

Researching the Scientific Networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe Multiplex Scholarly Paths through Opportunity and Choice

SEVASTI TRUBETA (Mytilene)

In his book entitled “Under Three Flags”, Benedict ANDERSON (2005) illustrates the paths which two young Filipino intellectuals and patriots (the political novelist Jose Rizal and the folklorist Isabelo de los Reyes) traced out in the last two decades of the 19th century. Starting from the Philippines, they travelled through several countries and continents and became involved in the contemporary turbulence of political movements in each, the anarchist and anti-colonial ones. Anderson concludes that while following these paths, they became “crucial nodes in the infinitely complex intercontinental networks that characterize the Age of Early Globalization” (ANDERSON 2005: 233). Using the biographical narrative as a vehicle, Anderson illustrates ways in which parts of the world can be (indeed, have been) interconnected through multiplex lines of action expanding to diverse countries and continents and embracing ideological streams and political movements. The reconstructed biographies of the two young intellectuals, anarchists, and patriots from the former Spanish colony reveal action reaching beyond unified national identities that are all too often thought of as tranquilly resting upon national origins (read: “roots”). Still, Anderson explores ways in which global hegemony and counter-hegemonic movements form a national consciousness for intellectuals, yet beyond a perspective limited to simplifying world dichotomies in the fashion of a leading western world vs. a backward world. His protagonists are depicted as being involved and acting within “a vast rhizomal network” (ANDERSON 2005: 4) that characterizes the early globalization operating across the continents. In this landscape shaped by interconnected sites, Anderson sees the main characters of his book playing “their various nomadic parts” (ANDERSON 2005: 4).

It is obvious that Anderson’s approach draws on the ideas of *rhizome* and *nomadism* as initially conceptualized by Gilles DELEUZE and Félix GUATTARI (1987; first French edition 1980). Or, more concretely, Anderson’s approach draws on the *perception* of these ideas in the currently flourishing research on networks within which the term “rhizomatic network” has been coined. Despite all the criticism which the Deleuze-Guattarian concepts of rhizome and nomadism have earned and all the controversy they have prompted (e.g. JARDINE 1984; SPIVAK 1988; MILLER 1993; cf. YOUNG 1995; BIGNALL & PATTON 2010), the notion of rhizomatic network has been largely applied to describe “decentralized, distributed patterns of human organizations” (GHORASHI & BOERSMA 2009: 670). Moreover, as Sarah Green remarks, “networks have come to be regarded as *the* form of postmodern Sociality” (GREEN 2002: 9). The perception of social action in terms of (rhizomatic) networking has found fertile soil in the field of cultural studies where a central concern is the question of identity (MILLER 1993: 6; see also GHORASHI & BOERSMA 2009). The crucial aspect that renders the idea of rhizome attractive might be that it allows for disasso-

ciating human agency from “roots”, i.e., from the determining role that origins supposedly have. Rhizomatic networks highlight variable and transformable connectedness instead of fated rootedness; diversity, complexity, and heterogeneity instead of uniformity and homogeneity. If nothing else, this idea destabilizes a certain way of thinking about social action across borders and boundaries and invites reflection on the multiplicity of the external world; moreover, it invites us to look for the paths the actors took which were created by their choosing, even if they were following an opportunity that was basically being presented to them.

Networks are in fashion when the matter is to describe postmodern, fluid relationships in a de-territorialized world, or to describe the rise of the network society in the era of globalization, as in the classical expression offered by Manuel CASTELLS (1996; 2000). However, networks as such are not a novelty but, as Robert J. Holton suggests, “have existed across time and space *ante verbum*” (HOLTON 2009: 26; see also KNOX, SAVAGE & Harvey 2006). In this article I will address some conceptual questions about researching the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe from a historical perspective, drawing on current approaches to scientific networks. I will start with contextualizing the topic in the broader setting of the rise of modern science within which the production and transfer of modern scientific knowledge takes place. The questions that arise concern the specific characteristics of the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe within this setting and how far the bilateral perspective can sufficiently explain the scientific interconnections between Germany and Southeast European countries. To what extent should/can the scholarly elites of both regions be regarded as state-centered elites, and where do the limits of such a consideration lay given the multifaceted affiliations – and thus possibly also loyalties – of modern scientists and their involvement in politics, either state-supportive or dissident? Furthermore, I will examine the contribution of the social history of medicine to an enriching of the research questions about the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe. In the last part, this article examines, using a case study, how networks can be built on the grounds of a subjective choice that takes advantage of the given historical or socio-political opportunity.

Scientific Networks as a Manifold Interconnectedness

The scientific ties that bind the Southeast European region with Germany are often considered from a vantage which renders the former area as a field in which German state cultural politics and scholarship were able to intervene during both the collapse of the Ottoman rule and the establishment of nation-states. Similarly, the training of Southeast European scholars at German educational institutions has every so often been interpreted as manifesting Germany’s hegemonic position in modern European history and the internalization of this state of affairs by Southeast European scholars. In order to contextualize the scientific interconnection between Germany and Southeastern Europe, I will argue that scholarly motion as such is not specific to the historical relationships between Germany and Southeast European countries, nor does this kind of mobility proceed exclusively according to hegemonic patterns. Rather, the matter concerns a series of phenomena related to the rise of modern science (including the production of universal knowledge) in a transnational space of interac-

tion within which scholarly motion was supported by, among other ways, the establishment of compatible educational systems in the diverse countries.

Indeed, when the Southeast European countries were emerging into nation-state entities, the production and transfer of knowledge in Europe was taking place in a modern scientific terrain, with Germany and France maintaining the leading role. As René SIGRIST (2009) argues, in the first half of the 19th century, modern science was given its form through the establishment of national educational systems which encompassed universities and faculties rather than academies, the latter having carried out the scientific production until then and promoting interpersonal relations.¹ In the same era, university positions were professionalized and the paid university professor came to epitomize the figure of the modern scientist. The eventual creation of compatible university systems on the basis of professionalization facilitated scientific networking across borders. According to Sigrist, “[i]n spite of the diversity of national scientific systems and disciplines, the modern scientist appeared in most countries in the same form of a paid university professor. As a result, international and even interdisciplinary cooperation became easier to carry out” (SIGRIST 2009: 63). Specifically in the case of botanists, René SIGRIST and Eric WIDMER (2011) have also shown that, in contrast to the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century, when the differences between training systems hindered mobility between educational institutions in Europe, from the late 18th century onward scholarly mobility, educational interrelations, and involvement in transboundary scientific communities became constitutive to both the world of modern science and the profile of the modern scientist. A space for the production of scientific knowledge was given shape beyond the narrow limits of national and disciplinary divisions (yet also including them), thereby giving rise to new types of collaborative networks at international levels. A further development that gave impetus to scientific networking was the creation of a national and international/transnational *market* for scientific research which when considered casts light on the establishment of multiple interest groups and stakeholders who cooperated across borders. As Sigrist suggests, “[i]nternational cooperation within the new disciplines also grew with the reorganization of the world of science in epistemic communities, which took the place of local and national transdisciplinary communities” (SIGRIST 2009: 62). Is this a matter of the establishment of *international* scientific elites or *transnational* and *global* ones, as Robert John Holton suggests? This question is not of normative significance if one agrees with HOLTON (2002) that the distinction between international and global elites allows the recognition that in the space of modern science, a multiplicity of elites and interest groups are involved, rather than exclusively state-centered and state-supportive ones (cf. DEUCHARS 2010). Even though *international* elites in this sense “continue to be building blocks of contemporary developments in international relations” (HOLTON 2002: 61), global elites operate in a multilateral and multicentered terrain, pursuing

1 René Sigrist sees the beginning of this process as coinciding with the establishment of “national systems of scientific education and research initiated by France in 1794–95 [...] and by Germany in 1810 [With the establishment of the University of Berlin by Wilhelm von Humboldt, soon to be imitated in other Prussian cities and German states]” (SIGRIST 2009: 62).

diverse ends and even having multiple loyalties. Grounded on a case study on the Universal Races Congress of 1911 (at which intellectuals, scholars and activists from diverse countries participated, and had diverse political convictions and affiliations), Holton suggests considering “a plurality of cosmopolitanisms as an important conceptual extension to our understanding of intercultural encounters and conflicts within the global arena” (HOLTON 2002: 167; see also FRIEDMAN 2002; CHEAH & ROBINS 1998; and with a focus on the Balkans, BALLINGER 2004).

This is, however, not to say that the national idea or state agency cease to be crucial driving forces in creating and transferring scientific knowledge, nor that multilateral interaction among scientific elites remains untouched by regional or global power relations and hierarchies. For all transboundary networking, modern epistemic communities do operate in an environment of nation-states and are largely influenced by domestic developments and, – not to be disregarded – are dependent on state funding. Moreover, in modernity, the national idea has prompted consensus and has even acted (and was utilized) as a resource for achieving professional objectives. Still, in modernity, the nation has also been perceived by scientists as a mode of thinking about humanity and this perception not only influenced worldviews but also gave form to the scientific categories by means of which universal knowledge was codified. What is quite illustrative of this is the presidential address given by the American surgeon and professor of archaeology and ethnology, Daniel Garrison Brinton (1837–99), at the International Congress of Anthropology held in Chicago (28 August to 2 September 1893). On that occasion Brinton talked about “The Nation as an Element in Anthropology” and stated: “... nationality has ever been and is to-day an agent more powerful in modifying both the physical and the psychical elements of man than either race, climate, religion or culture; and therefore that it must constantly occupy the attention of the anthropologist, whether his researches are in the purely physical or in the intellectual fields” (BRINTON 1894: 20). The questions rise, however: what kind of ideas, concerns and loyalties are codified in such a notion of nation, and how far can these ideas, concerns, and loyalties mobilize action, either promoting or hampering contacts?

Approaching the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe against the background of the issues outlined above provides reasons for re-examining a series of widespread propositions in Southeast European research. First of all, the contextualization of scientific networking in multilateral rather than bilateral settings of interaction challenges the perception of scholarly elites in both Germany and the Southeast European countries as undifferentiated state-centered entities whose action was determined by centrally shaped politics. In other words, the perception, on the one hand, of German scholars as being representatives of a hegemonic power which imposed the rules of the game using state cultural politics as a vehicle; and, on the other, Southeast European scholars as having internalized the backwardness ascribed to their countries/region of origin and as being mobilized by an eagerness to modernize their “own” nation. Such a dichotomic perception of scientific elites as national players (latently or openly palpable) is not independent from a strong focus on issues related to nationalism, nation building, and ethnic conflicts in Southeast European research (TRUBETA 2006). (The embracing of the concept of “ethnicization” in the 1990s comes to challenge, to some extent, this tendency to point at the essen-

tiallization of social and other conflicts; see for instance, STEFANOV 1994). Given the prevalence of nationalism research in Southeast European studies, it is not by accident that the research of the scientific interrelations between Germany and Southeast European countries has preferentially focused on the humanities (linguistics, ethnology, folkloristic, and historical science), that is, on such disciplines that sought to provide scientific arguments for substantiating the national idea.² This preference draws on a certain methodological approach, i.e., the logic of international relations, and puts into the foreground the elites loyal to the state, raising questions such as how science supports national ideology or how scholars and scientific elites elaborate anti-Western discourses that are marked by aspirations of national emancipation from Western or German projects that sought to have an influence on Southeast European countries (see e.g., BOJADŽIEVA 1986; GROTHUSEN 1990; KÖNIG 1995; SCHÖNFELD 1997; STEIN 2011).

This restricted perspective has been revised and enriched coinciding with a shift in the paradigms which now cast a differentiating gaze at the elites and scientific communities in both Southeastern Europe and Germany, revealing possible multiple affinities, affiliations, and loyalties of scholars. New impetuses have come from rising scholarly interest in those political and social movements in Southeastern Europe which had an internationalist character, or at least internationalist aspirations. These are, more concretely, the socialist, anarchist, and (not least of all) the eugenic movements (e.g. DIMOU 2009; POLEXE 2011; WEINDLING 2011b). Furthermore, significant impulses have been given by the intensified research on scientific institutions in Germany such as universities, research institutes, or associations. Such research has revealed the multilateral character of scientific collaboration between Germany and other European regions including Southeastern Europe (ZARIFI 2002; PISKORSKI 2002; UNGER 2007; MOSER 2011; THAMER, DROSTE & HAPP 2012).

Certainly, the production and transfer of scientific knowledge do not occur in a vacuum of power; modern scientists are typically involved with both science and politics. Questions then arise: how were regional disparities resulting from intra-European power relations eventually manifested in the scientific interconnections between Germany and Southeastern Europe? What are the limits to the capability of regional disparities in explaining scientific interconnections and networks? How could hierarchical orders, such as those of the European centers in the West and the Southeast peripheries both counteract interaction and yet also provide political opportunity for pursuing political, professional, or other goals? In dealing with these sets of questions, Southeast European research can learn a great deal from scholarly approaches to colonial regimes of power in the world peripheries. These were based on a “controlling by knowing,” which “inverted” the colonized region as a subject of knowledge, something which Mudimbe and others have shown with respect to Africa (MUDIMBE 1988; GILROY 1993; TILLEY 2005 and 2011; KEIM 2008). There is also the question as to how knowledge has been transferred into regional and local levels through multiplex channels and eventually transformed there.

2 Early studies include IRMSCHER 1989 on the activities in which the Southeast Institute of Munich was engaged in Southeastern Europe, see BEER & SEEWANN 2004.

In the following I will argue that the increasing research in the field of the social history of medicine and especially the recent focus on Southeastern Europe have greatly contributed to reframing the research questions on scientific networks between the Southeastern Europe and Germany while revealing the true multiplicity of the contacts.

The contribution of the social history of medicine

The politics of health and combating diseases are certainly not new subjects of research, either generally or with respect to Southeastern Europe. But, it was the rise of the interdisciplinary field of the social history of medicine (at the interface of new social history and the history of medicine) that prompted a clustering of hitherto separate research questions and a reexamination of health and disease as being of constitutive relevance for society (PORTER 1995). This is because the production and diffusion of medical knowledge, as well as the representations and politics of health and disease have flowed into the market, but also were instrumental in shaping relations along class, ethnic, racial, and gender lines. The specific research interest directed toward Southeastern Europe has arisen relatively late³, but this occurred in a period in which the theoretical and methodological tools in the social history of medicine had been enriched in the wake of the cultural and spatial turn in humanities and social sciences (see e.g. KOCKA 1994; JORDANOVA 1995; BASHFORD & HOOKER 2001a; BASHFORD 2004; COOTER 2007). At that point, medical discourses and practices came to be approached as facets of a broader phenomenon of medicalization, that is to say, the rise of medical power and its diffusion into society (ZOLA 1972; ILLICH 1974; CONRAD & SCHNEIDER 1980; CONRAD 1992 and 2007; TOMS 2009). Medical power does not mean merely the power of the doctors, but first and foremost the establishment and diffusion of regimes of truth that draw on medical knowledge and expertise (FOUCAULT 1988, 1994; ROSE 1994). From the 19th century and in the course of the proceeding industrialization, such regimes of power have been proven instrumental in designing a certain type of society, the medicalized society, in which the state and welfare institutions were engaged with taking over the health care of the population – and concurrently control over the population. But, “the dream of hygienic containment” (BASHFORD & HOOKER 2001b: 1) exceeded national borders and emerged as a global dream that shaped geographies within and across borders (ELBE 2010). Alison Bashford has illustrated well how, under imperial order, public health spaces intersected and oftentimes neatly dovetailed “with other governmental ‘lines’, other real boundaries of rule: national borders, immigration restriction lines, quarantine lines, racial *cordons sanitaires*, and the segregative ambitions of a grafted eugenics and public health. All these spaces – these therapeutic, carceral, preventive, racial, and eugenic geographies – produced identities of inclusion and exclusion, of belonging and citizenship, and of alien-ness” (BASHFORD 2004: 1).

3 The studies of the historian Paul Weindling could seem pioneering in this field. Weindling also turned his focus on Southeastern Europe while investigating Central Europe and Germany in particular. Later, he sharpened this Southeast European focus. Individual studies which can be subsumed in the same field include BUCUR 2002, TURDA & WEINDLING 2007; TURDA 2007a, 2007b, YEOMANS 2007; WEDEKIND 2007; PROMITZER 2003, 2010a, 2010b.

Phenomena related to medicalization make up the proper paradigm for investigating scientific networks. This is because the diffusion of medical knowledge (and power) into the medicalized society indicates the involvement of a plurality of agents, and furthermore, because (for all the local and national specifics of its appearance), medicalization transcends the boundaries of individual societies, attaining thereby global dimensions. Medical regimes of truth, codified in terms of public health, hygiene, eugenics, racial hygiene (the German version of eugenics), combating diseases and caring for the health of the whole, drew on universal knowledge about human beings; moreover, such regimes of truth are intended to serve the welfare of the society and indeed humanity as a whole. They also emerged to become concerns of social agents who saw themselves committed to a commonweal; the latter actors were not exclusively state authorities and doctors, but also included experts in population issues, bureaucrats but also social and political agents such as religious leaders, feminists, socialists, anarchists, and others (with respect to eugenics see SCHWARTZ 1995; TAYLOR 2000; NIEMANN-FINDEISEN 2004; ROSEN 2004). Indeed, concerns related to health and disease, hygiene and eugenics, demographic developments, etc., were conveyed at world conferences and meetings, where ideas were exchanged, and applied policies discussed. State authorities were parts of this worldwide network within which they interchanged ideas and experiences in adopting measures on health policies; Germany was no exception. Indeed, before the Nazi takeover, German authorities did not hesitate to seek advice regarding the implementation of eugenic measures within and beyond Europe. This was, for instance, the case in the 1920s when the German state intended to enact legislative measures to safeguard the health of offspring by means of establishing premarital health certification⁴ (cf. KESPER-BIERMANN 2007). German state institutions searched for legal drafts of international standards concerning marriage restrictions in other countries, including Brazil, Mexico, Turkey, and the Scandinavian countries.⁵ They were especially interested in the Turkish law, “Le réglementation du mariage,” that had been passed in 1926 and established health examinations prior to marriage.⁶

The involvement of scholars in the transnational networks of experts on health issues meant utilizing the given opportunity to participate in a domain in which epistemic contents were specified, policies were shaped, and professional profiles designed according to the newest state of affairs. Regarding the emergence of “health” as a public property and its increasing embedding in a vision of a perfect humanity beginning in the late 19th century, discourses of hygiene came to tie together agents in a “transnational social movement”, similar to the eugenic social movement, as Deborah Barrett and Charles KURZMAN have suggested (2004). If eugenics was the most militant stream in the overall program of engineering healthy humans (read: perfect

4 Reichsminister des Inneren, An das Auswärtige Amt, Berlin 15. Januar 1926. Betreff: Gesundheitszeugnisse für Ehebewerber. Bundesarchiv, R. 86, N. 2372.

5 The German Federal Archive [Bundesarchiv] testifies to the correspondence between such state institutions worldwide. See, for instance, BA, files R. 86; R. 1501.

6 It was the Law No. 37 (Stanboul 6.2.1926), “Le réglementation du mariage”. The text of this law with related correspondence between German ministries can be found in BA 1501/109380.

humanity), hygienic concerns managed to gather a wider spectrum of agents (both moderate and radical) who, in the name of the commonweal, sought to define health and disease and were involved in politics or aimed at influencing policymakers.

Exploring the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe on the grounds of the above explanations allows one to visualize a landscape of multilateral networks (plural) on issues related to hygiene, health, and disease, in which experts and scientists with origins in both regions were involved and active, yet with different points of departure. From the 19th century and during the interwar period, Southeastern Europe became a subject of health campaigns that were carried out by transnational agents and across national borders, typically addressing regions that were labeled as backward (WEINDLING 1995; FUCKS 2011). As Maria Bucur argues, "... Europe was as important as Africa or East Asia for shaping the subsequent institutions and power relations between policy makers (the Rockefellers, the League of Nations, the United Nations, the World Bank and so on) and the 'field'" (BUCUR 2011: 445). While health campaigns were conducted by transnational organizations, this was done along with the collaboration of state authorities and local and other experts. Such campaigns provided both state-affiliated and independent experts with the opportunity to participate in policymaking, specifying what was health, and what was disease, and also enabled access for the local elites to external funding, which occurred with the quite active Rockefeller Foundation in Southeastern Europe (TURDA 2010: 34; PROMITZER, TRUBETA & TURDA 2011: 9; FARLEY 2004, WEINDLING 1995). Obtaining funding meant gaining access not only to financial, but also to power resources insofar as funding promotes professional elites. Indeed, scientists and experts may have multiple affiliations with scientific communities, scholarly and intellectual circles, state and social welfare institutions, political parties, social organizations, etc. This was the case for scientists coming originally from Southeastern Europe or Germany, and their possible multifaceted affiliations were insofar worthy of consideration as they indicated a multiplicity of possible influences and loyalties.

Examining the scientific networks of racial hygienists and eugenicists between Germany and East/Southeastern Europe, Paul Weindling argues that German researchers who were involved in scientific institutions and politics operated in a verity of interconnected frameworks such as "the interstate Committee for Prevention of Diseases, which was linked to the Red Cross, the Rockefeller Foundation, several networks of the *Hamburger Tropeninstitut* [Hamburg Tropical Institute]" (WEINDLING 2011a: 53). On the other hand, Southeast European eugenics and its German influences cannot be adequately traced if other contacts remain neglected, "such as Lamarckian socialist populists or the autonomous and varied forms of Southeastern European eugenics as these interacted with the German racial hygiene [...] Such frameworks could work with both center-periphery models and one of multiple cultural centers that collectively shape the practices of eugenics and race" (WEINDLING 2011a: 53; see also WEISS-WENDT & YEOMANS 2013). In another publication, Paul WEINDLING (2011b) examines the opponents to eugenics and argues that the initial criticism by individual scientists (who expressed their opposition in public discourses) culminated in a "concerted international attempt to counter racialised forms of eugenics in response to National Socialism, when the critics formed organisations across Europe.

Here we see the Central European critique shaping a wider resistance to biologically based racial programmes” (WEINDLING 2011b: 95).

In view of this complexity, the editors of the volume “Health, Hygiene, and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe” proposed that a future research agenda should avoid a dichotomy of ‘East’ and ‘West’ in approaching health hygiene and eugenics in regional (namely Southeast European) settings and instead to reconstruct “how such an international diffusion of health, hygiene, and eugenic ideas and their implementation became possible and in some instances how geographical boundaries were challenged and ultimately rejected” (PROMITZER, TRUBETA & TURDA 2011: 20). The research of discourses on health and disease, hygiene, and eugenics in Southeastern Europe has revealed that there is hardly a specific Southeast European model of eugenics that could be regarded in analogy with any other regional and discursive pattern of eugenic models, such as the Scandinavian model (based on the welfare state) or Latin eugenics in Latin America that followed the French moderate model of Lamarckian and positive eugenics (PROMITZER, TRUBETA & TURDA 2011). This conclusion is insofar crucial as it contributes to challenging the stereotypic image of a region that is perceived as a uniformed entity. Nevertheless, even in this form it has not ceased being treated as a field of action by hegemonic powers.

Using as a point of departure the two-part hypothesis that the given political opportunity and cultural conduciveness are conditions favorable to networking, and yet the subjective choice is crucial to how the opportunity will be utilized, I will pass over the micro-level and outline the case of a prominent Greek gynecologist and his German ambitions in the interwar period when National Socialism was on the rise.

Nikolaos Louros: ‘A German professor with Greek nationality’

The socio-political environment provides scientists with the opportunity to attend to professional goals; however, individual choice is crucial in the mobilizing of contacts and collaborations. This is quite evident in the case of the prominent German-educated Greek gynecologist, Nikolaos Louros (1898–1986), whose biographer portrays him as the “most long-lived but also the person with the most creative stature in medicine” in 20th-century Greece (MARKETOS 2001: 1). Along with his posts as professor of medicine at the University of Athens and director of the maternity hospital “Alexandra,” he was distinguished by his involvement in social and political agencies, especially after World War II, and he was also the personal doctor to the royal family in the period 1947–64. The name of Louros is also associated with the founding and directorship of the first and only eugenics society⁷ in Greece which was influenced by the reformist eugenic movements of the post-war period.

Louros was the son of a physician, Konstantinos Louros, who was professor of medicine at the University of Athens and at one point temporarily dean of the faculty of medicine. Following his father’s professional path, Nikolaos studied medicine, first in Athens and later in Switzerland. After earning his doctoral degree in Berne

7 The activities of this society included public debates, which are printed in three volumes, and a center of prenatal examinations at the maternity hospital Alexandra, in Athens. See TRUBETA 2013: 263–273. This subchapter is an extract from the chapter on eugenics in TRUBETA 2013: 203–278.

(1919), he continued his specialization in Vienna, Munich, and Berlin. In 1925–28 he was engaged as a docent at the state clinic in Dresden (MARKETOS 2001: 7). Louros had an outstanding career in Greece, but his ambition as a rising young scientist was to continue his professional engagement in Germany or, at least, to be institutionally affiliated with German establishments even though he was then living and working in Athens. This is something which his correspondence with German institutions in the period 1926–1932 reveals.⁸ However, his hopes seem to have been dashed by unfavorable calculations from the German side and his professional competitors in Greece. A landmark in Louros's professional trajectory was the turbulent period at the turn of 1930s when Nazi power was rising in Germany. One consequence of the changing power relations was the rearrangement of coalitions among the scholars abroad (including in Greece) who maintained their professional relations and affiliations with German academia.

In 1930 Nikolaos Louros disclosed to German authorities his concern that a German-affiliated clinic for gynecology should be founded in Athens (which he himself was to head). His father's private clinic in Athens was to host this project. His proposal was first submitted in 1926 to the Section for Culture in the German Foreign Office [*Kulturabteilung des Auswärtigen Amtes*] and it was supported by the German Ministry of Culture and the Education Foundation [*Kulturministerium and Bildungsstiftung*]. At that point in time, however, the project failed to materialize due to a shortage of funds from the German side.⁹ Negotiations were reopened in 1930 and intensified between November 1930 and May 1931. The clinic was initially planned by Louros to be for women of the "second and third classes". This was the period in which the system of social welfare and health insurance was about to be established in Greece and the middle and lower social classes were becoming a considerable clientele for doctors.

In the course of the negotiations for winning the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Society [*Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft*, hereafter: KWG] as a partner, Louros's line of argument changed remarkably, shifting from outlining initially the philanthropic character of the project to now emphasizing his intention in 1932 to advance German influence in Greece. What was clearly indicated in this was his personal concern in facilitating his own research. The young Louros confessed this project held a certain fascination for him, and he expressed this in a letter from 1930 addressed to the executive director for the advancement of science of the KWG, namely Dr Cranach, who was the central figure in the negotiations on the German side. Louros wrote: "I have to admit, dear Sir Cranach, that this plan appears to me like an audacious dream. It captivates me in such a way that I would be ready to abdicate any other academic position in favor of this very plan" [*Dieser ganze Plan kommt mir, sehr geehrter Herr von Cranach, offen gestanden, wie ein kühner Traum vor. Mich fesselt er dermassen dass ich bereits wäre auf jede weitere akademische Anstellung zu gunsten dieses Planes zu*

⁸ Archives of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Society [Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft]; see below.

⁹ Louros's letter (1 November 1930) addressed to Dr Cranach (Geschäftsführer der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften). *AMPG*, Abteilung 1, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317: 4–5.

verzichten].¹⁰ And he goes on to mention his wish to also cooperate with the Rockefeller Foundation. This option came to him after meeting an influential person involved in this foundation; to enhance being successful he asked Cranach to put in a good word for him [*Deshalb möchte ich nicht versäumen Sie auch auf die Möglichkeit einer Unterstützung seitens der Rockefeller Foundation aufmerksam zu machen besonders wenn die K.W.G. ein gutes Wort für mich einlegen würde*].

In the process of the negotiations, Louros became increasingly aware that the KWG actually supported research rather than the founding of medical institutions. Hence in the months that followed he began suggesting that the planned clinic should operate in the fashion of a clinical institute. What he effectively needed was not financial support as such (he had enough from his family, he stated), but the status of an institutional affiliation with a German counterpart. His father confirmed this possibility in a letter from 1st December 1930 in which he concludes that the planned clinic would enable his son to “continue dedicating himself to scientific work for German purposes” [... *und sich der Fortsetzung seiner wissenschaftlichen Arbeit im Deutschen Sinne¹¹ zu widmen*]. Eventually, drawing on prestige and social capital was the constant theme in his project, while both the social relevance of his medical engagement and coalition partners were the negotiable variants. Indeed, while Louros had initially argued about the social, indeed philanthropic, relevance of his project in treating poor women for free, now he provided an alternative option which was to treat patients at cost instead of at no charge, in order to cover a part of the expenses. In the following negotiations only treatment at cost was under consideration. In 1932, when the private clinic of his father became affiliated with the University of Athens, he indicated the possibility of subventions from the Greek state for the joint project.

In bringing this project to realization, his stated intention was to be able to do his utmost in order to support, in any way, German scientific and cultural propaganda in Greece and in doing so, he was convinced that he served his own fatherland [*Was ich Ihnen sonst über meine innige Bereitwilligkeit sagte, in jeder Weise die deutsche wissenschaftliche und kulturelle Propaganda in meinem Vaterland nach Kräften zu unterstützen möchte ich mir erlauben auch schriftlich zu wiederholen. Es ist meine feste Überzeugung dass ich dadurch und nicht zuletzt, auch meinem Vaterlande diene*].¹² In subsequent correspondence, Nikolaos Louros disclosed that his motivation for arranging this German-Greek project was his preference for serving a German scientific institution rather than a Greek one. This was, he said, because Greek politics influenced scholarship in such a way that it was extremely difficult to engage in any serious scientific activity. On the other hand, he argued, in Germany he had no chance

10 Louros's letter (1 November 1930) addressed to Dr Cranach (Geschäftsführer der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften). *AMPG*, Abteilung 1, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317: 4–5.

11 Emphasis in original.

12 Louros's letter (1 November 1930) addressed to Dr Cranach (Geschäftsführer der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften). *AMPG*, Abteilung 1, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317: 4–5.

of being appointed to a leading position because of his status as a foreigner.¹³ What he meant by government politics and its influence on scholarship were apparently the rivalries between doctors which, in the end, proved to be pivotal in the failure of his own project.

Although the KWG initially rejected his request on the grounds that the proposal was beyond its mandate, the idea itself was deemed worthy of consideration due to its possible outstanding significance for German interests in the “Near Orient” [*im Nahen Orient*].¹⁴ In view of the intended German expansion into Southeast Europe (BEER & SEEWANN 2004) and the general German interests in Greece as part of that, the KWG did not close the file on Louros. Instead, it asked others for advice and information about him in order to decide the extent to which a possible collaboration would be beneficial for German interests. All who responded (above all the German professors who had collaborated with Louros at the universities in Berlin and Dresden) praised his scientific expertise and professional competence. However, a negative response came from the main informant (or rather, the person collecting information), who was the representative of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens.

To Louros’s detriment, this was not the only source of negative information about him. The legation counselor and representatives in the German embassy in Athens provided unfavorable assessments as well.¹⁵ Apparently, the rivalries among Greek physicians had proved sufficient such that they played a decisive role in the final rejection of his project. Serious objections were raised by the German legate who asserted that Louros had a difficult relationship with Greek institutions as well as with those Greek physicians who were “German-educated” and “German-minded” [*Deutsch gesinnt*] and had also provided valuable services for German interests for many years.¹⁶ A controversy between Nikolaos Louros and Konstantinos Logothetopoulos (1878–1961), likewise a physician, might in particular have impeded the realization of Louros’s project. The matter was not one of political significance, but concerned instead an article in a German gynecology journal in which Louros criticized Logothetopoulos’s approach as scientifically obsolete.¹⁷ His criticism clearly was with regard to just an issue of medical research and carried no political implications; nevertheless it proved harmful to Louros, given the standing Konstantinos Logothetopoulos enjoyed among the German authorities. Not by accident, Logothetopoulos became prime minister in the second occupation government in Greece (1941–1943).

13 Louros’s letter (1 November 1930): *AMPG*, Abteilung 1, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317: 4–5.

14 Lubarsch’s letter to Dr Cranach (12 December 1930). *AMPG*, Abteilung 1, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317.

15 Letter dated 14 January 1931 from Georg Karo (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Athen). *AMPG*, Abteilung 1, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317.

16 Deutsche Gesandtschaft (signed by Heberlein) to Cranach (Geschäftsführer der Kaiser Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft), Athens, 14 Januar 1931. *AMPG*, Abt. I, Laufzeit 1931; Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317/2: 43–5.

17 LOUROS 1930, cf. LOGOTHETOPOULOS 1926.

Louros's proposal was ultimately rejected by the KWG in May 1931 with the official argument that the founding of a hospital was beyond the scope of the KWG.¹⁸ However, this refusal did not discourage Louros, who did not abandon his dream project but changed orientation seeking other partners. Following the suggestion made by the executive director of the KWG, he looked to the German Red Cross as a possible collaborating institution and suggested his planned institution be an affiliated company [*Tochtergesellschaft*] of the KWG in which the latter would have an intermediary role.¹⁹

His last attempt took place in 1932 given form in a 16-page confidential proposal which was initiated in the face of the changing political relations in Germany, shortly before the takeover by National Socialism. The recipient of the proposal was not mentioned in the copy in the archive of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, but the context suggests that it was addressed to the NSDAP.²⁰ Louros specified his interest as "Suggestions on German Cultural Propaganda in Greece, Specifically the Establishment of a German Hospital in Athens" [*Vorschläge über eine deutsche kulturelle Propaganda in Griechenland namentlich über die Gründung eines Deutschen Krankenhauses in Athen*]. In this document, his arguments now concentrated on the advancement of German culture and spirit [*Geist*] in Greece by "a German University professor of Greek nationality", namely himself. He reiterated his loyalty by closing the proposal "With German Regards [*Mit deutschem Gruss*]"²¹ In the text he ensured that several German referees were willing to endorse him. His references included, in addition to the executive director of the KWG, Dr Lucas von Cranach ("who provides Greek intellectuals with National Socialist literature", as Louros remarked), and personalities from the German community and the NSDAP in Greece.²²

Ultimately his project did not come to be. Nevertheless, Louros had an outstanding career in Greece and belongs among the most prominent Greek gynecologists of the 20th century. According to his biographer, his attitude during World War II was one of resistance to the Italian and German occupying forces for which he was even imprisoned in July 1944 and later transported to the concentration camp "Chaidari" in Athens. He also declined the German offer to take an office as a minister during the occupation (according to MARKETOS 2001: 10). After World War II, he became

18 Extract from the Senate Protocol, 12 May 1931 [Auszug aus dem Senatsprotokoll vom 12. Mai 1931], *AMPG*, Abteilung I, Laufzeit 1931, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317/2: 70.

19 Louros's Letter, 22.V.31, *AMPG*, Abteilung I, Laufzeit 1931, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317/2: 73–4 and 76–8.

20 "Denkschrift des Dr. N.C. Louros, a.o. Professors für Geburtenhilfe und Gynäkologie an der Universität Arhen [*sic*], (bis 1932 a.o. Professor für Geburtshilfe und Gynäkologie an der Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Berlin.) Betrifft: Vorschläge über eine deutsche kulturelle Propaganda in Griechenland namentlich eines Deutschen Krankenhauses in Athen": *AMPG*, Abteilung I, Laufzeit 1932, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317/4: 87–102.

21 "Denkschrift des Dr. N.C. Louros ..." *AMPG*, Abteilung I, Laufzeit 1932, Repositur 1A, Best.-Nr. 317/4: 102.

22 He mentioned the German diplomat Dr Eisenlohr, personalities from the German community in Greece, such as the pastor Dr Kindermann, the head of the NSDAP in Greece and Mr Kuhdorfer, the foreign affairs editor in chief of the telegraphic office 'Wolf' Mr Koch (Außerpolitischer Chefredakteur Wolfs' Telegraphischen Büros).

actively involved in the Humanitarian Association [Ανθρωπιστική Εταιρεία]²³; it was the period in which humanitarianism was becoming a mainstream ideology. In the aftermath of the dictatorship in Greece (1967–74), Louros became the minister of education for a brief period (1974) in the so-called “Government of National Unity”. After the founding of the eugenic society and during his directorship, collaboration was orientated towards the British Eugenic Society, which followed the paths of reformism eugenics.²⁴

Nikolaos Louros seemed to have a good feel for relations in transformation and for incubating opportunities in the emerging order of affairs, and he adjusted his loyalties accordingly. Finally, national loyalty can be conditional and interchangeable; it can be used as a symbolic resource which can quickly lose priority when professional or other interests come into play. Certainly, the case of Louros is representative of a category of scholars, a case among others that include resistance by doctor or scholars to totalitarian regimes (see e.g. SCHOTT 1997; KAPOLNASI 2004).

Concluding reflections

Benedict Anderson’s protagonists from the Philippines were provided with the opportunity to become involved in developments worldwide by means of both the proceeding de-colonialization in the region of their origins as well as their social class. They are depicted as taking their paths by choice through the anarchist and intellectual circles in the multiplicity of the external world. And, certainly, neither were paths and trajectories created in a vacuum of power relations, nor were choices made without external influences, if not constraints. Both the multiplicity of the networking opportunities as well as the external circumstances are crucial facets in examining networks between world centers and peripheries, as in the case of the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe. I have argued that considering such networks as primarily bilateral negatively affects the recognition of the framework in which modern science was producing and transferring knowledge; such networks were part of a broader European – quasi transnational – space of interaction within which scholars from both Germany and Southeast European countries have multiple affiliations, such as to state authorities and policymaking centers, political organizations, intellectual circles, social movements, and others. Given their multiplex affiliations, scholars also have multiple loyalties. The examined case study illustrates that power relations are instrumental in the operation of scientific networks, but not only on the bilateral macro-level, such as between Europe’s center and periphery; the scientific world is ruled by distinct power relations that influence the scientific practice of those illustrated by Pierre Bourdieu as *homo academicus*. The question of how political opportunity can be used by scholars differently for drawing on symbolic capital in academia should lead one to keep in mind that scientific networks between Southeastern Europe and Germany took place within the field of the

23 See also Louros’s autobiography: LOUROS 1980.

24 As Nikolaos Louros announced, the Greek eugenics society had collaborated closely with its British counterpart in a joint study. Announcement at the meeting of the eugenics society (17 February 1965). See second volume of the public debates: Greek Eugenics Society (1976: 12).

production and transfer of modern science, but they also point to an interconnectedness between two European regions with different positions in the power constellation.

Bibliography

- ANDERSON, Benedict (2005): *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination*. London, New York: Verso.
- BAADER, Gerhard (2008): "Eugenische Programme in der sozialistischen Parteienlandschaft in Deutschland und Österreich in Vergleich". In: *Eugenik in Österreich. Biopolitische Strukturen von 1900 bis 1945*, edited by Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer & Thomas Mayer. Vienna: Czernin Verlag, 66–139.
- BALLINGER, Pamela (2004): "'Authentic Hybrids' in the Balkan Borderlands". *Current Anthropology* 45 (1), 31–60.
- BARRETT, Deborah; KURZMAN, Charles (2004): "Globalizing Social Movement Theory: The Case of Eugenics". *Theory and Society* 33 (5), 487–527.
- BASHFORD, Alison (2004): *Imperial Hygiene: A Critical History of Colonialism, Nationalism and Public Health*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BASHFORD, Alison; HOOKER, Claire (eds.) (2001a): *Contagion: historical and cultural studies*. London: Routledge.
- BASHFORD, Alison; HOOKER, Claire (2001b): "Contagion, modernity and postmodernity". Introduction to A. Bashford & C. Hooker (eds.): *Contagion: historical and cultural studies*. London: Routledge, 1–12.
- BEER, Mathias; SEEWANN, Gerhard (eds.) (2004): *Südostforschung im Schatten des Dritten Reiches. Institutionen – Inbalte – Personen*. München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag.
- BIGNALL Simone; PATTON, Paul (2010): *Deleuze and Postcolonial*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- BOJADŽIEVA, Elena (1986): „Werbung für deutsche Kultur in Bulgarien (1919–1932)“. *Bulgarian Historical Review* 14, 3–19.
- BRINTON, Daniel Garrison (1894): "The Nation as an Element in Anthropology". In: *Memoirs of the International Congress of Anthropology*, edited by C. Staniland Wake. Chicago: The Schulte Publishing Company, 19–36.
- BUCUR, Maria (2002): *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- BUCUR, Maria (2011): "Remapping the historiography of modernization and state-building in Southeastern Europe through Health, Hygiene and Eugenics". In: *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta & Marius Turda. New York, Budapest: CEU Press, 427–445.
- CASTELLS, Manuel (1996): "The net and the self: working notes for a critical theory of the informational society". *Critique of Anthropology* 16, 1–46.
- CASTELLS, Manuel (2000): *The Information Age, Vol. 1, The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- CHEAH, Pheng; ROBBINS, Bruce (eds.) (1998): *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- CONRAD, Peter; SCHNEIDER, Joseph W. (1980): *Deviance and Medicalization: From Badness to Sickness*. St. Louis: Mosby.
- CONRAD, Peter (1992): "Medicalization and social control". *Annual review of sociology* 18, 209–232.
- CONRAD, Peter (2007): *The Medicalization of Society: On the Transformation of Human Conditions into Treatable Disorders*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- COOTER, Roger (2007): "After Death/After-'Life': The Social History of Medicine in Post-Postmodernity". *Social History of Medicine* 20 (3). 441–464.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix (1987): *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis, London.
- DEUCHARS, Robert (2010): "Deleuze, Delanda and Social Complexity: Implications for the 'International'". *Journal of International Political Theory* 6 (2). 161–187.
- DIMOU, Augusta (2009): *Entangled Paths Towards Modernity. Contextualizing Socialism and Nationalism in the Balkans*. Budapest, New York: CEU Press.
- ELBE, Stefan (2010): *Security and Global Health*. Cambridge: Polity.
- FARLEY, John (2004): *To Cast Out Disease. A History of the International Health Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (1913–1951)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FOUCAULT, Michel (1988): *Die Geburt der Klinik. Eine Archäologie des ärztlichen Blicks*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer.
- FOUCAULT, Michel (1994): *Power. Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984: Volume 3*, edited by P. Rabinow & J. D. Faubion. New York: New York Press.
- FRIEDMAN, Jonathan (2002): "Situating hybridity. The positional logic of a discourse". In: *Structure, culture, and history: Recent issues in social theory*, edited by Sing C. Chew & David Knottnerus. Lanham: Rowman and Utlefield. 6–147.
- FUCKS, Brigitte (2011): "Orientalizing disease. Austro-Hungarian Policies of 'Race', Gender, and Hygiene in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1874–1914". In: *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta & Marius Turda. New York. Budapest: CEU Press. 57–85.
- GHORASHI, Halleh; BOERSMA, Kees (2009): "The 'Iranian Diaspora' and the New Media: From Political Action to Humanitarian Help". *Development and Change* 40 (4). 667–691.
- GILROY, Paul (1993): *The Black Atlantic. Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London, New York: Verso.
- GREEN, Sarah (2002): "'Culture in a network: dykes, webs and women in London and Manchester'". In: *British Subjects: An Anthropology of Britain*, edited by N. Rapport. Oxford: Berg. 181–202.
- GROTHUSEN, Klaus-Detlev (1990): "Deutschland und Südosteuropa 1871–1945. Zwischen Gegnerschaft und Partnerschaft", in *Osteuropa und die Deutschen. Vorträge zum 75. Jubiläum der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde* (= Osteuropaforschung, vol. 25), edited by Oskar Anweiler, Eberhard Reißner, Karl-Heinz Ruffmann. Berlin. 247–287.
- HOLTON, Robert J. (2002): "Cosmopolitanism or cosmopolitanisms? The Universal Races Congress of 1911". *Global Networks* 2 (2). 153–170.
- HOLTON, Robert J. (2009): "Network Theories and Network Types". In: *Networking across borders and frontiers. Demarcation and connectedness in European culture and society*, edited by Jürgen Barkhoff & Helmut Eberhard. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang. 19–31.
- ILLICH, Ivan (1974): *Medical Nemesis*. London: Calder & Boyars.
- IRMSCHER, Johannes (1989): "The scientific relations between the University of Berlin and Fascist Greece" [«Οι επιστημονικές σχέσεις του πανεπιστημίου του Βερολίνου με τη φασιστική Ελλάδα»] Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ιστορικού Συμποσίου, Η Ελλάδα 1936–1944. Δικτατορία, Κατοχή, Αντίσταση Μορφ. Ίδρυμα ΑΤΕ]. Athens. 336–356.
- JARDINE Alice (1984): "Woman in Limbo: Deleuze and His Br(others)". *SubStance* 13 (3–4). 46–60.
- JORDANOVA Ludmila, (1995): "The Social Construction of Medical Knowledge". *Social History of Medicine* 8 (3). 361–381.
- KAPOLNASI, Gergely (2004): *Medizin im Nationalsozialismus*. Norderstedt: Grin Verlag.
- KEIM, Wiebke (2008): *Vermessene Disziplin: zum konterbegemonialen Potential afrikanischer und lateinamerikanischer Soziologien*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

- KESPER-BIERMANN, Sylvia (2007). “‘Ehegesundheit’ als bevölkerungspolitisches Problem. Internationale Dimensionen von Diskussion und Gesetzgebung in der Weimarer Republik”. In: *Herausforderung Bevölkerung. Zu Entwicklungen des modernen Denken über die Bevölkerung vor, im und nach dem “Dritten Reich”*, edited by Ursula Ferdinand & Josef Ehmer. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. 123–32.
- KNOX, Hannah; SAVAGE, Mike; HARVEY, Penny (2006): “Social networks and the study of relations: networks as method, metaphor and form”. *Economy and Society* 35 (1). 113–140.
- ΚΟΚΚΑ, Jürgen (1994): “Perspektiven für die Sozialgeschichte der neunziger Jahre”. In *Sozialgeschichte, Alltagsgeschichte, Mikro-Historie. Eine Diskussion*, edited by Winfried Schulze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 33–39.
- KÖNIG, Christoph (ed.) (1995): *Germanistik in Mittel- und Osteuropa, 1945–1992*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- ΛΟΓΟΘΕΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Konstantinos (1926): “Eine absolut sichere Blutstillungsmethode bei vaginalen und abdominalen gynäkologischen Operationen”. *Zentralblatt für Gynäkologie* 50 (50): 3202–3204.
- ΛΟΥΡΟΣ, N[ikolaos] (1930): “Bemerkungen zu einer sogenannten ‘absolut sicheren Blutstillungsmethode’ nach Logothetopoulos”. *Zentralblatt für Gynäkologie* 54 (44). 2781–3.
- MARKETOS, Spyros G. (2001): *History of Medicine of the 20th Century. I Greek Pioneers: 5: Nikolaos Louros (1898–1986)* [Ιστορία της Ιατρικής του 20ού Αιώνα. I. Οι Έλληνες Πρωτοπόροι 5: Νικόλαος Κ. Λούρος (1898–1986)]. Athens: Iatrikes Ekdoseis Zita [Ιατρικές Εκδόσεις Ζήτα].
- MILLER, Christopher L. (1993): “The Postidentitarian Predicament in the Footnotes of A Thousand Plateaus: Nomadology, Anthropology, and Authority”. *Diacritics* 23 (3), *Historiques Coloniales*. 6–35.
- MOSEER, Gabriele (2011): *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft und Krebsforschung 1920–1970*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- MUDIMBE, Valentin Y. (1988): *The Invention of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- NIEMANN-FINDEISEN, Sören (2004): *Weeding the Garden. Die Eugenik-Rezeption der frühen Fabian Society*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- PISKORSKI, Jan M. (ed.) (2002): *Deutsche Ostforschung und polnische Westforschung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik: Disziplinen im Vergleich*. Osnabrück: Fibre-Verlag.
- POLEXE, Laura (2011): *Netzwerke und Freundschaft. Sozialdemokraten in Rumänien, Russland und der Schweiz an der Schwelle zum 20. Jahrhundert* (= Freunde – Gönner – Getreue 3). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- PORTER, Dorothy (1995): “The Mission of Social History of Medicine: An Historical View”. *Social History of Medicine* 8 (3). 345–359.
- PROMITZER, Christian (2003): “The Body of the Other: ‘Racial Science’ and Ethnic Minorities in the Balkans”. In: *Minorities in Greece – Historical Issues and New Perspectives*, edited by Sevasti Trubeta & Christian Voss (= Special Issue of *History and Culture of South Eastern Europe: An Annual Journal* 5, no. 40). 27–40.
- PROMITZER, Christian (2010a): “Physical Anthropology and Ethnogenesis in Bulgaria (1878–1944)”. *Focaal* 58. 47–62.
- PROMITZER, Christian (2010b): “‘Betwixt and Between’: Physical Anthropology in Bulgaria and Serbia until the End of the First World War”. In: *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, edited by R. Jöhler, C. Marchetti & M. Scheer. Bielefeld: Transcript. 141–65.
- PROMITZER, Christian; TRUBETA, Sevasti; TURDA, Marius (2011): “Framing Issues of Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe”. Introduction to *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta & Marius Turda. New York, Budapest: CEU Press. 1–24.

- ROSE, Nikolas (1994): "Medicine, History and the Present". In *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*, edited by C. Jones & R. Porter. London: Routledge. 48–72
- ROSEN, Christine (2004): *Preaching Eugenics: Religious Leaders and the American Eugenics Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHÖNFELD, Roland (ed.) (1997): *Germany and Southeastern Europe. Aspects of Relations in the Twentieth Century*. München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, in cooperation with the Center for European and Russian Studies, University of California.
- SCHOTT, Heinz (1997): *Die Chronik der Medizin*. Gütersloh, München: Chronik Verlag.
- SCHWARTZ, Michael (1995): *Sozialistische Eugenik: Eugenische Sozialtechnologien in Debatten und Politik der deutschen Sozialdemokratie 1890–1933*. Bonn: Dietz.
- SIGRIST, René; WIDMER, Eric D. (2011): "Training links and transmission of knowledge in 18th century botany", *REDES Revista hispana para el análisis de redes sociales* 21 (7). 347–387.
- SIGRIST, René (2009): "Scientific Networks and Frontiers in the Golden Age of Academies (1700–1830). An essay with new data". In: *Networking across borders and frontiers. Demarcation and connectedness in European culture and society*, edited by Jürgen Barkhoff & Helmut Eberhard. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang. 35–65.
- SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988): "Can the Subaltern Speak?". In: *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* edited by Cary Nelson & Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana und Chicago: University of Illinois Press. 271–315.
- STEFANOV, Nenad (ed.) (1994): *Bosnien und Europa: die Ethnisierung der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verlag.
- STEIN, Oliver (2011): "Die deutsch-bulgarischen Beziehungen seit 1878". *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 47 (2). 218–240.
- TAYLOR Allen, Ann (2000): "Feminism and Eugenics in Germany and Britain, 1900–1940. A comparative perspective". *German Studies Review* 23 (3). 477–505.
- THAMER, Hans-Ulrich; DROSTE, Daniel; HAPP, Sabine (eds.) (2012): *Die Universität Münster in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus: Kontinuitäten und Brüche zwischen 1920 und 1960*. Münster: Aschendorf Verlag.
- TILLEY, Helen (2005): "Ambiguities of racial science in colonial Africa: The African research survey and the fields of eugenics, social anthropology, and biomedicine, 1920–1940". In: *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950*, edited by B. Stuchtey. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 245–287.
- TILLEY, Helen (2011): *Africa as a living laboratory: Empire, development, and the problem of scientific knowledge, 1870–1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- TOMS, Jonathan (2009): "So What? A Reply to Roger Cooter's 'After Death/After-Life': The Social History of Medicine in Post-Postmodernity". *Social History of Medicine* 22 (3). 609–615.
- TRUBETA, Sevasti (2006): "Hybridity in Post-Colonial Discourse and in Southeast-European Studies". In *Marginal Linguistic Identities. Studies in Slavic Contact and Borderland Varieties* (= Eurolinguistische Arbeiten, 2), edited by D. Stern & C. Voss. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 31–43.
- TRUBETA, Sevasti (2013): *Physical Anthropology, Race and Eugenics in Greece (1880s–1970s)*. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.
- TURDA, Marius (2010): "Entangled traditions of race: Physical anthropology in Hungary and Romania, 1900–1940". *Focaal* 58. 32–46.
- TURDA, Marius; WEINDLING, Paul (eds.) (2007): *"Blood and Homeland": Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, (1900–1940)*. Budapest, New York: CEU Press.
- TURDA, Marius (2007a): "The Nation as Object: Race, Blood and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania". *Slavic Review* 66 (3). 413–441.

- TURDA, Marius (2007b): "From Craniology to Serology: Racial Anthropology in Interwar Hungary and Romania". *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences* 43 (3). 361–377.
- UNGER, Corinna R. (2007): *Ostforschung in Westdeutschland: Die Erforschung des europäischen Ostens und die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, 1945–1975* (= Studien zur Geschichte der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- WEDEKIND, Michael (2007): "Wissenschaftsmilieus und Ethnopolitik im Rumänien der 1930/40-er Jahre". In: *Herausforderung Bevölkerung. Zu Entwicklungen des modernen Denken über die Bevölkerung vor, im und nach dem "Dritten Reich"*, edited by U. Ferdinand & J. Ehmer. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. 233–264.
- WEINDLING, Paul (1995): *International health organisations and movements, 1918–1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WEINDLING, Paul (2011a): "Racial expertise and German Eugenic Strategies for Southeastern Europe". In: *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945*, edited by Christian Promitzer, Sevasti Trubeta & Marius Turda. New York, Budapest: CEU Press. 27–54.
- WEINDLING, Paul (2011b): "Critics, Commentators and Opponents of Eugenics 1880s–1950s". *East Central Europe* 38. 79–96.
- WEISS-WENDT, Anton; YEOMANS, Rory (eds.) (2013): *Racial Science in Hitler's New Europe, 1938–1945*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, London.
- YEOMANS, Rory (2007): "Of 'Yugoslav Barbarians' and Croatian Gentlemen Scholars: National Ideology and Racial Anthropology in Interwar Yugoslavia". In: *"Blood and Homeland": Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, (1900–1940)*, edited by M. Turda & P. Weindling. Budapest & New York: CEU Press. 83–122.
- YOUNG, R. (1995): *Colonial desire: hybridity in theory, culture and race*. London: Routledge.
- ZARIFI, Maria (2002): "Das deutsch-griechische Forschungsinstitut für Biologie in Piräus, 1942–1944". In: *Autarkie und Ostexpansion. Pflanzenzucht und Agrarforschung im Nationalsozialismus*, edited by S. Heim. Göttingen: Wallstein. 206–232.
- ZOLA, I. K. (1972): "Medicine as an institution of social control". *The Sociological Review* 20. 487–504.