39] They would be exempt from the ordinary moral rules, but would be subject to a far more rigid caste ethos. Central to it would be the military virtues, for they must have a monopoly of military service.[40] Haiser accorded them a number of specific privileges and duties, showing a curious sense of proportion. Unlike nearly every other enthusiast for "artistocratic" or "knightly" social forms, Haiser insisted as bluntly as a Marxist that higher social and moral rank absolutely demanded greater wealth, and a hard-up Kshatriya was a contradiction in terms. Therefore a member of the elite in "underserved" poverty had to receive sufficient help to

maintain his gentility. On the other hand, "deserved" poverty must incur degradation from the caste, and Haiser expected that such unfortunates would then take the only honorable course.

> A true Kshatriya of Nordic antiquity burned himself and his family when slavery threatened him. That's genuine Kshatriya-style. Better the most frightful death, better the state be overthrown in anarchy, than let himself be enslaved by Köter![41]

It was equally important that the highest stratum should sharply mark itself off from other castes in its social life and manners. It was especially important to keep their distance from the commercial caste (Vaisya), associating with it only on business and with the greatest reserve. The children of those of the highest rank must attend the special boarding schools aforesaid. The Kshatriya must live in a particular part of town, and their dwellings should be in good taste, but luxury was to be forbidden. They must show the greatest moderation in eating, drinking and all amusements, and refrain from vulgar display. Excess was always self-evidently the mark of a low spirit, and sufficient cause to be expelled from the caste. Their clothes too must be suitably stylized, and the women strictly forbidden to wear silly fashions, of either domestic or foreign origin. The men might visit only suitably respectable places of amusement-- bars and coffeehouses were specifically excluded-- and they must leave by midnight.[42]

However, the major source of complications in Haiser's ideal of restored oligarchy was that it be international. His

strict and logically highly consistent racialism led him to think distinctions between nations as at best of secondary importance, and potentially calamitous, for the wars to which they led were highly dysgenic, and powerful agents for Köter-izing society. He therefore devoted much attention to the evils of modern warfare, and also to the analysis of foreign nations, particularly those which seemed promising radical right allies, or at any rate must not become enemies.

Haiser believed firmly that violent strife and contention was the only way to select "master-natures," and was essential to keep civilization from becoming decadent. In ancient times, he ingeniously argued, warfare had served this wholesome purpose, because the upper class did most of the fighting, and it was technologically primitive. They fought in heavy armor, which was expensive and scarce, and only strong, high-race individuals could bear it. ("Only Achilles could carry Ajax's shield.") Therefore only race-aristocrats fought in the front rank, yet their losses were relatively low, and furthermore were quickly replaced because of their privilege of polygamy.[43] In the high periods of classical antiquity, the upper classes were very jealous of their military monopoly, for if the common people defended the fatherland they would necessarily have to be granted-- or would take-- the rights of citizens. "Blood-tax brings master-right."[44] The extension of military service to the lower orders started the ancient world on the road to plebeian degeneration, as the example of Rome especially

showed.

In Europe, warfare had been conducted with proper aristocratic exclusiveness in the Middle Ages, but since then (and especially from the eighteenth century) the growth of universal military service and mob-society had proceeded hand in hand. Conscription was, although few saw this, in fact a socialist weapon.[45] Because of their dependence on armies recruited from the masses, both the winners and the losers of a modern war were forced to adopt measures of a democratic tendency.[46] Also, the development of mass armies had caused war to become technologically hypertrophied, a matter of mere dull mass and mechanism rather than a proving ground for the heroic few.[47] Worst of all, this hypertrophy had disastrous eugenic effects, for it killed off mostly the racially superior and left the Köter to breed. In 1912 Haiser noted prophetically that the progress of modern science-- perhaps in electronics-- would allow some degenerate but brainy weakling, by pressing a button from a well-protected bunker, to wipe out a whole army of the braves and the best.[48]

Such lamentations at the degeneration of warfare were of course not new with Haiser:

> Miniver loved the days of old
> When swords were bright and steeds were prancing;
> The vision of a warrior bold
> Would set him dancing.
>
> Miniver cursed the commonplace
> And eyed a khaki suit with loathing;
> He missed the medieval grace
> Of iron clothing.

A number of the barbaric vitalists of the twentieth century agreed with him, including Georges Sorel and D.H. Lawrence.[49]

Furthermore, Haiser imaginatively argued, modern liberalism and democracy by their nature encouraged aggression and imperialism because there were so many more appetites to satisfy.

> While previously it was merely a matter of dynastic interests, there now were added by degress the interests of the whole people; the businessman yearned for ever more money, the intelligentsia for more fame for the nation, the people for ever cheaper bread and a higher standard of living. It is clear, that all these demands were to be filled only at the cost of neighboring peoples. . . . Ruling assumes ruler and ruled; the sovereignty of the people without colonial slavery or wars of conquest is unthinkable.

Thus the USA needed to exploit negro slaves or European immigrants, England likewise its colonies, and as soon as France had proclaimed itself the land of liberty, equality, and fraternity it promptly fell on its German neighbors. Bolshevik Russia, formerly the granary of Europe but now menaced with famine, would soon invade other lands as conquering pan-Slavists.[50] Not the much-cursed "militarism" of the kings and professional soldiers, but the cowardly and hypocritical liberal system, kept the world in bloody turmoil.[51]

However, Haiser saw great possibilities in one modern technological advance, aviation. In the interwar period, military aviation aroused great interest from its supposed potential (which proved, in the event, to be much exaggerated) for destroying the vital centers of an enemy's power in one

sudden blow, especially by bombing his cities. A single attack, it was prophesied, would kill many civilians and throw the rest into hysteria, screaming for peace at any price.[52] The sage of Scheibbs pleasurably speculated that, with this power at their command, the aviators could reestablish a proper "Viking aristocracy," and a handful of aero-Kshatriya would be able to dominate the world, instead of a handful of financiers, as at present. He recommended that the AAB take particular pains to win over the Air Corps of the several nations.[53] In less fanciful passages, he declared that the modern power of the defensive made attack on the enemy's front lines prohibitively costly, and it was better to attack his cities and industries. Quintessentially Haiserian was the conceit that bombing would make war more eugenic, massacring cowardly Spiesser and war-profiteers at home while the soldiers were safe in bunkers.[54]

However, Haiser's most emphatic conclusion concerning military affairs, endlessly repeated, was that a restored master caste was impossible unless it alone bore arms.[55] This prompted the obvious objection, how could any one country safely forgo the use of mass armies as long as its neighbors did not? He occasionally indulged in the wishful thinking that an army selected from only the best elements would actually fight much better than a conscript one.[56] Most of the time he concluded, more logically, that high-race peoples simply must not fight each other.

This military obsession meant that Haiser, quite unlike most of his German and Austrian contemporaries, was chiefly interested in foreign lands insofar as they offered prospects for friendship and cooperation. By far the most important, in his eyes, was Great Britain. They were indisputably a high-race people, and vital for keeping the world from sliding into Köter-ized chaos. Conventionally, he admired the political skill of the British upper class[57] and denounced the hypocrisy of their imperialism, but had to admit that it was brilliantly successful.[58] The British would be indispensable to any successful radical right international, and might even lead it.[59] He was however anxious that increasing democratization, and particularly the trend of actually living up to their professions of freedom and humanitarianism, was sapping their strength as a world power.[60] Above all, there must be no war between Germans and British. A large part of the German and Austrian population shared this Anglophilism, including Hitler.[61]

Haiser also had much to say on the USA, but of a very mixed character. Sometimes he described it as a racial and moral sink, the worst place in the world for allowing the vilest upstarts to rise high.[62] He made the standard criticisms of its plutocracy, materialism, vulgarity, and cultural inferiority.[63] America's only approach to a higher form of society had been the old slave-holding south, whose "feudalism," he added, had been the best way to secure the negroes'

own happiness.[64] Haiser warmly praised early American racial legislation for its thorough anti-liberalism.[65] Indeed the victory of the north in 1865 had been a "world victory" for the liberal Köter.[66] It had "annihilated the last bulwark of the feudal world-order, and hereafter (outside of Russia) the age of exploitation by 'fitness' [Tüchtigkeit] had no more opposition."[67] Nowadays the USA tried to peddle its quack nostrum, democracy, as a panacea of all mankind.[68]

Applying his general theory of civilization to the United States, Haiser declared that its insistence on a high standard of living for everyone was disastrous, for it demanded an unceasing ferverish economic growth, which had ended, as was to be expected, in the depression.[69] Also the need to reestablish a "gradient of worth" had led to importing many low-grade foreign immigrants, which would lead to racial degeneration.[70] Not less significant was the attendant spiritual exhaustion, for Americans were as addicted to work as if it were morphine.[71] The negro, he noted ominously, had escaped this exhaustion by remaining beneath American Kultur, and stood to take over from the worn-out whites.[72]

Yet in spite of all his harsh remarks, Haiser was convinced that the USA remained a vital potential ally of the Germanic peoples and of the radical right. However Germans and Austrians might resent its race-treachery in the recent war, they must see that America's collapse as a power would probably lead to extermination of the Nordic race, for in the

absence of America (and Britain) the Germans would be left to defend it alone against the "Mongols."[73] Unfortunately, the Americans were but dully aware of this role. They possessed excellent raciallist thinkers, like Madison Grant, but did not heed them.

> Their country today marches at the front of race-research. Do they read so little the works of their own investigators, that they do not grasp the value and meaning of noble-race? . . . Do they not think to perserve, to make independent and to increase in numbers the last remains of Nordic race, their own ancestral and brother-race, which they have handed over to annihilation and impoverishment by Jews and the Köter-gang?[74]

In regard to building up an American branch of the "white international," Haiser suggested that the likeliest nucleus would be the Ku Klux Klan, and for good measure mentioned the "Nordic Aryan Publishing Co., 325 Failing Building, Portland, Oregon."[75] In the realm of tactics, he suggested that in America the negro and Chinese questions would be the strongest issues, corresponding to anti-Semitism in Europe.[76]

It was not unusual for Germans to contemplate the Anglo-Saxon peoples as potential racial and ideological allies, but some of Haiser's other notions about foreign nations were remarkably original. In some of his pre-1914 writings he praised the Czarist regime in Russia, and considered that its destruction would menace everyone. He fully admitted the general worthlessness of the present ruling clique,[77] but insisted that in Russia nothing but an iron fist would work. Certainly the revolutionary intelligentsia in Russia, under its "generals

in caftans" was the scum of the earth.[78] He went out of his way to say (and in 1926 he was to brag of his prescience) "if revolution is victorious in Russia, it seals Semitic alien rule on all Europe and America, and the so-called Aryan people will no longer belong to history."[79] Writing just before the First World War, he declared that an international aristocratic secret society should perhaps extend into Russia, especially for preventing war between men of high race.[80] (Haiser's post-Bolshevik mentions of Russia are however nearly always contemptuous.)[81]

An equally original Haiserian enthusiasm was for Japan. The deadly "freedomish" plague of modern civilization was spreading into the non-western world too, notably in China; its recently created "proletariat of education," like that of the western world, was the principal revolutionary ferment, and it was ominous how friendly this element was becoming to the Bolsheviks. The Japanese, with this threat on their doorstep, were the natural allies of right-culture; it had been colossally stupid of Kaiser Wilhelm's regime to fall for the "Yellow Peril" slogan, and frustrate Japan's annexations. Unlike other non-western nations, Japan had borrowed very judiciously from western ways, and especially had avoided upsetting its traditional patriarchal society. At the top of the social order were the warrior caste, or Samurai, then in order the learned men, officials, peasants and artisans, and last of all the businessmen, "just the reverse from among

ourselves." The old-fashioned upper stratum still monopolized power, under modern parliamentary trappings, and the Mikado and the capitalists took orders from them. The strength and prosperity of Japan stood out as an excellent example to other Asians for keeping their ancient "unfree" ways, and also to "the deathly ill sham-civilization" of the west, to whom Japan advertised the benefits of "reaction." Perhaps Japan was the nation that would take the lead in mobilizing the remaining high-race elements of all peoples to reverse the prevailing world-order.[82] He suggested at one point that Russia should be opened to radical right colonization after being divided between Germany, England and Japan.[83]

Concerning foreign nations other than the preceding, Haiser's remarks were few and perfunctory. France, a nation very much on the minds of postwar Germans, was scarcely ever mentioned. His only notable comment thereon was motivated by the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. Conformably to his principles, Haiser ridiculed accusations that France was playing power politics, for when was history composed of anything else? He concluded that the episode would unite the German people, and make France generally unpopular, just as German excesses had worked in earlier days.[84]

Haiser actually devoted more space and hostility to the Czechs than to the French, although here too he was remarkably detached and lacking in venom. He occasionally used Czechs as rhetorical examples of thickwittedness and racial

inferiority, but as in the case of the Jews said that they became a problem only because of liberal folly:

> the Czech question would have been . . . possible to solve, for one could simply abolish the Czech intelligentsia and property owners, confiscate their goods, and set in motion a massive deportation to Russia. Higher and secondary education, and newspaper offices, would be closed down, and the elementary school teachers most closely regulated. The Czech peasant would then become again a stalwart, industrious and docile member of the state, as he was before the onslaught of German liberalism.[85]

Besides the foregoing cases, Franz Haiser scarcely mentioned other foreign countries, and certainly did not think them of any importance.

However, what of the Germans and Austrians? Here Haiser's mind was very divided. He made many remarks about his fellow-countrymen, which taken in isolation were in the conventional patriotic _völkisch_ vein, but they were thrown off casually and unsystematically, and his internationalist elitism engaged far more of his attention. No reader could miss that Haiser knew his own mind better in regard to the British, and even the Japanese, than concerning those of his own speech and culture.

Haiser was often harsh and scolding towards his fellow-nationals, but this in itself was not unpatriotic. Among the radical right it was fairly frequent, and was considered "idealistic," a sign that one expected more from the Germans than from other peoples. For Haiser, the Germans were rotten with the characteristic vices of liberalism (a view often heard among the _völkisch_). They doted on _Freie_

Selbstbestimmung, were disobedient and ill-disciplined.[86] Thanks to an excess of "schoolmasterism" they were weak in instinct, relied too much on books, and the more they studied the less able they were to act.[87] They lacked cunning, and were easily duped by clever strangers, especially Jews, liberals and humanitarians.[88] More than any other people, they would benefit from a dictatorship.[89]

But Haiser also paid Deutschtum some compliments. To be sure, most of these were intended specifically for Reich-Germans, for he rarely had a good word for anything Austrian.[90] A number of times he praised "Prussian" traditions and institutions, to Austria's disadvantage.[91] We might also count as a concession to nationalism Haiser's occasional compliments to the crude, unsophisticated Volk, as having retained more "instinct" and "prejudice" than the intelligentsia.[92] He also made some conventional remarks in praise of German Kultur and Geist.[93]

But Haiser's greatest concession to patriotism was to allow that the German-speaking population ought to be a master-people. Writing under the Dual Monarchy, he lamented the Austro-Germans' lack of a national sense. To expect different nationalities to live side by side in equality and harmony was idiotic; one had to be master. The great modern misfortune of Austria was not, as commonly said, the defeat at Koeniggratz, the Hapsburg dynasty, clericalism, alcohol, or south-German lethargy, but the liberal dogmas of "humanity"

and "equal rights," especially universal suffrage.[94] The "new-nationals" should not be distracted by clericalism or other irrelevant issues, but concentrate on the destruction of liberalism. To this end he proposed a secret Freemason-like alliance, but in this instance on a German-national basis.[95]

After World War I Haiser ceased to speak of Austria as a power factor, but several times accorded a special role to "the Germans" in the forthcoming radical right revolution.

> Besides civil wars Europe also seems about to face a great contest among nations for supremacy. As within the states the threat of anarchy can be held off only by a new master caste, so finally will the eternal strife of peoples in Europe . . . be restrained only through a central will ruling all peoples. If a single power attained to world-domination, then could all demands of the right-cultural movement, especially the Jewish question, be easily dictatorially solved. . . . The German people dare not exclude itself from this struggle for world supremacy.[96]

His strongest remark to this effect was

> I show to the German people the countenance of the true God, the unfalsified heart of nature. All else is miserable parson- or demagogue-deceit. Thus and not otherwise is Creation! It knows only masters and servants. Germans, we have divine blood [Asenblut] in us! The choice does not stand free to us: it is high treason to Creation, if we continue to be servants.[97]

Thus far, Haiser was taking a standard völkisch position; but such a role for the German-speaking peoples was contradicted by other of his theses, indeed from two directions at once. The first objection was, that in the Haiserian system strife was a divine command, and "live and let live" a vile philosophy.[98] Therefore there had to be contending states

in the world. It was a garden of many different flowers, but each flower might see only its own color as true. One could not cherish one's own values without ipso facto despising those of others.[99] The existence of a single world state would be a signal that the last stages of decadence had arrived, that the same low level of Kötertum prevailed everywhere, and a universal tyrant was called for.[100] A German-dominated world-state, it would appear, would be as much a dead end as any other kind.

A further contradiction, both of Teutonic nationalism and the thesis that strife is the father of all things, was that in Haiser's opinion peace was essential. Modern warfare was so destructive, and especially to the remnants of noble-race, and its outcome so uncertain, that the strife of nations must cease.

> I cannot say too much to the völkisch, that a fight for a "place in the sun" is nonsense, for it decides nothing, and leads only to an eternal shoving back and forth of power, exterminating the noble race without solving the world-chaos. Could you continually hold on to absolute supremacy? If so, I am straightway the greatest of chauvinists and disdain any compromise. . . .[101]

He frankly admitted that his praise of strife and aversion to warfare posed a problem, but never got very far with a solution.[102]

Even more crushing to patriotic hopes was our subject's frequent claim that all national states, including apparently the Reich and Austria, had fallen into Köter hands, and had been rendered agents of harm, or at best had become meaningless

and obsolete. Any Volk movement had to be demagogically led; if a radical right regime tried to rule through nationalist sentiment, it too would be forced by the greed and vanity of the mob to seek and fight foreign enemies, even if they were of the same idealogy.[103] A true restored aristocracy should transcend nationalism.

> The differentiated [race-aristocrat] is in a connection with his own people, but he stands nearer to the aristocrats of a neighbor-people than to the under-race of his own people. His [standards of] good and evil tend to approach the corresponding values of an international highly-bred caste.[104]

> The day will come, when the remains of the noble-race men of all western lands will secretly assemble themselves, and tired of fruitless nationality-quarrels, will put race pride in the place of national pride. If the best in all states come to sole power, and elect from their ranks a ruler, the overripe western world, sinking into its rotten "freedom," will again be saved [as Rome was by the Caesars].[105]

In perhaps his most extreme remark on the subject, he averred that caste loyalty might in certain cases justify treason.

> Kritias and Coriolanus valued the well-being of their own caste higher than that of the fatherland; they connived even with their country's enemy, in order to break the domination of the demos. Love of the fatherland has its limits. . . . If the aristocracy, the germ-cell of the people, is in danger of being overcome by the mob, the question is justified, whether foreign domination is not to be preferred than the rule of one's own mob.[106]

However, Haiser attempted at times a sort of ideological menage a trois, whereby his projected elite could somehow be both national and international at once. He conceded that "admittedly we stand before a riddle, or rather a prize-competition, whose solution is not yet to hand," namely how to bring the various national radical right bodies under the same

tent, for they tended to be intensely patriotic. However, "the solution seems to be not too difficult," for it should be self-evident that "purification of one's country of unwanted foreign guests," could only be conducted on an international basis.[107] Using one of his favorite biological analogies, he argued that it was useless for any one gardener to wipe out the vermin on his plot of ground if the adjacent land remained infested.[108] The enemies of the Aryan race, and all true civilization, were organized into the "black, gold and red internationals," all of course fronts or allies of the Jewish international.[109] (Sometimes he included also the pacifists, without however assigning them a color.[110]) They were so strong that any efforts against them on a merely national basis were bound to fail.[111] Particularly, the liberal world-economy would never suffer a local exception to its rule to survive very long. The very hypertrophy of modern industrialism, and its abominable social consequences, had arisen because each nation feared to be weaker than its neighbors.[112] Therefore the nations of the western world should consider themselves as cells of the same organism, and fight together against their common infection,[113] even the French and Germans side by side.[114]

Up to this point, Haiser was not too far from the völkisch mainstream. The "international Jew" and other cosmopolitan bogeys were indeed part of their standard line. The journal in which appeared one of his most elaborate

(and best written) expositions of these views was Der Weltkampf, a Nazi publication (edited by Arthur Rosenberg) which directed itself precisely at the international Jewish menace. At this stage (1925) it was not a contradiction to völkisch nationalism to oppose a repetition of World War I (although one wonders how many of Haiser's readers wanted cooperation with France, even against the Jews). However, as usual the sage of Scheibbs was too sincere to call a diplomatic halt at this point, and in this same Weltkampf article went on to his standard diatribe on the world's non-Jewish problem, which apparently included most of the German-speaking population, the völkisch included:

> The warriors (Kshatriya-caste) of all peoples will finally clasp hands and say: why do we try to annihilate each other, to create a fat opportunity for Jews, racketeers, parsons, or red demagogues? We, the noble race, the healthiest, strongest, handsomest, bravest, are enlisted and wiped out in warfare while at home all the cur-types and racially inferior abundantly multiply! So turn the gun-muzzle around, towards the upper as the lower mob of our own fatherlands! . . . Warriors of all lands, clasp hands, do not conduct national but race politics![113]

> It is a near prospect, that we warriors, Kshatriya, officials, academics, in a word we Nationalen and Vaterlandisch clasp hands, not in order to betray our fatherlands, rather to take counsel together about common reforms. We cannot wage war any more, as long as the plague rules in our countries! Armistice! . . . We will broadcast the slogan to the masses, "who of you slaves is of our type and our race? let him come to us in the upper stratum, for he should be a master, not a servant! Arm yourselves, form your troops . . . with which we will overturn this miserable cur-rule by one common world-shock, and can make you prosperous

> bourgeois!" This program of the warrior caste of all lands should become "all-Aryan" and be spread partly through national groups (Hakenkreuzler, Britons, Ku Klux Klan, Fascists, the awakening Hungary, etc.)[116]

However, he could not consistently keep to this line of argument either, and contended that somehow the high-race elite could also remain within limits ready to fight its foreign counterparts:

> Finally, the aristocracy of the "white international" stem from a national soil, and should be as brothers only for the end of purifying their own peoples through common measures of everything foreign, and especially Jewry. It is thus really an international, which inscribes nationalism on its banner! If conflicts arise between the peoples, obviously they cease to act as brothers, and everyone stands with his nationality and conquers or dies with it. Only that can be the meaning of true aristocracy. Admittedly the white international and the fraternization of the upper strata of all peoples have yet another aim, which is not less important: only through common measures can we again compel to obedience the rebellious and discontented lower strata. We demand equally a new version of a patriarchy.

He added, that it was going too far in national conflicts to stir up revolution at home against high-race opponents, as the Germans had egged on the Irish against the English and the Russian revolutionaries against the Czars, if only because it invited retaliation in kind.[117] An appeal for sportsmanship, from Haiser's mouth, has of course a certain quaint humor of its own.

Given contradictory battle plans like these, one wonders how the "white international" would know its duty, and indeed how it could be recruited in the first place. But Haiser was as usual supremely confident of his expertise in this too, and full of clever suggestions. He acknowledged

the existence of radical right schools of thought apart from his own, but was confident that his projected AAB could use "all right-directed currents, all renewals, which . . . work against . . . the 'modern Zeitgeist.'"[118] Its essential issue always had to be "the chief disease of the western world: the de-aristocratization of peoples."[119] Depending on the country, it would be better tactics to stress different issues, such as anti-Semitism among Germans, anti-Bolshevism in Italy, and the colored races' threat in the U.S.A.[120] He was quite confident that his Bund could infiltrate other organizations and schools of thought with its own world-view or at least convert them into fellow-travelers, as the Freemasons had so successfully done on the left. Outstanding prospects in Austria were the Christian Socials, monarchists, nobility and Nazis.[121] The Nazis' social radicalism was a drawback, and would have to be sidetracked; even more serious was the clericalism and nostalgia for Christianity of the other groups. (The Anglo-Saxon nations were especially besotted with the latter.) As with small children, the AAB would have to be careful not to offend anyone's pet beliefs publicly, although of course it had to be uncompromisingly anti-Christian at heart.[122]

Haiser acknowledged that within the AAB there would be great potential for difference of opinion, on ideological and even more so on nationalist issues.[123] This was an overpowering reason for it to be secret and also hierarchical,

like the Freemasons. It had to be divided into a rank and file who must be kept in the dark about questions that might divide it, and a small group of "people in the know" (Wissenden), manipulating them from behind the scenes. Necessary institutions would be an "interior ministry" for each country, and a "foreign ministry," for international matters, their leadership being united only at the top. The AAB would very often have to talk out of both sides of its mouth at once,[124] and one part be kept in ignorance of what another was doing. Indeed, Haiser was often outspoken on the need to keep vital secrets from the ignorant and corrupt rabble. One of his accusations against democracy was that it made public the most vital master-plans, for all enemies to read.[125] He admitted that his own doctrines of Herrenmoral could be dangerous in the wrong hands, and should be reserved for the qualified few, as explosives were kept locked in the arsenal.[126] However, this consideration never limited Haiser's own Expressionistic outspokenness, or inspired him to publish less.

However, at the same time Haiser fretted that since the growth of right-cultural sentiments was so recent, as a world-view it was still in the process of development. He wrote in 1912, that it would be premature to require Bund members to swear allegiance to a program and a Grand Master.[127] Foruteen years later he was still complaining that whereas all the wicked people (ultra-montanes, Marxists, liberals,

Jews, etc.) had a fixed program and a canonical set of scriptures, the forces of right-culture as yet did not.[128]

But the nearer one came to concrete questions of organizing actual people in an actual group, and what they were to do, the more Haiser became olympian and/or comical. At times he seemed to think that the weaknesses of modern civilization had already called into existence the forces that would destroy it, and the radical right had only to pull down what was ready to fall. Therefore, he vaguely hinted, the AAB should encourage and publicize destructive forces of all kinds, in effect the same "politics of the worst" recommended ty Charles Maurras of the Action Française (although Haiser to all appearances did not learn anything from him.)[129] He added some detailed suggestions, which seemed to amount to advising that the members should each act like little Haisers in their immediate circle. Members of the Bund must be outspoken about all cases of corruption and incompetence in the liberal state, and use all the opportunities it provided for journalism and free speech. They should not worry about being gentlemanly or fair about it, for "in relation to us, Jews stand beyond good and evil!" As long as it was weak, the AAB would have to be sure of its ground in such denunciations, but "patience! In the measure that we increase in numbers, we can reveal ourselves more boldly and ruthlessly."[130] Another possibility was that "a dishonorable although rich tradesman can by our counter-lodge become so

persecuted and isolated, that he will be impoverished."[131] Along the same lines, he recommended countering the influence of the Jewish press by calumniating their subscribers, at least those who lived in small communities and only read them out of curiosity.[132]

Haiser also gave some specifics on recruitment. The basic technique was to throw into the crowd "the apple of Eris," inscribed "you are more than the rest!" He slyly added, it didn't matter if those who picked it up were really worth more, as long as discord and rebellion were encouraged, and one could cull out the undesirables once the master-caste was again at the helm. The AAB would have a wide net of secret agents, "in every city, village and factory" to espy master-race material and draw up lists of prospects.[133] He suggested that

> if one of our scouts has discovered someone who through race, character, and Geist is above average, we should send him a leaflet with the words, "do you like your environment, in which you must live, serve and obey? Look in the mirror and compare yourself with your surroundings in figure, body form, bearing, manners, character, spirit! If you are quite different you have race, pure blood, the others are as street-Köter. . . . You are the pure-bred, that the rebellious vindictive servants have harnessed to the plow. . . . You live now in a state which has made you a slave though by race you should be a lord. . . . If you would throw off your yoke and meet together with men of like mind, come at ____ in the coffeehouse ____ Password ____.
>
> One of our representatives will then meet and check out the man, but will be careful not to give his right name. If the fellow is no good, as often will happen, we must keep quiet about it.[134]

However, as to what he personally was going to do about forming such an organization, Haiser showed excellent

common sense; namely nothing. For those interested in an international anti-Semitic movement, he suggested simply a few addresses to whom they might write.[134] However, as to the formation of a secret "counter-masonic" lodge. Haiser contented himself with saying that those who understood "the eternal biological law," would grasp his point, and needed only a stiumulus from him.

> As soon as it becomes a question of secret bands, I must be silent. I know, that there are many such bands standing ready at home and abroad, but I do not know their names and structures. . . . Whoso wants to be a member must seek them out. I have so far held myself aloof from them, because I want a free hand as a writer over all monks' quarrels. I'll become a secret-leaguer if the closest centralization and the style which I seek are attained, for I hate petty localism [Kantonliwirtschaft] and autonomy-nonsense.[135]

All in all, as a salesman of elitism and counter-revolutionary conspiracy Franz Haiser reaches heights of silliness unusual even for him. Yet if we assess him in the context of Germany and Austria in the postwar period, he scarcely takes a prize in this respect. Haiser at least confined his visions of a super-clever elite to his publications, and otherwise lived out a stable (if not very neighborly) bourgeois existence in the town of Scheibbs. A similar conceit, combined with far less grasp of reality, was to be found among the leading politicians who assisted Hitler towards power, confident that clever men like themselves could always control such an ignorant demagogue; for instance General Kurt von Schleicher, who believed that he could split the Nazi Party for the sake of establishing the power of the

Reichswehr, and paid for it with a squalid Mafia death. International Aryan counterrevolution was scarcely less fanciful, and much safer.

Notes to Chapter XIII

[1]Friedrich Hielscher, Das Reich (Berlin: 1931).

[2]See Norman Kohn, The Pursuit of the Millenium.

[3]Wolfgang Rosar, Deutsche Gemeinschaft (Vienna: 1971), p. 38.

[4]Krisis, pp. 48-49.

[5]Skl, p. 12.

[6]Krisis, pp. 48-49.

[7]Skl, p. 12.

[8]Ibid.

[9]FM, p. 1. See aslo FM, p. 92; "Das geistige Leben der Völker. . . ," DE, III, pp. 355-56; "Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 8.

[10]Ibid.

[11]See Peter Loewenberg, "The Psychohistorical Origins of the Nazi Youth Cohort," AHR, LXXXVI, pp. 1457-1502; Laqueur, Young Germany.

[12]W. Struve, "Hans Zehrer as a Neoconservative Theorist," AHR, LXX, pp. 1035-57; Deak, op. cit., pp. 58, 80.

[13]FH, "Studenten!", Michel, February 24, 1924, pp. 2-3.

[14]FH, "Studenten!", in FM, pp. 137-38; FM, pp. 100-101.

[15]FH, "Spiessertum. . . ," DÖTZ, November 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[16]FH, "Radikalismus," SPB, October 1, 1924, p. 2. See also "Judentum und Philistertum," Das Hakenkreuz, I, pp. 83-84; JF, p. 131; MB, p. 35.

[17]FM, p. 27; MB, p. 42; "Apostelbriefe," PAM, XVI, p. 150.

[18]FH, "Christlich-asketischer Spiritismus," PAM, XX, p. 139.

[19]MB, pp. 79-80.

[20]JF, p. 60.

[21]FH, "Rasse und Politik," in FM, p. 133.

[22]FH, "Die Verketzerung. . . ," PAM, XIX, p. 266; Skl., pp. 65-66.

[23]Skl., p. 21. See also Ibid., p. 55; "Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 9; JF, p. 29; MB, p. 42; FM, p. 123.

[24]JF, p. 131.

[25]FH, work uncertain; cited on cover of PAM, XV, no. 12 (March 1917).

[26]FH, "Volksvertretung. . . ," DE, II, p. 567; JF, p. 93; "Der Staat also sittliches Bewusstsein," PAM, XV, pp. 526-538; Anfang, p. 70.

[27]JF, p. 60.

[28]FH, "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, p. 516.

[29]Skl., pp. 56-57.

[30]Skl., p. 31.

[31]JF, pp. 60, 115.

[32]For instance Frierich Wichtl's Weltfreimaurerei, Weltrevolution, Weltreupblik (Munich: 1919), a pamphlet considerably shallower and sillier than most of Haiser's works, went through ten editions in four years.

[33]FM, pp. 38, 45, 54-55, 86.

[34]FM, pp. 31-32, 39.

[35]FM, p. 44.

[36]FM, pp. 86-87.

[37]FM, pp. 35-36.

[38]FM, pp. 87-88.

[39]FM, pp. 56, 85.

[40]FM, pp. 84-85.

[41]FM, p. 86.

[42]FM, p. 84.

[43]FM, p. 69; JF, p. 80.

[44]JF, p. 79.

[45]Anfang, p. 16.

[46]FH, "Edelrasse," PAM, XXI, p. 42.

[47]FM, p. 16; GFA, pp. 30-33.

[48]Krisis, p. 20.

[49]Sorel, Reflections, pp. 23, 166-67; Bentley, Hero-Worship, p. 218.

[50]FH, "Adelskriege. . . ," Das Hakenkreuz, II, pp. 16-17.

[51]JF, p. 130; MB, p. 55; "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, pp. 7-8, 113; "Democratia Corrupta," SPB, March 15, 1925, p.1.

[52]See e.g., Constantine Fitzgibbons, The Winter of the Bombs (New York: 1957), pp. 3-9.

[53]FM, pp. 17, 117; JF, p. 30.

[54]FH, "Adelskriege. . . , Das Hakenkreuz, II, p. 18; MB, p. 86; JF, pp. 52-53.

[55]Krisis, p. 46; GFA, p. 39; Anfang, p. 62; Skl, pp. 25-26; FM, p. 71.

[56]FH, "Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 7; FM, pp. 84-85.

[57]Anfang, p. 84.

[58]FH, "Diplomatie," PAM, XV, p. 252; Anfang, pp. 42-43; "Houston Stewart Chamberlain und Werner Sombart," OR, May 20, 1911, in Krisis, p. 80.

[59]FH, "Edelrasse," PAM, XXI, pp. 42-43; Anfang, p. 161.

[60]JF, pp. 43, 71-72.

[61]Peter Fleming, Operation Sea Lion (New York: 1957), pp. 73, 77-79.

[62]FH, "Die subjektive Dehnbarkeit des Gesetzes," OR, September 30, 1917, p. 5.

[63]UK, pp. 184, 192; MB, p. 54; Anfang, p. 83; "An Amerika," Michel, January 14, 1923, pp. 2-3.

[64]FH, "Der nordamerikanische Bürgerkrieg and seine Folgen," Völkischer Beobachter, March 4/5, 1928; MB, p. 88.

[65]JF, pp. 34-35.

[66]FH, "Rasse und Politik," in FM, p. 131.

[67]MB, p. 55.

[68]FH, "Japan und die Rechtskultur," PAM, XIX, p. 331.

[69]MB, pp. 72-73.

[70]JF, pp. 40, 69; UK, pp. 188-94.

[71]Anfang, p. 60.

[72]JF, p. 36.

[73]JF, p. 53.

[74]FH, "An Amerika," Michel, January 14, 1923, pp. 2-3.

[75]FM, p. 121.

[76]FM, p. 5.

[77]Krisis, p. 22.

[78]AI, p. 99.

[79]AI, p. 101.

[80]UK, p. 127.

[81]He considered a Russian alliance perhaps tactically useful, but distasteful and dangerous. MB, p. 82; JF, pp. 54, 56.

[82]FH, "Japan und die Rechtskultur," PAM, XIX, pp. 329-32.

[83]FH, Review of Lenz, Menschliche Auslese, PAM, XXI, p. 237.

[84]FH, "Die Franzosen im Reiche," Michel, February 18, 1923, p. 3.

[85]FH, "Volksvertretung, , , ," DE, II, p. 570; UK, p. 214.

[86]Anfang, p. 104; "Sombart und die Juden," DE, VI, pp. 333-39., 421-27.

[87]Skl., p. 66.

[88]FH, "Diplomatie," PAM, XV, pp. 250-54, "Sombart und die Juden;" "Freibeuterhauptleute im Reiche des Geistes," PAM, XV, pp. 352-56; "Erhalten, Schaffen und Vernichten," PAM, XXI, pp. 78-82.

[89]JF, pp. 28, 101; "Rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, pp. 9-10.

[90]Fairly representative was this comment apropos of Austrian elections: "Nine-tenths of our political mass, of our men of the people, are freed slaves, curs, mestizos, morally and physically decadent," whose only political motive was revenge on "all that is powerful, great, noble and dominating." AI, p. 95.

[91]FH, "Angenehmes und unangenehmes Mensch," Nord-deutsche-Monatshefte, IV, pp. 68-72; "Das † † † Junkertum," PAM, XVII, pp. 62-68; "Der alte und der neue Freimaurer," OR, November 11, 1917, p. 3.

[92]See following chapter.

[93]FH, "Der deutsche Genius," Hammer, XIX, p. 446.

[94]FH, "Wo ist unser Beschützer?" OR, March 24, 1910, pp. 1-2; "Mittelstand und Nationalitätsbewusstsein," in Krisis, pp. 69-73; "Die Links-kultur. . . , " PAM, XII, pp. 413-21.

[95]Ibid., pp. 419-20.

[96]"Rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 8. See also FM, p. 71; MB, p. 51n.; "Byzantinismus und Alleinherrschaft," Michel, May 6, 1923, pp. 2-3; "Der deutsche Artgeist. . . ," DE, IX, p. 619.

[97]MB, p. 88.

[98]JF, p. 43; Anfang, p. 104.

[99]Anfang, p. 102.

[100]Anfang, p. 110.

[101]JF, p. 53.

[102]JF, pp. 78-79.

[103]FM, p. 121.

[104]Angang, p. 133.

[105]FH, "Die Verketzerung. . . ," PAM, XIX, pp. 266-67.

[106]Skl., pp. 70-71. See also JF, pp. 54, 122.

[107]Anfang, p. 133.

[108]FM, p. 121; JF, pp. 8-9; 56, 131; "Rechtskultureele Bewegung," WK, II, p. 4.

[109]Ibid., p. 5.

[110]JF, pp. 54, 61.

[111]JF, p. 122.

[112]FH, "Antwort auf Porods Angrille," Michel, June 7, 1925, p. 4.

[113]JF, pp. 22, 63-64, 131.

[114]FH, "Worte zu einer 'Berichtigung,'" SPB, May 15, 1923, pp. 8-9.

[115]FH, "Rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 5.

[116]FH, "Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer," Das Hakenkreuz, II, p. 7.

[117]Anfang, p. 133; JF, p. 64.

[118]FM, p. 2.

[119]FM, p. 4.

[120]FM, p. 122.

[121]Haiser was here probably referring specifically to the Austrian branch of the Nazis.

[122]FM, pp. 122-23, 103.

[123]FM, p. 117.

[124]FM, pp. 17, 19; JF, p. 56.

[125]FH, "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, p. 8; "Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben," PAM, XV, p. 423.

[126]Skl., p. 14.

[127]Krisis, p. 49.

[128]JF, p. 121.

[129]JF, p. 59; FM, p. 29.

[130]FM, pp. 82-84.

[131]FM, p. 85.

[132]FM, p. 96.

[133]JF, p. 60.

[134]FM, p. 121. These were: Theodore Fritsch of Hammer; Dr. Heinrich Pudor of Leipzig; Allarierbund, Danzig; Nordic Aryan Publishing Co., Portland, Oregon.

[135]FM, p. 6.

CHAPTER XIV

THE REASON FOR UNREASON: THE PHILOSOPHY OF FRANZ HAISER

Mein teurer Freund, grau ist alle Theorie
Und gruen des Lebens goldener Baum.

--Goethe, Faust

To give political advice to the real world was indeed somewhat out of character for Franz Haiser; he felt more at home as a "philosopher," pontificating on a more cosmic stage. However, in this sphere too he never ceased to be the partisan of the select minority of "master-natures," who were (or ought to be) the lords of creation, and campaigned constantly to emancipate them from the false and inhibiting values contrived by the Köter. Integral to this enterprise was a running denunciation of the German and Austrian educational systems, the chief agency of modern spiritual corruption. Haiser's views on religion can be conveniently treated in the next chapter, for his chief theme was that modern humanitariansim and hyperintellectuality had destroyed the validity of religion (especially organized Christianity) and turned people into flabby sentimentalists and/or despairing skeptics. They needed something they could again really believe in, suitably

patriotic, heroic, and free of "humanity."

In all of these respects Haiser was well within the main stream of German-speaking barbaric vitalism. Few of his points had not been anticipated by Nietzsche, and the term "vulgar-Nietzschean" is an indispensable adjective to describe him. As a "philosopher" he was far less original than in his views on the history of civilization, race, elitism, and the "white international," but far more consistent and systematic. However, he did add a special twist of his own in emphasizing the elitist, exploitative and anti-humanitarian implications of barbaric vitalism.

Philosophically Franz Haiser was a colorful combination of skeptic and idealist, a sort of tavern mystic. He believed in the existence of compelling absolute truth, but definitely on existential rather than logical grounds:

> Anyone to whom all food tastes sour must accept that there is also sweetness, even if he has never encountered sugar. If we speak of beauty and our artists create ideal forms that do not exist, this is precisely a proof of their inkling that there exists beauty, which indeed we do not possess, but should strive for. Did there impel us no drives, that make us discontented with our existing condition, admittedly we would have no proof that there is a higher one. The search after something which lies outside our experience, proves to us its existence, for if no better condition was possible nature would have no cause to make us discontented.[1]

> The relativity-principle in no way contradicts the theory of ascending life. It does not say there is no absolute, only that for our human judgment the absolute remains only a virtual image. A virtual image is however indeed in itself no image, we make it an image with the help of our senses and our consciousness. But the consciousness of another type could depict it in

> quite another fashion. It is exactly the same with the absolute will and its varied reflections in brains of different [human] types. . . . Our regard for the greatness of the absolute would sink very low, if man were able to grasp the concepts of absolute truth, beauty and good with his disorganized brain! Whoso constantly wills to idolize man, thereby only devalues God. . . . Even an asymptotic approach to the absolute should . . . produce the coming man.[2]

However, Haiser was emphatic that the customary academic way of looking for the truth was an illusion, especially its precious "objectivity." All knowledge was simply a lesser or greater degree of faith or conviction, reflecting the will-power of the individual (which was, of course, racially conditioned).[3]

> The "objective manner of thinking" is nothing else than a degeneration. . . . Whoso disputes for a long time about a subject becomes finally unsure of his own viewpoint, for his reason-grounds have undermined his instinct-grounds.[4]

Truth was "universal" only for those who shared the same life-circumstances.

> Would you give up the billions of years of experience of mother nature for the sake of the fiction of your "truth"? Our truth, gentlemen, is faith, the conviction in our breast and our justice--the courage to risk all for it! Let us not subject to calculations and speculations the truth in life-questions. We don't live in a world of congruent triangles and mathematical axioms, but are of flesh and blood and are ourselves a part of nature in which the so-called, human-invented "perfect," eternal," and "strict," laws of logical thought don't exist. . . .[5]

> Everyone is born with prejudices, and he who has none himself accepts a stranger's; in questions of world-view there is no objectivity [Sachlichkeit] or impartiality.[6]

Persons or historical periods with a strong and healthy will to believe therefore did not seek proofs for their conclusions. But where convictions were weak proof was avidly

sought, as was all too obviously the case in the present age.

> All higher feelings are subordinated to the naked, cold intellect. For it is the further and highest extension of the organ of thought, a goal in itself, hindering rather than furthering action, and it resembles therein the esthetical fancies of nature, like the peacock's tail, which no more serves to steer its flight, but on the contrary prevents the bird from flying. Thus the burdensome uselessness of intellectualism becomes a torment to the genius man of action Faust, [and] drives him back to the soul of the Volk. . . .[7]

This hypertrophy of rational intellect ran together with the atrophy of instinct and will power, with disastrous results:

> While the lunatic in the asylum is lacking in the logic of conscious thought, decadent civilized mankind, which feels itself called to teach and correct the all-knowing and all-wise mother nature, lacks the logic of instinct, for with equal right one could also instruct us that the stink of carrion was only a prejudice, and one could eat it confidently.[8]

In practice it led only to utter doubt, and hence despair:

> Every thinker critical of the basis of knowledge, who really thinks critically, deeply and sincerely, must travel with Nietzsche the same path of damnation [Unheil], namely, that the "pure, will-free knowledge," the "pure, scientific objectivity," can only lead to dissolution [Auflösung], to nothingness, to doubt. . . . Positive values are created only within arbitrary limits to knowledge, [that is] in faith.[9]

As prime exhibits of this dismal intellectual situation, Haiser loved to cite modern natural science and mathematics, about which he was better informed than most völkisch authors. The so-called conclusions of research varied "like quotations on the stock exchange,"[10] and never were the same two years in a row. Nowadays the lower-school boys

could laugh at the recent Abiturienten, for the latter were already out of date.[11] Nor could we even rely on mathematics anymore, as once on the axioms of Euclid; there was also a non-Euclidean geometry, which some used.[12] Haiser merrily cited the case of certain "magnetic rays" lately fashionable in medicine, and affirmed to produce marvelous cures. However, if the patients could not come to the machine that produced them, one could simply mail them an irradiated cotton wool pad, and it worked apparently just as well. On grounds of "objective fact" how could one distinguish these cures from the "scientific" ones?

Haiser pursued this line of thought further, in some of his best-written passages:

> There was a period in the western world, when the necessity of a religion was denied. It was common to say, that reason should replace faith, the provable the unprovable. That was a grave error, an excessive conceit of itself by a scientific age. . . . Every proof rests on fundamental premises, and these exhibit no absolute but only assumed values. One might in a certain sense speak of a contract theory of human reason. Overturn one of the fundamental premises, the contract is broken and the whole structure falls apart. Also we cannot rely on our senses. They show us pictures, that were not painted without but within ourselves.

Thus a man trained in natural science will insist that the "ghosts" seen in a spiritualist seance were only a matter of suggestion, and the imagination of a strong will of course prevails over a weaker one. Technically the natural scientist is correct,

> but with equal right one could hold that the things normal men see are only illusions, but since we all see

> them alike we count them as reality. If one strong spirit succeeds in influencing whole peoples with his fancies, hundreds of thousands will see an altered world in their mind's eye. A few centuries ago one saw a goat as the devil and a woman as a witch.[13]

Haiser dismissed the popular view of scientific objectivity with unusual cogency and clarity:

> The last century believed it had found the Philosopher's Stone, because it replaced faith in God and religion with the data and proofs of science. Now finally there was light in the darkness . . . now clarity took the place of obscurity! Has this prophecy been fulfilled? Whoso gets his scientific knowledge only from the Neue Freie Presse or the Berliner Tageblatt will have the conviction that scientific questions are concerned only with indisputable facts, but whoso has gone to the sources will have recognized that so-called eternal truths are subject to change. One may object, that is the meaning of science, ever to separate the true from the false and so gradually attain to a firmly grounded structure. . . . But how can I erect a building, if I proceed from no fixed foundations, from no dogma? . . . [How can my calculations convince them, when] it is not certain that 2 times 2 is 4? Do not laugh at my drastic comparison, for that is actually how it stands in the sciences today. Criticism is free and may attack everything, even the very foundations, on which every scientific structure is built, therefore one after another falls apart, and the new ones don't last long. You may ask, how that's possible, . . . for the human spirit must finally in all regions of research attain the truth, for truth is one. . . . The response is, that according to higher scientific insight . . . there is nothing certain, absolute, unchanging, on which our knowledge may rely.[14]

But if "objectivity" was of no use as a standard, what should one use? Haiser readily answered, man is the measure of all things,[15] but not the individual man, or humans in general, but the "species-soul," [Gattungsseele]. Strife was cosmically necessary, but it had to be that of groups, not persons. "The Kulturkampf is a group-struggle and no anarchistic ideal."[16] For the individual when he died left

nothing, but the group survived. But "all mankind" was not a proper group-value (as philosophers and founders of religions liked to think) for if such a value ever prevailed all strife would cease, and civilization would become extinct.

> The way to the absolute leads through the species-soul. Remain true to your descent, your essential type, your people, to the Stand to which you belong, and you are on the right path. The Absolute speaks to us through the agency of the spirit of the type [Artgeist]. . . . There is no good and evil the same for all times and peoples, what earlier or there was good is today or here an evil.
>
> In my view there are well-suited, advantageous and worthy-to-be-developed doctrines, and [others not so]. There then comes a time that sees through them and throws overboard. But true in the philosophical sense is neither the one or the other.[17]
>
> The restless human soul cries out for a fixed homestead, for belonging to a clan [Sippe] species, life-style and immovable thought-form.[18]

A favorite word of Haiser's for this irrational authoritarianism was "stylization." He borrowed the concept (as had Nietzsche) from esthetics:

> Not only the muses of the fine arts are able to stylize whereby they lend a hand, a group, a time a people a characteristic stamp. that our senses immediately recognize, distinguishes and finds order in, but [which] our reason on the other hand can only clumsily and quite imperfectly arrive at, but also nature. Nature understands masterfully how to stylize, it separates its creations into groups. . . . For not only the body had form but also the Geist, which slowly and irresistably arises from the body.[19]
>
> There is no other truth but style.[20]

Without such unity, the life of individuals or societies was like a building combining serveral different styles, and so inharmonious.[21] In his view, it was precisly the

vice of the modern open society that it let everyone pretend to a style of his own.

> Stylelessness is always the fundamental idea of all emocratic essence, for the life-principle of democracy is built on the muddle of individual differences.[22]

> Freedom of conscience equals complete dissolution of the Volk-style.[23]

It was as disastrous in art as in politics:

> All those who seek after "truth and nature" in art seek nothing else than to wreck style and open wide the gates for freedom. A new style should take the place of the old classical style, [for] every individual of the "many-too-many" wishes to drag his own highly ignoble style into the divine temple of art.[24]

The "cur" or "chandala" was by definition unstylized, a mongrelized hodgepodge of traits, capable perhaps of superficial cleverness but incapable of real creativity.[25]

However, since style was quintessentially peculiar to each group Haiser did not venture to define its content. "The perfect man is the stylized man, that is to say the one who departs least from the particular characteristics of his group."[26] The word was simply a convenient shorthand for the dictatorial sort of authority which so obsessed Franz Haiser. Indeed, he was even offended that dictionaries gave variant meanings and usages, instead of simply laying down the law.[27] As in regard to political dictatorship, there was an inherent contradiction in Haiser's notion. If stylization was necessarily based on pure "high-race" groups, how could it survive, or be recovered, if these no longer existed? If in their absence it was simply decreed by a tyrant, how could

it be called "style" for anyone but him?

There was still another contradiction, which Haiser faced far more honestly than other radical right authors, between stylization and other aspects of barbaric vitalism. If fixed authoritarian stylization prevailed, how would if leave any scope for the bold and ruthless genius, the "master-nature," who was the source of all progress? He admitted that highly stylized ages had often been guilty of this excess, for instance the over-dogmatic Middle Ages. The solution was, in another of his favorite terms, an "equilibrium" of "style" and "freedom." The "free spirit" had to have an opportunity to break new paths, and to bring the community to making his innovations its style. But naturally this latitude could be allowed only to a very few, for it ruined everything to let all try their hand at it.[28] Inasmuch as Haiser elsewhere defines "high race" as detectable only by its attainments after the fact, this is reasoning in a circle; but other barbaric vitalist authors (including Nietzsche) scarcely faced the problem at all.

To say that the equivalent for logic was the "species-soul" and its "stylization" was of course very near to doing without it altogether, and in fact Haiser completed his barbaric vitalist system by virtually saying as much:

> All prophets have spoken in parables, for they cannot make real the virtual image of the absolute, the commands of their god, nor clothes it in human logic, for human logic swims but weakly in the infinite. . . . How helpless is understanding [Verstand]! In a thousand nooks and corners it arranges [its material], believes

> finally to have discovered everything, but only storms about in a labyrinth, where there is no beginning or end. Whoso possesses no Gefühl, no instinct, which whispers to him, what is the truth and far more what for him in the present circumstances should be the truth, is deaf to the voice of his species [Gattung] and his understanding will never save him.[29]

Haiser did not content himself with mere theoretical expression of these metaphysical views, but applied them vigorously to partisan purposes. Few authors were as blunt and emphatic as he on the anti-liberal, aggressive and tyrannical implications of barbaric vitalism's repudiation of reason as a universal human bond.

> The goal of the human spirit can never be a general one, for nature differentiates types . . . [and gives each] a distinct path of development. Every race, caste or group has a specific type-soul, which can never be found by scientific methods [or] by dry reasoning, but must be left to the instinctive sense of the human group in question. . . . Thinking, brooding and especially the scientific model only confuse the natural instinct, . . . and stands the natural meaning of creation on its head. If I prescribe to one people the same values of law, morality and beauty, the same views of true and false as to others of different type, . . . I make the same error as our equalizers within the national community. . . . The result is leveling of value-differences, decay of the worth-gradient, world-socialism and a halt of development, which depends on polar oppositions. If I wish to build up my decayed race again, to win back my master-rights, to enslave the mob, instead of letting them enslave me, . . . I may not make use of either the laboratory . . . nor the bespectacled sociologist, my Geist . . . [must become] a child again and find itself as such in its own self. A dictator and legislator gifted with instinct and strong will, even if less gebildet, is to me worth more than an army of physicians of the people and sociologists.[30]
>
> . . .what an unsure foundation is intellectualism, how easily structures built on it can be overturned. Our ethical values, which especially concern us new-nationals, because we wish to storm forward, to rule, must be carved in rock, on which every intellectual criticism must shatter

> like a glass bullet. But that is only possible if we create them out of a spiritual compulsion, that is from a domination of blood over Geist, from a national religion.[31]

The "aristocrat" was of course the chief beneficiary of this anti-intellectualism:

> Why is the aristocrat the higher man? Because that which we "enlightened" people call "prejudice" [Vorurteil] is his judgment [Urteil], because he has no eye but only a feeling for morality, indeed he is quite unaware there are "morals," because he is a non-intellectual.[32]

Haiser's views were up to a point very serviceable to chauvinism, and sometimes he sounded quite in the völkisch mainstream:

> Every people has its own concepts of good and evil, true and false, beautiful and ugly, for relativity-theory teaches us that in the world of time and space . . . there is and can be no absolute. But what do Christianity, liberalism and socialism, in short all modern world-views? They mingle together peoples as much as castes, and the state, as they imagine it, is from a biological standpoint immoral. The chief cities of the modern world are no homesteads, but stopping-places, there rules in them a constant cell-interchange from one state to another, from one caste to another, . . . This melange has on its conscience on the one side modern morality, on the other our hypertrophy of technology with its world-commerce. From whence should such a state take it concepts good and evil, just and unjust, etc., if it has not created them . . . itself? . . . It has verily only stolen them from somewhere, [and in effect wears another's clothes, as if] a prince wore a peasant's smock or . . . a peasant a purple robe.[33]

Likewise it was a völkisch cliche, and equally dear to Haiser's heart, to blame present German misfortunes in large part on the liberal professors:

> A lack of the drive to self-preservation, of the wish to be master . . . is a defect like lack of appetite. "The enemy is all bad, the friend is all good," so say and

> believe our healthy and life-strong neighbors; only in the German territories does there rule a spiritual aristocracy, which is in a position to spread a belief in blind authority, like the Aristotelian spirit of the Middle Ages. In this school one does not ask nature [or] historical experience . . . but supports oneself on murky speculation and preaches that our enemies may be better than we and that all we bring against them may be mere prejudices. This comes to pass from idolatry of phantoms, like objective truth, hyper-humanity, equality of rights, the equal worth of all, which France has spawned, as if in a fit of insanity. This is called the age of empiricism and the victory over speculation![34]

Haiser devoted a great deal of space and passion to how rational objectivity had corrupted modern spiritual life, with some touches of originality and even insight. The naive confidence in impartial human reason and the reality of scientific "laws," which had been so central to nineteenth century intellectual culture, was a considerable time dying, and there was still a considerable number (to use Henry James's phrase) of "tenderminded" people, reluctant to give them up. In the 1920's those of more or less progressive or left-wing political opinions were almost of necessity committed to faith in rationality, and this had much to do with their failure to appreciate the strength of the radical right, especially in regard to anti-Semitism.[35] Furthermore, since the eighteenth century, natural science had been popularly regarded as somehow allied to liberalism and progress, especially in regard to anti-clericalism; the Scopes trial of 1924 was a conspicuous late example. In the German-speaking world, this identification was especially to be seen in Monism, which had been founded as a formal

organization (indeed, a "church") in 1904, and was still a force in the 1920's. Its best known literary production was Ernst Haeckel's The Riddle of the Universe, which voiced such sentiments as

> The historical, gradual, evolution of the human soul from a long chain of higher and lower mammal souls must, by application of the universally valid laws of the theory of descent, be regarded as a fact which has been scientifically proved.
>
> The belief in the immortality of the human soul is a dogma which is in hopeless contradiction with the most solid empirical truths of modern science.
>
> The advance towards the solution of the fundamental riddle of the universe is brought nearer to us every year in the ever-increasing growth of our knowledge of nature.[36]

Haeckel even took physicists to task on the ether-hypothesis, which was being laid in ruins as he wrote:

> The existence of ether . . . as a real element is a positive fact and has been known as such for the last twelve years. We sometimes read even today that ether is a "pure hypothesis" . . . but there would be just as much reason to deny the existence of ponderable matter.[37]

Therefore in stressing the thoroughgoing nominalism and lack of finality in modern natural science and philosophy, Haiser was perhaps to be counted on the "advanced" side of intellectual development, at least for the early 1920's, whatever his motives. That the basic equality and rationality of human beings were only hopes and hypotheses, and anything but "historical facts," was certainly seldom frankly admitted by "decent" publications or public figures before the Hitler era. Discounting his ill-will, Haiser was technically correct in saying that

> What an Aristotle was for the Middle Ages, that is the spirit of the French Revolution and Forty-eighter liberalism for the intelligentsia-democracy of today.[38]

One of his favorite devices was to maintain that not the radical right but the liberal professors were the hidebound authoritarians and dogmatists, as anthropocentric and conceited of the eternity of their wisdom as the Roman Catholic Church.[39] Haiser also had a point when he insisted that a naturalistic view of man, which recent advances in science had made fashionable, must necessarily destroy not only the special claims of religion for defining and evaluating "humanity" and morals, but also those of secular metaphysics, and of liberal humanitarianism in particular. The liberals liked to maintain that they were "scientific" and progressive, but they would not proceed to the obvious conclusion:

> Indeed one has not at all the courage to look naked nature in the face, not only the doctrines of religion . . . would thereby be shattered, but the whole proud structure of revolutionary freethinking, which builds itself on speculatively fabricated human rights, and the humanity-ideal of '48-er liberalism with its equality of rights and seeking to propagate the sick and weak, falls into ruins. . . . If you have unveiled nature, . . . you must have the courage to experience with eyes open what seems to you frightful. . . . We must at any price obstruct that concept of humanity, speculatively fabricated and contrary to natural law, which chiefly concerns itself with breeding up the sickest and weakest, [which] injures our people more and more deeply.[40]

Likewise, Haiser read intellectual history correctly when he called objectivity a principal bulwark of liberalism. It was ideal for discrediting instinct, for however strong the latter it could never marshal the systematic evidence that this intellectual fashion demanded. Objectivity

implicitly denied special privileges to those of higher race, and allowed their inferiors to compete with them with equal (or, in practice, superior) spiritual weapons. This was especially true in the field of racialism itself, for the demand for "objective" standards in society and law made it impossible to identify or even define the Jews, however positive were our "soul-impressions" of them.[41] It was just like the situation whereby an over-learned judge could fail to convict a criminal, although the whole village knew he was guilty.[42] On several occasions, Haiser singled out the law as a glaring case in which objectivity was harmful. It was a fortress to protect the Jews, and Köter of all types, who were of course past masters of using its technicalities. A recent instance, which particularly incensed Haiser, was its inability in taxation to discriminate against the wealth of war-profiteers, who paid no higher rates than honest men.[43] On many occasions the law had to be administered subjectively, and a unique advantage of a dictator was that he could do this.[44]

Haiser was severe on professional Wissenschaftler for having allowed this situation to develop. He repeated the common complaint of Lebensphilosophie, that in their passion for objectivity they had become unable to create values, and had rendered the pursuit of knowledge existentially useless and sterile.[45] As mentioned in an earlier chapter, this indictment arose from the traditional high prestige and moral

pretensions of formal education in Germany and Austria, which led to widespread resentment, especially amid the general frustration and sense of betrayal after World War I. Haiser added his own favorite gibes, accusing the academics of being at best "spiritual day-laborers," plodding accumulators of data, lacking the imagination and boldness to make real discoveries.[46] He accused them of being principally motivated by envy:

> [They] look on the fullness of the gifts of the prophet with eyes full of hate. They are . . . but sparsely endowed by nature with spiritual gifts, but nonetheless are consumed with an ambition for fame. Already in their schooldays they seek to replace this lack by industriousness, they become A-students, earn three doctorates and write one scientific work after the other, but in spite of it all their hollow head does not become wiser by a hair, indeed this great mass of knowledge-vapor has obscured their last remains of spiritual independence. Therefore they look with envy and hatred at the great spirit, who need but set foot in an area of knowledge to create something new. . . . They seek to smother him with their mass of knowledge and lie in wait like poisonous spiders for the moment when his knowledge will reveal a gap.[47]

About the kindest thing he could find to say about the learned guild was that it was weak in instinct, and even if well-intentioned simply had no standards whereby to judge vital questions.[48] He warned biological researchers that if they insisted on being as stuck-up and exclusive as the jurists, they would become equally unloved.[49]

Especially glaring, because of the importance of the question, were the inadequacies of racial scientists such as Fritz Lenz, to whose chief work Haiser devoted a long review. Lenz, he claimed, all but abandoned the field to the enemy

out of scientific scrupulousness when he admitted that it was difficult to say in a given case whether an outwardly Jewish-seeming person was so by heredity, environment, or idiovariation, and whether his offspring would be also of Jewish racial type. "Potz Donnerwetter! My instinct decides far better than this complicated scientific apparatus!" It was a total misconception of science, really a pathological symptom, a contradiction to the goal of ascending life, to make it only a merely contemplative agency, given to analysis to the exclusion of synthesis. "You cannot fight war by writing military history." It was analogous to having eyes that could not distinguish colors, an achroia of the spirit, and it had mightily helped the Jews. "Up to now [1922] science has stood at the spearhead of the movement for Jewification of the German people." Such were the weakness of the credentials of the academics, that it was not farfetched that the Jews themselves will be able to infiltrate this branch of knowledge, like all others.[50]

As a corrective to the systematic errors of objective academics, Haiser advocated a greater role for the subjective amateurs, or as he frankly called them "dilettantes." As with his defense of the Rentner, Haiser was very much an interested party. He was careful to specify that there must be an equilibrium between the methodical investigator and the dilettante, and that the latter had to be acquainted with the work of the former. But the objective academic was inhibited

by his guild rules, and also by fear of offending his colleagues, and the Zeitgeist. Whatever spiritual capacity they had tended to go stale. Only the dilettante could transcend these limitations, and be a real pioneer. The racial question was Haiser's chief (and nearly his only) exhibit. He noted, with perfect historical accuracy, that it was men like Nietzsche and Gobineau, in the teeth of implacable hostility from "respectable" scholars, who had first broached racial doctrines, and only years later did the latter, under popular pressure, begin to take them seriously. Indeed, one of the few compliments he had for professional scholars was that they were not as objective as they liked to think; for instance Werner Sombart was a good deal of a dilettante on the Jewish question without knowing it.[52] Inasmuch as after all his erudition Sombart concluded that capitalism was a (largely undesirable) Jewish invention, basically Haiser was right; and as so often he played the role of Smerdyakov to the "respectable" and "decent" Ivan Karamazov of the radical right, revealing what really lay behind their high-minded facades.

As was normal among German-speaking barbaric vitalists, Haiser's anti-intellectualism quickly led to a denunciation of the institution of Bildung. "Our schools and our press are the downfall of Geist and character."[53] In large part he repeated well-worn criticisms, some of them made before he was born (e.g. by Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Lagarde),

damning it for its careerism and subservience to the "establishment," its soul-killing pedantry, its harshness to the sensitive and original spirit, and its pretension that shallow encyclopedism was wisdom. The "populist" element of the radical right for the most part agreed with this indictment, and it disliked further Bildung's snobbery and cosmopolitanism, which separated the gebildete from the Volk. But here Haiser diverged from the general völkisch view, for he accused secondary schools and universities of precisely the opposite fault, namely that they were prime agents of the open society, and especially of social leveling. Likewise, far from objecting to the harshness and authoritarianism of the schools, he thought they had become scandalously lax, and a prime factor in the indiscipline of the lower classes.

Here again stands out the basic incompatibility of Haiser's elitist and völkisch convictions. Traditional Bildung was the chief stronghold of elitism in Germany, and anyone especially concerned to keep the few separate from the many logically ought to advocate it, or something very similar. The völkisch understood this very well, and in general favored diminishing the spiritual and social caste-barriers within the educational system. The sage of Scheibbs could of course accept nothing of the kind:

> The present-day mountebankery of the supposed "sense of justice" which desires that the Chandala sit on the same schoolbench with the noble, is nothing more than radical evil, the left-principle.[54]

Therefore simultaneously with his repudiation of Bildung he

was constrained to advocate an anti-intellectual yet sufficiently snobbish curriculum for the racially select few. Not surprisingly, this was a vague and muddled idea, and in the end very like Bildung--indeed, the Kalksburg Jesuiten-Kollegium--all over again.[55] In brief, Haiser wanted to be vulgar in his opinions but not identify himself with vulgar people, a contradiction impossible of reconciliation. As in the case of his elitist internationalism, from time to time Haiser was saying what the völkish wanted to hear, but taken as a whole his views necessarily left him as a party of one.

As to the connection of modern education with the development of the open society, Haiser was emphatic and in the main historically correct. He was fond of the Nietzschean sentiment, "the masses have learned to read, that is the curse of our time."[56] Pre-industrial societies, he noted approvingly, had made literacy a rare and mysterious talent, and thereby a good means for maintaining the all-important "gradient."[57] But in modern times doctorates were stamped out like banknotes, with a similar depreciation of their value.[58] He denounced the way learning had become a career interest, in the usual vein of educated "idealism," that went back at least to Schopenhauer:

> Modern, man is stuffed full with this so-called "Bildung," sated with Catheder-wisdom, which dealers in Geist throw on the market by the ton. Whoso wishes to contend in this mass-competition with a new world-view, must know how to . . . beat the drum. We no longer live in an age, where youths thirsty for wisdom thronged to a master and greedily swallowed his words. Today the very schoolboys are critical, doubting, hairsplitting and

> seek a new personality to refute. . . . Faith and complete dedication are lacking, so that self-love has grown to a nauseating extent. . . . [We have bred up] men in whom there glows not a spark of higher inspiration, lame in the will, without spirit. . . . Every new thought must be presented like a movie-story, otherwise it doesn't draw.[59]

Likewise unoriginal was his denunciation of "schoolmasterism" for having weakened the German people's will to power:

> What strikes me most about the Germans is their complete lack of natural instinct. If they face a decision, they never ask themselves, but only the school, and leaf through a thousand books. The German must always carry around an encyclopedia, the schoolmaster has entselbstet him. . . . Whoso doesn't write school-fashion--the schoolmaster says "methodically"--is despised as a "dilettante" and excluded from all editorships and lecture halls. It is never asked among us; what have you got in you? but only: what have you learned? How much of another's smoke have you piled up in your brain? Knock down the schools![60]

Haiser was always outspoken in his assertion, although he well realized he would be called a "stupidifier of the people" [Volksverdummer] for his pains,[61] that the modern world educated too many too much, and with too little attention to their real spiritual fitness for it.[62] The fact was that the great majority of mankind had very limited mental capacity, and their vital function was to carry out the orders of the gifted few. Overeducation so to speak provided too many general and staff officers, and not enough riflemen at the front.[63] Haiser persistently denounced the German and Austrian penchant for demanding higher and higher educational standards for various occupations, which was economically wasteful and still worse made those in subordinate positions dissatisfied.[64] He noted that while once

education was inseparable from being well-to-do, today the intelligentsia was an impoverished class while the rich capitalists were uncultured boors. He warned, "What a frightening Catilinarian danger for the state, an impoverished intelligentsia!"[65]

A still greater evil was that modern education was the main means whereby the worst were enabled to compete with the best, and in fact with an overwhelming advantage.[66] Properly, there should be competition only among those of equal rank, not of flowers with weeds, but in modern times the vilest scum could compete with the best, and moreover on their chosen ground, such as financial talent, popularity or Bildung. Concerning skill in the latter, Haiser ingeniously argued that the person of solid, stylized race had a strong sense for what suited his essential nature, and resisted what was alien. He learned rather slowly, but what he did take in was as "carved in granite." However, most of the so-called learning demanded by modern schools was really non-essential, very far removed from a child's home experience, and the high-race child was apt to be no star pupil at it.[67] On the other hand the Jew, being a cosmopolitan mongrel, was plastically receptive to everything foreign, and like a stage comedian was at home in all roles. Left to themselves the teachers would give the best educational assignments to the conventional star-pupil types, that is to say quick but superficial learners, impressionable

but uncreative, industrious and good servants but incapable of learning how to command.

> With this manner of selection it will more surely prevail, that the Köter-type, the Semitic freedman, the spiritual as the financial self-made man will rise to the top even more than he does already.[68]

Gebildet and geistig were not al all the same thing, and any Volk was well-advised to take special pains to seek out its talented self-taught men.

However, Haiser also railed at the modern world for an excess rather in another direction, in that it was far too lax and indulgent in the upbringing of youth. He aimed his fire not only at the university-oriented secondary schools, but also at the less demanding Bürgerschule (corresponding approximately to junior high school). The German language has two words for "education," difficult to distinguish in other languages: Bildung, which particularly connotes the spiritual culture of the individual and the higher levels of intellect, and Erziehung, which especially signifies character-training and moral discipline. In Haiser's view Erziehung had been catastrophically neglected. Youth was overloaded with academic work, but otherwise given over to license, and puffed up with notions of "free selfdetermination."[69]

> The perniciousness of our Volks- and Bürgerschule lies, in my view, in that they raise the self-awareness of the masses, instead of humbling it by strong Erziehung. Every institution which only bildet without at the same time to erziehen is an evil. The teacher is today no

> more an Erzieher, he could not be, for his power over his pupils has been quite withdrawn . . . [and he must] in many cases beg the favor of his pupils.[70]

All that "free selfdetermination" achieved was

> the dissolution of family ties, of obedience, of respect for elders and ancestors! A race-alien element swells up in literature to accelerate and intensify the process of dissolution. Hardly is a girl fourteen years old but she takes these dirty books [and] "builds a world for herself." They grow up half-personalities and behave themselves like a peasant become a millionaire.[71]

Philosophizing about free self-determination to housemaids made them so sloppy they couldn't even dust mirrors right.[72] While their mothers had to cook and scrub, the young girls of the Bürgerschule were taught only to wear fancy clothes and have a lover at twelve or thirteen, while they could not even spell.[73]

Haiser's solution was simple: the country needed no Bürgerschüle, but instead schools for practical trades (including housework[74]). For Volkserziehung, there should be "less schoolmasterism and more barracks." The teachers should be tough sergeant types, their character was far more important than their intellect; indeed, the stress on the latter had often made the teachers themselves into the worst "enlightened" demagogues. Teachers should be decently paid, and have their right of corporal punishment restored.[75] As usual, the sovereign remedy was blind authoritarianism; one could never achieve good Erziehung by enticements or by giving reasons, for the latter only led to asking reasons for the reasons.[76]

Such was Haiser's detestation of the educated and

sophisticated world that it even inspired him to find virtues in the crude and ignorant lower classes. (That is, the country people; like most of the völkisch, he had a low opinion of the urban masses.)

> The rough instincts of the uneducated and the prophetic vision of the aristocratically thinking philosophers, which scans far above the range of the so-called "educated," often clasp hands.[77]

The peasants still lived by healthy common sense and traditional prejudices,[78] in contrast to the decadent and deracinated Gebildeten.

> Were this "society" the expression of a Volksstil, which was permanently rooted in the essense of the Volk, . . . this high regard for the rules of "society" would be all to the good, for nothing is holier than the Ur-instinct of the masses, which reveals itself in the stylized usages of the Volk. But between style and fashion there is a mighty difference![79]

The unspoiled common folk still respected the old-fashioned patriarchal master, but despised the upstarts.[80] It was the well-educated, not the common people, who were responsible for such perversions as tolerance, socialism and parliaments.[81]

Haiser especially commended the uneducated for their grasp of racialism[82] and the need for negative eugenics,[83] and above all for their anti-Semitism, which they had espoused long before the Gebildeten.[84] As the bankruptcy of modern "enlightened" intellectual culture became more obvious, the spiritual worth of the uncouth Volk was coming to be recognized.

> Soon the 90 percent "Geistigen" of our people will go to school to the remaining 10 percent "Ungebildeten" with the request to teach them, what is true and what is good and evil.[85]

Notes to Chapter XV

[1]Skl., p. 52.

[2]Anfang, p. 149.

[3]FH, "Der Wille zur Macht," PAM, XVI, pp. 492-93; "Weltanschauung und Religion," PAM, XII, pp. 197-98.

[4]FH, "Dilettantismus und Wissenschaft," PAM, XXI, pp. 175, 178.

[5]FH, "Houston Stewart Chamberlain und Werner Sombart," in Krisis, p. 79.

[6]FM, p. 94.

[7]Krisis, pp. 8-9.

[8]Krisis, p. 12.

[9]FH, Review of Francé, Der Wert der Wissenschaft, NL, VII, pp. 180-81.

[10]AI, p. 91.

[11]FH, Review of F. Lenz, Menschliche Auslese, PAM, XXI, p. 239.

[12]AI, p. 9; "Deutschtum, Modernismus und Hebräertum," Hammer, IX, p. 315.

[13]Skl., p. 50; "Okkultismus," PAM, XV, p. 190.

[14]Skl., p. 41.

[15]"Okkultismus," PAM, XV, p. 191.

[16]AI, p. 68.

[17]Skl., p. 42.

[18]FH, "Geist und Judentum," PAM, XXI, p. 31.

[19]FH, "Das stilisierte Leben," DE, I, p. 357.

[20]UK, p. 315.

[21]GFA, pp. 17-18.

[22]UK, p. 190.

[23]FH, "Freibeuterhauptleute. . . ," PAM, XV, p. 354.

[24]UK, pp. 174-75.

[25]FH, "Die Linkskultur. . . ," PAM, XII, p. 417; "Staat als sittliches Bewusstsein," PAM, XV, p. 432; Krisis, p. 28.

[26]UK, p. 249.

[27]FM, p. 119.

[28]FH, "Religion und Freigeisterei," Michel, July 29, 1923, p. 3; FM, pp. 35-36; Skl., pp. 54-55.

[29]Anfang, p. 171.

[30]Anfang, p. 28.

[31]Krisis, p. 41.

[32]AI, p. 60.

[33]Anfang, p. 75.

[34]Krisis, pp. 80-81.

[35]Pulzer, Anti-Semitism, pp. 266-69; Mehring, Lost Library, passim.

[36]Ernst Haeckel, The Riddle of the Universe (New York: 1900), pp. 169, 210, 383.

[37]Ibid., p. 225.

[38]Krisis, p. 71.

[39]Krisis, p. 33.

[40]Krisis, p. 26.

[41]FH, "Gesetz und Wilkür," Michel, July 28, 1923, pp. 2-3; FM, p. 46; JF, p. 42; Krisis, pp. 11-12.

[42]FH, "Die Verketzerung. . . ," PAM, XIX, pp. 261-67.

[43]FH, "Gesetz und Wilkür," pp. 2-3.

[44]JF, p. 127; "Demokratie, Monarchie oder Caesarismus?," Michel, November 21, 1920, pp. 1-2; "Die subjektive Dehnbarkeit des Gesetzes," OR, September 30, 1917, p. 5; "Zum Warburg-Prozess," Hammer, XXVI, pp. 216-17.

[45]See e.g. the works of Ernst Krieck, who became an important figure in education under the Nazi regime.

[46]AI, pp. 56 ff.

[47]Anfang, pp. 168-69.

[48]Krisis, p. 39; FM, pp. 45, 99.

[49]FH, Review of Lenz, Menschliche Auslese, PAM, XXI, p. 239.

[50]FH, Review of E. Baur et al., Menschliche Erblichkeitslehre, PAM, XXI, pp. 176-79.

[51]Ibid., p. 175; also FM, pp. 15, 66-67; Review of Lenz, Menschliche Auslese, PAM, XXI, p. 239; "Die Verketzerung. . . ," PAM, XIX, pp. 261-67; "Sombart und die Juden," DE, VI, p. 424.

[52]Ibid.

[53]FH, "Intelligenzsozialisten," OR, February 8, 1919, p. 2.

[54]UK, p. 246.

[55]See proposals for educating the restored master caste in the preceding chapter.

[56]Skl., p. 47.

[57]JF, p. 129.

[58]Anfang, p. 167.

[59]Anfang, p. 12. See also "Apostelbriefe," PAM, XVI, p. 147.

[60]Skl., p. 66.

[61]Skl., p. 13; UK, p. 242.

[62]Krisis, pp. 18-19; AI, p. 61; JF, p. 50; Review of Dankberg, Vom Wesen der Moral, NL, VII, pp. 95-96.

[63]FH, "Bildung," PAM, XIV, p. 480; UK, pp. 211-12.

[64]Anfang, pp. 55, 146; "Die Bildung und die neue Zeit," Michel, October 3, 1920, p. 3; MB, p. 62; FM, p. 88; JF, p. 33.

[65]FH, "Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 13.

[66]UK, pp. 186-87.

[67]FH, "Der Staat. . . ," PAM, XV, pp. 534-35.

[68]UK, p. 245; see also "Die Links-kultur. . . ," PAM, XII, p. 417.

[69]Skl., p. 38; JF, pp. 65-67.

[70]Skl., pp. 13-14.

[71]FH, "Das stilisierte Leben," DE, I, p. 361.

[72]FH, "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, p. 514; "Die Bildung und die neue Zeit," Michel, October 3, 1920, p. 3.

[73]FM, pp. 87, 124.

[74]Skl., p. 14.

[75]FM, pp. 92-93.

[76]Anfang, p. 87; "Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben," PAM, XV, p. 423.

[77]FH, "Antike Demokratie," PAM, XIV, p. 641.

[78]FH, "Weltanschauung und Religion," PAM, XII, p. 198.

[79]FH, Angenehmes und unangenehmes Mensch," Norddeutsche Monatshefte, IV, p. 70. See also FM, p. 87; JF, p. 60; Krisis, p. 45; "Thor oder Wodan. . . ," PAM, XV, pp. 251-53; AI, p. 18.

[80]JF, p. 75.

[81]FH, "Duldsamkeit," PAM, XIV, p. 521; "Intelligenz-sozialisten," OR, February 8, 1919, p. 2; "Volk und Parlament," DAP, April 4, 1925, pp. 1-2.

[82]FM, p. 72; Krisis, p. 11.

[83]FM, p. 64; Krisis, p. 31.

[84]MB, p. 17, JF, p. 21; "Geist und Judentum," PAM, XXI, p. 30.

[85]AI, p. 60.

361

CHAPTER XV

FRANZ HAISER ON RELIGION

> Let him begin by treating . . . patriotism or pacifism as part of his religion. Then let him . . . regard it as the most important part. Then . . . gradually nurse him on to the stage at which the religion becomes merely part of the "cause." . . . Once you have made the world an end, and faith a means, you have almost won your man, and it makes very little difference what kind of worldly end he is pursuing.
>
> --C. S. Lewis, The Screwtape Letters

Barbaric vitalism's emphasis on will power and emotion, at the expense of rationality and objective knowledge, resulted in a certain sympathy toward (in a broad sense) a religious attitude to life. But this was of little benefit to the established churches, for in the late Victorian age they tended to be the very personification of philistine orthodoxy and repressive convention. In the German-speaking world such an antipathy was especially conspicuous, no doubt because of the strong "establishment" identification of the Protestant and Catholic Churches.

From Lagarde through Hitler, the radical right frequently was bitterly hostile to the existing relgious institutions, Roman Catholicism was an obvious target, because it seemed an "un-German" body, which divided the loyalty of its members between their cult and their country, and was also

accused of exercising a tyrannical and obscurantist influence in education and cultural life. In Habsburg Austria there was the added animus of its apparent pro-Slavic bias. The anti-Catholicism of the radical right was indeed in good part an inheritance from the liberals of the Kulturkampf era. However, Protestantism provoked an almost equal animosity, which is harder to account for. From the middle of the nineteenth century the evangelical state churches of the Reich[1] although they still nominally included about seventy percent of the population, had sharply diminished in prestige and influence. They seemed to serve chiefly to bestow divine blessing on an established order that scarcely appeared to need it. To arrest their decline, they had extensively compromised (or "modernized") their doctrines, to appeal to a more sophisticated population. Evangelical Protestantism in effect tried to advertise itself as fully compatible with modern progress, and a contributor to German greatness. To no small extent, the disgust of radical right critics was the reaction of religious temperaments, unhappy at the alienation that the modern open society had inflicted upon them, and eager for something to belong to and to believe in, who were revolted at the evangelical churches' flabbiness and superficiality. From the specifically völkisch point of view, even the Protestant form of Christianity was too foreign and cosmopolitan, and too Jewish. Some at least also found it unmanly and riddled with humanitarian sentimentality,

so that it stood in the way of their respecting themselves as men and as Germans.

In response to these unsatisfied spiritual appetites, from about 1890 there arose a number of new religious currents, which in many cases had radical right affinities: as yet this area of history is virtually untouched by scholarship.[2] In a way they were a further development of theological "modernism," having the same end of accommodating religion to a public no longer attracted to traditional dogmas and ceremonies. The test for religion became not creeds or commandments, but a person's emotional state; God was visualized as immanent rather than transcendent; and humanity was seen less as sinners needing redemption than as co-workers of the divine, needing scope for the full use of their powers. The idea that man needed God specifically because of his inherent sinfulness was de-emphasized. God became a rather vague "All-soul," and grand and exalted things of any kind (mountain scenery, the symphonies of Beethoven, great deeds in metaphysics) were given a "religious" accolade, as were progressive-minded good works in general. Contrary to the age-old dualism of the western world, spirit was seen as in some respects inherent in matter, a view prominent in such sects as the Theosophists and Anthroposophists, and even found among Monists.

But of especial importance for present purposes was the tendency to consider the divine as immanent in the

nation, or conversely to maintain that no religion had any value unless it was quintessentially German. The moderate members of this school of thought aimed at Germanizing Christianity, the more extreme at replacing it with an outright pagan cult. Individuals belonged to these tendencies in complex ways, and it is not easy to draw up categories; in any case, whatever their religious views they, like the overwhelming majority of Germans, rarely withdrew formally from the confession into which they had been born. There was a great interest in the old Norse mythology, and ancient Germanic rituals, and even attempts to ascribe a sophisticated theology (including the Trinity) to the primordial Germanics. There were many revivals of the ancient celebrations of the summer and winter solstices (the latter being remarkably like Christmas). One widespread ritual, often encountered in völkisch publications, was the substitution of Germanic names for the months. July became Heuert and August Ernting, although both kept the thirty-one days the old Roman dictator and his nephew had assigned themselves. Jesus Christ was usually spoken of with respect, but some insisted on calling Him Frauwa, supposedly the term of Bishop Ulfilas. Indeed, the most striking characteristic of the movement was a neurotic obsession with breaking the ties to traditional Christianity, and pouring the old content into aggressively völkisch new bottles. The very fact that Christianity was shared with other peoples,

and was not unique to Deutschtum, gave offense.

Franz Haiser had much to say about religion, but for the most part it was a label for the arbitrary, anti-intellectual and intolerant manner of thinking that he equated with spiritual virtue. He was much in favor of religion in principle because it was transcendental and "idealistic," but cared little about its content.

> Proofs never establish a world-view; whoso seeks eternal truths, must be able to believe, must have religion. Religion offers not only consolation, it is also a social, even a biological necessity, for life streams upwards, it desires to create the higher, the highest forms of proof, and the way thereto demands sacrifice and therefore suffering. To be able worthily to traverse this way of sorrow, confidence is absolutely necessary, confidence in the eventual victory and reward, which never can be of this world. We are slaves of a higher idea, an unknown power, which draws us to itself, whether we will it or not, and to which we must sacrifice ourselves. Struggle, being a battle-sacrifice, is the meaning of existence; if we men of today are unwilling to suffer, our children must pay the debt with interest on interest. Where destiny has placed you, there stand and fall for the group, to which you belong, for Volk and fatherland. World-reconciliation lies off in eternity, presently strife reigns.[3]

> The destiny of life is the fulfillment of a transcendental duty. The specific and here-and-now moral law serves to lead the immanent phenomenon of this duty into ordered paths. . . . This transcendental duty is a point at absolute rest and as such is unrecognizable to fleeting existence, it remains a mystery, that appears to man dressed as religion. . . . The relativity-principle is the immanent cosmopolitan moral law. [It] defines no values, it contains merely the command: hold true to your group and contend for its values, for thereby you do your duty.[4]

He acknowledged that the rationalists and the Christians laughed at those who praised faith in principle but would not confess any in particular. But

> I would rather say: we wish to awaken again in ourselves faith for the kernel of it lies unconditionally within us. . . . If we consider our present race as an intermediate link, it has to influence the following ones favorably in the sense of the progress of creation, the present link surely cannot have finally developed the new form, but only put it in the hands of the next one to perfect it, and hand it down again. Our motto is indeed that it is not the parents who benefit, but the children. If we erziehen our children in a religious world-view . . . they will not be so skeptical as the men of today. How this religion is to be ultimately set up, and by whom, is admittedly a question which I cannot yet answer, which pressingly needs cooperative effort. But the time is at hand, when already a considerable part of the people scouts for a supportive force . . . which will give them strength and courage for the struggle [before them] . . . for from the doctrines of intellectualism we have become neither strong nor courageous nor happy.[5]

Haiser was not original in his religious instrumentalism, resembling inter alia Arthur Bonus, whom he cites in passing.[6]

Haiser's break with his Roman Catholic upbringing seems to have had little effect on his religious views. As he made clear, he had become a Lutheran only as a gesture of belonging to Los von Rom movement, and the conversion seems to have left no psychic scars. He bitterly remembered the Jesuits of his schooldays, but this was scarcely unusual among their alumni. His anti-Romanism was mostly conventional, and considering his talent for invective very mild. He wanted to keep the clergy out of the schools,[7] and considered their internationalism contrary to the well-being of the state.[8] As one might predict from his other views, Haiser denounced the clergy (or "brahmin-dom") for having historically aspired to dominate the Kshartriya-caste,

to whom they should always be auxiliaries.[9] Catholicism was "anti-race,"[10] notably in the way clerical celibacy had established an order of command in deliberate contradiction to descent, which had set a contagious bad example to modern democracy.[11] However, Haiser was always insistent that the Roman Caholic Church was only a minor problem, less important than the Jews or liberals. It was preposterous for the radical right to treat it as a major enemy, or to become bogged down in confessional quarrels.[12] German-nationals of Austria should not be "Catholic-eaters:"

> Among the left-völkisch are many who would sooner make a treaty with the Jews than with the parsons--such people belong in an asylum. That is Austrian school-teacher-nationalism, schoolmaster freethinking, which makes a sound stomach vomit.[13]

But Haiser disapproved not only of Catholicism but of Christianity in general, and attacked it on a broad vulgar-Nietzschean front. Historically, it had been a degeneration. Healthy, well-rooted ancient cults had recognized that strife and contradiction, not unity and harmony, were of the essense of creation, that the divine power was not benevolent like a nice old parson but demanded sacrifice, like the Aztec Huitzilopochtli.[14] Thus those who tried to see resemblances to Christianity in the old Germanic religion were mistaken in every way.[15] In antiquity every people had sought a god of its own, shared with no other, to lead them in struggle, as Hahweh had the Jews.[16] Primitive cults had implicitly and properly assumed that the

strong could and should dominate the weak[17] and did not burden themselves with philosophy and theology.

> Nature-fresh peoples don't pray either in a reasonable-religious and "monistic" nor in a "monotonotheistic" style, they pray to the gods.[18]

Christianity meant deterioration in every way. It was fundamentally un-Aryan, indeed rooted in no people at all, being rather a characteristic product of all mongrelized slave-castes, in their struggle against their masters.[19] In Christianity, "the Australian nigger and our Bismarck have the same [kind of] 'soul.'"[20] It fettered the proper egotism of strong personalities and peoples.

> It knows only world-values, but no Volk- or type-values, it knows only self-overcoming and self-sacrifice, but no overcoming or sacrifice of one's neighbors.[21]

> Christian love of one's neighbor makes all great small, compels all fighting natures to surrender instead of to victory, to self-overcoming, rather than overcoming others. . . . [Rather] if I feel in myself impulses which are hostile to the wellbeing of the state and ascending life, I must then overcome myself, but if I find these impulses in others, I must overcome them. A people that fetters its great men, commands them to be considerate, instead of allowing their justified ruthlessness free run, will have no future, for precisely consideration for one's neighbors destroys the finest plans of a statesman.[22]

It was ruinously individualistic, encouraging people to think of their individual salvation rather than the group's welfare.[23] Its sexual attitudes were unhealthy, and led to morality being obsessed with sex.[24] It was riddled with overintellectuality:

> Up to now all religions have shattered on too much thinking; they originally purely and childishly believed, but later became worn away by oversubtlety of reasoning.

> Always the same way; from mystery to dogma, to logical foundation, to nonsense, to scoffing.[25]

The Jews were of course behind Christianity, and in recent times it had been their chief protector.[26] In every religion class, schoolchildren were indoctrinated that the Jews were God's Chosen People.[27]

Nor was Christianity's pernicious influence confined to its enrolled adherents. In truly Rabelaisian catalogues, Haiser called it the source of all modern evils:

> It steps forth as tolerance, as "to understand everything is to pardon everything," Freemasonry, pacifism, Monism, feminism and women's rights, free love, free schools, "mild and non-punitive education of the young," abolition of the death penalty, free self-determination (naturally of the prettiest natures at the expense of the greatest), and in the political [sphere] as parliamentarism, free trade, liberalism and finally socialism and Bolshevism. . . . [And] in all the crazy doctrines of the declining west one reads only too significantly between the lines . . . "Aryan, love the Jew more than yourself."[28]

With characteristic ill-nature, but with a grain of truth, he accused the so-called "scientific" freethinkers of being but disguised Christians:

> You men of science, who are so proud of your matter-of-factness and smile at all fantasy . . . are <u>you</u> not far more the fantasizers, who clothe the ostensible "facts of experience" with ten layers of Christianity, or if you come from the freethinking and atheist camp, with as many coats of monistic or pantheistic humanity? That a Christian should arrive at a humane world-view is logical and sincere, but you atheists and matter-of-fact observers of nature? Does not there lie here a "grand illusion" . . . . perhaps deliberate illusion? How can one lull mankind to sleep with mildness, if nature demands the greatest harshness. . . ?[29]

Most of the foregoing was already to be found in Nietzsche, and his numerous vulgarizers, but Haiser showed

somewhat more originality in specifically denouncing Christianity for opposing struggle and conflict, and instead advocating the ideal of reconciliation, unity and harmony, which could only end in cultural and moral "heat-death."

> Nature kisses not merely with love, which multiplies, but also with struggle, which annihilates. A world religion would lead to the death of peoples and of development [itself], and not in vain is there prophesied the end of the world, as soon as all peoples of the earth have become Christians.[30]

On the contrary, the essential energy of the world came from loving and hating, and Haiser found the latter as essential (and, one suspects, far more congenial) than the former. As he himself put it, "the deepest thoughts spring only from hatred, not friendship."[31] To be sure, other Germans had expressed similar sentiments, including Bismarck.[32] In fact, in Haiser's view even attempting to understand an opponent's convictions was to weaken one's own. Tolerance like equality was a weapon of the weak, and ruinous to genuine religion.

Haiser was alarmed to find these evils everywhere, especially in what he called "Buddhism" and "Monism." As usual with his pet peeves, he used the terms loosely and carelessly, and the precise object of his scorn was often in doubt. He was clear enough about his basic concern, namely that both spirit and matter were necessary for "ascending life."

> Natural events without the destructive and thereby upwards-striving force of spirit remain forever an unalterable clockwork movement, a perpetuum mobile, an

> eternal return to the eternally the same. . . . On the other hand one-sided concern for the soul, which takes no thought for the body, which despises the world and has an eye only for the life of the beyond, robs itself of the only means to achieve its yearnings. . . . Spirit without matter as matter without spirit is . . . a situation of pure being, of eternal unalterability, but ascent demands change, and then change of the change, for that is becoming. Life is a union of body and soul, and the primordial view of primitive, but on this account healthy and instinct-gifted peoples, here thinks far deeper than intelligentsiafied speculation, which denies either spirit or matter. Monism is always a sign of degeneration, whether it appears in theistic or atheistic form, as all-matter or all-spirit.[34]

The denial of dualism undermined freedom of the will, man's responsibility for his acts, and any need to strive.[35] It naturally gave rise to "objectivity," the result of having no side to defend.

In recent times, "Buddhist" tendencies had infected even good "new-Germans."

> In very recent times Buddhism with its love of neighbor and denial of the will sneaked into new-German circles, at the hand of Schopenhauer. How editors could thus give themselves up, to let the spiritual renewal of the German people be melted together with a Nirvana-philosophy, is inconceivable to me. Even Christianity in spite of its manifoldly un-Aryan orientation is a thousand times better, for it preaches eternal life, but this decadence-philosophy of Buddha preaches eternal death as salvation! It portrays the will as a sin, which we Nietzscheans designate the greatest blessing! Crazy! Would you make the Germans into opium-smokers?[36]

A far greater villain was Monism, to which Haiser devoted extraordinary attention. Monism[37] was a philosophy of "scientific" materialism, directed against organized Christianity and traditional metaphysical thinking, especially in its association with Bildung. It had its own "church" in the Deutscher Monistenbund, founded in 1904.

Its chief spokesman for many years was Wilhelm Ostwald, winner of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry and Professor at Leipzig, but its best known author was the biologist Ernst Haeckel, whose phenomenally popular The World-Riddle was said to have been translated into twenty-five languages. To most educated French or English-speaking readers, Monism would probably have seemed old fashioned, if not puerile, at the turn of the century. But in the German-speaking world, it seemed quite daring, presumably because of the prevailing deference to the established churches, and to authority in general.[38]

In practice, Monism was less iconoclastic than it sounded. Its denial of the reality of spirit led not to crass materialism, but to a high-flown spiritualization of matter. As fancifully as any mystical theologian, Haeckel theorized that all matter partook of "soul," and even of love and hate, the human version being only the most developed form.[39] Haeckel furthermore insisted that the universe was eternal, and therefore refused to accept the laws of thermodynamics.[40] Monism was in part a throwback to the "nature-philosophy" of the Romanticist era, and also had affinities to theosophy and similar tendencies.[41] Ethically too most Monists shrank from the full naturalistic implications of their tenets, and like the other pious unbelievers in which the nineteenth century was so rich, preached ethical obligations suspiciously like those of Christianity.[42] Thus Ostwald, considering energy rather than matter the ultimate

reality, gave many sermons exhorting individuals not to waste energy, but expend it for socially useful purposes.[43]

In their political sympathies, Monists were quite diverse. Many of them, notably Haeckel and the prominent editor Johannes Unold, were drawn to the macho variety of social darwinism and racialism, and to illiberal domestic and foreign policies resembling those of the ADV.[44] The prolific radical right author Heinrich Pudor, whom Haiser regarded highly, was also a member of the Monistenbund. But it also included Wilhelm Schallmayer, Ludwig Gurlitt (a leading figure in the Youth Movement), a number of Jews, and even Karl von Ossietzsky.

Actually Haiser shared many ideas with leading Monists, notably racialism and contempt for humanitarian ethics. But in his opinion they were unrelieved bad news. He considered them basically old-fashioned and childish materialists.

> To see the creation process purely from the chemical-physiological side belongs to a naively materialistic age, hopefully soon to be surpassed. There certainly play a role spiritual forces, of which our monistic Haeckel-wisdom cannot even dream.[45]

There were an outgrowth of the petty, detail-obsessed "day-laborer" type of modern scientist, in Sir William Ramsay's phrase able to catch whiting but never salmon,[46] always Wagners and never Fausts.[47] In their fatuous insolence they assumed that our present human wisdom was absolute and final truth, and on the basis of it that man could dominate nature instead of being merely the tool of its mysterious purposes.

Haiser accused the Monists (and here with some justice) of denouncing the churches as speculative and dogmatic, but themselves constituting a church on the same basis, and (in his opinion) as greedy for power:

> Had Monism conquered as a Reformation in Germany, we would now have instead of the shrines, pictures of saints and reliquaries of the Catholics only idol-temples with the likenesses of the Grandmasters of the Monist League in Jena and Leipzig and miraculous radium capsules.[48]

Haiser especially detested Ostwald (whom he accused inter alia of having had his assistants do his laboratory work[49]). He pointedly disagreed with his exhortation, that since energy was limited, it should be used worthily and not wasted. Haiser preferred a more "aristocratic" interpretation of the cosmos, considering it demeaning to the Creator to imagine Him stopwatch in hand, like a factory timekeeper:

> wasteful is nature! millions of eggs, billions of sperm, and only one offspring! Wasteful is the aristocrat, and lavish with time, he is no man of industry, no piece-worker, this he leaves to the Sudra. Bees are industrious but not the peak of development of life.[49]

Ostwald should take his own advice:

> If Herr Ostwald had set down "the energetic imperative" on a couple of pages, that would be a pretty thing, at the least an interesting question for debate. But to write folios in the form of an encyclopedia about it, is the greatest waste of energy there ever was. Ostwald would have far better served the world if he had played Skat. Indeed for what faith says in a few words the intellect needs a library up to the ceiling.[50]

In short, "humanity-dripping materialistic monism" was "also a branch of the tree of atheistic Christianity," and these "monistic Sunday-preachers and materialistic

rosary brothers bear much of the blame that our fatherland was broken to pieces."[51] Haiser even suggested that there was a real need to have people sworn to vows precisely contrary to the "usurpation of the learned" of which monist "rosary-brothers" were glaring examples.[52]

Haiser was equally contemptuous, although less anxious, about spiritualism, or "occultism" as it was commonly called in Germany. He took pains to say, that he held no brief for "the holy halls of science, where the masters of the guild pronounce the judgment of their Fehmgericht."[53] Table-lifting was as "scientific" a fact as seeing the devil in the Middle Ages, or for that matter the assertions of modern radium research. Haiser's objection was rather that occultism tried to materialize and debase spirit, as did the Monists, and he often denounced them both at once. The phenomena of spiritualism were undignified and trivial, fit for silly society women but not for building true aristocrats. To try to cure our modern materialism this way was like coming from the rain into the roof-drip, and served only "left-culture."[54]

Yet as to a replacement for "atheist-Christianity" Haiser was sketchy and vague. His most extensive suggestions concerning religious worship are found in Freimaurer, along with his other blueprints for a restored aristocratic state. He denounced the party of the radical right who wanted to eradicate religion altogether, or at least among

educated people, for without a religious sense there was no true Kultur or morality.[55] It was especially necessary that Kshatriya youth be brought up to be God-fearing, so that they would see the highest virtues as serving their country and their caste. Naturally such a faith had to be strictly national, with no cosmopolitan admixture, and the priest had to be strictly subordinate to the warrior.[56]

As a basis for a rejuvenated religion, present Christianity would never do, because it denied the all-important inequality of men. But rather confusingly Haiser also suggested a number of modifications to Catholicism to make it more acceptable to Kshatriyas and also bridge the gap with the Protestants. Quite unacceptable to true aristocrats was kneeling to anybody, along with auricular confession: in the new state the highest caste would be forbidden to let their womenfolk go to confession, a shameless exposure of family secrets. He proposed retaining the Mass (in a single species), the decoration of churches, and the dignities of the Roman Catholic Church, but a de-emphasis on the cults of the Savior and the Virgin. Marriages could be dissolved by the state, priests could marry, and there would be a single archbishop for all Germans, loosely tied to Rome.

However, if such a reform proved impractical (and Haiser does not seem to take it very seriously) he suggested a new supra-confessional state religion. To make it a national cult would admittedly be difficult, because of the

vital spiritual distinction between castes. As one expedient, he suggested that the lower ranks might look forward to rewards in the next world for serving their betters in this one. The rites of the new cult, including baptism, marriage, and funerals, would be compulsory, and refusal to participate would mean the loss of all citizen rights. But aside from outward observances no dogma or confession of faith would be required, and citizens would be free to practice other religions on the side, although the state would not recognize them. Perhaps the old Germanic worship would play a role.[57] Haiser added, that he viewed the promise of a life after death as essential to encourage people to do their duty.[58]

To make religion such a handmaid of ulterior motives, and at the same time claim to respect it, may seem farcical even for Franz Haiser; but among theologically very "liberal," ultra-nationalist Protestants his views were really different only in their boldness and bad manners.

Notes to Chapter XV

[1]In Austria, where German-speaking Protestants were in any case very few, the role and character of the Evangelical Church was quite different from Germany's. As of 1914, it had recently gained a good many converts, for a variety of reasons.

[2]Some data are to be found in P.B. Means, Things that Are Caesar's (New York: 1935), pp. 108-120. See Bibliographical Essay.

[3]FH, "Religion und Freigeisterei," Michel, July 29, 1923, p. 3.

[4]UK, p. 154.

[5]Krisis, p. 43.

[6]Krisis, pp. 7, 35, 43.

[7]FM, p. 93.

[8]FM, p. 38; JF, p. 52; UK, p. 314.

[9]FM, p. 12; 80-81; JF, pp. 122-23.

[10]FH, "Die Linkskultur. . . ," PAM, XII, p. 414.

[11]GFA, pp. 34-35.

[12]"Die Linkskultur. . . ," loc. cit.; JF, p. 124; "Deutschtum, Modernismus und Hebräertum," Hammer, IX, pp. 314-18; X, pp. 263-67; Krisis, pp. 6, 13.

[13]JF, p. 125.

[14]FM, p. 24; MB, pp. 63, 65-66.

[15]FM, p. 11.

[16]JF, p. 41; Anfang, p. 171.

[17]JF, p. 114.

[18]FH, "Weltanschauung und Religion," PAM, XII, pp. 201-202.

[19]Anfang, p. 92.

[20]Krisis, p. 36.

[21]Anfang, p. 113.

[22]Anfang, pp. 118-19.

[23]Anfang, p. 48; MB, pp. 50-52.

[24]Anfang, p. 96.

[25]Krisis, p. 36.

[26]MB, p. 41; Anfang, pp. 165-66; Skl., p. 63; "Biologische Gesetze und seelische Gebote," WK, II, p. 122.

[27]JF, p. 31; "Judentum und Philistertum," Das Hakenkreuz, I, pp. 58-59.

[28]Anfang, pp. 119-20.

[29]Anfang, p. 127.

[30]Anfang, p. 102.

[31]FH, "Erinnerungen an Georg von Schönerer," Alldeutscher Zeitweiser, XXV, p. 48.

[32]As Bismarck said, "Hate is just as great an incentive to life as love. My life is preserved and made pleasant by two things--my wife and Windhorst. One exists for love, the other for hate." Cited in K. S. Pinson, Modern Germany, p. 190.

[33]Krisis, p. 36.

[34]Anfang, pp. 31-32.

[35]Anfang, p. 39.

[36]Anfang, p. 119. See also Anfang, p. 49; "Weltanschauung. . . ," PAM, XII, p. 202.

[37]So-called because it denied the duality of spirit and matter, allowing only matter to be real, and admitting the existence of spirit (if at all) only as a derivative of matter.

[38]It is worth noting that Haeckel himself did not resign from the Evangelical Church until over seventy.

[39]Haeckel, Riddle, pp. 217-24; Charles M. Williams, A Review of the Systems of Ethics Founded on the Theory of Evolution (New York: 1893), pp. 23-25.

[40]Haeckel, Riddle, pp. 246-47. See also Niles Holt, "Ernst Haeckel's Monistic Religion," Journal of the History of Ideas, XXXII, pp. 265-80.

[41]Daniel Gasman, The Scientific Origins of National Socialism (New York: 1971), pp. 64-76; H. Weinel, "Religious Life and Thought in Germany Today," Hibbert Journal, VII (July 1909), pp. 738-41.

[42]See Niles Holt, The Social and Political Ideas of the German Monist Movement 1871-1914 (Ph.D. Thesis, Yale: 1967).

[43]Frederic Lilge, The Abuse of Learning (New York: 1948), pp. 81-82.

[44]Gasman, op. cit., pp. 39-49, 82-87, 90-98, 106-122, 136-37, 151; Johannes Unold, Politik im Lichte der Entwicklungslehre (Munich: 1912), pp. 13-14, 30, 37, 55, 125.

[45]Anfang, p. 130.

[46]AI, pp. 53-55.

[47]Krisis, p. 41.

[48]FH, "Freibeuterhauptleute im Reiche des Geistes," PAM, XV, p. 354. See also "Monistengrossenwahn," in Krisis, pp. 53-59; AI, p. 64.

[49]AI, p. 69.

[50]AI, p. 57. See also UK, pp. 250-51.

[51]Anfang, p. 13.

[52]AI, p. 70.

[53]FH, "Okkultismus," PAM, XV, p. 189.

[54]Ibid., pp. 190-94. See also FM, pp. 34, 41, 109; "Christlich-asketischer Spiritismus," PAM, XX, p. 139.

[55]FM, p. 103.

[56]FM, pp. 38-39.

[57]FM, pp. 104-109.

[58]JF, p. 114; Anfang, p. 33.

381

CHAPTER XVI

FRANZ HAISER'S PUBLIC RECEPTION

> But I am constant as the northern star,
> Of whose true-fixed and resting quality
> There is no fellow in the firmament.
> The skies are painted with unnumbered sparks
> They are all fire and every one doth shine;
> But there's but one in all doth hold his place.
>
> --Shakespeare, Julius Caesar

Franz Haiser was not a leading figure of the radical right, but his works had enough circulation, and provoked enough reaction, to reveal a great deal about it. None of his books (save possibly Gastmahl) had any considerable sales, but his periodical pieces appeared in such major völkisch organs as PAM, DE, Michel, DÖTZ, and Völkischer Beobachter. Certainly a considerable proportion of the committed völkisch public had come across one or more of his works. And the press certainly took notice of him; from 1912 to 1933 the reviews, commentaries and notes concerning our subject number at least 130, and probably considerably more.[1] A small percentage of these appeared from circles unsympathetic to the radical right; nearly all the rest came from authors and publications of the völkisch camp.

This attention depended very little on personal friendship and exchange of favors. Haiser was no joiner, and for

most of his writing life, especially after 1914, he seldom went far from Scheibbs. There are few indications of person-to-person contact with editors or reviewers. Having no office, wealth or editorial influence at his disposal, he was scarcely in a position to confer favors, and on balance he probably received far more help from his friends than he gave. Most of his public, editors and commentators included, knew him as we do, from the printed page.

Franz Haiser liked to pose as the isolated genius, neglected but contemptuous of fame, but he protested rather too much. He cared a great deal about what was said about him, and as early as 1914 published at his own expense a compendium of his reviews and controversies. He loved to debate, and engaged in at least eleven exchanges in the press. These might be quite peripheral to his main interests, such as the Austrian army's record in the war,[3] and temperance in alcohol.[4] He often referred to his controversies in his publications, relevantly or not.

Haiser's controversies did not at all involve the liberals or the left wing, towards whom his hatred was impersonal and indeed metaphysical. This was not unusual; as noted above, the various extremes of opinion of the German-speaking world (and no only in politics) had too little contact even to argue with each other. It was beneath their dignity to refute the ideas of the opposite camp, or to review (or even to mention) their books. This was a

reflection of general civic inexperience, and was especially true of the radical right. Until at least the late 1920's, this body of opinion tended to stand outside the world of power and responsibility, and to be largely occupied with the doings of its own organizations, "circles," and publications. The closest analogy in the English-speaking world would be those associated with "little magazines," or under-graduate cliques and Greek-letter societies, or perhaps religious sectarians. The radical right expended its nervous energy mostly within its own set, and took its squabbles and schisms desperately seriously.

In Haiser's case, it is noteworthy that despite his capacity for vituperation he rarely engaged in personalities, and he was often careful to say that he attacked only opinions, and meant no offense to individuals. He had a number of pet enemies, but the chief (and the only one discussed in the present work) were the "populists" of the radical right, or in his phraseology the "left-völkisch." His basic criticism, which was by no means without basis, was that they pretended to repudiate liberalism, root and branch, while implicitly accepting much of it, or deluded themselves that it could be adapted to radical right purposes. Once liberalism and "enlightenment" had destroyed the essentially arbitrary inequality and authority of the preindustrial order, no stable replacement was possible, and there was no stopping the full achievement of mass society. The

left-völkisch openly averred that one must trim one's ideological sails in order to attract more followers, which Haiser denounced with the zeal of an Old Testament prophet.

Really quite fairly, Haiser discussed his divergence in a dialogue between himself and a member of the Austrian Volkspartei. Haiser complained of the mildness of its anti-Semitism.

> He said, it was tactically unsound--a too sharp tone would attract none and do harm. I said, that's to cloak you Hosensch. . .rei[5]. . . . If I had my own paper I would never be censored by the editors and toned down. At least [one should] get away from the philistine bourgeoisie, this slimy formless jelly-fishmass, which consists of 98 percent Pilsener beer and only 2 percent dry matter, [and] twitches from left to right like frogs' legs in an electric current.
> He: I don't understand you. You knock [both] proletariat and bourgeoisie. One must have followers from somewhere. . . . Our movement must have the Volk behind it. Why are you so unpolitical? You have talent, but misuse it.
> I: . . . I am greatly afraid our völkisch movement will retrogress, for the ideal "Race, Volk, and Fatherland," becomes "stylish," and "humanity" is trusted too much. The entire movement orients itself too much toward recruiting large numbers, and threatens to go democratic. I write ever against the masses and only for the few. . . . I too believe in race, Volk, and Fatherland, but the will of the masses will never attain them, so therefore I renounce mass-recruiting. I have in mind [only] the One, who will compel the good of the masses.
> He: You live still among men and not over them. All social life sets bridges between men, on which nationality and Rechtsstaat are founded.[6]
> [Haiser responds that he finds very little in common with his fellow-Austrians, especially those around Scheibbs.]
> He: you talk class-politics, not Volk-politics, as do the Bolsheviks or the western capitalist states. . . . We [of the Grossdeutsch Partei] want a strong, united Germany. We bridge over contradictions, you rather sharpen them.
> I: you take the words out of my mouth. In regard to leveling of society, modern nationalism is as bad as

> socialism. It contradicts itself, for it attains no unified fatherland, but a divided and weak one. Equality and the bridging of class differences make for strife; if the head fails to order the lower parts, the whole state organism falls into disorder. Everyone wants to be head, to command and not to obey. Idealistic nationalism, resting on a common patriotism of free and equal citizens, is a despicable utopia. Democratic nationalism is less logical than communism. . . . . A nation can only conquer when under the rule of one man or a small group. . . . Our Volk is a race-mixture, and leadership properly belongs only to the superior types.[7]

Since most of the German-speaking radical right tended to agree with his interlocutor, Haiser found in it little to praise and much to scold. He adhered to virtually none of its parties or organizations, save briefly and uncomfortably to the NDKBiO, as mentioned above.[8] Throughout his works, and more frequently in the later ones, whatever point he made against the liberal open society was apt to be coupled with a denunciation of those on the radical right who misunderstood or even approved of it. In fact, many supposed "new-nationals" were really crypto-democrats,[9] and even admirers of the principles of 1848.[10] The radical right faithfully copied the errors of the opposite camp, including pettiness, obstinacy, "personality," and resentment of authority.[11] Völkisch political parties were as corrupt as the left-wing ones.[12]

To these general accusations, Haiser added a long bill of particulars. The left-völkisch mistakenly tried to compete with the forces of left-culture--both "black" and "red"--on such issues as education,[13] a higher standard of living for the masses,[14] equalization of wealth,[15] women's rights,[16]

and praise of the peasant and even the Landspiesser.[17] In 1912 he went so far as to accuse Austrian "left-nationals" of taking up the anti-militarist issue, simply to steal votes from the socialists.[18] He sneered at proposals to replace the existing type of parliament with one based on Beruf or Stand, which would be equally subject to selfishness and squabbling. The only stable basis of government was a racial master-caste.[19] They were also mistaken on anti-Semitism, for they regarded the Jews as the central evil, not the liberal open society which gave the Jews their opportunity. They even considered attacks on it as unvolkstümlich.[20] Still more frequently and indignantly Haiser belabored the left-völkisch for endorsing the principle of a "free path for talent," which required the noble to compete on even terms with the ignoble,[21] and for expecting them to work for a living like everyone else.[22] Haiser was notably vivid, no doubt from personal experience, on the pusillanimity of radical right publications about printing unpopular views[23] in the preposterous expectation of gaining left wing adherents thereby.[24]

Franz Haiser's views were so extreme and outspoken that one might expect vigorous hostile criticism of him; both from the left, which were apparently presented with ideal ammunition for exposing the real motivation of the enemies of the open society, and from the rest of the radical right, as a response to his harsh remarks against their views, and the way he made their movement seem ridiculous. Yet both of these

responses were infrequent. The left and liberal camps paid him remarkably little attention, and the notices he received from right-wing authors and periodicals were generally favorable.

The lack of attention to Haiser from the left and liberal sides has probably the simple explanation, that the extremes of the German-speaking world tended to ignore one another. Among about 130 notices, only six can be classified as critical on left-wing grounds.

In fact there were nearly as many comments on the sage of Scheibbs from Roman Catholic quarters, namely four reviews of Krisis. The book's anti-intellectualism might arouse mild praise, but his racialism and naturalistic ethics made the reviewers add that he "will only push deeper into the abyss"[25] and "we cannot connect the expectation of a higher Christian humanity with his radical demands."[26] The prestigious Catholic journal Hochland took the book remarkably seriously, saying of its ruthlessness

> That such a sentence could be spoken ten years ago was a warning sign of our moral downfall, which led the way to [our] political and economic collapse; but how it could attain a second edition in the year 1919 is to me incomprehensible. . . . It seems to me this cultivation of natural instinct is in the highest degree unnatural, an artificial product of an overheated greenhouse-atmosphere, inconceivable as a native growth from the German forest. . . . I consider it a false self-esteem, that the author fancies himself justified, to employ continually the phrase of Nietzsche's about the "writing rabble" to other people.[27]

These remarks aroused Haiser to one of his rare specific mentions of his critics; he replied, rather lamely, that he would

not deny Hochland's right to disagree with him on religious grounds, "but instead [it] threw about Jewish-humanitarian and freedomish-progressive phrases and slogans, that I believed I had the Berliner Tagblatt or Vorwärts in front of me."[28]

Left-wing critics on the other hand regarded Haiser with derision, although their attempts at wit seem scarcely less laborious than those on the radical right. Surprisingly, they made but weak use of Haiser's divergences from the rest of the völkisch, especially his noisy proclamation that the main objection to liberalism and democracy was that it did not grant arbitrary privileges and a life of ease for a favored few. Thus a leading socialist monthly commented on AI that "in its pathological openheartedness it gives some very interesting glimpses on certain extreme reactionary tendencies," but chiefly remarked on its brutal tone and weak logic, in which respects it was little different from stacks of völkisch books, and scarcely worth bringing to readers' attention. More deft was the conclusion, that Haiser's denunciation of the indiscipline of this countrymen, and hence their hatred of everything authoritarian and "Prussian," "might even be felt as compromising by the gentlemen of the Prussian alliance."[29]

Of superior quality was a squib in Die Welt am Montag published at about the same time. This concerned a controversy then in progress between Haiser and one of his

reviewers, Professor Wilhelm Schölermann, on the one hand, and one Heinrich Driesmans, on the other, which will be further described below. "Dr. Frosch"[30] took Haiser's distinction of "aristocrats" and "curs" as the starting point for a denunciation of parasitic aristocrats who based their claim to superiority on some mysterious quality of "blood." Some things are indeed hereditary, and possibly spiritual qualities among them. "But how this blood is constituted, we can recognize by only one sign; what the man does." It was therefore cowardice, and itself proof of unfitness, to claim high place without submitting to fair and open competition. Only those who fear they are unqualified oppose democracy; "the truly noble should welcome it," for only so can they prove that they are not Köter.

But, the author concludes, while one can understand why those of old families should still believe in arbitrary privileges, it is inconceivable how a bourgeois could. Yet "the words above cited, which set blood and work in contradiction, originate from a bourgeois, one Dr. Haiser," assisted by another bourgeois, Professor Schölermann. "The names of these gentlemen and that of Dr. Hunkel in Lichterfelde, who accepts applications to the 'Russian secret society,' do not have the ring of old nobility. Whether these gentlemen can prove their unbroken descent over the necessary centuries is very doubtful." And without this, it will do them no good to cite their useful activities to a consecrated end, "for

one can justly say to them, what they themselves teach: nothing is achieved by work!" and one kick of a knightly boot will knock them down to Köter again. "Perhaps then they will consider what--if one in the eyes of certain people belonged to the Köter already--is better: to be a biting Köter or a fawning one."[31]

The Haiser-Schönermann-Driesmans affair was also the subject of two articles in the Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus. Among the "Pan-Germans of the strictest observance" there had emerged Dr. Franz Haiser, who had discovered that the root evil of modern times was valuing earned more than inherited wealth and position, and hypertrophy of the brain, especially through Bildung. There prevailed "mish-mash" and leveling both of race and of spirit, and the only remedy was restoration of a racially select oligarchy. To this end a secret league should be formed--"Dr. Hunkel of Lichterfelde is obliging enough to receive the applications." These "prophets" of racialism had discarded the centuries-old idea of the intrinsic worth of human beings; "in the transvaluation of all values, Nietzsche is no comparison to Dr. Haiser." As for the value of a noble idle-rich, the article cited some aristocrats of the best and purest blood lately involved in scandals. But the reviewer cheered the appearance of a "heretic" in the same circles, Heinrich Driesmans, who had called Haiser cracked, and earnestly declared that modern aristocrats were

"as corrupt as democrats."[32] (Actually this perpetrated an error of Driesmans, assuming that Haiser identified the existing nobility with his ideal elite, which was never true.)

Some three months later, the same publication gave an update on the by now extensive quarrel, this time with sharper wit. Haiser was easiest to deflate by simply quoting him, especially when he held that nobody understood "right-culture" but himself. He suspected the "Jewish sneak-spirit" was everywhere, lumping together in his habitual Rabelaisian-catalogue fashion "not only in Zabern, in the 'Ostwaldian world-picture,' in the women's movement and elsewhere, but also within the new-national 'fitness-efforts' [Tüchtig-keitsstrebungen]. I have a fine nose for it." He likewise accused Goethe, in his words, of serving "the camp of the esthetic-cosmopolitan thinker-spirit," and he also scorned Fichte, for what use was his patriotism

> if he spoke to us as a freedomish-progressive? Thunderation! First [throw] 'modern ideas' out the window, then let [us] think of setting our sinking fatherland up again!

Such was his horror of the "army of modern Gebildeten," that he even longed to flee to the village tavern, for "only there am I safe from this caricature of Geist." Yet once again anti-climax resulted, when the article concluded with some of Haiser's anti-Semitic remarks, which were certainly no novelties whatever to the readers of this paper.[33]

In the postwar years, when Haiser had his greatest circulation, the non-radical right press noticed him only

twice. In 1925 a comic paper, Die Leuchtrakete, printed a quote from him calling for a world union of the radical right, adding a line of psuedo-biblical sarcasm and a cartoon (See attached).[34] The last comment from the anti-radical right side, and the most acute, appeared in a Jewish publication of 1926. Reviewing Gastmahl, it noted that "it shows with cynical frankness the contempt of [so-called] race-aristocrats towards those whom they call 'the people'," adding a quote from Haiser:

> Thus in spite of the racial distinctions which separate them, the noble persons of different nations stand closer to each other than the aristocrat and underlayer of one and the same people.

To make his point Haiser had included a distincly aristocratic Sephardic Jewess among the characters.

> Bravo! . . . This is at last an honorable confession of völkisch literature. Here is to be recognized clearly and unambiguously the "social" and "national" sense of völkisch race-men. Love of the people is a thing for the common. . . . [For] the völkisch "aristocrat" the mass of the people, which consists of "Köters and half-breeds," [are only] an object of utility and exploitation, and must eternally remain so. The "rise of a member of the lower classes to the higher," is morally impermissible. "Birth alone" determines "membership in class and rank." Ability [Tüchtigkeit] is an ignoble concept, a Jewish invention.[39]

This reviewer struck at Haiser's glaring inconsistency, his attempt to be elitist and patriotic at once. He could have used Haiser for a revealing expose of the general völkisch weakness on this score, their attempt to be heartily for the Volk yet savagely opposed to democracy, yet he did not. It is indeed surprising that persons hostile to the radical right cited Haiser so seldom and with such

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs _____
2. Colored illustrations _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓ throughout _____
7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
9. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author _____
10. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows _____
11. Poor carbon copy _____
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type _____
13. Appendix pages are poor copy _____
14. Original copy with light type _____
15. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
16. Other _____

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

Aus dem Reiche des Hakenkreuzes

In der Folge 2-3 der Wiener Zeitschrift „Das Hakenkreuz" finden wir in dem Aufsatze „Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer" eine sehr tiefsinnige Betrachtung. Da heißt es:

„Es liegt nun nahe, daß auch wir Krieger, Kschatrija, Beamte und Akademiker, mit einem Worte: wir Nationalen und Vaterländischen und Opferbereiten, uns die Hände reichen, nicht etwa, um an unseren Vaterländern Verrat zu üben, wohl aber, um über gemeinsame Reformen zu beraten. Wir brauchen eine Ehereform, die uns reichlichere Vermehrung gestattet, sonst sterben wir aus. Wer von euch Sklaven ist unserer Art und unserer Rasse? Er komme zu uns in die Oberschicht, denn er soll Herr, nicht Knecht sein! Bewaffnet euch! Bildet Truppen, die nicht unter der Botmäßigkeit der jüdischen Regierungen (auch in Österreich?) und Parlamente stehen, damit wir durch einen gemeinsamen Weltruck diese elende internationale Kötterschaft stürzen und euch zu wohlhabenden Bürgern machen können! Dieses Programm soll all a r i s c h werden und durch die nationalen Verbände, Hakenkreuzler, Britons, Kukluxklan, Faschisten, die Erwachenden Ungarn etc. verbreitet werden."

A l s o i h r M ü h s e l i g e n u n d B e l a d e n e n, i h r s o l l t k e i n e K n e c h t e m e h r s e i n! H i n e i n i n d i e a l l a r i s c h e O b e r s c h i c h t e d e r H e r r e n!

uncertain focus. Possibly the reason lies in the unfamiliarity of the German-speaking world with the debating style that an open society calls for, and for which Bildung was such a poor preparation.

The bulk of the public attention to Haiser came from publications of a pronounced right-wing character. Many of these items were brief and relatively non-committal, but wherever they disclose a point of view their tone is usually highly favorable. Yet scarcely anybody on the radical right, including (as can often be demonstrated from other of their works) agreed with Haiser's most deeply held convictions, namely the need for a restoration of preindustrial elitism and cosmopolitan, essentially anti-national counter-revolution; nor, as we have seen, did Haiser shrink from pointing out how they disagreed.

Undoubtedly the explanation of this anomaly is, that the radical right (or at least, that part of it which paid attention to Haiser) was essentially weak in analysis and argument, and it preferred to think with its viscera rather than any higher or sharper organ. Haiser was raucously anti-Semitic, anti-intellectual and anti-liberal, so he was automatically a comrade. The German-speaking radical right felt itself a beleaguered minority under a triumphant liberalism, and welcomed all the adherents that came forward. As usually with "causes," it was easier to define a "movement" in terms of what people were against, rather than what they were for. Barbaric vitalism also encouraged this tendency,

for it found feeling a stronger bond than reason.

The editors and reviewers of Haiser's material sometimes virtually admitted the above, specifying that they did not approve of everything he said (or of how he said it), but they declared that his heart was in the right place, and certainly readers would find him stimulating. Typical were the remarks of two Nazi publications:

> This rough ruthlessness is at this time of cowardice much to be hailed. From a practical standpoint we are in this and that point not entirely of the author's opinion.[36]

> We publish the essay of this preeminent race-philosopher, without thereby having committed ourselves to his views. But Haiser is one of the most courageous, sharpest, and--in spite of his numerous contradictions--pathbreaking spirits of the present day, whom to learn to understand will give every one of our readers pleasure and stimulation.[37]

Likewise a reviewer for the official organ of the ADV:

> This pamphlet will find few readers, who can declare themselves in agreement with all [of it]. . . , but also few thinking Germans, in which there will not resonate related thoughts and moods from reading [it]. The value of this work lies in its high endowment of truth and in the fruitful stimulations, which it gives. It is on this account highly worthy of attention.[38]

Usually, radical right commentators converted Haiser into a member of the club by a process of "creative misunderstanding," singling out those of his notions that they found congenial and ignoring the remainder.

Most of the critical attention to our subject's works came from the specifically <u>völkisch</u> section of the radical right, or more bluntly its more lowbrow and unmannerly wing. However, it is remarkable that some

publications appealing to the well-bred and gebildeten also praised him. Perhaps the most surprising of these comments came from a Lutheran church magazine. Its reaction to Krisis was that

> With inner assent one rejoices at the knock-down struggle of the author against the hollowness and insipidity of intellectualism, which he considers the fundamental weak point of our time. . . . That the author also reproaches degeneration through intellectualism in Christianity, will make this book important for us as theologians.[39]

Haiser also received favorable notice from four publications intended for university students. The earliest, in 1913, gave a careful synopsis of AI and Krisis. It commended his belief that increased reliance on rational proof was the sign of a people's decadence, as well as his call for an aristocratic restoration. "We recommend these rhought-rich works of Haiser's to our readers ardently."[40] Postwar, he received two even more enthusiastic notices from the Akademische Blätter, the organ of a principal radical right student group, the Kyffhäuserbund. Gastmahl was praised for treating both national and social questions "in their finest ramifications," and "brilliantly contrasts the biologically and philosophically founded social-aristocratic world-view to the Jewish-social democratic, the heroic to the tradesmannish." Haiser showed how all good qualities proceeded from Aryan blood, and gave what-for to the "shallow Enlightenment of demagogic liberalism, which . . . has mob-stink as its result, which we must shake off if we wish to

rise up again." The reviewer concluded,

> Haiser's splendid book . . . is first of all written for academics, who will become leaders of the coming age. May it be laid especially warmly to the heart of members of the organization.[41]

Some months later the same reviewer commended Anfang to the same audience, as a call "to all those in whom the old, strong German spirit still lives, to resistance, first of all in the spiritual region,"[42] to the dominance of the mob over the best.

> No reader will read the book to the end without marginal notes and question marks, but it stimulates as seldom happens to consideration of the dangers of race-mixture and their connection with the morality of the presently so broad "street."[42]

In the 1920's, two other student-oriented magazines also commended our subject's books, although not so effusively.[43]

Another journal with an impeccably gebildete readership which praised Gastmahl was the Muenchener Medizinische Wochenschrift, which printed probably the longest notice it received. This was a very prestigious medical journal, also published by the J. F. Lehmann firm, which also reviewed some books of general interest.[44] The reviewer was especially impressed with Artaria's call for a new religion, combining "the laws of biology and hygiene with the ideals of God and the Beyond." He also called attention to Haiser's using a Sephardic Jewess to voice how homeless one is outside one's race. Also commendable was Haiser's notion that "style," in the sense of tradition, was possible even for ordinary families and Mittelstand businesses. He concluded

by quoting Artaria's exhortation to do one's duty in the particular situation in which one found oneself, and noted how it reminded one of Fichte (an author, in fact, whom Haiser detested as "left-völkisch"). He prophesied the book would be linked up

> with a new configuration of the Zeitgeist, which will have the value of a characteristic mark for the struggle of Germandom toward new values, as the spirit of the Wartburg and its festival was characteristic for a new world of the spirit after the war of liberation.[45]

The high point of Haiser's recognition by "respectable" and gebildete elements was achieved in 1920 by a very favorable review, again of Gastmahl, in the prestigious Preussische Jahrbücher. This notice included Haiser's book in an article, "Literature on Religious Questions," taking as its central concern Haiser's attacks on Christianity. It quoted the same passage as the MMW reveiw on the need for a new religion, combining "the laws of biology . . . [and] the ideals of . . .the Beyond." The reviewer preferred to believe that Haiser's remarks on the need for inequality and slavery were "exaggerations" occasioned by his "all too justified horror" of mob rule. Yet Haiser was "ethical" and not at all a "reactionary," for he saw aristocracy not in the conventional sense as masters, but "racial noble men, who are brought up to become lords of themselves and their own common impulses." The notice concluded,

> The fullness with which the deepest life-questions are treated in this small but meaty book is so great that a mere book review cannot exhaust them. On this account one must reommend to every thinking man to read the book

itself and form his own opinion on it.[46]

This is perhaps the most striking case of a reviewer's softening the harshness of Haiser's caste ideas, and trying to absolve him of being a "reactionary," a title he himself took pride in. Here we encounter a kind of apologetics very common in barbaric vitalism, which is thrilled by an author's insolent and "heroic" tone, but which shrinks from going all the way to the ungentlemanly practical conclusions which inexorably follow.[47] But attention to Haiser from these quarters was itself a commentary on the moral and intellectual state of the times. If Lebensphilosophie was all one needed to know, what basis remained for the social and moral pretensions of Bildung? Obviously the possessors of Bildung no longer valued it very highly if they could find such warm compliments for a vulgar-Nietzschean dilettante like Franz Haiser.

At a very different level of Bildung among their readers, and perhaps their editors, were Nazi publications. One might suppose that as an arch-left-völkisch group, they and Haiser would be on the worst terms. Hitler and his older compatriot agreed that liberalism had shattered pre-industrial elitism and brought about modern mass society. But whereas Haiser saw the new life-form as radical evil, Hitler accepted it, caring only how he might manipulate it to raise himself to power. Many of the more gentlemanly anti-democratic foes of the Weimar Republic indeed disapproved

of Nazism because it seemed only a variant of democracy.[48] Haiser would prima facie have reason to agree with them in principle, although his elitism had little in common with theirs.

Yet in actual fact Haiser was, at least for several years, quite well-disposed to the Nazis, and they to him. No doubt one factor was the aforementioned predisposition of the radical right to see every anti-democrat as a potential ally, and to minimize the differences among them. Also we must note that before the late 1920's the NSDAP was relatively weak, and hard to distinguish from other völkisch groups. It was less under Hitler's personal domination, and tied to a single party line, than it later became. In the earlier period its publications show far more ideological and stylistic variety (indicating far less central control over their editors) than after 1930 or so. Obviously if contributors' views had had to harmonize with Hitler's, they could never have printed or praised Franz Haiser. For his part the sage of Scheibbs imagined the Nazis as by no means merely an extension of the personality of their Führer (whom he mentions, casually, two or three times). He regarded the Nazis (or Hakenkreuzler, as he often imprecisely referred to them) as excellent radical-right material, if only they could be weaned away from their foolish "red" affectations (a hope in which Haiser was not alone).

Haiser made specific references to the Nazis in at least five of his works, sometimes quite extensively. His earliest such remark was in May, 1923 (some months before Hitler's attempted Putsch) after he had given a lecture to the local Nazi group at Scheibbs. He was, he specified, not a party member, but

> In spite of many differences in general world-view I nevertheless feel myself much attracted to the National Socialist Party. . . . What most pleases me in the National Socialists is the courage and political independence with which they step forward for their cause. One sees equally, here are men who know what they fight for, not mere well-rehearsed party hacks who unthinkingly repeat the catechism of the party leader. Above all no Philistines, who unfortunately weigh down all the bourgeois parties like dead weight, and make impossible all decisive measures against Jewish foreign domination. Jewdom recognizes in them its most dangerous enemy and seeks to annihilate them; that alone speaks for them. I expect much from them.[49]

Even warmer was his exhortation to National Socialist youth in a Nazi magazine, a few months later:

> Youth in the sign of the hooked cross, I turn to you! You behold a preacher in the desert! I preached to the nobility and the bourgeoisie, but they called me a fool, who wants to swim against the current. . . . To you, youth, goes forth my call: be master, be hard, be frightfully hard! Also be hard against yourself! Only he who can say from innermost conviction "I am more than the others" will save the world.[50]

However, at the same time in Freimaurer Haiser expressed doubts that the Nazis were developing as they should; "precisely the Hakenkreuzler should be converted to my principles, because they are master-men and thereby could form a new master-caste."[51] Certainly his projected counter-masonry would be thoroughly in agreement with their hatred of

parliaments, wish to expropriate Jews, and ambition to create a powerful military. However, he lamented that they did not endorse a return to admitted slavery and a caste state. But perhaps their very appeal to the lower classes would effect a kind of caste and race selection, as only those of good race, anxious to recover their rightful rank in society, would respond to their call.[52]

But when the NSDAP showed no signs of becoming less left-völkisch, Haiser's remarks about that party showed less satisfaction. In Judenfrage (1926) he noted that his critics asked how a Junkertumschwaermer like himself could so admire the Hakenkreuzler; he responded that the chief reason was that they were not reptilian philistines but ardent reckless youth, and their type was marching to victory in Germany and indeed all over the world. He admitted that they did not as yet understand him, especially his caste ideas. But he trusted that they would eventually drop their sentimental enthusiasm for a socialized state, with rights for everybody, and also de-emphasize nationalism, in favor of a supra-national radical right policy. He even suggested that the Nazis would soon split into "whites" and "reds," the former visualizing themselves as a reconstituted master caste of orthodox Haiserian type, while the latter, mired in dreams of social equality, would collapse into utopian futility, like the rest of "left-culture," and rule themselves out as master-material.[53] As the NSDAP came

closer to power, even these hopes seemed to fade. His last mention of them came in 1932, when he sneered at the plan of Walter Darre (later Minister of Agriculture under Hitler) to create "a new nobility from blood and soil," because it would have to work for a living.[54]

On their side, the Nazis were much more obliging to Haiser than he to them. Nazi publications placed at least fifteen of his articles, and accorded him six reviews and notices, all favorable if not enthusiastic. Of these twenty-one items, five appeared in 1926-1932, when few other papers were paying him any attention. Nazi reviewers showed a remarkable talent for ignoring his strictures on their movement, and treating his gibes at the left-völkisch as if intended for somebody else. As one of them said apropos of Judenfrage, "Haiser believes that within the völkisch movement democratic spasms can be distinguished, against which he conducts a sharp campaign."[55] Another review of the same work in an Austrian Nazi weekly singled out Haiser's anti-Semitism and nationalist collectivism, passing over in silence the tension between his aristocratic and patriotic loyalties, although in this work they were unusually prominent. The author concluded with a sigh, and an apt quotation from Goethe, that a preacher of master-morality must expect opposition; Haiser was too sincere for his own good.[56] The editor of another Austrian Nazi publication was even more complimentary, even expressing some awe

of his intellectual attainments. Since his publication intended to be a "scientific" [wissenschaftlich] magazine, "a spiritual Zentral of the party," it needed to include "outstanding spirits of the modern age," such as "the race-philosopher Haiser,"[57] although a present-day reader would probably have difficulty imagining a periodical whose intellectual tone his contributions would elevate.

But all these were outdone by a notice of Aristokratische Imperativ in the Völkischer Beobachter itself, which was undoubtedly the most ecstatic (and the worst-written) review that Haiser ever received:

> This book already appeared in 1913 but it seems to have been written exactly for our time. This book on the whole is not for the "modern," enlightenment-benighted, and thereby ever-wavering bourgeoisie, lacking body, goal and instict! Are there still men, men of Aryan race, not mere shadows of men, aristocrats of blood and further aristocrats of mind, in our chandala-age, in the age of slattern- and curdom? If there are such people, who also have the courage, at the same time sitting in judgement on themselves, frankly to think through the "aristocratic imperative" without but and howevers, they might, they must, read this pamphlet of Haiser's! At first, admittedly, they will all be struck [hard]; they might throw the book at the head of an author [who writes] such almost unbearable words for our modern, enlightened brain, covered over with the madness of overripeness and pulpiness. Yet soon one flees the turmoil of the city! Only leave aside the cursed intellect, this all-grinding world-mill that works on noble golden kernels as on chaff and donkey-manure; read with the heart for yourself and over yourself and leave behind you for once all thoughts of "modern" slogans like rights or humanity, league of nations, socialism and other Jewish dragon-seeds; then perhaps will open before you a ray of light, why the Aryan "master" people must sink so deep and yet deeper and why the rabble marked as serfs and thieves in body and soul and everything which belongs to

> chandala-dom makes earth a hell with scornful laugh! But hail to those who wish to press on, without griping and criticizing, to the personal obligation of the "aristocratic imperative," but courage for the recognition, that the difference between man and man is greater than the difference between man and beast, to unite with strength to racial-moral affairs!

Other publications of the radical right treated Haiser's works in much the same way as the Nazis. Fairly typical were such remarks as:

> Thus whosoever is seized with nausea by the Bildungs-arrogance of the mass with its croaking after "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," will gain from this outstanding book reassurance, hope and will to act.[59]

> In short, this book deserves to be read by all those worthy to think, whereby our Bildungs-layers finally will emerge from the democratic shriveling of the brain and understand the future and recognize its tasks as the obligation from the blood, as the "aristocratic imperative."[60]

> We have hardly ever taken a book in hand in which every single line has so deeply taken hold of us.[61]

Even a reviewer who admitted that Judenfrage was badly written, and inferior to his other books, declared that

> He touches on fundamentals. He is the refiner's fire and the assayer's acid. We must be able to hear him, without being aggrieved. We must go a great part of the way with him. Thus we concur with conviction in the request of the publisher, to be concerned for the wide circualtion of the book.[62]

We find even the organ of the ADV, to whom surely Haiser's low opinion of nationalism was extremely unapalatable, sying that Anfang could

> give everyone rich instruction, who takes the trouble to follow the author through his trains of thought and does not rush along on the mere surface. It can be most warmly recommended.[63]

Nor did closer acquaintance dim their enthusiasm; one of the

longest and warmest encomiums our subject ever received was the very last notice of any of his works, Hammer's review of his privately printed Moralbiologie in May, 1933:

> A closer acquaintance reveals him to us as one of the most significant thinkers of biological comprehension, indeed I might call him the Nietzsche of biological world-view. His writings form pieces of a strongly enclosed system. With ruthless boldness and careless openess he carried on the fight against everything that was "holy" to the past era, against liberalism and individualism, against democracy and "freedom," against slave-rebellion and miscegenation. With club-blows he shattered modern slogans, and in their place set up not less forceful but promising and future-joyful basic principles in epistemological, cultural and political areas. . . . Such a man . . . was obviously up to now quite out of tune with the times, and yet we thank him for part of our most valuable insights. It now becomes high time for us to render him thanks. . . . Precisely in the yet appalling confusion, in which the greater part of the völkischly awakened masses hovers, is a spirit like Haiser's, which purifies like a driving storm, . . . indispensable and irreplaceable.[64]

In the foregoing, we have deliberately omitted notices by individuals having particular personal bonds with Haiser. As stated above, cronyism was certainly a very minor factor in his favorable reception. Not surprisingly we do find a favorable review of Krisis in the official journal of the NDKBiO, before which it was originally delivered,[65] and gushing remarks in PAM and DE:

> Our time cries out for an awakener, a leader. Here he is![66]

> From him streams the dawn of a new era.[67]

at a time when he was frequently appearing in those magazines. (Yet the reviews from Michel might be quite cool or critical, as we shall further note below.)

Personal friendship seems to have benefited Haiser significantly only in the case of Benno Imendöffer, a fellow Austrian whom he had known at least since 1914. We have already mentioned his role as a link between Haiser and the Deutscher Klub. Imendörffer reviewed Haiser's books at least three times and went out of his way to mention him in one of his own articles, as

> one of the most acute social philosophers of the present day . . . who has created his deep-probing works in quiet isolation in a little hamlet of lower Austria.[68]

Himself of some academic distinction, he professed that

> His practical vision lets him recognize clearly the eternal effects of the modern nature-historical religion and he proves with relentless consequentiality all the thousand threads which lead from it into all imporant areas of human culture. He shows with a clarity up to now not available how our strained social, artistic, economic relationships are ultimately bound up with progressive but often falsely understood natural knowledge.[69]

Haiser used his solid grounding in natural science to expose its false application, and the effects of his "methodical schooling," were to be seen throughout his works, a claim that surely would have mystified even sympathetic readers. Imendörffer concluded the review (written in 1913) with a plea to propagandize for Haiser's works:

> From the "great" press naturally nothing is to be hoped for, so may our unfortunately alltoo scarce völkisch publications make it their duty, to represent and spread Haiser's thoughts.[70]

Yet it was notable that Imendörffer's later reviews admitted to disagreement with some of Haiser's extreme elitist

positions[71] and were, in fact, less enthusiastic than some notices by complete strangers.

Notes to Chapter XVI

[1]See Bibliographical Essay.

[2]JF, p. 113.

[3]FH, "Schwarzgelbe Geschichtsklitterung," Michel, April 29, 1923, p. 5; June 3, 1923, p. 6.

[4]FH, "Studenten!", Michel, February 24, 1924, pp. 2-3; "Zur Alkoholfrage," Ibid., May 4, 1924, p. 6; "Alkoholfeinde," Ibid., March 26, 1922, p. 4; "Zur Alkoholfrage," Ibid., July 16, 1922, p. 3.

[5]Abbreviation for Hosenscheisserei, literally "shitting in one's pants."

[6]JF, pp. 25-26.

[7]JF, p. 28.

[8]AI, pp. 18-21, 72-85; "Zu Dr. Rösler's Aufsatz. . . ," NL, VIII, p. 93.

[9]Anfang, p. 134; FM, p. 67; UK, p. 186; "Schwarzgelbe Geschichtsklitterung," Michel, April 29, 1923, p. 5.

[10]FH, "Gesetz und Wilkur," Michel, July 8, 1923, pp. 2-3.

[11]JF, pp. 63, 113; "Die Auferstehung des Abendlandes," PAM, XXI, pp. 121-25.

[12]MB, p. 57.

[13]JF, p. 50.

[14]MB, p. 71.

[15]FH, "Die Verketzerung. . . ," PAM, XIX, p. 263.

[16]JF, pp. 92-94.

[17]JF, pp. 89, 118.

[18]Krisis, pp. 20-21.

[19]JF, p. 109; MB, p. 86; "Der deutsche Artgeist. . . ," DE, IX, pp. 618-22.

[20]MB, pp. 40, 85.

[21]FH, "Der Widerspruch. . . ," DE, III, pp. 3-9, 109-118; Anfang, p. 145.

[22]JF, pp. 71, 89; MB, p. 56; "Der edle und der gemeine Streit," PAM, XVII, p. 197; "Das Felativitätsprinzip," PAM, XIX, p. 500; "Arbeitsloses Einkommen," NL, XI, pp. 183-85.

[23]FH, "Freie und Unfreie," PAM, XIX, pp. 509-10; JF, p. 111.

[24]JF, p. 62.

[25]Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, XLIV, p. 278.

[26]Volkswohl, Vienna, X, p. 391. The Literarischer Handweiser, LVI, p. 64, has a further brief review by a Roman Catholic clergyman, but this was not a church periodical.

[27]Review of Krisis in Hochland, XVIII, pp. 760-61.

[28]Anfang, p. 166.

[29]Review of AI in Sozialistische Monatshefte, XX, p. 260.

[30]Pseudonym of Hans W. Fischer.

[31]"Dr. Frosch," "Menschenkötertum," Die Welt am Montag, January 5, 1914.

[32]"Rassenphraseure," Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, XXIII, pp. 2-5-16.

[33]"Eine völkische Kakophonie," Ibid., XXIV, p. 69.

[34]Die Leuchtrakete, III, no. 5 (May 1925), p. 7.

[35]Review of GFA in Central-Verein Zeitung: Blätter für Deutschtum und Judentum, V, p. 432.

[36]Note by Alfred Rosenberg to FH, "Die Rechtskulturelle Bewegung," WK, II, p. 1.

[37]Note by R. Suchenwirth to FH, "Adelskriege und Volkskriege," Das Hakenkreuz, II, p. 16.

[38]Review of Skl. in Alldeutsche Blätter, XXXIII, p. 32.

[39]Review of Krisis in Evangelische Freiheit, XIX, p. 325.

[40]Review of AI in Die Wartburg, XIV, pp. 211-12.

[41]Review of GFA in Akademische Blätter, XXV, p. 190.

[42]Review of Anfang in Ibid., XXXVI, p. 212.

[43]Reviews of GFA in Deutsche Hochschule, XI, p. 90, and FM in Burschenschaftliche Blätter, XXXIX, p. 138.

[44]One might suspect this was a piece of in-house favoritism by Haiser's publisher, but the present writer considers this unlikely. Lehmann could not and did not try to manipulate the scientific side of his publishing output as he did it völkisch side, and for that matter Gastmahl was genuinely popular, going into a second printing, and later a revised edition. It aroused enthusiasm well outside the publishing house.

[45]Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift, LXVII, p. 728.

[46]Review of GFA in Preussische Jahrbuecher, no. 182 (October-December 1920), pp. 119-20.

[47]See Crane Brinton's discussion of the same squeamishness among "gentle" Nietzscheans in Brinton, Nietzsche, pp. 184-93.

[48]See George K. Romoser, "The Politics of Uncertainty," Social Research, XXXI (Spring 1964), pp. 73-91.

[49]FH, "Worte zu einer 'Berichtigung,'" SPB, no. 20 (May 15, 1923), pp. 8-9.

[50]FH, "Judentum und Philistertum," Das Hakenkreuz, I, PP. 83-84.

[51]FM, p. 25.

[52]FM, pp. 119-20.

[53]JF, pp. 77, 107-108.

[54]MB, p. 56.

[55]Review of JF, in WK, III, p. 523.

[56]Review of JF, in DAP, April 2, 1927, pp. 2-3.

[57]Remarks by Richard Suchenwirth in Hakenkreuz, II, p. 84.

[58]Review of AI in Völkischer Beobachter, February 11, 1920, p. 4.

[59]Review of UK in NL, XI, p. 108.

[60]Review of AI, VIII, no. 3.

[61]Review of AI in Chemnitzer Tagblatt, August 18, 1913.

[62]Review of JF in Hammer, XXV, p. 356.

[63]Review of Anfang in Alldeutsche Blätter, December 3, 1921, p. 227.

[64]Review of MB in Hammer, XXXII, pp. 132-33.

[65]Review of Krisis, in NL, VII, no. 4.

[66]Review of Anfang in PAM, XX, pp. 469-72.

[67]Review of GFA in DE, IV, p. 64.

[68]Benno Imendörffer, "Adam Mueller und die Staatslehre," Deutsche Politische Hefte aus Grossrumänien, II, no. 12, pp. 2-4.

[69]Review of AI by Benno Imendörffer, Deutsche Soziale Rundschau, Vienna, October 15, 1913.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Review of FM by Imendörffer in Mitteilungen des deutschen Klubs, I, Folge 10, pp. 5-6.

413

CHAPTER XVII

HAISER IN THE ARENA

The reaction to Haiser included not only reviews of his books but also a number of press controversies, in which he took a vigorous part. These are highly revealing of the German-speaking radical right, for they catch it so to speak in undress, writing in haste and with its feelings ruffled. They also illuminate how Haiser was little more muddled and and fantastical a writer and thinker than others in the movement, including persons with ostensibly far higher qualifications than he. They were anything but orderly discussions, for the participants readily lapsed into the clumsiness, digressions and vagueness of which the German language is so easily capable, plus the fact that they were often "dialogues of the deaf," wherein nobody was really conscious of any ideas save his own, or interested in learning anything. Necessarily we give but a selection from this material, and there have been omitted many tangents and obiter dicta, of which Haiser was by no means always the worst offender.

The most majestic of these controversies was carried on from October 1913 to May 1914, and involved altogether six persons, writing in the pages of three different

magazines. It was like an argument in a half-drunken political cafe, where no one was really listening to anyone else, or even keeping track of what he himself had been saying. Its initiator was not Haiser himself, but one of his reviewers, Wilhelm Schölermann (1865-1923). Schölermann, who had the honorary title of Professor, was a painter and writer on art, as well as a poet, translator and völkisch publicist (and, one gathers, a marginal figure in all these respects). He had voiced "social-aristocratic" ideas somewhat similar to Haiser's, calling for special privileges for the culturally valuable.[1] A resident of Weimar, it is doubtful if he and Haiser ever met, although they corresponded.[2]

The spat began with Schölermann's reviews of Haiser's Aristokratische Imperativ in Hammer and PAM in October 1913, which managed deeply to offend two other radical right authors. He endorsed Haiser's skepticism "on good grounds" of the "not altogether healthy idealism" of the scheme of "aristarchy" of Dr. Rösler, of the NDKBiO, because it compromised with the hardness necessary for real aristocracy, and "here again the 'socialist idea' was at work."[3] Rösler promptly replied in Neues Leben, the organization's journal, that "the proof that my idealism is not altogether sound, I leave to Professor Schölermann." The intent of his special term "aristarchy," he continued, was to stress that the best should rule not by brute force but by respect; "the

true nobleman is no 'blonde beast'; the ideal aristos is 'artist, saint and philosopher in one person.' Saintliness is sociality heightened to an ideal, in the inwardly devout true dedication to the highest goal, to the farthest, widest, interests. That is also the religiosity of 'new-German heathenism.'" He especially differed with Haiser, he noted, in that he equated the aristoi with the most talented [Tüchtigsten] although he allowed there was a large hereditary factor therein.[4]

In the next issue of NL Haiser himself entered the fray. In the remarks in question, he explained, he had had in mind not so much the ideas of Dr. Rösler as those of Gustav Simons, whose system seemed to him a "preeminent arena of left-culture." However, he wished to avoid further debate, for "one can never win friends through 'proof,' they are already there."[5] But one K. Grill would not let him off so easily. Condescendingly allowing that every writer tends to be well-informed only on the things that serve his own purposes, he declared that Haiser failed to understand Silvio Gesell, and also Simons, "the best-known crusader for land- and money-reform in the Bund," who thereby wanted to achieve "a race-pure civilization for aristocrats." The national economy was a basic organ of the life of the Volk, and the state had to have the power to reshape it, especially by land- and money-reform. The best state-form and the best leadership could accomplish nothing

without it.[6]

To this Haiser replied, first, that he had never read Silvio Gesell, and never would, but considered himself qualified to discuss economics even so. Second, such so-called reformers arbitrarily condemned and wished to eradicate old institutions, as doctors the appendix, and replace them with today's fashions. But for him the old forms (apparently here meaning either private property or the idle rich, or both) were "ancient structures of human society," which certainly had not made our ancestors unhealthy. The cause of modern ills was rather the ill-health of the race itself, and if it was unsound any new-implanted organs would sicken too.[7]

This was the end of the row in Neues Leben, but Schölermann's remarks had prompted a far more extensive imbroglio with another radical right author, Heinrich Driesmans (1863-1927). Like Schölermann he dabbled in belles-lettres and art-criticism (and for good measure, reform of women's clothes as well). Like Haiser and Schölermann, he too had advocated special public support for the spiritually gifted. He began a debate with these two which was conducted simultaneously in the pages of Hammer and PAM, and probably the protagonists themselves were mixed up as to precisely what they were replying to.

In his first salvo in Hammer, Driesmans objected that Haiser would only make the radical right look silly.

> The extravagant Herrentum of Haiser's is inclined to render the race-movement of our time and under present relationships a comic figure, and put in the hands of the opponents [and] the scoffers of this movement new weapons against it.[8]

He was justified in admiring the master-castes of antiquity, but they were dead beyond recall. And while his claim "that the former serf had it better than the modern 'free' wage-earner," is not to be disputed, to talk of returning to medieval conditions was only building castles in air. Driesmans added, that Schölermann and Haiser had only gone half way with their ideas; for instance, logically they should condemn Luther too, for his "freedom of a Christian man" was a direct ancestor of liberalism and democracy, and go on to embrace Roman Catholicism, especially the authority of the Papacy. Far better to seek a new aristocracy from the ablest elements in all parts of the Volk, in a life-form suitable to our time, along the lines marked out by himself and Theodor Fritsch.[9]

In the same month Driesmans also made a rejoinder in PAM. This time he began by saying "I value Haiser as in general as a force of great value and to be taken seriously in the region of our racial efforts," but pettily added that, so far as his ideas were any good his own "racial imperative" had anticipated him by fifteen years. He objected to Haiser as a "doctrinaire" and "life-alien," postulating a golden age of aristocracy that never really existed. Aristocracies inevitably degenerate, for otherwise

the mob would never be strong enough to overthrow them; the "Köter-type" was of insignificant effect. Further Haiser misconceived what an aristocracy should be, especially in taking responsibility for the whole. Because of his extremism and oversimplifications, Haiser talked like a demagogue. "I can thus not find, that Haiser himself always has an aristocratic-imperative sensibility," although he added (if one chose to believe it) that he did not intend the observation personally. Haiser and Schölermann were no help whatever for recreating an effective modern aristocracy, which had to draw on the best people of the whole population. Driesmans concluded by denouncing the contemporary nobility as racially and morally contemptible, apparently assuming--quite mistakenly--that it was what they had in mind.[10]

Haiser responded in PAM with a disclaimer that the present nobility represented in any way his aristocratic ideal, and further complained that Driesmans did not grasp that he wrote as a philosopher, not in terms of party platforms. He then launched into his usual attack on "free self-determination" and competition between unequals.[11] In Hammer he said much the same thing, with a somewhat more cogent attack on the preposterousness of selecting an aristocracy from modern hyperintellectualized "self-made men," rather than by strict heredity. Driesmans' mention of religion prompted a further tangent on that.[12]

Meanwhile Schölermann had also counterattacked in both magazines, far more angrily than Haiser. In PAM he made the same point concerning the present nobility, and went on to say that it was wrcng to attack a

> valiant fellow-fighter, who belongs in our little outpost line, to the strengthening of the enemy on the left. . . . I deplore the overzealous attacks from the side of a serious investigator like Driesmans. In future may he wield his good sword in 'a better cause.'[13]

In Hammer his tone was nastier. Driesmans had very carelessly read Haiser, and what he objected to was only in his own fantasy. More personally, Schölermann added that in his works in general Driesmans was inhibited in his remarks on race by the influence of his "oriental" milieu; "you can't and aren't permitted to write as freely and openly as you might. That's your tragedy as a race-author." He concluded by quoting J. S. Mill that it was better to found a family than discourse about population, and "that especially applies to race-improvers and defenders of the 'racial imperative.'"[14]

Driesmans not surprisingly protested that he never wrote save in accordance with his own convictions, and that the insinuation that only family men could talk about eugenics was "tactless." He went on to say that Haiser's "right-culture" was merely a sterile dialectical contrast to "left-culture." Once the latter had disappeared, right-culture would have nothing to do:

We would then be a people of aristocrats in the worst

> sense, with nothing left for us but to despise and to tyrannize over each other, for the object of so doing--left-culture--would be lacking.

He also considered Haiser's fear of freedom, and refusal to trust even his aristocrats with it, as very timid and unaristocratic.

Driesmans also took exception to the eugenic schemes of Haiser and Hentschel, especially the attempt of small groups to make themselves the "true aristocratic saints and cardinals" of eugenics, excommunicating the rest. He would like to know, who would build this new Jerusalem, besides Haiser, Schölermann and Hentschel? "For he can't blame me if I find this Trinity rather inadequate for such a great undertaking." Lastly, by his definition Goethe would be counted as part of left-culture, a sufficient commentary on the scheme.

> Is the "independent conscience" of this Olympian, which he called "the sun of our moral day" also "free-selfstupidification"? . . . He must say yes, and thereby his right-culture leads to absurdity.

Nietzsche would likewise have to be condemned.

> Thus, because "getting on" [Streberei] and "drudgery" [Schufterei] are plebeian, therefore no more striving or creating! One may finally say with Shakespeare, "dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?"[15]

Driesmans repeated several of these points in PAM two months later, also devoting much attention to his own primacy in "aristocratic" ideas.[16]

Controversy apparently was not Schölermann's forte, for

he made a very weak and muddled reply. His remark on the limitations of candor imposed by the "oriental milieu" were not aimed with personal malice at Driesmans, but only took him as an example of what was all too prevalent nowadays. Thanks to the influence of the Jews, few had the civil courage to write as they really felt. He noted also, rather disconnectedly, his anger at the "poison-spitting, contemptuous accusations against Haiser and myself" in Die Welt am Montag, cited above. Apparently hurt and upset by just everything, he made further confused remarks, concluding with the deadly accusation that Driesmans

> asks me for "proofs" of my allusions. I ask him simply; how does the race-investigator Driesmans stand on Jewry?[17]

Conceivably Driesmans might have sent his seconds to wait on Schölermann for that, but he contented himself by saying in the next issue of Hammer, with a brevity that all parties would have done well to emulate, that his views had been made clear in two of his previous articles in the magazine, and concluding

> Schölermann further shows he has nothing conclusive or material to oppose to my clarification. Cave canem.[18]

At this point the controversy was enlivened by a third participant, who signed himself only as "one who also knows Haiser's works." This writer strove to defend Haiser's racial emphasis, and thought his use of the term "Köter" ought not to offend Driesmans. Furthermore Goethe, as he proved by a quote, believed in aristocracy too.[19] Driesmans curiously

thought this worth a lengthy reply, repeating most of his earlier points. He stressed that although he drastically disagreed with Haiser, he respected his courage and sincerity, and his willingness to carry his conclusions to a logical if shocking end. However Haiser seemed to his followers so shocking and inelegant

> that they seek again to prettify, to set right, to make pleasing his essence [Art]. God protect him from his friends! A man like Haiser should renounce all followers and always pursue his cause alone.[20]

The advice was of course superfluous.

In response, "one who also knows Haiser's works" made fresh criticisms of Driesmans, enough to start a new controversy by themselves. But as Haiser said in the same issue of Hammer, it was time to finish, and he signed off in both magazines in April-May 1914. In PAM he objected, in a good-natured way, that Driesmans was himself trying to define orthodox Haiserism, and insist that he must hold certain opinions. He concluded with thanks to him for his trouble, and a recommendation (which to be sure he seldom followed himself) that

> We new-Germans should not . . . fall into the mistake of wrangling savants, who often carry on interminable squabbles about some ridiculous spiritual patent, for among us it only befits that we throw as many as possible flaming torches into the fortress [Zwingburg] of left-culture, to set this ugly building on fire and finally destroy it.[21]

Haiser's summing up in Hammer was longer and more polemical, and ranks as one of his best-written works. He was

especially anxious about the people who were trying "to lead the new-national movement to the farthest left," who were morally worse than the socialists. He attempted a philosophical definition of the right-in-itself, specifically to sharpen the cleavage between liberal and national. "I am proud of the label reactionary." The fatherland was to be saved only by the sacrifice of personal freedom, for individualism was a sweet-tasting poison, posing as medicine. The Semitic cancer-cells were all over bourgeois society, and could even make use of the "Goethean thinker-spirit." The "freedom of the spirit" so cherished by Driesmans led to a fatal tolerance of the enemy spirit. His projected "aristocrats of the spirit" were as little able to defend themselves against the infection as the titled aristocracy against the political onslaught of the mob. "Freedom of conscience," once society had lost its caste distinctions, only assisted the mob to gain power. As history proved, in a deracinated world "free conscience" was useless, as people had no basis for intercommunication.

Driesmans apparently feared that Haiser's "spiritual compellers" would lead to a restoration of the influence of the clericals, the "Jewified nobility," and other modern trash. But if so, the Aryan "spiritual aristocracy" had only itself to blame. It should offer itself as the councillors of the king, but obviously was not wanted if it came as democrats, rather than as aristocrats. Haiser denied

that he had in mind any particular personnel in mind (including himself) for such a role. "The true aristocrat of the spirit . . . is nothing other than the crystallization of . . . healthy racial understanding." Only a few were needed to do the job, and enough "stylized German racemen" were left, especially among the earth-anchored peasantry, among "the so-called Spiessbürger of small provincial towns and among pure-race agrarian nobles, in a word everywhere that spiritual and bodily Köter-ization has not yet intruded."

Stylized unity of mind was essential to the state, and it could be secured only by allowing originality and disagreement within the "general staff," as in the military, which presupposed rigid caste distinctions. "A group that is not bound by a common rigid principle consists of Köter." They were by definition a hereditary mish-mash, a "dissonance," although of course present in many degrees and variations; this made it impossible to give a stricter definition, and name names, as Driesmans had requested.

> To me, the perfect Köter-type is a negroid Semite with a Slavic-German admixture. If he is also a writer of belles-lettres into the bargain, then one can speak of an arch-Köter [of which the Semi-Kürschner[22] was so full]. One part of him writes Semitically, the other Aryanically,

and the whole was a sewer. Everything cosmopolitan was "Köter-typical-suspicious." Haiser admitted that he defined the aristocracy as simply the opposite of a Köter, but this was tactically necessary, to avoid deadly tolerance and force

them to endorse the "prejudices" of their own race, if they wished to be counted as members of it.

As for Driesmans' contention that Goethe by his definition would be a Köter, Haiser avowed that he really had no opinion on the matter, but added that he was all too useful for the gebildete riffraff. The true spiritual aristocrat did not use his reason [Vernunft] speculatively but as an instrument of his will, and therefore as a "dogmatist," and furthermore he related all values to his group, not to man-in-general. As for Driesmans' quoting Goethe to prove his case, every high-school boy could do that, and Faust for one could be cited in the opposite sense. Anyway Driesmans had missed the point, for he objected only to striving and creating by the wrong sort of people, and was himself proud of his long (and entirely unpaid) labors in his chemical laboratory.[23]

Haiser's next comradely controversy came in 1917, again in the pages of Neues Leben. One "Friderikus" took issue with his views in UK on unearned income, and also his disrespect to Silvio Gesell. Neatly turning Haiser's organic analogy against him, Friderikus pointed out that an organism supported organs only as long as they contributed to the well-being of the whole, and useless ones were allowed to atrophy; otherwise the species would die out.

> In nature there is no "dominating" organ, but only organs that are performing, serving, and important because of the services they perform. . . . "I am the first servant of the state" said one of the greatest aristocrats."[24]

Nobility was not privileged, but "obliged." In a völkischly united state there were no rights of mere individuals, nor general human rights in the sense of the French Revolution, nor the rights of a master-class, but only the "right of the völkisch collectivity, the völksorganischen Massiv," and individuals would possess rights only in proportion to their duties to the state.

Haiser, he said, seemed to fear that abolition of all unearned income meant loss of all independent income, killing off the performance of all "higher life-tasks." But instead, without unearned income every income would become more independent. As things stood, "great performers," in Haiser's sense, depended on the patronage of the rich, who under finance-capitalism were a most unworthy lot. In our present mammonistic economic order, overpowered by the "trader-spirit," material possessions are everything, so no wonder ideal goods fell into the background. Gesellism by no means put all work on a level, and would give differential rewards based on the value placed on it. In the absence of the money-hierarchy of today, "great performers" would more easily find a public, and the general increase of wealth under Gesellism would allow large numbers to pursue higher activities as an avocation.

Friderikus also contradicted Haiser's accusations that the Physiokrat, the Gesellian organ, was democratically inclined. Gesellism contradicted both liberalism and

socialism, because it granted to the state powers intolerable to the first, and to the individual rights intolerable to the second. Nor was Haiser justified in his sneer that Gesellism would destroy thrift, wherein he equated thrift and interest. The article concluded with a list of books on Gesellism that Haiser might read, to amend his ignorance of the subject.[25]

To this Haiser made a good-natured and relatively coherent rejoinder. Ignoring the question of Gesellism, he declared that the prevailing currency or economic system really made no difference, the vital issue was a racial master-caste. It would be quite compatible with right-culture to have a state in which this elite lived communistically, especially if the servants might handle money and the masters not. But since in our society only money made one free, the select few had to have Rentner-style independence. Haiser admitted the unworthiness of many present possessors of unearned income, but abolishing rights of inheritance was not the solution. It was no use preventing an unworthy clever businessman from leaving his fortune to still more unworthy sons, if the sons could still make fortunes on their own. Right-culture, as he understood it, guaranteed hereditary property only for the right families. "Without class privileges pure blood can never be preserved." He defended the idle rich with his standard arguments.

> The world-view of the man of work is sharply different from that of the quiet observer, who performs or directs the highest kind of work. Leading spirits need contemplative quiet, or the spirit of the world will unravel on the loom. . . . It is the ground-evil of our time, that one cannot break loose from the idea of usefulness to society.

What would have become of Nietzsche had he not been a Rentner? Those who needed to make a living out of it had to pander to the mob whether in politics or in cultural life, and the so-called Tüchtigsten, if they alone had the highest posts, would be as bad as the rest.[26]

The editor of NL, Ernst Hunkel, thought Haiser's article deserved a commentary of equal length, which revealed sharply the elitist/populist ambivalence of the Völkisch movement. Covering his flank, he first specified that he was himself of "outspokenly racial-aristocratic fundamental orientation." He felt akin to Haiser in many ways and had read his books with pleasure and profit; "they are an eminent antidote against the swindling democratic Zeitgeist." However, he had to protest his low opinion of the "physiocratic movement," (i.e., Gesellism). Rather than emphasizing differences in world-view, one should seek "common Germanic ground," on the basis of "the recognition of a deeper inborn community." Gesellism was a valuable potential ally, because it "gains more and more ground precisely in worker-circles, [and] perhaps it may liberate our workers from international heretics." Hunkel agreed that a currency system by itself would not decide between right and left, but questioned Haiser's

reliance instead on unearned income for the racially select. How decide who should be so included? Haiser himself admitted that racial inheritance today was as scrambled as a snowstorm, so we can never restore castes as in the old days. His proposition that the masses must be forced into dumb obedience was a divisive and indeed a criminally dangerous idea, as the recent Russian Revolution gave warning. Such a suggestion would only weaken the present monarchy, and the tyranny which Haiser offered as the only alternative would be a poor exchange. As he himself had quoted from Tacitus, only in despotisms could freedmen rise high. The present upper class had no racial or moral claim to unlimited domination of the masses, and the latter still possessed, even in the proletarian big cities, enough "blood-genuine Germandom" to resist being treated like African negroes. Defending the unity of the Volk was the first demand of the day; our heroic fightingmen, whom Haiser himself thought fit to form a European master caste, came mainly from the masses.

Hunkel was also pained by the sage of Scheibbs' contradistinction of the "contemplative masters" and "work-slaves," for such a "master" was basically only a slave, namely to his own laziness. By mere contemplation nothing great was done in the world. There was a "higher third," the joyful creator, whose pride it was to live only on the fruits of his own works, and such persons were to be found in all

classes. Certainly they were not all Rentners, and Hunkel knew of no great German from that class. Further, Haiser ought to learn more about Gesellism before he criticized it. The physiocratic movement would in fact liberate the creative types, for it would make it much easier to gain a living, and break the domination of finance-capital. Haiser quite misunderstood Gesellism if he thought it would prevent saying unpleasant things to the public, or to the powerful. The right to the full yield of the value of one's work would give more independence than an income dependent on the government. In the last analysis, it would depend "on what sort of wood one is cut from." A Rentner could be a coward and a man on salary enjoy the proudest independence of convictions and expression.

> For instance, I support my wife and child only by my work, yet never wrote a line that did not express my innermost convictions, and have never shied away from saying what I believed.[27]

After 1918, even though Haiser was at the peak of his popularity, and most reviews and comments were highly favorable, a number of left-völkisch criticisms appeared, which presaged how brief it was to be. Finding themselves under democratic constitutions, the radical right nolens volens changed from griping sectarians into a political public, virtually forced to think in terms of mass support, and Haiser, however one tried to be polite, was bound to become odd man out. It was prophetic that Willibald Hentschel, a

leading eugenicist and one with whom Haiser had often been bracketed, gave Anfang a very cool review. In calling for a "revolution from above," he

> seems to overlook, that in this mass there still remains a portion of healthy Volk-energy, and that up to now a völkisch upper layer, which strongly separated itself from the Volk, has never been able to keep its vitality permanently. Admittedly one must concede, that there is also an end to peoples when their ruling stratum dwindles away.[28]

Haiser likewise could have been warned (if he had been the type to listen to warnings) by some of the comments of Hermann Gustav Holle (1853-1926), a völkisch biologist. Holle wrote more reviews of Haiser's books (five) than anyone else, and also went out of his way to praise him in his Allgemeine Biologie.[29] The first two of these notices were highly favorable, but reviewing Anfang he threw cold water on Haiser's vision of breeding back the noble master-caste of antiquity, a biological impossibility. Anyway the present-day Germans were a recently created biological entity, not the same as the old races, and while there might exist some pure-race individuals they were quite out of the question as the foundation of a ruling caste. He disliked Haiser's materialistic view of race, for upward-striving life was really created by Geist. Rather than "in the beginning was strife," better to say "in the beginning was the idea." He added, a true ruling element of society worked for the benefit of the whole, not for itself.[30] Freimaurer aroused in Holle even stronger objections. He thought Haiser sophomoric in

suggesting that leaders of the "whilte army" would speak differently among themselves than to the rank and file. Truthfulness was a prime ancient Nordic virtue, and if his Bund was as racially select as he claimed they could stand to be told the whole story. Especially bad was such deviousness in regard to established Christianity, accepting it in public to gull the vulgar but scorning it in private. This was too clever by half, and would only benefit the sinister ambitions of Rome.[31]

In the last and most critical of his reviews, of Sklaverei in Michel, Holle praised Haiser's dedication and combativeness, but added the devastating remark that he did not grasp that cooperation was as vital as competition and strife. Today it was impossible to impose a Viking-style aristocracy by conquest, and anyway modern technology had made the pre-industrial form of exploitation obsolete. He agreed with Haiser on the evils of capitalism, but it was over-optimistic to assume it would obligingly work its own ruin, and a radical right revolution could then pick up the pieces. Capitalism could be got rid of only by political means, and specifically by replacing the present sham-democracy with "true democracy of the Volksgeist effective in all Germans, which conceives of work as the life-task in the service of the Volk as a whole." Accordingly, the representation of the people should be by means of Stand and Beruf. Only thereby could an aristocracy of the spirit

function effectively.

Holle also disagreed with Haiser's contention that race differences would become more important than language and nationality differences, which was quite contrary to experience, and if true fatal to Deutschtum. Anyway, even if race was the vital factor, if our present population was as mongrelized and corrupt as Haiser said, how could his idea of a race-aristocracy be recovered from it? Lastly, he rejected the claim that spiritual leaders were exhausted by Arbeit. It was on the contrary idleness that wore the spirit out, as one could see from cloisters, or in the offspring of the rich. One need only be sure that its work was of the kind that benefited "the Volkheit, towards which its spirituality must remain directed." This no longer meant only military service, but all productive and "cultural" occupations.[32]

To this review Haiser made a very inept reply, chiefly repeating his customary arguments and ignoring most of Holle's. As for modern technology making slavery obsolete, admittedly it was materially very productive, but it had not at all abolished slavery, for machines only led to more machines, which demanded workers to be their slaves. Capitalism, unlike ancient civilizations, tried to hold in slavery freeborn and intelligent men, able to bear arms, which was insanely dangerous. He went on as usual about the "endothermy" of civilization, and hence the need for a

worth-gradient and a tyrannical ruling caste, to be reconstituted by a counter-revolutionary international conspiracy. His only novelty was a quite irrelevant reference to the currency scheme of one R. Dietrich, otherwise untracable.[33]

Holle's Sklaverei review almost seems like part of a general anti-Haiser movement building up in the Michel circle, for it was followed by three progressively more antagonistic commentaries. The first of these was a lengthy review of Freimaurer by Dr. Wilhelm Huber, in February 1925. Huber's technique was to praise Haiser warmly, and then lecture him on the book he should have written. Contra Haiser, useful work did not at all disgrace the elite, but only work that was done under compulsion, and which forced an intellectually distinguished man to mix with his inferiors. As to racialism, Haiser shared the common modern error of being too "rational-materialistic," and given to "one-sided theorizing." Haiser partly corrected this by allowing for a large psychological factor in racialism, but this was in effect to dissolve the whole concept. In any case great creators were commonly men of mixed race.

But in Huber's eyes, Haiser's greatest error was to recommend in effect an alliance with clericalism, against which "speaks the whole historical past since Charlemagne . . . down to the most recently concluded concordat of the Roman Church with Bavaria and the current plans for a

Danubian confederation." Haiser himself was muddled on the issue, since under certain circumstances he envisaged his "counter-masons" as aligned with the Freemasons against the Church. Haiser expected that his Bund could manipulate the Church, but the reverse was more likely.

Furthermore, Haiser undervalued national traditions, which surely would be far stronger than allegiance to a cosmopolitan Aryan league, and worse he considered the bond of race more important than that of speech. "Such a one-sided and exaggerated race-standpoint we must unconditionally reject!" A pro-German non-Aryan was obviously to be preferred to an anti-German Aryan, e.g. the Anglo-Saxon nations. Huber allowed that Haiser's AAB might be a good idea if limited to Austria and Germany, and used mainly for anti-Semitism.[34]

The very next week Michel noted that Freimaurer had raised a commotion in the völkisch camp, and accordingly presented an article on Haiser by Willibald Hentschel. Hentschel doubted, first, Haiser's analogy of his worth-gradient of social energy with waterfalls and the like; he noted that some years before he had written a book giving his own ideas on the subject, "which nobody had wanted."[35] The energy of society did not proceed from Haiser's gradient of master/slave, but rather from a "racial energy" to be found in all levels of the population. As rather a non sequitur, he also noted the driving power of Christianity

in history, and considered that to call it a mere "slave-rebellion," as Haiser and Nietzsche did, was "banal"; "it incorporated also the struggle of the pure and free towards light and truth." Haiser's gradient-thesis was quite disproved by Nordic history, for no race had paid so little attention to distinctions of rank, notably the Vikings. Among surviving pockets of Nordic peasantry such equality still prevailed, for instance in the lower Elbe region where he now lived. It was a "peasant republic," where properties were all of modest size and had been in the family for 200 years or more. The hired help ate with the family, and the peasants saw no incongruity in hauling manure while they sent their sons to the Gymnasium. "In spite of the complete lack of a Haiserian worth-gradient they form a community highly worthy of respect," and, he added, one savagely hostile to socialists.

Real mastery, Hentschel declared, did not have to be proclaimed or schemed for, it simply was. He suggested that Haiser was inspired by the fact that Austrians had traditionally treated the Czechs with contempt, but now found the tables turned. Whatever his motivation, from Haiser's elitism arose "whole crowds of errors and exaggerations," which could do harm to "immature heads." Concerning his view that bodily labor was unworthy of a free man, "I am on the contrary of the opinion it is the basis for the growth of freedom." His notion of a Kshatriya-caste was medieval,

already obsolete in the time of Cervantes, and the present era called for other bases of organization. To suggest a counter-revolution by the plot of a few aviators was simply silly. The thing needful today was practical ideas, as for instance his own "Artam" scheme for replacing Slavic with German agricultural workers in the eastern provinces.

Hentschel concluded patronizingly,

> I am sorry that I must lecture you in this way. You are a strong character and talented writer, but your thoughts often lack direction, and so much good is drowned.[36]

Given the severity of the Huber and Hentschel criticisms, one might have expected Haiser to make a reply; but if he did it was not printed. Instead there shortly began a voluminous and devastating critique of Haiser by Ludwig Porod, the editor (or sub-editor) of Michel, which appeared in five successive issues of the weekly.[37]

Porod began by asking, why, if Haiser thought all truth was subjective anyway, did he bother to publish his books? But his comments on practical questions called for an answer. Briefly, Haiser was a "right-anarchist," who proposed to rescue the German people from the Jews and their other afflictions by making some ninety percent of them slaves to the rest (at a time when even Asiatic maharajahs were abolishing slavery). For the purpose he proposed an "all-Aryan" conspiracy, to be recruited out of a wide variety of anti-democratic elements but then cleverly used only for the benefit of a "blue international," behind the scenes;

it could as needed fight "with everybody and against everybody." Its chief duty was to work for the cooperation of the upper classes of all peoples, and especially to prevent war between them, yet Haiser was also emphatic that true Ksahatriyas could only prove themselves by fighting their equals.

The master caste he proposed was moreover not very noble, public-spirited or even trustworthy. Its creed was mostly a sadistic contempt for anybody and anything of inferior rank. Its prime ambition was to enjoy a life of ease, and its greatest shame--a fate worse than death--was to have to earn an honest living. One could trust it to serve the state only for very high pay; "the Haiserian noblesse are nothing other than Jews in spirit." And it was "truly a 'fine' nobility," which had to be forced to live in a special quarter of town, patronize only "suitable" places of amusement, and leave them by midnight.[38]

His basis for selecting his master-caste was supposedly strictly racial, but he scorned all racial science as mere fashion, and frankly avowed that "subjectivity" was the proper standard. He was a Weismannist or a Lamarckian as suited his convenience, and was equally free with "nordic" and other racial labels. Haiser categorized various classes as "decadent," yet allowed their members to join his Kshatriyas, simply by "confessing themselves" so. Also he allowed that inferior children of high ranking parents were not to be kicked out of the master-caste. This was to perpetuate

precisely the evils of present society.

Haiser's insistence on a master-slave gradient was equally misconceived. History, and least of all Nordic history, simply was not like that. In modern Sweden "the ancient Germanic democracy" was still preserved, and prospered. Haiser's ideal was to be found, if anywhere, in the ancient Inca empire, so easily conquered by a handful of Spaniards. Its weakness was obvious: a slave had no fatherland to fight for.[39]

The slogan of the sage of Scheibbs that work was ignoble would serve no one better than the Jews, in their devilish drive to undermine the German people's will to improve itself, and would intensify class hostility. Those whom the recent war had forced into unaccustomed labor should not lapse into self-pity, but accept it as a national duty. On the virtues of labor Porod cited Gandhi, Schiller, Spengler, Dr. Walter Riehl, Hebbel, D'Annunzio, and Mussolini. The declaration "work disgraces," "is morally irresponsible, is un-völkisch, and anti-völkisch, [and] is a crime against the German Volk."[40]

Porod also damned Haiser's attempts to reserve education and military service for the upper caste. As Hitler had well said, members of a Volk could not be moved to fight for something they did not understand. Again, Haiser ought to look at Nordic regions, where every peasant had books in the house. And regarding military service, how could his handful

of Kshatriyas, plus perhaps a few mercenaries, defend Europe against "Asiatic horders"? "Could Marxism, Pacifism, and Anarchism find a better shield anywhere than in Haiser?" It was arming "the mob" that had liberated Prussia from Napoleon, and likewise they had been the mainstay of all modern wars. To "someone who has learned to know his Volksgemeinschaft in the trenches" Haiser's references to an "arms-bearing mob" must seem "a calumny desecrating the dead [directed] towards our fallen comrades."

It was precisely Haiserian caste-selfishness among the upper class, Porod went on to say, that had alienated so many Germans of the lower orders from their fatherland. "To their working-class Volk-comrades . . . they were inwardly as foreign as to an Eskimo or Papuan," and not surprisingly this caused many of the working classes to be deaf to patriotic appeals. But whereas "we wish to make amends for this sin against our people, Haiser raises it to a biological axiom!" By his principles, not a single German worker would be won over from Marxism, or less ready to see the Jews as their friends and guides.

Haiser's notions of a counter-revolutionary revolt by a select international minority of aviators (or naval officers) was "a mixture of a Spanish pronounciamento and Bolshevism," and obviously offered nothing to the Germans as a people, who would under it be enslaved or annihilated like the French and English. This idea stood worthily beside "the

Haiserian dictatorship and the life-foreign, mechanizing, schematizing, material-dogmatic-doctrinaire spirit of his 'patriarchal' state." That was, of course, not to criticize dictatorship as such:

> Who does not long for the strong man, who with iron hand will root out all rotten and alien [things] from our people, [and] will lead back our people to their own essential purity, to self-aware strength and world-validity!

But the völkisch dictatorship was instead the servant of the whole people, from high to low, and was a means rather than an end. Its most ideal goal would be the Goethean principle, that that form of government was best which taught us to rule ourselves.

> The great art of the dictator will be, to reconcile the people with the dictatorship in spite of all necessary forcefulness [Gewalt] . . . [and] speak to its heart

as Lloyd George did to England's in the recent war. After a dictatorship modern Germany would become either "a constitutional monarchy . . . or a free state."

For although democracy and parliaments were evil in their present day corrupted form,

> we may not throw out the baby with the bath! The people of poets and thinkers is ultimately not a herd of sheep, which ought eternally to be led by a despotic state. In our people there lies an ancestral democratic kernel,

the heritage of the ancient Germanics, and still to be seen functioning in Switzerland. Haiser's vision of unlimited arbitrary monarchy was rather an "oriental-semitic growth," and it appealed primarily to greed and licentiousness, as one

would to a horde of Huns. His form of dictatorship would become an end in itself, the protector of an oligarchy of parasites, racially no better than their slaves. Haiser said eloquently that one's first duty was to be a German and sacrifice oneself for one's people, but his elite cared only for themselves.

As for Haiser's racial notions,

> The race-question contains an extraordinary meaning for making our people healthy, and the furthering of race-health efforts belongs to the first duties of every völkisch. But the misuse of the race-question for reactionary efforts must be strongly opposed, [for] there [it] becomes race-struggle and class-struggle! [Master-men were either there or not; specialized talents might be hereditary] but the secret of the origin of a great personality, which is determined by a thousandfold imponderables, withdraws itself from the grasp of reason.

The true "over-men" had the right to live free of material anxiety at the expense of the generality only

> because their precious power would be unworthily consumed by ordinary occupations; [that is] inspired artists and thinkers, progress-serving discoverers, essential men of action, but not a whole swarm of conceited asses, who can do nothing but play at master-men, with more or less "pathos of distance." We do not know when and where the great ones arise, they can proceed from the poorest hut or a palace, and accordingly we must unite the whole Volk in a social Gemeinschaft, whereby the noble kernel, wherever it is born, can prosper, unfold, and have effect. Thus to strive for the Volksgemeinschaft is to strive for the over-man.

He quoted Lagarde, Adolf Harpf and Hitler in support.[41]

Earlier in the series Porod had noted, that the concept "völkisch" was broadly and loosely used, comprehending

> Slaveholders as much as national socialist worker representatives, the blackest reactionaries, the prophet of enslavement, of class obscurantism and of class struggle

> from above, and his opposite, the fighter for class-reconciliation and Volksgemeinschaft.

He preferred to define it, like Theodor Fritsch and Ludendorff, as the party for the union of all Germans without class distinction, indeed "socialist" in the healthy sense of that word. If the völkisch movement tried to comprehend them and such as Haiser at once, it will incure "the curse of ridiculousness"; this "wolf in sheep's clothing--though it be the clothing of a pure-race sheep--must be unmasked."[42]

Porod had made telling points against Haiser, even though he may seem at times to be breaking a butterfly on the wheel. But he did not seem to realize how much he was giving away to the left wing, thus substantiating Haiser's accusations that the "left-völkisch" were no better than democrats.

Obviously the völkisch had to be racialists, or they would have no basis for their anti-Semitism; and by the 1920's this was the main purpose of that "science." Porod's denunciation of Haiser's "subjective" racialism was itself very vulnerable, for as a previous chapter has shown such paragons as Chamberlain, Günther, Clauss and Lenz were essentially as subjective but more discreet about it. The chief difference was that they wanted to define nobody as hopelessly and irrevocably inferior but the Jews and most Slavs, whereas Haiser thought the proscription list should be longer, and include particularly many of the people in and around Scheibbs. His target was not only Jews and Slavs but democracy itself, which

had given these wretches their opportunity. Without such an arbitrary categorization the rulers would necessarily continue to be dependent on the popular will, and the vices of the open society would continue to flourish. He insisted, with considerable logic, that it was impossible to be elitist and populist at once.

Porod indeed gave the whole show away when he demanded that racial science might not be used to draw "reactionary" conclusions. If anything he made more nonsense of racialism than Haiser, for if as he claimed superior individuals were widely and quite unaccountably distributed, what was the point of any kind of racial selection? And if one admitted that we were all racial conglomerates, Jews included, why could they not produce superior persons too? Porod made it difficult to say what was so bad about the Jews as a race, or for that matter how to distinguish a Jew at all. Finally, if freedom of opportunity was the only thing needed for the best specimens to reach their proper level, why not vote for the socialists?

Much the same resulted from his political arguments. His advocacy of Volksgemeinschaft and the eradication of class barriers were völkisch commonplaces, but his praise of democracy, and even parliamentarism, was quite unusual. But obviously if these were by origin ancient-Germanic institutions, it was rather difficult to define what was so evil in their present form (except, that his side could win few votes)

that a dictator was needed to reform them. The best Porod could do was to say they were dominated by a "corner-grocer spirit," which to say the least was undramatic. Certainly he gave no compelling reasons for destroying the existing German and Austrian republics. In general Porod had been so careful to cover himself on the right flank that he left himself almost wide open on the left, precisely as Haiser had warned against.

On the other hand, Porod's concession that a few choice spirits had to be exempted from the need to earn a living gave away points to Haiser. For how could this be secured if dependent on the approval of others, who were by definition their spiritual inferiors? Likewise in regard to dictatorship Haiser had probably the better of the argument, for a dictator whose function it was to restore free government was to say the least unrealistic, even by the standards of Bildung. Haiser was generally superior to Porod and the rest of the left-völkisch in his freedom from gentlemanly squeamishness, and his frank avowal that the establishment of an undemocratic society would be a dirty business.

Haiser made two rejoinders in Michel to the Porod series, but as in other cases (one is tempted to say, because genuine debate was such a foreign art to him and to most of the German-speaking radical right) they were lacking in instinct for the jugular. Unusually, he also stooped to petty name-calling, which made these pieces extremely tiresome. In

his first article, he accused Porod of distorting his views like "a perfect parliamentarian," especially those on modern warfare and the Nordic race. Haiser admitted that he didn't read a great deal, "in order not to let myself be influenced," but as far as racial science was concerned Porod knew less than he. Anyway, in such a new field a demand for strict canonical orthodoxy was out of place, and the AAB should be flexible in its racial criteria. As for the need of the Kshatriyas of different nations to cooperate yet also fight each other, there was he claimed no real contradiction. There would be an armistice for the cleaning of Europe's "Augean stables," leaving until later the decision who should be master of Europe. (Although as usual Haiser was on this point not clear.)

Haiser admitted that his works were only sketches, needing further elaboration. Any pathfinder was afflicted by false steps and contradictions, and the only way to avoid them was to be a conventional philistine. One learned how to correct them from "decent" critics, but not from "demagogues, misquoters and scene-shifters." Haiser wondered aloud if Porod belonged to the "democratic patent-<u>völkisch</u>" who tried to knock down anything that stood high. And while his critic talked about <u>Volksgemeinschaft</u>, in fact the <u>völkisch</u> were divided into a thousand groups and grouplets, endlessly quarreling, the result of "your democratic wisdom." Obviously a single authoritative voice would be superior. And Haiser

included perhaps the deadliest insult one could make in these circles: "Did I step too near his race? Can he show me a photograph?"[43]

Porod, not surprisingly, felt called upon to reply, but with less Billingsgate. He accused Haiser of esteeming his fellow countrymen less than men of equal race of another nationa, although the recent war had shown how much such a bond was worth. At any rate, Nordic racial politics could only be conducted by a völkischly led state in which the true and qualified aristocrats (not Haiser's kind) could rise to power. For "the majority of Nordics consist of 'average men,' exactly as other races, and history shows us, [that] . . . our great men . . . were seldom pure-race light Asen," but of mixed race and not very handsome. [Did Porod realize how much he was giving away?] Racial goals were anyway for the long term, and the burning present necessity was a united Volk.

> All in all, Haiser's world-view can very much harm the völkisch movement, but do it hardly any good; he can precisely be labeled as a horror to the peasant and worker. Within his thoughts dwells the greatest imaginable shock-power. . . . Without and against the German peasant and worker, [for us] to arise again is impossible! . . . God is seldom on the side of table-societies, but mostly on the side of the strongest batallions!

Porod went on to repeat several of his criticisms, and to claim that Haiser refused to answer them. His method of racial selection was better fit for a Bierzeitung. If he meant to turn the world upside down, he should offer more than

sketches and half-baked schemes. Nor had he at all met the objection that his Kshatriyas had the double duty of international cooperation and fighting each other. Haiser declared, to quote his own words, that "the national movement, as a Volks-movement, must be demagogically led, as all that proceeds from below," but was no slouch at demagogic tricks himself, such as having the leaders of the AAB systematically lie to the rank and file. Haiser had written a "Protocol of the Elders of Zion" for the far right.

Lastly, Porod adjudged that Haiser's stooping to "inquiry concerning the race of his opponents, including [requests] for photographs and if possible fingerprints," sufficiently revealed his own character. He would say only, that he could class himself as what H. F. K. Günther called "predominantly Nordic," and that he had seen active service in the war, and subsequently in defending his native Carinthia against the Yugoslavs.[44]

Michel allowed Haiser the last shot in the battle, but he responded with his standard lecture, varied this time with an extra dose of self-pity and personal abuse of Porod. He admitted that

> One may reproach me, that I anticipate events, and give too little prominence to the needs of the present moment. . . . But there must also be men who think ahead, [for] of politicians for the present moment we have quite enough.

A pathfinder was bound to be unpopular. The basic issue

remained, that Porod spoke for the masses, he for the elite. Democracy was strong everywhere, and he was one of the few with the courage to attack it at the root. The only solution was Gewalt. If the left-völkisch were pacifists they might consistently oppose him, but instead they admitted force as a possible tool, but refused to countenance its use against admitted moral inferiors, such as Jews. It was also self-evident that all civilization rested on compulsory labor (a question Porod refused even to mention) and so harmony of classes was a pipe dream. He largely agreed with Porod on the evils of the modern liberal economy (wherein, he said, he had been misrepresented) but precisely because it was an international phenomenon it called for international counter-measures. Then anticlimatically he concluded (in contradiction to most of his remarks on the subject) with a suggestion that another good policy would be resettling the countryside with a "master-peasant class" on the model of the Junkers, with all properties "neither too great or too small," whatever that might mean.[45]

This exchange did not finally kill Haiser's connection with Michel. The next year Porod had a savage quarrel with Hans Kipper, the editor in chief, and departed the magazine.[46] Probably as a result, Haiser was able to publish one further article in October 1926, which however was largely concerned with an attack on Christianity, and especially the stupidity of its confessional rivalries.[47] In the same month Michel

also reviewed, quite favorably, Haiser's Judenfrage, which contained bitter references to his row with Porod. The reviewer diplomatically avoided specifics as to its content, remarking only that Haiser wrote only for a few, and complimenting him for his courage in contradicting the prevailing world opinion. The book was intended for him

> who still with heroic drive is root-fast and anchored to his native soil or bound to tradition and feels a racially justified mastery pulse in himself.[48]

Judenfrage was indeed Haiser's most contentious book, and unusually full of personal references, which we have extensively cited in previous chapters. In it he went out of his way to denounce "a certain Porod" for distorting his words and declaring that he had insulted [sic] "our braaaaven Bauern" and officials, who were so many votes, and thus made himself "impossible" to the völkisch. "Praise and thanks to God, that I never became a Volksmann!"[49] Likewise he denounced Hentschel, "the old master of race-breeding," for having sold out to the democratic nonsense of a restored Bauernstand. He "leaves me alone in the fight against the democratic pack, and even attacks me."[50] This book was especially rich in references to all the vices of the left-völkisch, at times referring to Michel and its authors by name.[51] (This material has been cited in the relevant chapters above.) Haiser also made some attempt to meet radical right criticisms of his views, but stated them more clearly than he answered them.[52]

Notes to Chapter XVII

[1]The present writer has been unable to locate any of Schölermann's works.

[2]Review of Krisis by Schölermann in PAM, XII, pp. 164-66.

[3]W. Schölermann, "Vom adeligen Pflichtsgefuhl," Hammer, XII, pp. 536-38.

[4]Dr. Rösler, "Nationalaristarchie," NL, VIII, no. 5.

[5]FH, "Zu Dr. Rösler's Aufsatz 'Nationalaristarchie,'" NL, VIII, no. 6., p. 93.

[6]K. Grill, "Zu Dr. Haisers Ablehnung der 'Richtung Simons,'" NL, VIII, no. 8, p. 125.

[7]FH, "Meine Antwort an Herrn Grill," NL, VIII, no. 11, pp. 165-66.

[8]Heinrich Driesmans, "Rassen-reaktion und Kulturadel," Hammer, XII, pp. 611-12.

[9]Ibid.

[10]H. Driesmans, "Zu Haiser's 'aristokratischen' und meinem 'Rasse-imperativ,'" PAM, XII, pp. 441-44.

[11]FH, "Entgegnungen gegen Driesmans," Ibid., pp. 493-95.

[12]FH, "H. Driesmans Einwendungen," Hammer, XIII, pp. 24-26.

[13]Schölermann, "Entgegnungen gegen Driesmans," PAM, XII, pp. 492-93.

[14]Schölermann, "Ein Wort an Herrn H. Driesmans," Hammer, XII, pp. 665-66.

[15]Driesmans, "Meine Antwort an Schölermann und Haiser," Hammer, XIII, pp. 50-53. The Shakespeare quote is in English in the original.

[16]Driesmans, "Zur Kritik Schölermann's und Haisers," PAM, XII, pp. 668-69.

[17]Schölermann, "Zur Klärung!," Hammer, XIII, pp. 109-110.

[18]Driesmans, "Wie steht der Rassenforscher Driesmans zum Jundentum?," Hammer, XIII, p. 137.

[19]"Einer, der auch Haiser's Schriften kennt," "Zum Streit mit Driesmans," Hammer, XIII, pp. 137-38.

[20]Driesmans, "Zum Streit um den 'Kötertypus,'" Hammer, XIII, pp. 164-65.

[21]FH, "Meine Antwort an Driesmans," PAM, XIII, pp. 102-103.

[22]A well-known anti-Semitic directory of Jewish or part-Jewish writers.

[23]FH, "Schlusswort zum 'Aristokratischen Imperativ,'" Hammer, XIII, pp. 188-91.

[24]Frederick the Great.

[25]"Friderikus," "Ist 'arbeitsloses Einkommen' berechtight?," NL, XI, pp. 152-55.

[26]FH, "Arbeitsloses Einkommen," NL, XI, pp. 183-85.

[27]Ernst Hunkel, "Nachwort des Herausgebers," NL, XI, pp. 185-87.

[28]Willibald Hentschel, Review of Anfang, in Hammer, XX, pp. 472-73.

[29]H. G. Holle, Allgemeine Biologie (Munich: 1925), pp. 14, 210. Haiser was one of the few to share his Lamarckism.

[30]Holle, Review of Anfang, in DE, V, p. 714.

[31]Holle, Review of FM, in DE, VIII, pp. 771-72.

[32]Holle, Review of Skl., in Michel, September 30, 1923, pp. 1-2.

[33]FH, "Erwiderung an Prof. Holle," Michel, October 28, 1923.

[34]Wilhelm Huber, Review of FM, in Michel, February 15, 1925, pp. 1-4.

[35]In fact Haiser reviewed it.

[36]Willibald Hentschel, "Der Kampf um Franz Haiser," Michel, February 22, 1925, pp. 1-3.

[37]The first four articles of the series were apparently written by Porod as a unit, before he had seen any of Haiser's replies. They are accordingly treated as one work. The last of his series was written after reading Haiser's answer, and is covered at the appropriate place.

[38]Ludwig Porod, "Rechtsbolschevismus oder Volksgemeinshaft?", Michel, March 29 through April 26, 1925, in five parts; Part 1, March 29, pp. 2-4.

[39]Ibid., Part 2 (April 5, 1925), pp. 2-3.

[40]Ibid., Part 3 (April 12, 1925), pp. 3-4.

[41]Ibid., Part 4 (April 19, 1925), pp. 2-4.

[42]Ibid., Part 3, as in note 40.

[43]FH, "Ludwig Porod und seine 'grundsätzlichen Bemerkungen,'" Michel, April 5, 1925, pp. 1-2.

[44]Porod, op. cit., Part 5 (April 26, 1925), pp. 3-4.

[45]FH, "Antwort auf Porods Angriffe," Michel, June 7, 1925, pp. 3-4.

[46]See Der Kleine Michel (supplement), July 25, 1926, p. 3.

[47]FH, "Von Ost und West," Michel, October 27, 1925, pp. 2-3.

[48]Review of JF in Michel, October 3, 1926, p. 1.

[49]JF, p. 89.

[50]JF, p. 74.

[51]JF, pp. 62, 109.

[52]JF, pp. 65-69, 104-107.

EPILOGUE

The quarrel in Michel marked a watershed in Haiser's career, although it was more a symbol of his decline than a cause of it. His appearances in print peaked in the immediate postwar years (reaching twenty-five in 1919), but then fell off, being only ten in 1924 and nine in 1925. Thereafter the rate fell to one or two articles a year, and his last pamphlet had to be published at his own expense. The chief influence on his relative success was clearly the overall ebb and flow of radical right sentiment, of which it provides virtually a graph. He was saying the same thing for a quarter century, but before 1914 mostly in obscurity. After the war his ideas did not change, but the mood of the public did, and for several years he received considerable attention. A turn of the fortunes of German and Austrian politics put him out of fashion again in the mid-1920's, and by the time the radical right had again become strong, it had come under committed populist leadership. Haiser (along with other too inflexible elitists) found that his place at the anti-democratic Stammtisch had been taken. However, while the rest of the radical right had probably become bored with the sage of Scheibbs, it did not repudiate him. The Porod denunciation stood alone, and the reviews and commentaries of his twilight years, although less frequent,

were on the whole as favorable as the earlier ones.

It is less profitable to inquire why Haiser's career faded, than to ask why he ever had one in the first place. He loudly professed unpopular opinions, and drew attention to the fact that they were unpopular; and he anathematized, sometimes by name, those who disagreed with him. The practical problems and anxieties that chiefly concerned the right-wing Germans of those years, such as the restoration of their role as a Great Power, received almost no attention in his works. His especial enthusiasms ran counter to two of the principal sentiments of the völkisch of the 1920's, their German patriotism and their desire for political effectiveness. Certainly it is far easier to explain why he disapproved of them than why they approved of him.

To explain the situation tempts one into psychiatric speculation; one thing is certain, that the proto-Hitlerian radical right was not obsessed by rational problems, nor did it try to meet them with rational solutions, but rather with myths, symbols and dreams. Haiser's popularity was limited less by his literary and intellectual deficiencies (for many influential right-wing figures were no better thinkers or writers than he) than because his brand of fancifulness was a minority taste. Elitism to be sure was the secret addiction of a large part of the German-speaking world, but generally it was considered genteel to flavor it with high-minded and patriotic mixers, and sip it discreetly; to

be known as an elite-aholic would damage one's reputation as a lover of the Volk and lose votes for the anti-democratic cause. Haiser however took his elitism neat, in large doses, smacking his lips and belching the while.

The historical value of the career of Franz Haiser does not lie in the extent of his influence, which admittedly was never great, but in his sincerity and outspokenness. Anti-democratic Germans seem muddled to us because they were muddled about themselves. The real impulses behind their dislike of modern times were screened by a desire to think of themselves as a leading "civilized" people, a quality which they still defined largely in the western liberal, humanitarian and Christian tradition, however contradictory to other of their ambitions. This self-deception was greatly facilitated by a particular kind of education. Bildung's "idealistic" rhetoric and thought-forms offered almost unlimited resources for dodging, quite innocently, the down-to-earth issues, especially who should get what, and at whose expense? After Hitler's fall the anti-democratic "decent people" protested loudly, and probably sincerely, that they had never intended, nor expected, what had in fact taken place under the regime that they had helped into power, or at least had willingly accepted. As a group they were well-educated, but not at all in their own less "decent" side. Franz Haiser stood to them as a special mirror, revealing not their outside but their inside; had he been taken more

seriously, there would have been fewer surprises as to what a radical-right regime would really mean.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

Locating source material about Franz Haiser poses a number of problems, some peculiar to his case and others general to the German-speaking radical right. Inasmuch as Haiser left no children, and to all appearances had no followers in Scheibbs, there was no one to preserve his papers. And since he generally eschewed membership in formal organizations, there are no leads as to archives where relevant documents might be found. This forces us to rely almost entirely on the printed word, although as noted in Chapter II he provides much personal data in his works.

Similar problems afflict much research into the rest of the radical right. Much material was lost or destroyed as a result of the Second World War, and for a considerable time afterwards few Germans or Austrians were eager to identify themselves, even remotely, with the Hitler regime or any tendency that seemed akin to it. The radical right tradition was in effect treated as an ugly family scandal. Neither its participants, nor their friends and relations, were apt to be solicitous to preserve their records, nor libraries and archives their papers and publications. The files of radical right publishing establishments are an especial loss. In addition, the occupying powers made efforts to purge libraries of material that they considered unwholesome.

Finally, such evidence as has survived in Communist-controlled areas (in which regard Czechoslovakia and Poland as well as East Germany are important) is difficult of access to western scholars.

Further difficulties arise from the very nature of radical right publishing, and from German library science. There were so many periodicals, often of irregular appearance, shortlived, and flimsily produced, that preserving complete files of them would not be easy even under orderly conditions. Not a few publications seem to have been preserved only fragmentarily, or to have vanished altogether. Nor is it convenient to discover and use what material there is. For the listing of books and pamphlets the Deutscher Buechervertzeichnis (under its several titles) is generally satisfactory, but to locate items in newspapers and magazines one must rely largely on the Bibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur, which is not a model of Teutonic thoroughness. If an author is known to have been a frequent contributor to a journal, leafing through it will probably uncover considerable material by him that has not been listed. The BdZ is especially inadequate in regard to book reviews, which are listed very capriciously. Uncertainty as to the name behind an author's initials, duplicated or phantom entries, and garbled index numbers, call for their own special techniques. (A few erroneous citations may remain in this bibliography.)

Altogether the author has had access to at least

ninety-five percent of the works that Franz Haiser is known to have written, and ninety percent of the known reviews of his books. Further search of newspapers, particularly the DOeTZ of Vienna, the Völkischer Beobachter of Munich, and local publications of Lower Austria would probably disclose a few more Haiser articles, and perhaps details of his life, but one doubts any new ideas or themes. On the other hand, probably many more reviews of his books could be found, given greater access than the author's to the radical right press. Haiser published in 1914, at his own expense, Meine Schriften und die Presse, a collection of all the reviews of his books, favorable and unfavorable, that he knew of. (He missed a few.) It includes all those listed in the BdZ, plus a larger number that are not, mostly from local or obscure publications of Germany and Austria. At this time Haiser had published only two books and a handful of articles. Had he published an update of Meine Schriften ten years later, it seems certain that it would include a comparable proportion of reviews unlisted in the BdZ, and the total number of Haiser reviews would be at least half again as large as given here. There also may be a considerable number of hostile or satirical notices in periodicals not identified with the radical right; the few listed in this work were found in good part by accident. However, all evidence converges on the conclusion that there was a precipitous drop in interest in him after 1925, and further search subsequent

to this date would probably find little.

Furthermore, in some ways research into the radical right has been ill-served by German and Austrian scholarship. Scholars treating any topic related to the anti-democratic right-wing were inclined to stress their protagonists' basic decency, and their distance from the Nazis. This is a notable weakness in Armin Mohler's Die Konservative Revolution (2nd ed. 1972), whose categorizations serve essentially as dikes to separate the rest of the Weimar right wing from Hitlerism. Gerhard Ritter similarly blames "mass society" for Nazism, and exculpates the gebildete gravediggers of liberal democracy.[1] In the immediate postwar years, a synthesis of pre-Hitlerian German history, to show how Nazism incorporated many existing aspects of German thought and feeling, was not a comfortable subject.

German scholarship, at least since the mid-1950's, has largely recovered from this uneasiness, but for Austrians the embarrassment is still strong. As the saying goes, "the Austrians persuade themselves that Beethoven was an Austrian and Hitler a German." The matter strikes to the heart of Austrian patriotism; any study of its radical right element emphasizes how weak and half-hearted was the German-Austrians' desire to be a separate nation before the end of World War II.[2] Austrian inhibitions are well illustrated by the case of the most important Austrian völkisch figure, Georg von Schönerer. In the Hitler era he was the subject of the voluminous

hagiographical biography by Eduard Pichl, and many doctoral dissertations. Since 1945 he has been largely left to foreign scholars, such as the Americans Andrew Whiteside and Carl Schorske. Similarly, the most famous resident of pre-1914 Vienna was left to William A. Jenks' Vienna and the Young Hitler (New York: 1960). And whereas Austria is well-provided with biographical dictionaries for its authors, including some of marvelous obscurity, the prolific and far from obscure Franz Haiser goes unmentioned. The postwar Kürschner Nekrolog does mention his death, but the date is wrong. In general, the student of the Austrian völkisch movement can expect that the country's own scholars have done little to blaze his way.

In general, radical-right scholarship is poorly served by reference works. Its important personalities are often not even mentioned in encyclopedias and biographical dictionaries. Thus far the most useful reference work in the field (as distinct from its historical narrative) is Armin Mohler's Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland (1918-1932: Ein Handbuch (2nd ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellshaft, 1972), but it has many errors and omissions. The recent Encyclopedia of the Third Reich (ed. Louis L. Snyder) promises also to be of use. Of particular value would be a comprehensive listing of periodicals and publishing houses, with their chief personalities and affiliations. In the pre-Hitler era, radical right political parties and other organizations were not very effective, so publications were

principal foci of the movement. Gary D. Stark's Entrepreneurs of Ideology (Ph. D. Thesis, Johns Hopkins: 1974), which describes five publishing houses, is a step in this direction.

In spite of the massive publications on the antecedents and auxiliaries of Nazism, in certain important respects the radical right has been inadequately treated, or quite neglected. A principal such category, especially important for the present work, is the "non-völkisch elitists," as we have called them. This comprises that part of the radical right which repudiated liberalism and democracy because they did not give a due place to the intellectually and spiritually superior few, an attitude much encouraged by the traditions of public life and education in Germany and Austria. This element was in favor of destroying the Weimar Republic, but by no means enthusiastic over its replacement by Nazism, because it was quintessentially populist and vulgar. They were notably cool, or opposed, to anti-Semitism, because this was essentially a populist notion, as described in earlier chapters. The most substantial contribution in this area so far is Walter Struve's Elites Against Democracy (Princeton: 1973).[3] The present writer has found it very useful as an anthology of material, but does not necessarily subscribe to its theses and approach. There is also useful material on the non-völkisch elitists in Klemens von Klemperer's Germany's New Conservatism (Princeton: 1957), and in George K. Romoser's "The Politics of Uncertainty," in Social Research,

XXXI (Spring 1964), pp. 73-91.

The role of Bildung in shaping elitism has been very ambitiously treated in Fritz K. Ringer's The Decline of the German Mandarins (Cambridge, Mass.: 1969), which is certainly one of the most important recent books on modern German intellectual history. K. D. Barkin[4] however takes exception to its thesis and method. While no doubt many academics did engage in the caste pretensions and consequent intellectual narrowness and dishonesty that Ringer describes, it is doubtful if they were ever as powerful and prestigious as he assumes, even within higher education. The present writer has found Ringer's book very useful as a source of information, but takes issue with certain of his assumptions and hypotheses. First of all, it is debatable whether the notion of the educated as a special class was as new, and as peculiarly German, as Ringer seems to believe. Bildung did not stand alone as a caste-shaping ideology, but depended on its integration into a complex of social and moral attitudes inherited from the Old Regime. This complex was general to western Christendom, and centuries old; the categorization of university education as a kind of knighthood goes back to the Middle Ages.[5]

Furthermore, we are struck by the way Bildung's pretensions were threatened not only by the advance of more "modern" and "practical" forms of education, but also by the advance of what we have called "barbaric vitalism," as a competitor

indeed for the souls of the Gebildeten. This movement was already strong in the 1890's, as is demonstrated by the appeal of Nietzsche, Langbehn, Stefan George, and the Youth Movement. Considering the surprising strength of irrationalism among university students after 1918, one wonders how much of a constituency Ringer's "mandarinism" had left. The style and manner of Bildung had indeed left a strong impression--even the anti-intellectuals were inclined to talk like philosophy professors--but it was only an empty shell.

Another neglected area of radical right interest is racialism and eugenics. As our chapter hereon has stressed, racialism was as international as socialism, but a comprehensive survey is still lacking. Racialism in the USA has been covered well by Thomas F. Gossett's Race: the History of an Idea in America (Dallas: 1963), but for the German-speaking world the only general treatment is a brief and less useful work by Hedwig Conrad-Martius, Utopien der Menschenzüchtung (Munich: 1955). There is also an article by Hans-Günter Zmarzlik, "Der Sozialdarwinismus in Deutschland als geschichtliches Problem," in Vierteljahreshefte fuer Zeitgeschichte, XI (1963), pp. 246-273.[6] The present writer takes strong exception to one of his theses, namely the attempt to divide German-speaking racialism into two schools: 1) the "racial anthropologists," clustered around PAM and the Gobineau Vereinigung, and later represented by the very popular works of H. F. K. Günther, and encouraged by such

outspokenly völkisch bodies as the ADV and DHV;

2) the "race hygiene" school, whose chief foci were the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene and the publications AfRGB and Volk und Rasse.

The former school, in Zmarzlik's opinion, was composed of "dilettantish freelance scholars with inadequate scientific training," while the latter was dominated by "university men who . . . made a serious effort to confine themselves to demonstrable facts."[7] In our opinion, Zmarzlik is too readily impressed by university education, and this distinction is at best trivial. There was considerable overlapping of interests, and several authors appeared in both PAM and AfRGB. The data of the "race-hygienists" may be more compendious and their tone more polite, but in basic conclusions--the superiority of "Nordics" to other races, the evils of big-city life, the distinctiveness of Jews and Germans, and general hostility to the democratic open society--there is little to choose between them. The AfRGB frequently praised, with only slight reservations, the views of such as Ammon, Hentschel, Woltmann, and Günther, and even Lanz-Liebenfels. It even gave a favorable review to one of Haiser's early books,[8] although subsequently Fritz Lenz said of him that such writers would make racial science seem only "the wishful thinking of reactionaries."[9] But in his own principal work Lenz could write that

> If it is found that the children of cultured parents are on the average more gifted than the children of uncultured

> parents, this is not because the parents of these gifted children acquired culture, but because the parents already possessed the hereditary equipment inclining them to make themselves cultured.[10]

The bibliography of the same volume lists Gobineau's Essay as "an inspired work."[11] Lenz himself summed up the matter--in the very issue of the AfRGB where his gibe at Haiser appeared--in his comment on a book entitled The völkisch Content of Race-Hygiene, that "the title is puzzling; . . . for if one were to take away the völkisch content of race-hygiene, what would remain would indeed have little value."[12] Lastly we may note that J. F. Lehmann published Lenz, Günther, Haiser, AfRGB and Volk und Rasse (the latter beginning as a supplement to DE), and he was most unlikely to sponsor anything contradictory to radical right bigotry. If the "race-hygiene" school possessed superior intellectual capacities to that of the "racial anthropologists," they lay chiefly in the sphere of self-deception.

Another issue which actively engaged the radical right, but which has been neglected by scholarship, is religion. It was often strongly opposed to traditional Christianity, and attempted either to Germanize it, or to replace it with a revived paganism. These anti-Christian efforts received considerable encouragement from the Nazi regime. Books or even articles about the movement seem completely lacking. No doubt one factor is that after the Nazi collapse erstwhile Germanized Christians and neo-pagans became as extinct, as sects, as the Gnostics, and their former members strove to

pass as good Protestants and Catholics again. Modern German religious history has mostly been written by Catholic or Lutheran church historians, and their foreign counterparts, and they take notice of radical-right anti-Christians only insofar as they affected the two established confessions. German Protestantism has especial reason to find the subject distasteful, for the "Germanizers" of religion were clearly a hypertrophy of certain tendencies within itself, going back to the Romanticist era.[14]

Lastly, there are lacunae concerning the German-speaking radical right's relation to literature and the theater, and especially studies of its favorite authors. One suspects that a prime reason for this neglect was simply that its characteristic productions were of such poor literary quality. In other countries radical right affinities have not been a barrier to high literary reputations, as in the cases of e. g. Pirandello, Hamsun, Barrès, D. H. Lawrence, W. B. Yeats, and Ezra Pound. Certainly Nazism, and the whole radical right, were deeply rooted in German soil, and not least in its literary tastes and traditions. It is to be hoped that specialists in German literature will look into the question.

Notes to Biographical Essay

[1]A. G. Whiteside, "The Nature and Origins of National Socialism," Journal of Central European Affairs, XVII no. 1 (April 1957), pp. 48-73.

[2]Albert Fuchs, Geistige Strömungen in Öesterreich 1867-1918 (Vienna: 1949), pp. 166, 195.

[3]See reviews of Struve in AHR, LXXX, (1975), pp. 429-430; American Political Science Review, 1976, p. 1000.

[4]Journal of Modern History, XLIII (1971), pp. 276-286.

[5]Johan Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages (Garden City: 1954), pp. 66-7.

[6]Reprinted in Hajo Holborn, ed., Republic to Reich (New York: 1972), pp. 435-474, as "Social Darwinism in Germany, Seen as a Historical Problem." Zmarzlik has also written a further article, "Der Sozialdarwinismus in Deutschland," in Kreatur Mensch, ed. G. Altner (Munich: 1973), pp. 289-311.

[7]Zmarzlik, "Social Darwinism," pp. 445-46.

[8]Review of AI in AfRGB, X no. 6 (June 5, 1914), p. 820.

[9]Lenz, review of UK in AfRGB, XII no. 5/6 (May 28, 1918), pp. 490-3.

[10]Lenz in Baur et al., Human Heredity (New York: 1931), p. 606.

[11]Ibid., pp. 701-6.

[12]Lenz, Review of Franz Siebert, Der völkische Gehalt der Rassenhygiene, AfRGB, XII (1918), p. 511.

[13]Karl Kupisch, Zwischen Idealismus und Massendemokratie (Berlin: 1955), p. 189.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Documents concerning Franz Haiser.

II. Periodicals.

III. Works of Franz Haiser.

IV. Reviews and Evaluations of Franz Haiser.

V. Works and Reviews of Justine Haiser.

VI. Other Primary Sources for the German and Austrian Radical Right.

VII. Secondary Sources.

Note: Some publications by or concerning Franz Haiser cited here are known to the author only by report, and their entries are incomplete and possibly inaccurate. Haiser himself mentions several articles which the author has not traced, and the citation of reviews from the Bibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur may be in error. Furthermore Haiser several times used the same title more than once, usually for a reprint of the same text but sometimes for a quite different one. Where the text is identical, succeeding entries are marked [same]; otherwise title is repeated.

List of abbreviations of periodicals:

AfRGB	Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-biologie
AHR	American Historical Review
DAP	Deutsche Arbeiter-Presse
DE	Deutschlands Erneuerung
DOeTZ	Deutschösterreichische Tageszeitung
JCH	Journal of Contemporary History
NL	Neues Leben
OR	Ostdeutsche Rundschau
PAM	Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift
SPB	St. Pöltner Beobachter
WK	Der Weltkampf

List of Abbreviations of the Works of Franz Haiser:

AI	Der aristokratische Imperativ
Anfang	Im Anfang war der Streit
Aufruf	Aufruf an die deutschen Hochschüler
FM	Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer
GFA	Das Gastmahl des Freiherrn von Artaria
JF	Die Judenfrage
Krisis	Die Krisis des Intellektualismus
MB	Moralbiologie
MS	Meine Schriften und die Presse
Skl	Die Sklaverei
UK	Ueberzeugungskraft des "Beweises"

I. DOCUMENTS.

Letter to the author from Pfarramt, Scheibbs, Nieder-Österreich, June 12, 1974.

Letter to the author from the Rev. Rudolf Rechlin-Meldegg, S. J., Rector of Jesuitenkollegium, Kalksburg, giving Haiser's school records 1882-86.

Letter to the author from Dr. Heinrich Jellinek of Scheibbs, June 4, 1974, giving personal reminiscences of Haiser.

Rigorosenakt of Franz Haiser at the University of Vienna, July 5-12, 1895.

Letter to the author from Dipl.-Ing. Fritz Markmiller, Archiv- und Museumspfleger der Stadt Dingolfing, Bayern, July 12, 1974.

"Haiser, Franz," in H. A. L. Degener, ed., Wer ist's, [illegible] 1922, 1928, 1935.

"Haiser, Franz," in Kürschner's deutscher Literatur Kalendar, 1922 to 1937/8.

II. PERIODICALS.

Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie.

Deutsche Arbeiter-Presse, Vienna.

Deutschlands Erneuerung, Munich.

Deutschösterreichische Tageszeitung, Vienna.

Hammer, Leipzig.

Michel: Unabhängige völkische Wochenschrift für alle Deutschen, Graz.

Neues Leben, Reichenberg etc.

Ostdeutsche Rundschau (officially Deutsches Tagblatt-Ostdeutsche Rundschau), Vienna.

Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift (before Sept. 1914 known as Politisch-Anthropologische Revue), Berlin.

St. Pöltner Beobachter, St. Pölten.

III. WORKS OF FRANZ HAISER.

A. Doctoral Dissertation in Chemistry.

Haiser, F[ranz], and Wenzel, F., "Karnin und Inosinsäure." Monatshefte für Chemie und verwandte Teile anderer Wissenschaften, XXIX (1908), pp. 157-76; XXXI (1910), pp. 357-63.

[Same.], Sitzungsberichte des Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Classe), CXVII (1909), II Abteilung b, pp. 877-94; CXIX (1911), pp. 243-48.

[Same]. Anzeiger der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse), XLIV (1907), p. 477; XLV (1908), pp. 527-28; XLVI (1909), p. 74; XLVII (1910), pp. 29-30. [Abstracts of the preceding, submitted by Prof. Rudolf Wegscheider of the University of Vienna.]

B. Books and Pamphlets (omitting offprints of magazine articles.)

Im Anfang war der Streit: Nietzsches Zarathustra und die Weltanschauung des Altertums. 173 pp. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1921.

Aufruf an die deutschen Hochschüler. 16 pages. Vienna: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1907.

Der aristokratische Imperativ: Beiträge zu der neudeutsche Kulturbestrebungen. 107 pages. Berlin-Steglitz: Politisch-Anthropologischer Verlag, 1913.

Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer im Kampfe um der Weltherrschaft. 141 pages. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1924.

Das Gastmahl des Freiherrn von Atraria: ein Kampf zwischen rassenaristokratischen und demokratischen Weltanschauungen. 172 pages. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1920.

[Same]. Second edition, 1925.

Die Judenfrage von Standpunkt der Herrenmoral: Rechtsvölkische und linksvölkische Weltanschauungen. 131 pages. Leipzig: Theodor Weicher, 1926.

Die Krisis des Intellektualismus: ein Beitrag zu den neudeutschen Kulturbestrebungen. 81 pages. Hildburgshausen: Thüringische Verlags-Anstalt, 1912.

Die Krisis des Intellektualismus: die Schreckensherrschaft des Zeitgeistes und die geistige Umwälzung. Heft 1. 81 pages. Second edition. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1919.

Meine Schriften und die Presse. 78 pages. Scheibbs: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1914.

Moralbiologie, Judenfrage, und Volkswirtschaft. 88 pages. Scheibbs: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1932.

Die Sklaverei, ihre biologische Begründung und sittliche Rechtfertigung. 71 pages. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1923.

Die Ueberzeugungskraft des "Beweises": ein Kampf zwischen Stil und Freiheir um die Vorherrschaft. 361 pages. Vienna: Carl Konegen, 1916.

Untraceable book:

Christentum und Herrenmoral- die Biologie des Staates. [Haiser states in "Zum Warburg-Prozess," Hammer, XXVI,

p. 218 that this book would be published by Lehmann that year, but there is no evidence thereof. The above listing is given by him in Kürschners deutsche Literatur Kalendar in 1928-1932, and in Degener, Wer ist's?, in 1928 and 1935, but does not appear in any indexes or catalogs.]

C. Magazine and Newspaper Articles.

"Adelskriege und Volkskriege." Das Hakenkreuz, II, no. 4 (April 1925), pp. 16-19.

"Alkoholfeinde." Michel, IV, no. 13 (Mar. 26, 1922), p. 4. See SERIES.

"Der alte und der neue Freimaurer." OR, Nov. 11, 1917, p. 3.

"An Amerika." Michel, V, no. 2 (Jan. 14, 1923), pp. 2-3.

"Am Anfang war der Streit." [Letter to the editor, Hans Kipper.] Michel, III, no. 20 (May 15, 1921), p. 5.

"Im Anfang war der Streit." [Selection from the book.] Michel, III, no. 25 (June 19, 1921), p. 3; no. 30 (July 24, 1921), pp. 2-3.

"Angenehmes und unangenehmes Mensch." Norddeutsche Monatshefte, IV (1917), pp. 68-72.

"Antike Demokratie." PAM, XIV, no. 12 (Mar. 1916), pp. 638-41.

"Apostelbriefe." PAM, XVI, no. 3 (June 1917), pp. 143-50.

"Die Auferstehung des Abendlandes." PAM, XXI, no. 3 (June 1922), pp. 121-25. See BOOK REVIEWS.

"Das 'aufgeklärte' Geschlechtsleben." PAM, XV, no. 8 (Nov. 1916), pp. 421-26.

"Bei den 'Müttern.'" PAM, XIX, no. 3 (June 1920), pp. 123-25.

"Bewegungen des menschlichen Körpers und ihre Rasseneigentumlichkeiten." PAM, XVIII, no. 9 Dec. 1919), pp. 414-19.

"Bildung." PAM, XIV, no. 9 (Dec. 1915), pp. 478-81.

"Die Bildung und die neue Zeit." Michel, II, no. 36 (Oct. 3, 1920), p. 3.

"Die Biologie des Staates." [Lecture to Deutscher Klub, Vienna, Oct. 26, 1926.] Mitteilungen des Deutschen Klubs, Folge 9 (Dec. 1926).

"Biologische Gesetze und seelische Gebote." WK, II, pp. 121-27. See SERIES.

"Biologische und liberale Rechtsauffassung." Michel, V, no. 35 (Sept. 2, 1923), pp. 2-3.

"Byzantinismus und Alleinherrschaft." Michel, V, no. 18 (May 6, 1923), pp. 2-3.

"Houston Stewart Chamberlain und Werner Sombart." OR, May 20, 1911, pp. 1-2. Reprinted in Krisis, pp. 77-81.

"Christlich-asketischer Spiritismus." PAM, XX, no. 3 (June 1921), pp. 138-40.

" Democratia Corrupta." St. Pöltner Beobachter, March 15, 1925, p. 1.

[Same] Reprinted in DAP, March 21, 1925, p. 3.

"Demokratie, Monarchie, oder-- Caesarismus?" Michel, II, no. 43 (Nov. 11, 1920), pp. 1-2.

"Der deutsche Artgeist und ein Deutscher der Gegenwart." DE, IX, no. 10 (Oct. 1925), pp. 618-22.

"Der deutsche Genius." Hammer, XIX, no. 443 (Dec. 1, 1920), p. 446. [Signed "Dr. Fr. H." but unmistakably by Haiser.]

"Deutsches Schrifttum." PAM, XIX, no. 11, (Feb. 1921), pp. 519-22.

"Der deutsche und seine Religion." Michel, VI, no. 48 (Dec. 7, 1924), pp. 2-3; no. 49 (Dec. 14, 1924), pp. 2-3.

"Deutschösterreichs Todeskampf." Michel, IV, no. 18 (April 30, 1922), pp. 2-3.

"Deutschtum, Modernismus, und Hebräertum." Hammer, IX, no. 192 (June 1910), pp. 314-18; X, no. 214 (May 1911), pp. 163-67.

"Deutschtum, Modernismus, und Hebräertum." Die Hilfe, no. 22 (1910), pp. 314ff.[Existence doubtful; probably a mistake for the preceding.]

"Dilettantismus und Wissenschaft." PAM, XXI, pp. 175-79. See BOOK REVIEWS.

"Diplomatie." PAM, XV, no. 5 (Aug. 1916), pp. 250-54.

"Dogmen des Liberalismus." Michel, IV, no. 43 (Nov. 5, 1922), pp. 2-3.

"Duldsamkeit." PAM, XIV, no. 10 (Jan. 1916), pp. 519-24.

"Edelrasse." PAM, XXI, no. 1 (April 1922), pp. 42-43.

"Der edle und der gemeine Streit." PAM, XVII, no. 5 (Aug. 1918), pp. 193-98.

"Ehrgeiz." PAM, XV, no. 2 (May 1916), pp. 95-98.

"Erhalten, Schaffen und Vernichten." PAM, XXI, pp. 78-82. See BOOK REVIEWS.

"Erinnerungen an Georg von Schönerer," Alldeutscher Zeitweiser (Hammerjahrbuch), XXV (1932), pp. 46-48.

"Die Franzosen im Reiche." Michel, V, no. 7 (Feb. 18, 1923), p. 3.

"Freibeuterhauptleute im Reiche des Geistes." PAM, XV, no. 7 (Oct. 1916), pp. 352-56.

"Freie und Unfreie." PAM, XIX, no. 11 (Feb. 1921), pp. 509-17.

"Freihandel." PAM, XV, no. 1 (April 1916), pp. 26-30.

"Freiheit." OR, Aug. 19, 1917, pp. 9-10; Aug. 26, 1917, p. 9.

"Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer." Das Hakenkreuz, II, no. 2/3 (Feb.-Mar. 1925), pp. 6-7.

"Der Freisinnige." OR, Oct. 26, 1917, pp. 4-5.

"Führende Deutsche zum neuen Jahre." [Anthology, including remarks by Haiser.] Michel, V, no. 1 (Jan. 7, 1923), p. 2.

"Das Gastmahl des Freiherrn von Artaria." [Selections from the book.] DE, III, no. 11 (Nov. 1919), pp. 791-93.

[Same.] Michel, I, no. 44 (Nov. 16, 1919), p. 3; no. 48 (Dec. 14, 1919), p. 3; no. 49 (Dec. 21, 1919), p. 3; II, no. 1 (Jan. 11, 1920), p. 2.

[Same.] OR, March 1919 [Date unknown; perhaps two installments before Mar. 18]; Mar. 18, 1919, p. 10; April 1. p. 3; April 7, pp. 2-3; April 14, p. 3; April 24, p. 4; May 19, pp. 2-3; May 26, p. 3; June 23, p. 3.

[Same.] PAM, XVIII, no. 4 (July 1919), pp. 170-72; XIX, no. 2 (May 1920), pp. 89-92.

"Gedankenspäne." Michel, V, no. 12 (Mar. 25, 1923), pp. 1-2.

"Geist und Judentum." PAM, XXI, pp. 30-34. See BOOK REVIEWS.

"Das geistige Leben der Völker und der sogennanten arbeitslose Einkommen." DE, III, no. 10 (Oct. 1919), pp. 720-23.

[Same.] OR, June 14, 1919, pp. 3-4.

"Geschäftsmoral." OR, July 1914. Reprinted in UK, pp. 320-24.

"Gesetz und Wilkur." Michel, V, no. 27 (July 8, 1923), pp. 2-3.

"Die grosse und kleine Liebe." DE, II, no. 6 (June 1918), pp. 411-13.

"Eine hartes aber gerechtes Urteil." SPB, no. 33 (Dec. 1, 1923), pp. 6-7.

"Intelligenzsozialisten." OR, Feb. 8, 1919, p. 2.

"Japan und die Rechtskultur." PAM, XIX, no. 7 (Oct. 1920), pp. 329-32.

"Judentum und Philistertum." Das Hakenkreuz, I, no. 5 (July 1924), pp. 45-46; no. 6 (Aug. 1924), pp. 58-59; no. 7 (Aug. 1924), pp. 70-71; no. 8/9 (Sept. 1924), pp. 83-84.

"Ein Jünger Nietzsches?" Michel, Nov. 18 and 23, 1923. See BOOK REVIEWS.

"Das + + + Junkertum." PAM, XVII, no. 2 (May 1918), pp. 62-68.

"Von Kind und Ehe." [Selection from Anfang.] Michel, III, no. 22 (May 29, 1921), pp. 2-3.

"Der König mit den sieben Ministern." Deutscher Volksbote (Supplement to Michel), IV, no. 51 (Dec. 31, 1922), pp. 1-2.

"Korruption und Anzeigepflicht." OR, Sept. 12, 1917, p. 4.

"Vom Krieg und Kriegsvolke." [Selection from Anfang.] Michel, II, no. 28 (Aug. 1, 1920), p. 2; no. 29 (Aug. 15, 1920), p. 2.

[Same.] PAM, XX, no. 4 (July 1921), pp. 160-65.

"Kriegsgewinner und Demokratie." Michel, II, no. 13 (April 17, 1920), pp. 2-3.

"Kriegsgewinner als Führer der Sozialdemokratie." OR, May 29, 1919, p. 3.

"Der Krokodilismus im Reiche des Geistes." OR, Nov. 9, 1917, p. 3.

"Die Links-kultur und der deutsch-österreichische Rassenkampf." PAM, XII, no. 8 (Nov. 1913), pp. 413-21.

"Das maskulierte Weib." PAM, XVI, no. 1 (April 1917), pp. 27-35.

"Mittelstand und Nationalitätsbewusstsein: Ein Kapitel zur deutschen Gemeinbürgerschaft." Deutsches Volks-Blatt (Morgenausgabe), Vienna, Oct. 14, 1909. Reprinted in Krisis, pp. 69-73.

"Moderne 'Idealisten.'" OR, Aug. 31, 1917, p. 5.

"Monistengrossenwahn." Appendix to Krisis, pp. 53-59.

"Napoleon und Freiherr vom Stein." DOeTZ, date unknown. (Before Jan. 1925.)

[Nimführs, Raimund.] Article, title unknown, in DOeTZ sometime before 1924, about Nimführs' invention of a new type of sailplane; noted in FM, p. 117.

"Der nordamerikanische Buergerkrieg und seine Folgen." Der Stärkere, VIII (1928), pp. 58-60.

[Same.] Voelkischer Beobachter (Bayernausgabe), March 4/5, 1928.

"Oesterreichs wissenschaftliche Institute." OR, Jan. 20, 1910, p. 4.

"Offener Brief an Karl Heckel." Michel, V, no. 10 (March 1923), pp. 3-4. See BOOKREVIEWS.

"Okkultismus." PAM, XV, no. 4 (July 1916), pp. 189-94.

"Die Opfertheorie in der Volkswirtschaftlehre." National-sozialistische Monatshefte, Munich, III (1932), pp. 33-36. [Selection from MB.]

"Von Ost und West." Michel, VII, no. 39 (Oct. 27, 1925), pp. 2-3.

"Die östische Rasse." Michel, V, no. 3 (Jan. 22, 1923), pp. 3-4.

"Partei und Staatspolitik." Michel, III, no. 50 (Dec. 18, 1921), p. 2.

"Radikalismus." SPB, Oct. 1, 1924, p. 2.

[Same.] DAP, Oct. 4, 1924, pp. 4-5.

"Rasse und Politik." Völkischer Beobachter, date unknown. Reprinted in FM, pp. 127-37.

"Rassenaristokrat und Menschenköter." Deutsch-völkische Blätter, Hamburg, 1919, p. 63.

[Same.] OR, Jan. 31, 1919, p. 3.

"Rassenhygiene und menschliche Vererbungslehre." [Lecture to Deutscher Klub, Vienna, Dec. 9, 1924.] Mitteilungen des Deutschen Klubs, 1925, no. 1, p. 3.

"Die rechtskulturelle Bewegung." WK, II, no. 1 (Jan. 1, 1925), pp. 1-13.

"Rechtsradikale Weltrevolution." Völkischer Beobachter, date unknown, Cited in FM, p. 116.

"Das Relativitätsprinzip." PAM, XIX, no. 11 (Feb. 1921), pp. 495-502.

"Religion und Freigeisterei." Michel, V, no. 30 (July 29, 1923), pp. 2-3.

"Rentner und Kapitalisten." Die Sonne, II (1925), pp. 684-90.

"Die schmützigen Finger." PAM , XX, no. 7 (Oct. 1921), pp. 327-28.

[Same.] Michel, III, no. 41 (Oct. 9, 1921), pp. 4-5.

"Zum Sendschreiben an den Adel von Ernst Freiherr von Wolzogen." Hammer, XIX, pp. 392-93. See SERIES.

"Sinkende Währung- zunehmende Teuerung." Michel, II, no. 47 (Dec. 19, 1920), p. 2.

"Sombart und die Juden; ein Urteil über die Irrwege der sogennante 'Unparteilichkeit.'" DE, VI, no. 6 (June 1923), pp. 333-39; no. 7 (July 1923), pp. 421-27.

"Spiessertum und achtundvierziger Liberalismus." DOeTZ, Nov. 25, 1923, pp. 1-2.

"Der Staat als sittliches Bewusstsein." PAM, XV, no. 10 (Jan. 1917), pp. 526-38.

"Das stilisierte Leben." DE, I, no. 4 (July 1917), pp. 357-67.

"Studenten!" DOeTZ, date unknown. Reprinted in FM, pp. 137-38.

[Same.] Sudetendeutsche Tageszeitung, Folge 205 (Dec. 8, 1923).

"Studenten!" Michel, VI, no. 8 (Feb. 24, 1924) pp. 2-3. See SERIES.

"Die subjektive Dehnbarkeit des Gesetzes." OR, Sept. 30, 1917, p. 5.

"Thor oder Wodan der deutsche Gott?" PAM, XVI, no. 5 (Aug. 1917), pp. 251-53.

"Trieb und Hemmung im Menschen- und Völkerleben." PAM, XVIII, no. 6 (Sept. 1919), pp. 261-65.

"Verbrechen und Modernismus." OR, March 9, 1910, pp. 1-2. Reprinted in Krisis, pp. 63-66.

"Die Verketzerung der Reaktion durch die roten Pfaffen." PAM, XIX, no. 6 (Sept. 1920), pp. 261-67.

"Volk und Parlament." DAP, April 4, 1925, pp. 1-2.

"Volksküchen." OR, Sept. 20, 1917, p. 4.

"Volksvertretung und Rassengemisch." DE, II, no. 8 (Aug. 1918), pp. 567-71.

"Zum Warburg-Prozess." Hammer, XXVI, no. 596 (April 1927), pp. 216-17.

"Der Weg der 'freien Selbstbestimmung.'" Michel, II, no. 17 (May 16, 1920), pp. 2-3.

"Weltanschauung und Religion." PAM, XII, no. 4 (July 1913), pp. 197-202. Also issued as an offprint.

"Die Weltkrankheit." DE, VI, no. 1 (Jan. 1922), pp. 46-49.

"Der Widerspruch der neuzeitlichen Entwicklung." DE, III, no. 1 (Jan. 1919), pp. 3-9; no. 2 (Feb. 1919), pp. 109-18.

"Der Wille zur Macht." PAM, XVI, no. 10 (Jan. 1918), pp. 487-95.

"Die Willensfreiheit als Grundlage des Lebens." DE, IV, no. 1 (Jan. 1920), pp. 44-52.

"Wo ist unser Beschützer?" OR, March 24, 1910, pp. 1-2.

"Worte zu einer 'Berichtigung.'" SPB, no. 20 (May 15, 1923), pp. 8-9.

"Young Plan und Zentralismus." Der Stärkere, X (1930) p. 157.

Article, title unknown, in OR, 1908, on foreign affairs.

Article[s], title unknown, in Der Deutschmeister.

D. Book Reviews.

Bartsch, R. B. Seine Jüdin [Novel.] Leipzig: Staackmann, 1921. In Michel, IV, no. 5 (Jan. 29, 1922), pp. 1-2.

Baur, Erwin; Fischer, Eugen; Lenz, Fritz. Grundriss der Menschliche Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1921. In PAM, XXI, no. 4 (July 1922), pp. 175-79. ("Dilettantismus und Wissenschaft.")

Lenz, Fritz. Menschliche Auslese und Rassenhygiene. [Vol. II of the preceding.] In PAM, XXI, no. 5 (Aug. 1922), pp. 237-40.

Coudenhove-Kalergi, Richard N. Adel and Die Apologie der Technik. Leipzig: Verlag "der neue Geist," 1922. In Michel, V, no. 46 (Nov. 18, 1923), pp. 1-2; no. 47 (Nov. 25, 1923), pp. 1-2. ("Ein Jünger Nietzsches?")

Dankberg, Hans. Vom Wesen der Moral. Eine Physik der Sitten. Stuttgart: Verlag Jul. Hoffmann, 1910. In NL, VII, no. 6 (Dec. 1, 1912), pp. 95-96.

Die deutsche Renaissance, von einem Deutscher. Prien am Chiemsee: Kampmann und Schnabel, 1926. In DE, X, no. 2 (Feb. 1926), p. 72.

Dickel, Otto. Die Auferstehung des Abendlandes. Augsburg: Gebrüder Reichel, 1921. In PAM, XXI, no. 3 (June 1922), pp. 121-25. ("Die Auferstehung des Abendlandes.")

Engelhardt, R. v. Organische Kultur: Deutsche Lebensfragen im Lichte der Biologie. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1925. In DE, XII, no. 1 (Jan. 1928), p. 64.

Francé, Raoul Heinrich. Der Wert der Wissenschaft. Zürich and Leipzig: Th. Schröter. In NL, VII, no. 11 (May 1, 1913), pp. 180-81. [Perhaps the same as Wert und Unwert der Wissenschaft, Munich: Hans Sachs Verlag, 1913.]

Gerlach, Kurt. Buch der Blondheit. Leipzig: Erich Matthes, 1920. In PAM, XIX, no. 10 (Jan 1921), p. 480.

[Same.] In DE, V, no. 1 (Jan 1921), p. 65.

Günther, Hans F. K. Ritter, Tod und Teufel: der heldische Gedanke. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1920. In PAM, XIX, no. 9 (Dec. 1920), p. 429.

Heckel, Karl. Nietzsche, seine Leben und seine Lehre. Leipzig: Reclam-Verlag, 1920. In Michel, V, no. 10 (March 11, 1923), pp. 3-4. ["Offener Brief an Karl Heckel."]

Hentschel, Willibald. Das Relativitätsprinzip im Rahmen einer Gesamtansicht von Welt und Mensch. Leipzig: Erich Matthes, 1921. In PAM, XX, no. 5 (Aug. 1921), pp. 237-38.

Höffer von Löwenfeld, Albrecht. Republik oder Monarchie. Leipzig: Theodor Weicher, 1922. In PAM, XXI, no. 5 (Aug. 1922), pp. 235-36.

Hotzel, Curt. Blutweihe, Gedanken über deutsche Zukunft. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1919. DE, III, no. 7 (July 1919), p. 520.

Johannes, Martin Otto. Adel verpflichtet! [Novel.] Leipzig: Erich Matthes, 1920. In PAM, XIX, no. 4 (July 1920), pp. 186-87.

Kips, J. H. Valckenier. Der deutsche Staatsgedanke. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1916. In PAM, XVI, no. 6 (Sept. 1917), p. 328.

Kjellén, Rudolf. Der Staat als Lebenform. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1917. In PAM, XVI, no. 5 (Aug. 1917), pp. 276-78.

Lublinski, Samuel. Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1910. In UK, pp. 302-6.

Romain, François. 1935: Die Untergang Frankreichs. [Novel.] Berlin: Hoffmann und Campe, 1921. In PAM, XIX, no. 10 (Jan. 1921), p. 471.

Siemens, Hermann Werner. Die biologischen Grundlagen der Rassenhygiene und der Bevölkerungspolitik. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1917. In PAM, XVII, no. 1 (April 1918), pp. 46-47.

Trebitsch, Arthur. Geist und Judentum. Leipzig and Vienna: E. Strache, 1919. PAM, XXI, no. 1 (April 1922), pp. 30-34.

Viergutz, Rudolf. Die Möglichkeit eines Religionswechsels in der Gegenwart. Rostock: Widar Verlag, 1928. In DE, XIII, no. 4 (April 1929), pp. 255-56.

Winzer, Georg Ewald. Die Judenfrage in England. Hamburg: Deutschvölkische Verlagsanstalt, 1920. In DE, V, no. 10 (Oct. 1921), p. 645.

[Same.] PAM, XIX, no. 10 (Jan. 1921), pp. 476-77.

Wolfram, Aurel. Das Schöne im Weibe. Leipzig: Th. Weicher, 1920. In PAM, XXI, no. 2 (May 1922), pp. 78-82. ("Erhalten, Schaffen und Vernichten.")

E. Controversial Series.

1. Concerning reviews of Haiser's Aristokratische Imperativ, by Wilhelm Schöllermann in Hammer and PAM.

Schöllermann. "Vom adeligen Pflichtgefühl." Hammer, XII, no. 272 (Oct. 15, 1913), pp. 536-38.

Driesmans, Heinrich. "Rassenreaktion und Kulturadel." Ibid., XII, no. 274 (Nov. 15, 1913), pp.611-12.

Schöllermann, "Ein Wort an Herrn H. Driesmans." Ibid., XII, no. 276 (Dec. 12, 1913), pp. 665-66.

Haiser, "H. Driesmans Einwendungen." Ibid., XIII, no. 277 (Jan. 1, 1914), pp. 24-26.

Driesmans, "Meine Antwort an Schöllermann und Haiser." Ibid., XIII, no. 278 (Jan. 15, 1914), pp. 50-53.

Schöllermann, "Zur Klärung!" Ibid., XIII, no. 280 (Feb. 15, 1914), pp. 109-10.

Driesmans, "Wie steht der Rassenforscher Driesmans zum Judentum?" Ibid., XIII, no 281 (Mar. 1, 1914), p. 137.

"Einer, der auch Haiser's Schriften kennt." "Zum Streit mit Driesmans." Ibid., pp. 137-38.

Driesmans. "Zum Streit um den 'Kötertypus.'" Ibid., XIII, no. 282 (March 15, 1914), pp. 164-65.

Haiser. "Schlusswort zum 'Aristokratischen Imperativ.'" Ibid., XIII, no. 283 (April 1, 1914), pp. 188-91.

"Einer, der auch Haisers Schriften kennt." "Ein letztes Wort an Driesmans." Ibid., p. 192.

Schölermann. Review of Haiser, Aristokratische Imperativ, in PAM, XII, no. 7 (Oct. 1913), pp. 390-92.

Driesmans. "Zu Haisers 'aristokratischen' und meinem 'Rasse-imperativ!'" Ibid., XII, no. 8 (Nov. 1913), pp. 441-44.

Schölermann. "Entgegnungen gegen Driesmans." Ibid., XII, no. 9 (Dec. 1913), pp. 492-93.

Haiser. "Entgegnungen gegen Driesmans." Ibid., pp. 493-95.

Driesmans. "Zur Kritik Schölermanns und Haisers." Ibid., XII, no. 12 (March 1914), pp. 668-69.

Haiser."Meine Antwort an Driesmans." Ibid., XIII, no. 2 (May 1914), pp. 102-3.

Dr. Gustav Rösler [editor of NL]. "Nationalaristarchie." NL, VIII, no. 5 (Nov. 1, 1913), In MS, pp. 26-27.

Haiser, "Zu Dr. Rösler's Aufsatz 'Nationalaristarchie.'" Ibid., VIII, no. 6 (Dec. 1, 1913), p. 93.

Grill, K. "Zu Dr. Haisers Ablehnung der 'Richtung Simons.'" Ibid., VIII, no. 8 (Feb. 1, 1914), p. 125.

Haiser, "Meine Antwort an Herrn Grill." Ibid, VIII, no. 11 (May 1, 1914), pp. 165-66.

[The foregoing three controversies are reprinted, with some omissions, in MS.]

The following series are in order of the names of the chief other participant, besides Haiser.

2.

Bry, Karl Kristian. "Erst komme ich!" DE, IV, no. 8 (Aug. 1920), pp. 492-94. [Attack on E. von Wolzogen's Sendschreiben an den Adel.]

Haiser, "Zum Sendschreiben an den Adel von Ernst Freiherr von Wolzogen." Hammer, XIX, no. 440 (Oct. 15, 1920), pp. 392-3.

3.

"Friderikus." "Ist 'arbeitsloses Einkommen' berechtigt?" NL, XI, no. 10 (April 1917), pp. 152-55.

Haiser, "Arbeitsloses Einkommen," NL, XI, no. 12 (June 1917), pp. 183-85.

Hunkel Ernst. "Nachwort des Herausgebers." Ibid., pp. 185-87.

4.

Holle, H. G. "Sklaverei oder Freiheit?" Michel, V, no. 39 (Sept. 30, 1923), pp. 1-2. [Review of Skl.]

Haiser, "Erwiderung an Prof. Holle." Ibid., no. 43 (Oct. 28, 1923), pp. 1-2.

5.

M[aschke], G[ustav]. "Schwartzgelbe Geschichtsklitterung." Michel, V, no. 15 (April 15, 1923), pp. 2-3.

Haiser, same title. Ibid., no. 17 (April 29, 1923), p. 5.

Maschke, same title. Ibid., no. 18 (May 6, 1923), pp. 5-6.

Haiser, same title. Ibid., no. 22 (June 3, 1923), p. 6.

6.

Porod, Ludwig. "Rechtsbolschevismus oder Volksgemeinschaft?"
Michel, VII, no. 13 (March 29, 1925), pp. 2-4.
Ibid., no. 14 (April 5, 1925), pp. 2-3.
Ibid., no. 15 (April 12, 1925), pp. 3-4.
Ibid., no. 16 (April 19, 1925), pp. 2-4.
Ibid., no. 17 (April 26, 1925), pp. 3-4.

Haiser. "Ludwig Porod und seine 'grundsätzlichen Bemerkungen.'" Ibid., no. 14 (April 5, 1925), pp. 1-2.

Haiser. "Antwort auf Porods Angriffe." Ibid., no. 23 (June 7, 1925), pp. 3-4.

7.

Haiser, "Alkoholfeinde." Michel, IV, no. 13 (March 26, 1922), p. 4.

Schöck, Stephan. "Alkoholfeinde." Ibid., no. 17 (April 23, 1922), pp. 4-5.

Haiser. "Zur Alkoholfrage." Ibid., no. 29 (July 16, 1922), p. 3.

8.

Siemens, Hermann Werner. "Kritik der rassenhygienischen und bevölkerungspolitischen Bestrebungen." PAM, XV, no. 10 (Jan. 1917), pp. 547-51.

Haiser. "Für und gegen Hentschels Mittgartplan." Ibid., no. 3 (June 1917), pp. 164-65.

Siemens. "Zur Mittgartfrage." Ibid., no. 4 (July 1917), p. 212.

Haiser. "Zur Mittgartfrage." Ibid., no. 5 (Aug. 1917), p. 273.

9.

Haiser. "Studenten!" Michel, VI, no. 8 (Feb. 24, 1924), pp. 2-3.

Turek, Gustav Adolf. "Rotwein, das Getränk der Herrennaturen?" Ibid., no. 11 (March 16, 1924), p. 6.

Haiser. "Zur Alkoholfrage." Ibid., no. 18 (May 4, 1924), p. 6.

10.

"Biologische Gesetze und seelische Gebote: Ein interessanter Briefwechsel." [Letter to Haiser from an unnamed correspondent, and his reply.] WK, II, no. 3 (Feb 1, 1925), pp. 121-27.

IV. BOOK REVIEWS, CRITICAL EVALUATIONS AND REMARKS CONCERNING FRANZ HAISER.

A. General and Miscellaneous Remarks.

Bleiber, Dr. Fritz. "Dr. Franz Haiser 60 Jahre alt." Wiener neueste Nachrichten, Vienna, Jan. 6, 1931, p. 6.

"Dr. Frosch." [Pseud. for Hans W. Fischer.] "Menschenkötertum." Welt am Montag, Berlin, Jan. 5, 1914. (MS, pp. 20-23.)

Hentschel, Willibald. "Der Kampf um Franz Haiser." Michel, VII, no. 8 (Feb. 22, 1925), pp. 1-3.

Imendörffer, Benno. "Ein deutscher Kämpfer." See Reviews of Anfang.

Konrad, Karl. "...und beten zu den Göttern." Hammer, XII, no. 274 (Nov. 15, 1913), pp. 603-5.

Porod, Ludwig. "Rechtsbolschevismus oder Volksgemeinschaft?" Michel, 1925. See SERIES.

Viergutz, Rudolf. Article, title unknown, in Der Hüter (Leipzig: Verlag Aufstieg), no. 7 (Feb. 1926).

"Von einem greisen Gelehrten und einem jugendlichen Ignoranten." SPB, April 15, 1923, p. 9.

"Unsere Mitarbeiter- Dr. Franz Haiser." Michel, VI, no. 4 (Jan 27, 1924), p. 3.

"Franz Haiser über den Nationalsozialismus," Volk und Gemeinde, XI, no. 1 (Feb. 1927), pp. 7-8.

"Aus dem Reiche des Hakenkreuzes." Die Leuchtrakete, III, no. 5 (May 1925), p. 7. [Quotation from FH, "Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer," Das Hakenkreuz, II, pp. 6-7, and satirical cartoon.]

"Rassenphraseure." Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, XXIII, no. 27 (Dec. 31, 1913), pp. 215-16; "Eine völkische Kakophonie," Ibid., XXIV, no. 9 (May 16, 1914), p. 69. [Sarcastic remarks on the Schönlermann- Driesmans- Haiser controversy.]

Incidental mentions or citations of Franz Haiser:

AfRGB, XVII (1926), p. 383.

Alldeutscher Zeitweiser, XXIII (1930), p. 101.

Hammer, XV (1916), p. 430.

Das Hakenkreuz, II (1925), p. 84.

PAM, XIII (1914), pp. 271-72.

Kämpfer, Hermann, Heimatschutz und Judentum (Vienna: Bund für Volksaufklärung, 1930), p. 2.

Molisch, Paul, Geschichte der deutschnationalen Bewegung in Oesterreich (Jena: G. Fischer, 1926), p. 262.

Zell, August, Wie können wir Deutschen wieder hochkommen? (Klagenfurt: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1926), pp. 18, 114.

B. Reviews of Haiser's Books, by Title.

(Note that some of these are known only through Haiser's citations of them in MS, and other indirect sources.)

1. Im Anfang war der Streit.

Akademische Blätter, XXXVI, no. 16 (Jan. 1, 1922), p. 212, by Ferdinand Khull-Kholwald.

Alldeutsche Blätter, XXI, no. 25 (Dec. 3, 1921), p. 227.

Bücherei und Bildungspflege, II (1922), p. 28, by von Hauff.

DE, V, no. 11 (Nov. 1921), p. 714, by H. G. Holle.

Deutschvölkisches Jahrbuch, III (1922), p. 143, by Dr. H. Kellermann.

Hammer, XX, no. 468 (Dec. 15, 1921), pp. 472-73, by Willibald Hentschel.

Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland, LXXIII, no. 28 (July 15, 1922), p. 552, by Th. Mauch.

Das literarische Echo, XXIV, no. 12 (Mar. 15, 1922), p. 725, by Karl Strecker.

Michel, III, no. 47 (Nov. 20, 1921), pp. 1-2, by Benno Imendörffer. ("Ein deutscher Kämpfer.")

PAM, XX, no. 10 (Jan. 1922), pp. 469-72, by Wilhelm Marks. ("An die Wenigen, auf die es allein kommt!")

Der Tag, Berlin, Ausgabe B, Feb. 4, 1922, by A. Wirth. ("Ein aristokratisches Buch.")

2. Der aristokratische Imperativ.

AfRGB, X, no. 6 (June 5, 1914), p. 820, by Arthur Wollny.

Chemnitzer Tagblatt, Aug. 18, 1913.

Deutsche Kunst (Supplement to Michel), I, no. 19 (Aug. 15, 1920), p. 2.

Deutsche soziale Rundschau, Vienna, Oct. 15, 1913, by Benno Imendörffer.

Deutsche Tages-Zeitung, Berlin, Aug. 2, 1913.

Grazer Tagblatt, Aug. 24, 1913.

Hammer, XII, no. 272 (Oct. 15, 1913), pp. 536-38, by Wilhelm Schölermann. ("Vom adeligen Pflichtgefühl.") See also SERIES.

Leipziger neueste Nachrichten, Sept. 20, 1913, by Wilhelm Schölermann.

Michel, II, no. 1 (Jan. 11, 1920), p. 2.

Mitteilungen des Leuchtenburg-Bundes, IV, Heft 4.

NL, VIII, no. 3 (Sept. 1, 1913), by Philip Stauff, p. 46.

PAM, XII, no. 7 (Oct. 1913), pp. 390-92, by Wilhelm Schölermann. See also SERIES.

Die Post, Berlin, Jan. 14, 1914, by C. Th. Kämpf.

Sozialistische Monatshefte, XX (1914), p. 260, by Conrad Schmidt.

Tägliche Rundschau, Berlin, Dec. 19, 1913, by Herbert Stegemann.

Völkischer Beobachter, XXXIV, no. 12 (Feb. 11, 1920), p. 4, by "Volker."

Der Volkserzieher, Berlin, March 1, 1914, by Rudolf Paulsen.

Die "Wartburg," XIV, no. 8/9 (Aug.-Sept. 1913), pp. 211-12, by "A. R."

Wegweiser und Wegwarte, Berlin, July 12, 1913.

Wiener Rundschau, Jan. 1914. ("Vernichtung oder Verjüngung.")

3. Freimaurer und Gegenmaurer.

Burschenschaftliche Blätter, XXXIX, no. 7 (April 1925), p. 138.

DE, VIII, no. 12, Dec. 1924), pp. 771-72, by H. G. Holle.

Michel, VII, no. 7 (Feb. 15, 1925), pp. 1-4, by Wilhelm Huber.

Mitteilungen des Deutschen Klubs, I Folge 10 (Nov. 1924), pp. 5-6, by Benno Imendörffer.

WK, II, no. 1 (Jan. 1, 1925).

4. Gastmahl.

Akademische Blätter, XXXV, no. 16/17 (Nov.-Dec. 1920), p. 190, by Ferdinand Khull-Kholwald.

Central-Verein Zeitung: Blätter für Deutschtum und Judentum, V, no. 33 (Aug. 13, 1926), p. 432. ("Das neue Plato.")

Deutsche Hochschule, Vienna-Berlin, XI, no. 8 (Aug. 1921), p. 90, by Dr. O. F. Scheuer.

Deutsche Kunst (Supplement to Michel), I, no. 7 (May 16, 1920), p. 2, by H[einrich] K[ipper].

Deutscher Volkswart, V.(1920), p. 70, by H. G. Holle.

DE, IV, no. 1 (Jan. 1920), p. 64, by Erich Kühn.

Deutsche Zeitung, Berlin, date unknown, by Dr. Schmidt-Gibichenfels. [Review probably of Gastmahl.]

Deutsch-völkische Blätter, May 13, 1920, by "Germanus."

Deutschvölkisches Jahrbuch, II (1921), p. 146, by Dr. H. Kellermann.

Hammer, XIX, no. 423 (Feb. 1, 1920), p. 55, by Johannes Hering.

Jahrbücher für die deutsche Wehrmacht, XLIX (1919-II), p. 246, by Keim.

Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland, LXXI (1920), pp. 502-3, by Th. M[au]ch.

Magazin für Pädagogik, Spaichingen, date unknown. [Review probably of Gastmahl.]

Michel, II, no. 1 (Jan. 11, 1920), p. 2.

München-Augsburger Abendzeitung, date unknown.

Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift, LXVII (1920), p. 728, by Siebert.

NL, XV, no. 1/2 (July-Aug. 1920), p. 18, by Johannes Hering.

OR, Jan. 19, 1920, p. 11.

PAM, XIX, no. 1 (April 1920), p. 46, by Wilhelm Marks.

Preussische Jahrbücher, no. 182 (Oct.-Dec. 1920), pp. 119-20, by Dr. Waldmann.

5. Judenfrage.

DAP, April 2, 1927, pp. 2-3, by Ida Maria Deschmann.

DE, X, no. 10 (Oct. 1926), p. 503, by O. L.

Hammer, XXV, no. 578 (July 15, 1926), p. 356, by J. O.

Michel, VIII, no. 40 (Oct. 3, 1926), p. 1, by Günter Macketanz.

NL, XXI (1926), pp. 34-38, by O. Thormann.

Reichsland-Bund, VI (1927), p. 554, by G. Macketanz.

Die Sonne, IV (1927), p. 239.

WK, III, no. 35 (Nov. 1926), p. 523.

6. Krisis des Intellektualismus.

Deutsche Soziale Rundschau, Vienna, Oct. 15, 1913, by Benno Imendörffer.

Evangelische Freiheit, XIX, no. 11 (Nov.-Dec. 1919), p. 325, by J. J.

Hochland, XVIII-I (March 1921), pp. 760-61, by Hans Otto.

Literarischer Handweiser, LVI, no. 2 (Feb. 1920), p. 64, by B. W. Switalski.

Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland, LXX (1919), p. 677, by Th. Mauch.

Natur und Gesellschaft, Berlin, VII (1919), pp. 15-16, by M. Finke.

NL, VII, no. 4 (Oct. 1, 1912), by Dr. Günter Schlesinger. (1st edition.)

NL, XIV (1919/20), p. 186. (2nd edition.)

PAM, XII, no. 3 (June 1913), pp. 164-66, by Wilhelm Schölermann.

Studierstube, XVIII (1920), p. 267.

Tägliche Rundschau, Berlin, Dec. 19, 1913, by Herbert Stegemann.

Der Tag, Berlin, Ausgabe B no. 190 (Aug. 31, 1919), by Artur Brausewetter.

Volkswohl, Vienna, X (1919), by Dr. S. Guggenberger, p. 391.

Der Wanderer, XI (1917), p. 259, by W. Schabert. [Identity uncertain.]

Die "Wartburg," XIV, no. 8/9 (Aug.-Sept. 1913), pp. 211-12.

Wegweiser und Wegwarte, Berlin, Sept. 21, 1912.

Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht, XXXIII, no. 12 (Dec. 1919), pp. 594-95, by Rudolf Stübe.

Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, XLIV (1920), p. 278, by F. Klimke.

7. Die Links-kultur und der deutsch-österreichische Rassenkampf. [Offprint of PAM article, above.]

NL, VIII, no. 5 (Nov. 1, 1913), p. 83, by Gustav Rösler.

Die Post, Berlin, Nov. 14, 1913.

8. Moralbiologie.

DE, XVI, no. 7 (July 1932), p. 446.

Hammer, XXXII, no. 741/742 (May 1933), pp. 132-33, by. Martin Otto Johannes.

Reichspost, Vienna, Sept. 12, 1932, by E. Brunner, p. 7.

Ringendes Deutschtum, XII (1932), p. 72.

9. Sklaverei

Alldeutsche Blätter, XXXIII no. 7 (July 20, 1923), p. 32.

Michel, V, no. 39 (Sept. 30, 1923), pp. 1-2, by H. G. Holle. ("Sklaverei oder Freiheit?") See also SERIES.

10. Ueberzeugungskraft.

AfRGB, XII, no. 5/6 (May 28, 1918), pp. 490-93, by Fritz Lenz.

NL, XI, no. 7 (Jan. 1917), p. 108, by Karl Hutten.

PAM, XV, no. 2 (May 1916), pp. 111-12. [Listing of the contents.]

PAM, XV, no. 6 (Sept. 1916), pp. 334-35, by H. G. Holle. [Review of the book.]

V. WORKS AND REVIEWS OF JUSTINE HAISER (MRS. FRANZ HAISER.

A. Works.

"Freiheit und Pflicht}" [Poem.] DE, I, no. 8 (Nov. 1917), p. 703.

Hamann, Walter. [Pseudonym for Justine Haiser.] Metaphysik der Liebe: Betrachtungen über Wege und Ziele einer idealistischen Weltanschauung. Vienna and Leipzig: W. Braumüller, 1918.

"Rasse und Weltanschauung." Michel, II, no. 39 (Oct. 24, 1920), pp. 1-2; no. 40 (Oct. 31, 1920), pp. 1-2.

B. Reviews of Metaphysik der Liebe.

Archiv für Frauenkunde und Eugenik, V (1919), pp. 328-29, by K. Bruchmann.

PAM, XVIII, no. 10 (Jan. 1920), p. 480, by Wilhelm Marks.

Prana, Leipzig, IX (1919), Auswahl, p. 381.

VI. OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES FOR THE GERMAN AND AUSTRIAN RADICAL RIGHT, RACIALISM, AND BARBARIC VITALISM.

A. Reference Works.

Kürschner's deutscher Literatur-Kalendar. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, etc., 1883-

Mohler, Armin. Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918-1932: Ein Handbuch. 2nd ed. Rev. and Enlarged. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.

Sperlings Zeitschriften-Adressbuch. Stuttgart: H. O. Sperling Verlag, 1898-

Wer ist's: Unsere Zeitgenossen . Leipzig: Verlag von H. A. Ludwig Degener, 1905-1935.

B. Books.

Ammon, Otto. Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürlichen Grundlagen. 3rd. ed. Jena: G. Fischer, 1900.

Baur, Erwin; Fischer, Eugen; Lenz, Fritz. Human Heredity. New York: Macmillan,1931. [Translation of Menschliche Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene, 3rd. ed.,Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1927-31.]

Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century. New York: Howard Fertig, 1968. 2 vols.

Class, Heinrich. [Pseud. Daniel Frymann.] Wenn ich der Kaiser wär': Politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten . 5th ed. Leipzig: Th. Weicher, 1914.

Clauss, Ludwig Ferdinand. Die nordische Seele: Eine Einführung in die Rassen kunde . 7th ed. Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1939.

Galton, Francis. Hereditary Genius: An Inquiry into its Laws and Consequences. London: Macmillan, 1869.

Grant, Madison. The Passing of the Great Race. New York: Scribner, 1916.

Günther, Hans F. K. Adel und Rasse . Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1927.

_____ The Racial Elements of European History. London: Methuen and Co., 1927.

Haeckel, Ernst. The Riddle of the Universe at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. New York: Harper, 1900.

Haycraft, John Berry. Darwinism and Race Progress. New York: Scribner, 1895.

Hellwald, Friedrich Anton Heller von. Kulturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 2 vols. Augsburg: Lampart, 1876-77.

Hentschel, Willibald. Vom aufsteigenden Leben: Ziele der Rassenhygiene. Leipzig: F. R. Eckhardt Verlag, 1910.

_____ Mittgart: Ein Weg zur Erneuerung der germanischen Rasse. Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1906.

_____ Varuna, Das Gesetz des aufsteigenden und sinkenden Lebens in der Geschichte. 4th ed. Leipzig: Erich Matthes, 1924-25.

Jung, Edgar J. Die Herrschaft der Minderwertigen, ihr Zerfall und ihre Ablösung. Berlin: Deutsche Rundschau GmbH, 1927.

Keyserling, Hermann Alexander. The Travel Diary of a Philosopher. 2 vols. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1925.

_____ Europe. London: Jonathan Cape, 1928.

Krieck, Ernst. Die Revolution der Wissenscaft: Ein Kapitel über Volkserziehung. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1920.

Langbehn, Julius. Rembrandt als Erzieher. Berlin: Theodor Fritsch Verlag, 1944.

Möller van den Brueck, Arthur. Germany's Third Empire. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1934.

Popenoe, Paul B., and Johnson, Roswell H. Applied Eugenics. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Rathenau, Walter. Zur Mechanik des Geistes. Berlin: S. Fischer, 1913.

Schallmayer, Wilhelm. Vererbung und Auslese in ihrer soziologischen und politischen Bedeutung. 2nd ed. Jena: G. Fischer, 1910.

Schoenberner, Franz. Confessions of a European Intellectual. New York: Collier Books, 1965.

Spengler, Oswald. The Hour of Decision. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934.

_____ The Decline of the West. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1939.

Stoddard, Theodore Lothrop. The Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under Man. New York: Scribner, 1922.

Tille, Alexander. Von Darwin bis Nietzsche: Ein Buch Entwicklungsethik. Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, 1895.

Treitschke, Heinrich von. Politics. Abridged by Hans Kohn. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1963.

Unold, Johannes. Politik im Lichte der Entwicklungslehre. Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1912.

Vacher de Lapouge, Georges. L'Aryen, son role social. Paris: Thorin et fils, 1899.

Woltmann, Ludwig. Die Germanen in Frankreich. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1907.

_____ Die Germanen und die Renaissance in Italien. Leipzig: Thüringische Verlagsanstalt, 1905.

_____ Politische Anthropologie. Eisenach and Leipzig: Thüringische Verlagsanstalt, 1903.

VII. SECONDARY SOURCES.

A. Books.

Ardelt, Rudolf G. Zwischen Demokratie und Faschismus: Deutschnationales Gedankengut in Oesterreich 1919-1930. Vienna-Salzburg: Geyer, 1972.

Bentley, Eric Russell. A Century of Hero-Worship. 2nd. ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

Conrad-Martius, Hedwig. Utopien der Menschenzüchtung: Der Sozialdarwinismus und seine Folgen. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1955.

Daim, Wilfried. Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab. Munich: Isar Verlag, 1958.

Fuchs, Albert. Geistige Strömungen in Oesterreich 1867-1918. Vienna: Globus-Verlag, 1949.

Gasman, Daniel. The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League. New York: American Elsevier, 1971.

Gossett, Thomas F. Race: The History of an Idea in America. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963.

Hüttig, Helmut. Die politische Zeitschriften der Nachkriegszeit in Deutschland. Inaugural Dissertation, University of Magdeburg, 1928.

Hughes, H. Stuart. Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought 1890-1930. New York: Random House, 1958.

Jászi, Oscar. The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. Chicago: University of Chicage Press, 1929.

Johnston, William M. The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History, 1848-1938. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Joll, James. Three Intellectuals in Politics. New York: Pantheon Books: 1960.

Kann, Robert A. The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy 1848-1918. New York: Octagon Books, 1964.

Kaufmann, Walter A. Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. New York: Meridian Books, 1964.

Kohn, Hans. The Mind of Germany. New York: Harper, 1965.

Kolnai, Aurel. The War Against the West. New York: Viking Press, 1938.

Laqueur, Walter. Weimar: A Cultural History, 1918-
Laqu 1933. New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1974.
1933. New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1974.

_____. Young Germany. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Eilge, Frederic. The Abuse of Learning: The Failure of the German Universities. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Lohalm, Uwe. Völkischer Radikalismus: Die Geschichte des deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbundes 1919-1923. Hamburg: Leibniz-Verlag, 1970.

Mehring, Walter. Lost Library: The Autobigraphy of a Culture. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1951.

Mosse, George L. The Crisis of German Ideology. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.

Paulsen, Friedrich. German Education, Past and Present. New York: Scribner, 1908.

Pulzer, Peter G. The Rise of Political Antisemitism in Germany and Austria. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Ringer, Fritz K. The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community 1890-1933. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Rosar, Wolfgang. Deutsche Gemeinschaft: Seyss-Inquart und der Anschluss. Vienna and Franfurt: Europa Verlag, 1971.

Samuel, Richard H., and Thomas, R. Hinton. Education and Society in Modern Germany. London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1949.

Sokel, Walter Herbert. The Writer in Extremis: Expressionism in Twentieth-Century German Literature. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

Sontheimer, Kurt. Antidemokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik: Die politischen Ideen des deutschen Nationalismus zwischen 1918 und 1933. Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1962.

Stark, Gary Duane. Entrepreneurs of Ideology: Neo-Conservative Publishers in Germany 1890-1933. Ph. D. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University 1974.

Stern, Fritz. The Failure of Illiberalism: Essays on the Political Culture of Modern Germany. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

_____ The Politics of Cultural Despair. Garden City: Doublday Anchor, 1965.

Struve, Walter. Elites Against Democracy: Leadership Ideals in Bourgeois Political Thought in Germany, 1890-1933. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Whiteside, Andrew G. The Socialism of Fools: George Ritter von Schönerer and Austrian Pan-Germanism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

B. Articles.

Graham, Loren R. "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920's." AHR, LXXXII (1977), pp. 1133-64.

Kohn, Hans. "Romanticism and the Rise of German Nationalism." The Review of Politics, XII (1950), pp. 443-72.

Phelps, R. H. "Theodor Fritsch und der Antisemitismus." Deutsche Rundschau, LXXXVII (1961), pp. 442-49.

Montgomery, William M. "Germany." In The Comparative Reception of Darwinism, ed. Thomas Glick. Austin, Texas: 1974, pp. 81-116.

Ringer, Fritz K. "Higher Education in Germany in the Nineteenth Century." JCH, II (1967), pp. 123-38.

Romoser, George K. "The Politics of Uncertainty." Social Research, XXXI (1964), pp. 73-91.

Sontheimer, Kurt, "Antidemocratic Thought in the Weimar Republic." In The Path to Dictatorship . Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1966, pp. 32-49.

Struve, Walter. "Hans Zehrer as a Neoconservative Theorist." AHR, LXX (1965), pp. 1035-57.

Whiteside, Andrew G. "The Nature and Origins of National Socialism." Journal of Central European Affairs, XVII (1957), pp. 48-73.

Zmarzlik, Hans-Günter. "Der Sozialdarwinismus in Deutschland als geschichtliches Problem." Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte, XI (1963), pp. 246-273. Reprinted as "Social Darwinism in Germany, seen as a Historical Problem," in Hajo Holborn, ed., Republic to Reich: The Making of the Nazi Revolution, New York: Random House, 1972, pp. 435-74.