



## Spaces on the temporal move: Weimar *Geopolitik* and the vision of an Indian science of the state, 1924–1945

Luna Sabastian

To cite this article: Luna Sabastian (2018) Spaces on the temporal move: Weimar *Geopolitik* and the vision of an Indian science of the state, 1924–1945, *Global Intellectual History*, 3:2, 231–253, DOI: [10.1080/23801883.2018.1450619](https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2018.1450619)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2018.1450619>



Published online: 13 Mar 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 49



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# Spaces on the temporal move: Weimar *Geopolitik* and the vision of an Indian science of the state, 1924–1945

Luna Sabastian

Faculty of History, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

## ABSTRACT

The termination of the Great War hailed a universally modern moment and a new ‘global’ condition. Early to recognize this was the Bavarian scholar and general Karl Haushofer (1869–1946), who built his *Geopolitik* school on temporal expectation. Defying its reduction to Hitler and Nazism, Haushofer’s *Geopolitik* aimed to gain revolutionary momentum from anti-colonial nationalisms in the East. In Haushofer’s vision, geopolitical spaces themselves acquired motion as the long-dormant East rose with a globally resounding ‘energism’. Haushofer’s *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* (‘Journal for Geopolitics’) made India a particular model for Germans seeking to ‘catch up’ on world affairs. The world signified exposure, but, if harnessed correctly, rejuvenation for the nation. In his attempt to de-orientalise the German mind to prepare it for geopolitical momentum, Haushofer drew on the vision of a dynamic East offered by the Indian sociologist Benoy Kumar Sarkar (1887–1949). This flipped the temporality of colonialism. Geopolitical temporality offered the promise of a history that would not manifest itself in time, but in space. In 1933, for Haushofer, the centre of emancipatory dynamism shifted to the fascist countries as champions of a just spatial order against the ‘status quo’ of British or US hegemony.

## KEYWORDS

Geopolitics; Karl Haushofer; Benoy Kumar Sarkar; global fascism; temporality; colonialism

## 1. Introduction: history, geography, and the time of *Geopolitik*

The problem with studying *Geopolitik*, the German case of ‘geopolitics’, is that we receive our object through the mediation of specific refractions that result from the struggle over the intellectual heritage of National Socialism.<sup>1</sup> While there is much resistance to – and perhaps unsurprisingly, a neo-conservative espousal of – the term in the German context, its quotidian use in English has in the past required that it be disconnected from, and immunized against, its perceived German aberration.<sup>2</sup> The German *Geopolitik* is immediately associated with the Munich-based scholar-General Karl Haushofer (1869–1946), comprised by the debate over Haushofer’s influence on Hitler<sup>3</sup> and overdetermined by the social Darwinist architecture of *Lebensraum* (‘living space’) that underpinned the Nazi megalomaniac projects of ‘racial’ extinction and conquest in the East.<sup>4</sup> The term was first coined in 1899 by the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellén (1864–1922), a disciple of Friedrich Ratzel’s (1844–1904), who developed the concept of

*Lebensraum* in turn. In its general definition, *Geopolitik* is the science of the state as an organism, which is out to expand its 'living space'. Although *Geopolitik* is understood to be both older and more expansive than its Nazi distillate, it is through its co-optation by Nazism that the concept has acquired its definite and persisting 'taint'. The result of this fraught intellectual history is a peculiar splitting of the *Geopolitik*-geopolitics compound into: one, *geopolitics*, which has found a solid place in the English language and maps onto a political reality 'out there'; and two, severed from it, the other, discredited *Geopolitik*.

Contravening against this, recent work by Alison Bashford and others has shed light on a global geopolitical moment visible, in its extreme points, in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Anglo-phone Political Geographies, and extending into the post-war era, the spatial gaze of Fernand Braudel's maritime histories.<sup>5</sup> Against geopolitical self-representation, this literature views geopolitics as an exercise in space-making rather than panoptic description.<sup>6</sup> My revisiting of the privileged disseminator of geopolitical thinking in the Weimar period, Haushofer's *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* ('Journal for Geopolitics'; hereafter: *ZfG*), will help to redress – and historicize – the nevertheless persistent reduction of the German case of geopolitics to a species of space-grabbing nationalism and militarism. My examination is informed by the unlikely 'entanglement' that, as Kris Manjapra has shown,<sup>7</sup> drew Karl Haushofer to the Bengali sociologist and economist Benoy Kumar Sarkar (1887–1949), but moves beyond this singularity to reconstruct a unique projection of anti-colonial modernity that connected India and Germany in the interwar years, in radically new ways. Haushofer's *Geopolitik* aimed to gain revolutionary momentum from anti-colonial nationalisms in the East. To Haushofer and to Sarkar, *Geopolitik* blue-printed the science of the state in the global age. This science combined optimistic futurities and projections of emancipation with a rhetoric of 'just-so' sobriety in political thought. As this article will argue, *Geopolitik* as it was formalized in Haushofer's group, including Benoy Sarkar, anticipated the globalization discourse by its claims to, and harnessing of, the global now-time. Crucially, this history troubles the identification of a commitment to 'the global' with a liberal ideology. My objective is to restore *Geopolitik* to the intellectual history of time and to the discipline dealing with it – History. Scholars have failed to tease out the temporal structure of *Geopolitik* because they have not recognized it as an intervention – if one coming from a rogue disciplinary vantage point – in the crisis of historicism and its particular Weimar fractures.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, it was not with geographers but with established historians such as Friedrich Meinecke, next to proponents of the emergent discipline of Political Science, that Kjellén's *Geopolitik* first gained any traction in Germany – and not until theories outbreak of the First World War prompted a search for new directions.<sup>9</sup> *Geopolitik* prefigured the layering of different strata of historical time and their relative significance that is seen as Fernand Braudel's contribution to theorisations of time.<sup>10</sup> Haushofer's notion of 'the secular' (*das Säkulare*), defined as 'that which lasts' (*das Dauernde*) in opposition to 'daily noise' (*Tageslärm*) – a play on 'daily political news' (*Tagespolitik*) – prompts a comparison with Braudel's conceptualization of a *longue durée* as distinct from a middling *moyenne durée* and the singularity of the *événement* on the surface-level of time.<sup>11</sup> 'The secular' defines the proper subject of *Geopolitik*: it makes a qualitative statement about profundity rather than duration. Socio-political movement that Braudel would brush off as *événement*, points the geopolitical initiate to momentous transformation. Where Braudel privileged time as the category

through which civilisational space (the Mediterranean<sup>12</sup>) is understood, Haushofer's *Geopolitik* elevated space over time. In a rare article to address this relation directly, the ZfG's involved publisher-contributor Kurt Vowinckel opined that History and *Geopolitik* now contended for precedence as the 'universal science' (*Universalwissenschaft*). All other sciences would be relegated to auxiliaries deriving their analytical framework from either space or time.<sup>13</sup> The geo-historian Braudel viewed history as developing with the painfully slow ground pace, quite literally, of the earth, close to a standstill.<sup>14</sup> For Haushofer, whose spatial manoeuvres appeared more like a snapshot of time, this would have spelt insufferable statism. Haushofer's *Geopolitik* declared a state of global synchronicity in geographic dispersion (in the sense of what Penelope Corfield and others before her have called the 'latitudinal' dimension of space instead of 'longitudinal' time).<sup>15</sup> Of the two, Haushofer, like his counterpart Sarkar, was the historian of modernity.

A discipline setting itself apart from Wilhelmine *Politische Geographie* ('Political Geography'), *Geopolitik* was catapulted into prominence by the Great War and its settlement, unanimously viewed as disastrous in Germany. Through academic production, Prussian school curricula, books and through public discussion, and Haushofer's own regular radio broadcasts, geopolitical ideas would have been familiar to Weimar Germans even before their endorsement by the Nazis.<sup>16</sup> It was arguably in the intellectual fervour (and trench warfare) of Weimar that *Geopolitik* was at its most innovative, and where it was discussed across the political and disciplinary spectrum, before its reduction to 'Germandom', blood and soil.<sup>17</sup> As the new republic drew citizens into political responsibility like never before, *Geopolitik* pushed for hegemony by claiming that what Germans, dazed and perturbed by their defeat, now required was to catch up to the kind of geopolitical thinking that had brought their enemies to victory.<sup>18</sup> Like a geopolitical forecast, the ZfG aimed to educate the general public and advise statesmen;<sup>19</sup> its implicit subject was the British Empire, and later, US-American world supremacy (*Panamerika*).<sup>20</sup> Yet what makes Haushofer a more interesting case than many of his colleagues is that he, far from any preoccupation with the lost colonies or German rustic life,<sup>21</sup> developed his thought through other, 'indirect', foreign examples 'that are removed from *ressentiment*, like India and East Asia'.<sup>22</sup> In Haushofer's opinion, if Germany's refusal to entrust politics to geopolitical expertise had brought it defeat, then its particular blindness to the 'pan-Asian question' (nationalism and pan-nationalism) had been the primary cause.<sup>23</sup> Haushofer identified the geopolitical fault lines of the future in the "'battle for Asia'". The 'rising tide of colour' that brought white supremacists, including Hitler, to hysterics, presented itself as an opportunity for Haushofer.<sup>24</sup> Rather than capitulate again – this time, to the 'yellow peril' – Germany could be energized by the enormous activity in the East.<sup>25</sup> The Bavarian general who spent years as a military advisor in Japan and founded a school of Japanese *Geopolitik*, was certainly not willing to repeat Germany's mistake. Global historians have looked at *Geopolitik* mainly in conjunction with Japan and the Pacific,<sup>26</sup> though it has escaped notice that Haushofer harboured an equal enthusiasm for everything that was forward-looking, modernizing, and industrializing in the national movement in India.<sup>27</sup> As I hope to show, India served to demonstrate the story that the ZfG told of discrete geographies pushing into global modernity. Nationalism and modernism formed the teleological horizon for all such geopolitical movements. In Haushofer's circle, *Geopolitik* acquired a distinctive futurist thrust that belied its identification with conservatism on the one hand and geo-strategy on the other, and in this, it took on the 'futurism'

of one Benoy Sarkar.<sup>28</sup> The following will present a close reading of the case for India that was made in the *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* from its establishment in 1924 to 1945, when the journal was discontinued. Haushofer committed suicide in 1946. When the journal reappeared with a new publisher from 1951 to 1968, little remained of Haushofer's original vision.

*Geopolitik*, as it developed through the pages of the ZfG, affirmed its foundation in physical geography. Its imagery was spatial; its vision moved from inorganic to organic matter, from geological formations to plant and animal life, and finally centred on anthropogeography. Space squared with a monthly presentation of current affairs that was systematised into remarkable geopolitical entities called the Indo-Pacific, the Euro-African, and the American regions, a world condensed to just the Indo-Pacific and the Atlantic in 1933. Reports on the Indo-Pacific were Haushofer's forte.<sup>29</sup> A contemporary described Haushofer's method in their compilation as the 'arduous, daily perusal of the world press, [and the] meticulous study of world literature not only of geopolitical and geographical, but also of historical, strategic, artistic, and philosophical content'.<sup>30</sup> Its raw material consisted of a wealth of Anglo-American, French, and Indian newspapers and journals: *The Manchester Guardian*, *The Times*, and *Le Temps* were met by *The Times of India*, *Young India*, *The Calcutta Review*, *Amrita Bazar Patrika* and Benoy Sarkar's own Bengali journal *Ārthik Unnati* (Economic Progress), which ran from 1926 to 1938.<sup>31</sup> Yet Haushofer insisted that neither the aim, nor the method, nor the presentation of his monthly reports could be coextensive with 'news'. The geopolitician's interest lay elsewhere: he suffered geopolitical space to transcend itself and become manifest as the agent of history. The geopolitical gaze provided a series of events with the interpretational closure, not so much of historical developments, but of 'expressions of consciousness' (*Bewußtseinsäußerungen*).<sup>32</sup> This is the life proper to *Lebensraum*. However, as I will argue, the temporal dimension became decisive here even as it was articulated through the spatial (*Raum*) or, as Alison Bashford suggests, the biological register (of *Leben* or *bios*).<sup>33</sup> It is in this sense that earth-bound geopolitics projected a distinctive temporality. The craft of the geopolitician rose to the occasion: working as if on 'a well-regulated switchboard', he isolated 'electric currents' or developments otherwise kept in deliberate confusion by the press.<sup>34</sup> Described by another characteristically thick metaphor, the *Geopolitiker* stands atop 'a high lookout'<sup>35</sup> – his vertical elevation from the ground of Physical Geography – thereby gaining 'sufficient geopolitical range of vision and penetrating depth of perception' to assess movements in time.<sup>36</sup> Geopolitical events revealed the structural cogency of momentous developments, in which the historical 'event' was understood as a symptom pointing to the 'advance and ebb of geopolitical processes'.<sup>37</sup> The use of these oceanic metaphors and of tectonic or stratospheric imagery, elsewhere<sup>38</sup> did not embellish but *made* the argument: the cycle of politics demanded respect – and constant monitoring – as an animate force of nature.<sup>39</sup> *Geopolitik* looked at the emergent rather than at the static; where it was put to use on Indian issues, it unseated orientalism as the science of India.

## 2. The sociologists' India

In ZfG presentations, the contemporaneity of geographically dispersed movements (in a temporal register) and their global interconnectedness (in a spatial register) articulated

a powerful discourse of political modernity for India. Where it remained implicit as was often the case, this temporality was extractable as the inverse function of geopolitical spaces being ‘on the move’ – spaces like India, as Haushofer insisted. Explicit, however, was Haushofer’s objective to recover modernity for India, and India for modernity. He was impatient with the German inability to recognize the profundity of what was underway in the nationalist movements in the Orient, an inability resulting, no doubt, from the wide dissemination in Germany of orientalist knowledge and fantasies about India. Seeking to emancipate not so much India or Indians, but rather Germans, from orientalist time, Haushofer charged:

Indology and Sinology, to the despair of men who are leaders in the Chinese and Indian movements in these respective countries, show an India or China from two or four millennia ago in a Bengali light, and the dynamism of today and tomorrow remains in the dark.<sup>40</sup>

Denunciations of the German bias became formulaic in introductions to the new, non-orientalist works coming out of Germany, and were eagerly echoed by Indians living and writing in Germany after the war Benoy Sarkar and the developmental economist Sudhir Sen (1907–1989).<sup>41</sup> Through Haushofer’s monthly reports and biannual literature reviews on the Indo-Pacific, together with long pages of book advertisements, the *ZfG* provides entry points to the new India taking shape in Weimar. New India could be accessed through its political, economic, and societal makeup, and its tension with colonial rule. The household names in the *ZfG* were, next to Sarkar and Sen, the revolutionary-in-exile Taraknath Das (1884–1958); Radhakamal Mukerjee (1889–1968), the Lucknow-based Professor of Economics and Sociology; and at Lahore, the economist Brij Narain. These men sought to combat the ever-fossilised past of the India of ‘Germanism’<sup>42</sup> by embarking on comparative sociological and economic study: modernizing and universalizing projects. By submitting India’s ‘positive data’ and importantly, not its culture, for global comparison, they projected India as simultaneous (rather than coincidental) and hence of equal value with ‘Western’ modernity.<sup>43</sup> Comparison equalized and secularized time. This was true also of Sarkar’s historicist measuring of developmental gaps between India and what he called ‘Euro-America’. These works were unambiguously welcomed as geopolitical contributions by Haushofer’s group, which closely followed publications such as Sarkar’s *The Sociology of Population* (1936)<sup>44</sup> as Indian articulations of the problem of national populations in global ‘living space’.<sup>45</sup> A last show of appreciation of the Indian connection came after the Second World War, when Haushofer, by now under investigation for war crimes and soon to commit suicide along with his wife Martha, named Benoy Sarkar and Radhakamal Mukerjee, as well as familiars like the British geographer Halford John Mackinder and the American strategist Alfred Thayer Mahan, as his foreign teachers and, presumably, redeemers. Haushofer applauded these men as pioneers who had brought the “politike techne” from its erstwhile limitation to the city state Athens to truly ‘earth-spanning’ proportions by internationalizing and making objective the study of politics: geopolitics.<sup>46</sup>

During the Weimar year, the *ZfG* never posited India as British India, but as the property of the Indian nation-people. Based in Berlin (later Heidelberg), the journal’s publisher Kurt Vowinckel, fostered its Indian project.<sup>47</sup> This is not to say that the discourse in the *ZfG* was univocal, or that it always looked favourably upon India and Indians. Indeed, orientalist stereotypes in the *ZfG* persisted and dovetailed with a heightened racial

ambivalence towards Indians, sometimes slipping into outright contempt, that puncture the discourse of Indian modernity throughout. *Geopolitik* could adopt the imperial language of the need to pacify the Indian ‘hinterland’,<sup>48</sup> or converge with the gaze of the modern, leisurely German backpacker, tacitly confirming India’s place in the colonial economy of access to adventure, knowledge, and exploitation.<sup>49</sup> But – and this is the critical point – such articulations failed to consolidate into the older mode of orientalist temporality that could challenge Haushofer’s authorial treatment of India as modern. Instead, the spectre of orientalism regrouped around the figure of Gandhi. It was through the Mahatma that the religious, effeminate and otherworldly – India’s insufficient modernity – was articulated in the ZfG. A rift ran between the journal’s treatment of Gandhi in an orientalist, depoliticized mode, and the new India studied under a sociological lens. Yet the thrust was clear: it was not Gandhi’s India that would win, but the India of the social scientists. This was, above all, Sarkar’s India.

A polyglot who mastered German during his world travels between 1914 and 1925,<sup>50</sup> Benoy Sarkar contributed his expertise to Germany’s new Indianism during his guest professorship at the Technische Hochschule in Munich in 1930–1931, a position he acquired with help from the Deutsche Akademie (German Academy), of which Haushofer was co-founder.<sup>51</sup> New India’s institutional loci in Germany were unsurprisingly not the established humanistic or research universities constructed in the image of the Humboldt University in Berlin, but rather the new polytechnic universities. At Munich’s polytechnic for four days a week, Sarkar lectured on India’s current economic and social development.<sup>52</sup> Beyond the lecture theatre, he repeated much of the same on visits to factories, polytechnics and trade centres all over Germany, arranged by the Deutsche Akademie.<sup>53</sup> Following his post in Munich, Sarkar aimed to remain permanently in Germany by way of a self-conceived chair in ‘Comparative Economy and Economic Legislation’ at one of Berlin’s polytechnic universities, Dresden, or Leipzig.<sup>54</sup> This met the wishes of the German Foreign Office to counteract Philology and Philosophy in the study of India with ‘Indian realia’, that is, with the India of today ‘with its problems that are so important to us’, namely, trade and politics.<sup>55</sup> This official endorsement notwithstanding, Sarkar’s application was ultimately unsuccessful: a decision that was likely affected as much by Sarkar’s high salary requirements as by the suspicion that for all his ‘embarrassing’ academic chest-beating, the Indian may have been, above all, only a ‘dazzler’.<sup>56</sup>

### 3. Fatigued ‘wish for statics’ in Middle Europe – dynamism in Asia

Indian nationalist writings provided sophisticated analyses of the international system which, the ZfG group bemoaned, had been absent from antebellum Germany. Through the study of British India, Haushofer invited Germans to re-situate themselves in a world that had become global. This was a world in which the British Empire functioned as hegemon – and at its centre lay India. This meant that, whether in its dealings with Persia, its hostility towards Russia, France, and Germany, or its current suspicion of Japan and China, India formed the true concern of Britain’s foreign policy. So ran the argument of scholars such as Taraknath Das and Agnes Smedley, a white American émigré who had found refuge in Germany along with other (Indian) radicals involved in the so-called Hindu-German plot to oust British rule in India during the past world war.<sup>57</sup> With the German translation of Taraknath Das’s *India’s Position in World Politics*

(1922)<sup>58</sup> – published with an introduction by Karl Haushofer as *Indien in der Weltpolitik* (1932) – the foundations were laid for an alternative, counterfactual history. If British anxieties over the Berlin-Baghdad Railway giving land access to India had been the real *casus belli* in 1914, as Das claimed, and if Indian troops and revenues had brought Britain to victory, then the German defeat could have been avoided if only the Indians had refused their cooperation and produced an uprising in India instead, forcing Britain to deploy its troops there.<sup>59</sup> Significantly, only the German version of Das's book contained this analysis plus a summary of the Indian independence movement that had demonstrably become both relevant and proximate. In his introduction to Das, Haushofer raged against the liberal lie that 'the world war was fought for the liberation of oppressed peoples, the safeguarding of popular sovereignty, of democracy on earth'.<sup>60</sup> Long a staple of Indian nationalist critique, the untenable 'hypocrisy' of liberalism when articulated as the ideology of victor and colonist became a subject for Germans two decades before its popularization by 'Netaji' Subhas Chandra Bose's war time propaganda in Germany.<sup>61</sup> Haushofer introduced Germans to a discourse that was directed at someone else: these were Indians writing back at Britain *on Britain's own terms*, who, as Haushofer applauded, used English and not German footnotes<sup>62</sup> as 'reversed weapons of the enemy'.<sup>63</sup>

Haushofer's expectations of focusing on Sarkar's part of the world invariably looped back to Germany. However, to shine a single spotlight on Haushofer's 'self-Orientalization' conducted in a semantics of post-Versailles loss, as recently done by the historian Kris Manjappa, is to miss the point. Haushofer's India did not lie suspended in humiliation and disenfranchisement, because the identification it allowed did not exhaust itself in the moment of shared 'colonial' dejection that had inspired it after the war. Nor did India represent a staple of the 'archaic' and 'archetypal' soon to 'take revenge over the modern'.<sup>64</sup> Nor still did Haushofer share in the occultist, 'Ariosophist' appreciation of the ancient subcontinent, however great the fascination with Nazi paganism today among academics and laymen – and Neo-Nazis.<sup>65</sup> Haushofer expected Asia's geopolitical dynamism (another tradition might call it 'revolutionary') to ripple across the unfree world and into the core of *Mittleuropa* ('Middle Europe'). He therefore displaced discrete 'living spaces' in favour of globally interconnected, animated geographies. Ever more grandiloquent than his literary talent allowed, Haushofer wrote:

For the danger was close at hand that Inner- and Middle Europe would here again overlook a huge movement and not incorporate it into its conceptions of culture, power, and the economy – despite the fact that it [the movement] could renew its [Middle Europe's] old environment and help provide it with the freedom to breathe and national dignity – if it [Middle Europe] knows how to use these heavy swells in order to be carried by them, for which it would be a precondition that it [Middle Europe] first helps it [the movement in the Orient] to clear its path.<sup>66</sup>

This topples the "first in Europe, then elsewhere" structure of global historical time', which, as Dipesh Chakrabarty has convincingly argued, doomed colonies to the eternal 'waiting room of history'. By this historicist paradigm, India would remain under colonial tutelage until it could evince the presence of developments whose endpoint had already been achieved in the West – possibly, forever.<sup>67</sup> *Geopolitik* required that national liberation be effected in Asia, first.<sup>68</sup> But why exactly? Haushofer's explanation combined



flaming critique with a call to action: Middle Europe, fatigued and filled with ‘deep longing for more or less returning political statism’ after the war, had yielded itself to the ‘mutilation’ of its ‘life form’: soil. In contrast, Asia at the inflexion point of its ‘deepest humiliation’ and a ‘maximum of compression’, had snapped back into political reaction and dynamism.<sup>69</sup> Of the old civilization of India in particular, Haushofer ‘want[ed] to know above all else, what [was] still alive of the former powers in the India of today and what [wasn’t]’.<sup>70</sup> If Haushofer thereby deduced physical laws about the ‘resurgence of raped territories [*Erdräume*]’, then the locus of universalism had shifted to Asia.<sup>71</sup> The compliment was mutual. In 1926, Sarkar wrote in directly symmetrical terms to Haushofer: ‘India is quite well used to the sociology of subjection but she has forgotten the fact of “defeat.”’<sup>72</sup> ‘[A]s an instance of crushing defeat’, Germany constituted for Sarkar ‘a living laboratory for the investigation of processes in social causation’. That laboratory made national resurgence observable. Such transference and counter-transference can only be partially explained by techniques of modernization, which promised similar procurements of political emancipation and economic prosperity regardless of location. More fundamentally, Germany and India could teach each other the law of history, as one slave would be able to instruct another in the art of overthrowing their master. In this way, Germany triangulated India’s dialectical relationship with Britain.

The dominant identification of (especially but not exclusively) German geopolitics with statism, state-centrism, and geographic determinism cannot account for this *Geopolitik* of dynamism that was developed at the centre, rather than at the margins, of academic discussion in Weimar. A sense of the irreducibility of *Geopolitics* to a counter-hegemonic commitment motivates Manu Goswami to freely use ‘geopolitical’ as a descriptive term in an article that opposes the ‘extensively studied geopolitical theories of the [...] Nazi strategist Karl Haushofer’ with Sarkar’s internationalism, ignoring their direct relation. In this way, Sarkar’s project appears as ‘a mobilization of geopolitics against the geopolitical’.<sup>73</sup> The definitional exclusion of dynamism from geopolitics, which is based on the selective reduction of discursive evidence, has produced problems for historians and political theorists elsewhere, too. In at least one case, this was solved by the introduction of a differential criterion, “dynamic geopolitics”, for a special case of (American) geopolitics.<sup>74</sup> But such solutions leave the ‘normal case’ definition intact. Recent attempts to identify a new era of ‘postmodern’ geopolitics unmoored from these determinants on the eve of the twenty-first century, or to write dynamism back into geopolitical practice, are invited to revisit the border-transgressing dynamism that declared the cardinal distinction between ‘domestic’ and foreign’ defunct, and celebrated the brotherhood of the globally oppressed, already after the Great War.<sup>75</sup> Haushofer’s *Geopolitik* celebrated the ungovernability of socio-political movements precisely in their ability to shake statism and thereby produce openings for national emancipation. This *Geopolitik* regarded the state as insufficiently captured by the people, and applauded nationalist usurpations of the state.

The world of interconnections and the total exposure that emerged from this vision was not based on the global organization of capital, as globalization theory postulates.<sup>76</sup> *Geopolitik* as practiced by the ZfG and Benoy Sarkar alike was predicated on somewhat mystifying ‘world forces’, which were sooner brought into global orbit by people’s movements than by the state. Ideology mattered here as a driver of geopolitical movement. This ability of ‘the people’ to change the political status quo added a fourth dimension – that of time – to sterile geometrical calculations: geopolitics had become dynamic. It was their shared

geographic-temporal radicalism and their insistence on a global push forward that levelled geographic difference, that made such unlikely partners of the Bavarian and the Bengali, Benoy Sarkar. In the essay collection that made his name, *The Futurism of Young Asia* (1922), and throughout his career, Benoy Sarkar castigated the geographical and climatological essentialism of those who followed Bodin, Montesquieu, Buckle, and Hegel in viewing spaces as charged with ontic difference: spirit or ‘Geist’.<sup>77</sup> Among these he counted Friedrich Ratzel,<sup>78</sup> just as Haushofer had Halford Mackinder, whose attribution of ‘The geographical pivot of history’ (1904)<sup>79</sup> to the Old World disqualified him in the coming Pacific Age.<sup>80</sup> What drew Sarkar to Weimar *Geopolitik* was that its temporal dynamism promised emancipation from the vulgarized “geographical interpretation of history” that underlined since Kipling and for ever more: “East is East, and West is West”.<sup>81</sup> Disregarding the culturalist and racist aspects of *Geopolitik*, Sarkar was fully satisfied with its universalizing thrust.

An aspirational science, *Geopolitik* recommended manoeuvres in the objective relations between time and political space. In this way, Haushofer’s magnum opus with a circulation of 85,000 copies,<sup>82</sup> *Weltpolitik von Heute* (‘World Politics of Today’) locates the world politician in the temporal incision of 1918, from where he is ready to lunge ‘where apertures may gape in the distribution of power and earth, in which to place [his] feet for the new rise’.<sup>83</sup> Haushofer was invested in new global force fields whose ‘wrestling’ (*Ringgen*) made everyone – and, emphatically, India – a party to the coming war. This was a war which Haushofer not only believed to be inevitable but positively invited.<sup>84</sup> The past future<sup>85</sup> of *Geopolitik* appeared both pre-determined and open-ended; its realization was predicated on the act of becoming a geopolitician. Germany’s revival depended on the adoption among the masses of a mind-set that had previously been reserved for pioneers. Haushofer’s lecture notes preserve a sketch of German explorers like Alexander von Humboldt or ‘Engelbert Kämpfer-the most famous Japan-cultural-explorer-in Japan itself!’ as lonely visionaries and pioneers of creative drive – until the state and ‘popular consciousness’ (*Volksbewußtsein*), too, rallied behind their vision.<sup>86</sup> Haushofer already opted to use the term ‘cultural politics’ (*kulturpolitische Arbeit*) to describe this work, which did not involve the goal of fostering mutual understanding between cultures. Rather, it constituted a test of creative power that many contemporaries interpreted as a racial property. Germany, in Haushofer’s optic, triumphantly passed this test with its modernization of Japan’s military and forestry.<sup>87</sup> From its inception to its expiration amid the ashes of Hitler’s war, the concept of *Lebensraum* doubled as England’s imperial horizon, and pinpointed Germany’s inferiority complex towards England.<sup>88</sup>

Haushofer’s *Geopolitiker* thus corresponds to Sarkar’s Indian world citizen who opens him- or herself to the world, to act in it for India. As Satadru Sen has demonstrated, in Sarkar’s concept of *visvashakti* or ‘world-forces’,<sup>89</sup> cosmopolitanism meets conquest and the expansionism of Radhakumud Mookerji’s ‘Greater India’.<sup>90</sup> The ‘world-forces’ dispelled the past in view of the pre-eminence of the present and the synchronous world of international relations. Through their manipulation India could achieve independence and contribute to the ‘spiritual reconstruction of mankind’.<sup>91</sup> What appealed to Sarkar in Haushofer’s vision (and vice versa), was not an ideological commitment to cosmopolitanism or internationalism. Rather, their understanding of world history as a struggle for power as (national) life, with all the desperate overtones of racial extinction, formed the mutual point of attraction. The forces of ‘life’ required a buffed-up state for their

protection. This was no invitation for passivity for either man, however. Sarkar in particular required the individual to act as a telescoped collective by performing the self-referential task of vitality: this showed as dynamism in politics, economic production, cultural innovation. The Indian's thought was premised, perhaps ominously, on an ethics of contribution to the national work. This imperative meant that the political morality of action set the problematic for every 'creative' individual. From the manifold adoption of this directive sprang the political will. Signposting his co-optation of Haushofer's *Geopolitik* as the only viable political science in the war year 1941, Sarkar quoted-cum-translated Haushofer's words in *Raumüberwindende Mächte* ('Space-Transcending Powers') of 1934: 'The individuals have to decide for themselves as to whether they are to submit to existing facts (*Gegebenheiten*) or rule (*beherrschen*) them. The choice lies between resting on one's laurels and lying awake, between the anvil and the hammer.'<sup>92</sup> The Indian understood the rebellion of the global subaltern as the process of becoming *the hammer*, which he welcomed as the law of history. Though siding with this rebellion at every level, for Sarkar, all liberation required the organization of peoples into states. Rejecting the utopian offers of his time, he urged Indians to steer clear off the world-forces of 'humanity', 'internationalism', or socialism. These, he warned, only served to neuter geopolitical antagonism and derail India's national emancipation.<sup>93</sup>

Sarkar continued to sing the praises of *Geopolitik* until his death in 1949, but his last contribution to the German discourse came in a 'Festschrift' issue of the *ZfG* that marked the 70th birthday of its illustrious founder on August 27, 1939 – notably, just days before the beginning of the Second World War. As well as an ovation to Haushofer, Sarkar here clearly envisions his own project within the analytical terrain of *Geopolitik*. Like German conservative theorists of the state, he explains the nation and state as causally linked and racially undergirded: the group is born of the will, the *Volk* is born of the group, and the state is born of the *Volk*.<sup>94</sup> Since the *Volk* may burst through its borders not as a *Volk ohne Raum* ('People without Space')<sup>95</sup> but as a *Volk* willing to assert *Raum*, Sarkar could glorify the spread of Indians across the globe as a 'Greater India'. Its archetype was, of course, no longer the indentured Indian labourer but the self-possessed colonizer of all 'Greater' visions.<sup>96</sup> The present-day concept of 'diaspora' as global webs of displacement and suffering would have offended Sarkar's vision. Greater India proved Indian's 'spacious consciousness' (*raumweites Bewußtsein*), which Friedrich Ratzel had set as the necessary condition for state-building and hence survival.<sup>97</sup> Making a semantic concession to his German environment, Sarkar presented India's current geo-vision as a 'two-front-war' for political independence at home and legal emancipation in the countries where Indians themselves appeared as colonists.<sup>98</sup> Lastly, practicable geopolitics for India meant that the builders of India's future could not afford to 'overestimate' the political friend-enemy distinction: as economists Indians needed to be, as indeed they were, ideologically agnostic internationalists.<sup>99</sup> Signposts of national 'energism', economists had to become politicians perforce and capture the state along with its foreign policy.<sup>100</sup> Haushofer, in his own contribution to the *Festschrift*, agreed with Sarkar that *Lebensraum* also meant 'economic space' (*Wirtschaftsraum*).<sup>101</sup> As their contemporary the legal theorist Carl Schmitt noted, modernity was characterized above all by the diversion of war from the battle field into the economy.

Sarkar found his call for a 'realistic philosophy of the state' answered by Weimar *Geopolitik*. Haushofer's discipline, in Sarkar's optic, constituted a disenchanting science of the

state that could in the last instance dispense with the nation.<sup>102</sup> The Bengali spurned the romantic nation that was epitomized by the ‘cultish’ nationalism of Nazism and Fascism,<sup>103</sup> their more sober offerings in political thought – the Fascist doctrine of “‘The state creates the nation’” or Hitler’s admission that the German nation had not been formed by any ‘conscious or possibly even deliberate national Becoming (*Volkwerdung*)’ but by a primal act of state-making – notwithstanding.<sup>104</sup> Tied to the nation as blood to soil, Sarkar reserved particular ire for that ‘greatest superstition of Indian patriots’, the map of India.<sup>105</sup> A ‘hodgepodge’ of British annexations now threatened to become the *sine qua non* for India’s political future, as nationalists succumbed to ‘systematic blindness to the simple truism that there is no such country as India’. Nor need there be, for ‘the real and only legitimate basis of political differentiation is territorial’.<sup>106</sup> Unlike the sacred geography of Hindu nationalism,<sup>107</sup> the boundaries of Sarkar’s state did not need to coincide with those of the *Volk*. But this was no liberal indifference to the ‘stuff’ of the nation,<sup>108</sup> for Sarkar measured a people’s vitality or *śakti-yoga* by its ability to redraw the political map.<sup>109</sup> In their seminal books published within one year of each other in 1926 and 1927, Sarkar and Haushofer made an identical turn to what they posited to be the foundation of political sovereignty: the notion of the border.<sup>110</sup> By asserting the state within de-spiritualised borders first and foremost, Sarkar brilliantly switched the order of primacy for attaining political independence that had left India in such a deadlock over ‘nation’ and ‘race’.<sup>111</sup> The nation and state, would be forged by a community of will. Its extreme case could be the self-willing individual:

There is a state in posse, an embryonic nation, whenever and wherever the status quo of the powers that be is challenged by a group of armed human beings. To be extreme, the positive theory of nation-making would assert that even a single revolutionary militant, by his sheer existence happens to be the nucleus of a new state or nation.<sup>112</sup>

Sarkar envisioned the birth of the state in a supreme act of will that need not be contractual, and unpacks its inherent violence. As the state is born of violence, so it continues to live through violence. In this pronouncement, Sarkar was indebted to an earlier generation of Indian revolutionary nationalism as well as to the saturation of discourse with Nietzschean self-assertion. But unlike India’s revolutionary nationalists, Sarkar, not being a political practitioner himself, nor, therefore, violent in his practice, asserted the primacy of the state.

#### 4. 1933: the end of Germany’s tutelage

In voicing his appeal to Germans through India, Haushofer straddled an ambiguity. On the one hand, India served as a model for Germany’s resurgence. On the other, it allowed Germans to join in the civilizational and racial superiority of the British in India. Racial belonging and geopolitical positioning diverged, exactly, on the Great War. If the deployment of colonial troops and ill-advised liberation rhetoric had roused India from slavish ‘half-slumber’, as Haushofer accused,<sup>113</sup> then the liquidation of that white ‘self-laceration’ ensured that defeated Germany must now side with the colonized.<sup>114</sup> Because what mattered for Haushofer was firstly, the construction of an overarching ontology and secondly, a manual of rule, rather than a political ethos, he failed to take an ideological stance on India. Instead, he invited Germans to side with the

present mutiny in the colonies, and to leapfrog that present to glimpse their own future as colonizers, a role for which they would be well-apprenticed by Indian actions and British blunders. Special value therefore came to books written by British administrators. *The Lost Dominion*<sup>115</sup> by Al Carhill (a pseudonym for the Briton Bennet Christian Huntingdon Calcraft-Kennedy) in particular proved inescapable for Haushofer's readers from its publication in 1924. Promptly translated into German by Haushofer's wife Martha<sup>116</sup> and published by Vowinckel press at Haushofer's urging,<sup>117</sup> Karl's preface to the book invited readers to regain, by way of India's example, a trust in national recovery and emancipation from the British dictate.<sup>118</sup> Yet Carhill seemed decidedly ill-fitted to tutor Germans on the Indian movement, as he denied the existence of an Indian nation altogether. Instead, he explained Britain's inevitable loss of India as the result of a continuous lapse of judgement on the part of the British. Indian nationalism was but a 'phony product' that, unsourced by a positive national essence, remained purely reactionary in its hatred of Western influence, capable only of destruction, and not, it was implied, state-building and governance.<sup>119</sup> Carhill made no attempt to conceal his disgust.

The tension was resolved only with Hitler's rise to power in 1933: the *Geopolitiker* welcomed it as proof of Germany's regeneration, the Nazis aestheticized it as a 'revolution' that defeated communism and held out the prospect of another revolution yet to come.<sup>120</sup> Now, Germany's position in a world of empires needed readjustment. The contributors to the ZfG immediately took to discussing new colonies for Germany; Haushofer's vacillation between the two subject positions offered to him by Carhill's India shifted to that of colonizer. That year, a bracketed '(Lost dominion!)' – like an outcry, no longer in need of reference – sufficed for the signifier to meet its signified.<sup>121</sup> Triumphant, malicious even, was its identification by Haushofer as a 'symptom of the flagging English will to Empire [*Reichswillen*]' in *Weltpolitik von Heute*.<sup>122</sup> If Carhill was to be corrected on his view of the origin of British rule in India in trade, when the truth was 'blood, violence, and deception',<sup>123</sup> then this was given a further, self-revelatory twist in 1936: 'A liberal people cannot rule, that is why England is losing India'.<sup>124</sup>

If one followed Indian denunciations of British rule as did the Haushofer group, then imperialism effectively reaffirmed slavery as the basis of the political. But slavery was not only dismissed by all modern political thought, but Haushofer himself regarded crude colonialism to be 'technically no longer justifiable' in 1926.<sup>125</sup> Yet, betraying the anti-colonial cause in his introduction to Das, he already asserted in 1932 that a colony was not be inherited but 'something to be won anew with each generation!'.<sup>126</sup> The colonial drive represented an innate national trait whose loss signified a loss of national vigour. In this way, 'India was first lost in the heart of the British', opined a frequent contributor to the ZfG in 1933.<sup>127</sup> International politics in this imaginary left no subject position but that of victor or loser, colonizer or colonized. The *Geopolitiker* were not the first to conclude that it was not the meek who shall inherit the earth. Writing from the epoch of decadence, Paul de Lagarde, hailed by Alfred Rosenberg as the great 'seer' of the Third Reich, found the elixir of eternal youth for the nation in each generation fighting for, and being sublimated anew, by ever-new national missions.<sup>128</sup> Sarkar, not to be repelled, judged that '[i]n the midst of all internationalizing ideologies,' Haushofer's *Geopolitik* alone remembered 'that the eternal problem of today is, as our Mahābhārata has taught for all ages, to study the science of *Macht*, i.e. *shakti* or power'.<sup>129</sup> He prepared the Indian student of *Geopolitik* to therein 'come across such dicta of Somadeva's *Nītvākyaṃrīta* as *na hi kulagatā*

*kasyāpi bhūmih* (nobody's territory is derived from his family) and *vīrabhogyā vasandharā* (It is by the powerful that the earth can be enjoyed). This was no wonder, for Haushofer had found to *Macht* precisely as *shakti* in the trenches of the Great War. Noting in his war diary how he felt the 'horrors' of war 'gnaw at the tender roots of [his] strength', Haushofer turned to the *Bhagavad Gita*, the central battle related in the *Mahabharata*, to find resolve for dutiful action.<sup>130</sup> He would have encountered the epic in its 1912 translation by the Indologist Leopold von Schroeder,<sup>131</sup> whose various cross-fertilizing with Richard Wagner's son-in-law Houston Stewart Chamberlain produced a distinctly Aryan Gita, which told of the Aryan duty to wage war against the un-Aryan.<sup>132</sup> By this ancient example, Haushofer meant to become 'Aryan' so as to finally pacify an inner conflict that he externalized as one of 'racial souls': 'Battle within me of the 2 races: "the corroding mind that can never construct" (demon), as Semitic patrimony, a[nd] the brazen strong synthetic drive, the metaphysical-creative urge of the Aryan tribe.'<sup>133</sup> Following the desire for psychological wholeness, Haushofer's arrival at *Geopolitik* may be read as the victory of the constructive 'soul'.

Haushofer's understanding with Sarkar survived his reduction of the polyvalence of 'India'. In the decisive 1933 volume of the *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik*, the appearance in India of a sympathetic (and almost certainly misquoted) article titled 'From Fichte to Hitler' afforded its author, Sarkar, much praise.<sup>134</sup> The following issue reproduced the probably identical 'Von Herder zu Hitler' in Haushofer's own translation.<sup>135</sup> Indian approval of the *Machtergreifung* came as a timely counter-narrative to the generous circulation in the English press of Hitler's derision towards India in *Mein Kampf*.<sup>136</sup> In a letter to his former protégé and Hitler's deputy in the NSDAP Rudolf Hess, Haushofer put the ideology of *Geopolitik* in opposition to the Nazi 'race', fuming that if the Nazis could not temper their racist rhetoric to give the Japanese 'noble race' (*Edelrasse*) and the 'coloured Aryan' their due, then even that 'poorest friend in India, Sarkar' would be alienated.<sup>137</sup> Thankfully, Sarkar's article presented a favourable story of Germany's historical ascent to national freedom, which brought its young marchers to purposefully zigzag from romantic rekindling to economic sobriety as the situation demanded.<sup>138</sup> The apex of this development formed Hitler's revolution, which came 'not a moment too soon' given the 'moods of Marxist defeatism and despondency'.<sup>139</sup> The problem to whose solution Hitler was called, Sarkar characterized as one of foreign politics: Germany's borders needed reconstituting, as did 'German national honour' in the eyes of the world.<sup>140</sup> Both doubled as psychological exercises. Sarkar's article was to be read in conjunction with an excerpt from Herder's *Schulrede* 'Von der Annehmlichkeit, Nützlichkeit und Nothwendigkeit der Geographie' (On the pleasantness, utility and necessity of Geography), with which it communicated across the issue.<sup>141</sup> Seducing a generation of *Geopolitiker*,<sup>142</sup> Herder here posited that 'geography is the basis of history, and history is nothing but the geography of times and of peoples, set in motion'.<sup>143</sup> Following Kant, Herder viewed geography in close connection with anthropology as central to the question of 'Being' (*Sein*). Introducing the transcendental principle of *Kraft* or 'force' that manifests itself in a 'geography of becoming',<sup>144</sup> Herder offered geography up to historicism. In 1933, that history had arrived at its vanishing point in the new Germany.

As the German and Indian geopoliticians saw it, the world was divided into the haves and the have-nots. On one side stood aligned the nations that possessed (Wilsonian)<sup>145</sup> self-determination, space enough for 'breath expansion' (*Atemweite*), prosperity and

‘racial’ vitality, and on the other, those that did not. To contest such liberal crosshatchings as Benoy Sarkar’s project has recently received,<sup>146</sup> it serves to appreciate this vision was of one piece with the restoration and entitled retribution – markedly, a project of racial justice – imagined by the Weimar have-nots.<sup>147</sup> With the downtrodden lay all geopolitical ‘dynamisms’ that sent the ‘forces of renewal’ (*Mächte des Erneuerns*) out to defeat the ‘forces of persistence’ (*Mächte des Beharrens*), represented by the League of Nations. This international system was now under attack by the ‘innovator[s], the breaker[s] of old tablets’, as ever so many Zarathustras and National Socialists re-writing the world order in Germany, Italy, and Japan.<sup>148</sup> To Haushofer, men like Sarkar were the Indian Zarathustras. Sarkar in his turn dreamed of eternal rejuvenation by the global cross-fertilization of Faustian souls.<sup>149</sup> Statism signified death, battle signified life. The battle fronts were drawn in such a way that Haushofer, in 1933, could even devise a visual representation for a Fascist International: one had to juxtapose a world map of self-determined nations in international law with a ‘world map of National Socialism’, and colour-graduate the intensity and ‘radiation’ of their German-style dynamisms.<sup>150</sup> In 1933, time itself was on the (spatial) move, in Germany and notably, too, in India.<sup>151</sup> Again, India served as a metaphoric terrain for Haushofer’s operations, this time, to savour Germany’s triumph in the temporal imminence of India’s following suit: ‘Has the Cobra really been transformed into a harmless slow worm? How mistaken was the world about its true nature! – Until it bites!’<sup>152</sup> The seismic waves now originating in Middle Europe would soon overthrow colonial rule in Asia.

## 5. Conclusion

The importance of the Great War for thinking temporality in the interwar period can hardly be overestimated. *Geopolitik* insisted that the global strife for emancipation, only seemingly disparate and disjointed, actually reverberated across the globe by mechanical ‘impacts at a distance’ (*Fernwirkungen*), as Haushofer’s *Festschrift* was fittingly titled. The arrival of the global shifted the grounds of sovereignty as they it had been laid by Grotius,<sup>153</sup> opined Sarkar in 1926: ‘the role of the omnipotent state’ is ‘gradually diminishing’.<sup>154</sup> In geopolitical discourse, sovereignty came to be defined as the power of dealing with a foundational extra-territoriality through foreign policy, the military, and national economy. Early exposure to their global condition taught the Indian and German *Geopolitiker* to fortify the nation-state, dominate other states, or be pushed aside. As Haushofer mused in his war diary, haunted by humiliation as by the spectre of extinction:

From the perceptions that push into our consciousness a[nd] displace each other a[nd] out of which each excludes every other, to the state structures, where every existing structure [?] cheats countless others out of its opportunity for realisation – [*illegible*] battle for existence!<sup>155</sup>

Recent scholarship has shed light on the genealogy of spatial thinking, it has readdressed (restored or refuted) the place of geopolitics within it. As one scholar has argued, the ‘spatial turn’ of the 1970s and 80s itself should itself be understood as an overdue rebuke of historicism, and therefore the primacy of time over space, in the study of history.<sup>156</sup> As I have tried to show, the spatial argument of *Geopolitik*, which produces a temporal vector as it cuts across geography – dynamism – anticipates this development by decades. *Geopolitik* was a globalisation theory before the term, and before the bomb.<sup>157</sup>

## Notes

1. Sprengel, *Kritik der Geopolitik*, 15–26.
2. *Ibid.*, 25.
3. It is debatable whether Hitler ideas would have required derivation from Haushofer. Their connection was mediated by Rudolf Hess, who became Haushofer's devoted disciple in 1919 but decided against an academic career to become Hitler's personal secretary in 1925. The influence debate hinges on Hitler's and Hess's imprisonment in Landsberg prison in 1924: Hess's role in the writing of *Mein Kampf*, and possible encounters between Hitler and Haushofer. Strong positions on Haushofer as Hitler's mentor and factual co-author have been taken by Hipler, *Hitlers Lehrmeister*, and Herwig, *The Demon of Geopolitics*, and repudiated by Plöckinger, *Adolf Hitler's "Mein Kampf"*, 143–6. See also Smith, *American Empire*, 274–5, 283–4.
4. As an example of this, see Smith, *Origins of Nazi Imperialism*, 218–23.
5. Bashford, "Haushofer's Geopolitics," 122, 137.
6. Gearóid Ó Tuathail and Simon Dalby, Introduction to *Rethinking Geopolitics*, 2.
7. Manjapra, *Age of Entanglement*, 199–204.
8. Geppert and Kössler, "Zeitgeschichte als Aufgabe," 11.
9. Sprengel, *Kritik der Geopolitik*, 27–8; see also Murphy, *The Heroic Earth*, 24.
10. Hölscher, "Von leeren und gefüllten Zeiten," 61; Corfield, "Time and the Historians," 85.
11. Haushofer, Introduction to *Geschichte der nationalen Bewegung*, xi. See also Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 5, no. 1 (1928), 11.
12. Braudel, *The Mediterranean World*.
13. Vowinckel, "Geopolitik als Wissenschaft," 24.
14. Corfield, "Time and the Historians," 80.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Murphy, *The Heroic Earth*, 127–8, 107.
17. *Ibid.*, 23.
18. *Ibid.*, 131–2.
19. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Geopolitik, "Denkschrift," 302. All translations from the German are my own.
20. Haushofer, "Geopolitik von Groß-Südostasien," 329.
21. On the role of geopolitics in Germany's agitation for colonial repossession, see Murphy, "Space, Race."
22. Haushofer, *Grenzen*, 229.
23. Haushofer, *Das erwachende Asien*, 112–4, 121.
24. Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*.
25. Haushofer, "Das Erwachen des Ostens," 32.
26. Bashford, "Haushofer's Geopolitics;" Spang, *Haushofer und Japan*.
27. Cf. Manjapra, *Age of Entanglement*, 200–4; Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*, 97, 107, 114.
28. Sarkar, *Futurism of Young Asia*.
29. Manjapra, *Age of Entanglement*, 201.
30. Lautensach, "Literaturbericht," 447.
31. No title, *IfZArch*, MA 619.
32. Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 5, no. 3 (1928), 207.
33. Bashford, "Haushofer's Geopolitics," 122.
34. Haushofer, Introduction to *Geschichte der nationalen Bewegung*, xi.
35. *Ibid.*, xi.
36. Haushofer, "Physische Erdkunde," 441.
37. Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 5, no. 6 (1928), 470.
38. See for example Haushofer, *Weltpolitik von heute*, 20.
39. Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 5, no. 8 (1928), 632.
40. Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 5, no. 12 (1928), 997: 'Indologie und Sinologie zeigen zur Verzweigung von Männern, die in der chinesischen und indischen Bewegung in den betreffenden



- Ländern führend sind, ein Indien und China vor zwei und vier Jahrtausenden in bengalischer Beleuchtung, und die Dynamik von heute und morgen bleibt dabei im dunkeln.’
41. Sarkar, introduction to *Die Lebensanschauung des Inders*, n.p.; Sen, *Deutschland und indische Wirtschaft*, 9–10.
  42. Sartori, “Beyond Culture-Contact”, 68–84.
  43. On Sarkar, cf. Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*, 11.
  44. Sarkar, *The Sociology of Population*.
  45. See for example Haushofer, “Bericht,” *ZfG* 13, no. 6 (1936), 398.
  46. Haushofer, Manuscript (1945), in *Lebensweg 1869–1949*, 259.
  47. Significantly, Vowinckel’s Indian publications predate Nazi Germany’s sponsorship of an eight-volume handbook on India as part of the war effort: Vowinckel (ed), *Indien in Einzeldarstellungen*. Cf. Kuhlmann, *Subhas Chandra Bose*, 161–3.
  48. Haushofer, “Bericht,” *ZfG* 5, no. 5 (Mai 1928), 378.
  49. Haushofer, “Literaturbericht,” *ZfG* 5, no. 2 (1928), 184–5.
  50. Goswami, “Imaginary Futures”, 1456.
  51. Deutsche Akademie [to ‘Ew. Hochwohlgeboren?’], n.d., PA AA, RZ 504, R 64066.
  52. Technische Hochschule München, *Unterrichtsplan 1930/31 (1930)*, 89.
  53. Deutsche Akademie [to ‘Ew. Hochwohlgeboren?’], n.d., PA AA, RZ 504, R 64066.
  54. Sarkar [to Ulrich?], November 27, 1930, PA AA, RZ 504, R 64066.
  55. Freudenberg to Ulrich, May 2, 1931, PA AA, RZ 504, R 64066.
  56. Thierfelder to Freudenberg, March 14, 1930, PA AA, RZ 504, R 64066; Freudenberg to Ulrich, Mai 2, 1931.
  57. Smedley, “Indien als entscheidender Faktor,” 391.
  58. See Manjapra, *Age of Entanglement*, 206.
  59. Das, *Indien in der Weltpolitik*, 55, 200–5.
  60. Haushofer, Introduction to *Indien in der Weltpolitik*, 10: ‘der Weltkrieg sei zur Befreiung der unterdrückten Völker, zum Sichermachen der Volksherrschaft, der Demokratie auf Erden geführt worden’.
  61. In Berlin from 1941, the former Congress leader Bose parlayed with Germany, Italy and finally Japan to support India’s invasion by a liberating force of Indian POWs captured by the Axis powers: see Hayes, *Subhas Chandra Bose*; Kuhlmann, *Subhas Chandra Bose*.
  62. Manjapra states the opposite for his Indo-German ‘entanglements’: *Age of Entanglement*, 200.
  63. Haushofer, Introduction to *Indien in der Weltpolitik*, 12.
  64. Manjapra, *Age of Entanglement*, 201–2.
  65. For an example of this, see Kurlander, “The Orientalist Roots?,” 157; Goodrick-Clarke, *Hitler’s Priestess*. As is endemic in the discussion of Haushofer, his claim to the ‘occult,’ derives from his student Rudolf Hess’s involvement in the Thule Society and other vestiges of Nazi paganism. For Haushofer, this has been exposed as fictional: Goodrick-Clarke, *Occult Roots of Nazism*, 219–21.
  66. Haushofer, Introduction to *Geschichte der nationalen Bewegung*, ix: ‘Denn die Gefahr lag nahe, daß Inner- und Mitteleuropa auch hier wieder eine gewaltige Bewegung übersehen und nicht in sein Kultur-, Macht- und Wirtschaftsbild einstellen würde – und das, obwohl sie seine alte Umwelt erneuern und ihm selbst wieder zu Atemfreiheit und nationaler Würde verhelfen könnte – wenn es den Wogengang zu nützen weiß, um sich von ihm tragen zu lassen, wozu aber freilich Vorbedingung wäre, daß es ihm vorher hilft, sich freie Bahn zu schaffen.’
  67. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 8.
  68. Haushofer, “Südostasiens Wiederaufstieg zur Selbstbestimmung,” 19–20.
  69. Haushofer, “Das Erwachen des Ostens,” 17.
  70. Haushofer, “Das Indien von heute,” 123.
  71. Haushofer, “Südostasiens Wiederaufstieg zur Selbstbestimmung,” 2, 19.
  72. Sarkar, *Economic Development*, 48.
  73. Goswami, “Imaginary Futures”, 1485.

74. Rosenboim, "The Emergence of Globalism", 77.
75. I am here thinking of Ó Tuathail, "The Postmodern Geopolitical Condition", 167; Starr, "On Geopolitics".
76. See above all Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*.
77. Sarkar, *Futurism of Young Asia*, 15–6. On the European intellectual history attacked by Sarkar, see Günzel, "Geographie der Aufklärung (Teil 1)"; idem, "Geographie der Aufklärung (Teil 2)".
78. Sarkar, *The Sociology of Population*, 12.
79. Mackinder, "Geographic Pivot of History."
80. Haushofer, "Geopolitische Breiten- und Längsdynamik," 291.
81. Sarkar, *Futurism of Young Asia*, 315–6.
82. Spang, *Karl Haushofer und Japan*, 181.
83. Haushofer, *Weltpolitik von heute*, 23.
84. Haushofer, Introduction to Das, *Indien in der Weltpolitik*, 12.
85. Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft*.
86. Haushofer, "5. Deutsche Zeugen", 24: 'Engelbert Kämpfer-der berühmteste Japan-Kulturschliesser-in Japan selbst!'
87. Ibid., 30.
88. See for example Koellreutter, *Grundriß der allgemeinen Staatslehre*, 29.
89. Sarkar, *Creative India*, 476 (German words bracketed and italicized in the original).
90. Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*, 9.
91. Sarkar, *Futurism of Young Asia*, 306–7.
92. Sarkar, *Villages and Towns*, 539.
93. Sarkar, *Futurism of Young Asia*, 31–2.
94. Sarkar, "Grundfragen der Geopolitik," 631. Cf. Koellreutter, "Grundriß der allgemeinen Staatslehre," 263: 'Aus dem Volksgeist entwickelt sich der Volkswille, durch den sich politisch ein Volk im Staate zur Nation formt.'
95. Grimm, *Volk ohne Raum*.
96. Sarkar, "Grundfragen der Geopolitik," 632–3.
97. Sprengel, *Kritik der Geopolitik*, 76.
98. Sarkar, "Grundfragen der Geopolitik," 633.
99. Ibid., 634–5, 637.
100. Sarkar, *The Politics of Boundaries*, vii.
101. Vowinckel, "Zum Begriff Lebensraum," 638–9.
102. Sarkar, *The Politics of Boundaries*, 7–8.
103. Ibid., 7–8.
104. Prinzing, "Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus," 9–10.
105. Sarkar, *The Futurism of Young Asia*, 344.
106. Ibid., 343.
107. Goswami, *Producing India*, 11; Ramaswamy, "Visualizing India's Geo-Body," 154.
108. Cf. Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*, 31, 54.
109. Sarkar, "Grundfragen der Geopolitik," 631.
110. Sarkar, *The Politics of Boundaries*; Haushofer, *Grenzen*.
111. Cf. Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*, 5.
112. Sarkar, *The Politics of Boundaries*, 18.
113. Haushofer, Introduction to *Indien in der Weltpolitik*, 10.
114. Haushofer, "Literaturbericht," *ZfG* 4, no. 2 (1927). This was a common trope: cf. Rosenberg, *Der Mythos*, 646.
115. Carthill, *The Lost Dominion*.
116. Carthill, *Verlorene Herrschaft*.
117. Haushofer, *Grenzen*, 229–30.
118. Haushofer, Introduction to *Verlorene Herrschaft*, 12.
119. Carthill, *Verlorene Herrschaft*, 154.
120. Clark, "Time of the Nazis," 163.

121. See for example Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 10, no. 7 (1933), 434.
122. Haushofer, *Weltpolitik von heute*, 220.
123. Ibid.
124. "Geopolitik: die Bücher," n.p.
125. Haushofer, "Das erwachende Asien," 119.
126. Haushofer, Introduction to *Indien in der Weltpolitik*, 12.
127. Ross, "Kolonien?," 264.
128. Rosenberg, *Der Mythos*, 457–8.
129. Sarkar, *The Sociology of Population*, 13.
130. Haushofer, no title, BArch N 1122/167, fol. 234. On the Bhagavad Gita and the making of the Indian 'political', see Kapila and Devji, eds., *Political Thought in Action*.
131. Leopold von Schroeder, Introduction to *Bhagavadgita*, iv–v.
132. Deeg, "Aryan National Religions," 68. On becoming Aryan, cf. Chamberlain, Preface to the third edition of *Arische Weltanschauung*, 8: '... nicht darauf kommt es an, ob wir "Arier" sind, sondern darauf, daß wir "Arier" werden. In dieser Beziehung bleibt ein ungeheures Werk an uns allen zu vollbringen: die innere Befreiung aus dem uns umfassenden und erstickenden Semitismus.' [... what matters is not whether we are 'Aryans' but that we become 'Aryans.' In this regard, there remains an enormous work to be performed on us: the inner deliverance from the semitism that envelops and suffocates us.]
133. Haushofer, no title, BArch N 1122/167, fol. 238: 'In mir Kampf zwischen den 2 Rassen: "dem zersetzenden Verstand der nicht aufbauen kann" (demon), als semitischen Erbeil, u. dem ehernen starken synthetischen Trieb, dem metaphysisch-schöpfer. Bedürfniss [sic] des arischen Stammes.'
134. Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG*, 10, no. 8 (1933), 487.
135. Sarkar, "Von Herder zu Hitler." An enlarged version was published in English as Sarkar, *The Hitler-State*. See also Sartori, "Beyond Culture-Contact," 83; Zachariah, "A Voluntary Gleichschaltung?," 70.
136. Sarkar, "Von Herder zu Hitler," 526.
137. Haushofer to Hess, October 23, 1933, in Jacobsen, *Lebensweg 1869–1946*, 150.
138. Sarkar, "Von Herder zu Hitler," 527.
139. Sarkar, *The Hitler-State*, 5.
140. Sarkar, "Von Herder zu Hitler," 529–30.
141. The title is misquoted in the *ZfG* as Herder, "Über Schönheit und Nützlichkeit der Geographie."
142. Günzel, "Geographie der Aufklärung (Teil 1)," 73.
143. Herder, "Über Geographie," 565: 'Geographie ist die Basis der Geschichte, und die Geschichte ist nichts als in Bewegung gesetzte Geographie der Zeiten und der Völker'.
144. Noyes, *Herder*, 41–2.
145. Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment*.
146. Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*; Goswami, "Imaginary futures".
147. Ibid., 8.
148. Haushofer, *Weltpolitik von heute*, 64.
149. Sarkar, *Futurism of Young Asia*, 37.
150. Haushofer, *Der nationalsozialistische Gedanke*, 12–13.
151. Haushofer, "Bericht," *ZfG* 10, no. 9 (1933), 547–8.
152. Ibid.: 'Hat sich die Kobra wirklich in ein harmloses Blindschleichen verwandelt? In welchem Irrtum befand sich doch die Welt über ihre wahre Natur! – Bis sie beißt.'
153. For a spatial re-reading of Grotius, see Brett, "The Space of Politics".
154. Sarkar, *The Politics of Boundaries*, vii–viii, ix.
155. Haushofer, no title, BArch N 1122/167, fol. 237: 'Von den Vorstellungen, die sich in unser Bewusstsein drängen u. sich gegenseitig verdrängen u. von denen jede eine andere ausschliesst, bis zu den Staatenbildungen, wo jedes seiende Gebilde [?] unzählige andere um die Verwirklichungsmöglichkeit bringt – [illegible] Kampf ums Dasein!'
156. Schlögel, *Im Raume*, 64.

157. While the nuclear bomb hailed the global age of wholesale extinction for Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers, (Devji, *The Terrorist*, 11–2) Haushofer dated it already to the turn of the twentieth century: Haushofer, “Das Erwachen des Ostens,” 35.

## Acknowledgments

This article owes a debt of gratitude to a number of people, most of all to Shruti Kapila and Alison Bashford. It has benefited from discussion with or Rosenboim. Special thanks go to the conveners of the Graduate Conference on ‘The Concept of Space in the History of Political Thought’ held at Cambridge University on 2 June 2017, as well as to the anonymous referees acting for this journal.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

*Luna Sabastian* is, at the time of publication, completing a PhD at the University of Cambridge on Indian political thought in the global context of Germany’s fascism. Her research spans Indian political thought, Hindu nationalism, neo-Hinduism, global fascism and Weimar political thought.

## References

- Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Geopolitik. “Denkschrift: Geopolitik als nationale Staatswissenschaft.” [Exposé: Geopolitics as National Political Science]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 10, no. 5 (1933): 301–304.
- BArch N 1122/168 (Zum Lebenslauf K. H., 1914–1918). Bundesarchiv, Koblenz.
- Bashford, Alison. “Karl Haushofer’s Geopolitics of the Pacific Ocean.” In *The Atlantic World in a Pacific Field: Effects and Transformation Since the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Kate Fullager, 120–143. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars’ Press, 2012.
- Becker, Hermann, “Geopolitik und Wirtschaft.” [Geopolitics and Economics]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 4, no. 1 (1927): 84–89.
- Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Brett, Annabel. “The Space of Politics and the Space of War in Hugo Grotius’s *De Iure Belli Ac Pacis*.” *Global Intellectual History* 1, no. 1 (2016): 33–60. doi:10.1080/23801883.2016.1228175.
- Carhill, Al. *The Lost Dominion*. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1926.
- Carhill, Al. *Verlorene Herrschaft: Wie England Indien aufgab* [Lost Dominion: How England Gave up India]. Translated by Martha Haushofer. Berlin-Grunewald: Vowinckel, 1924.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. *Preface to the Third Edition of Arische Weltanschauung*, 8–9. 3rd, revised and enlarged ed. Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1916.
- Clark, Chris. “Time of the Nazis: Past and Present in the Third Reich.” In *Obsession der Gegenwart: Zeit im 20. Jahrhundert* [Obsession of the Present: Time in the 20th Century], edited by Alexander C. T. Geppert and Till Kössler, 156–187. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Corfield, Penelope. “Time and the Historians in the Age of Relativity.” In *Obsession der Gegenwart: Zeit im 20. Jahrhundert* [Obsession of the Present: Time in the 20th Century], edited by Alexander C. T. Geppert and Till Kössler, 71–91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Das, Taraknath. *Indien in der Weltpolitik* [India in World Politics]. Translated by Paul Fohr. München: Callway, 1932.

- Deeg, Max. "Aryan National Religion(s) and the Criticism of Asceticism and Quietism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." In *Asceticism and its Critics: Historical Accounts and Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Oliver Freiberger, 61–87. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Devji, Faisal. *The Terrorist in Search of Humanity: Militant Islam and Global Politics*. London: Hurst, 2008.
- "Geopolitik: die Bücher des Kurt Vowinckel Verlags GmbH" [Geopolitics: Books by Vowinckel Press L.L.C.]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 13, no. 12 (1936): n.p.
- Geppert, Alexander C. T. and Till Kössler. "Zeitgeschichte als Aufgabe." [Contemporary History as Mission]. In *Obsession der Gegenwart: Zeit im 20. Jahrhundert* [Obsession of the Present: Time in the 20th Century], edited by Alexander C. T. Geppert and Till Kössler, 7–36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. *Hitler's Priestess: Savitri Devi, the Hindu-Aryan Myth, and Neo-Nazism*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. *The Occult Roots of Nazism: The Ariosophists of Austria and Germany 1890–1935*. Wellingborough: Aquarian, 1985.
- Goswami, Manu. "Imaginary Futures and Colonial Internationalisms." *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 5 (2012): 1461–1485.
- Goswami, Manu. *Producing India: From Colonial Economy to National Space*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Grimm, Hans. *Volk Ohne Raum* [People Without Space]. München: Albert Langen, 1926.
- Günzel, Stephan. "Geographie der Aufklärung: Klimapolitik von Montesquieu zu Kant (Teil 1)." [Geography of the Enlightenment: Climate Politics from Montesquieu to Kant (Part 1)]. *Aufklärung und Kritik* 11, no. 2 (2004): 66–91.
- Günzel, Stephan. "Geographie der Aufklärung: Klimapolitik von Montesquieu zu Kant (Teil 2)." [Geography of the Enlightenment: Climate politics from Montesquieu to Kant (Part 2)]. *Aufklärung und Kritik* 12, no. 1 (2005): 25–47.
- Gwynn, John Tudor. *Indian Politics: A Survey*. London: Nisbet, 1924.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Haushofer, Karl. "Bericht über den Indopazifischen Raum." [Report on the Indo-Pacific Region]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik*, Various Volumes and Issues.
- Haushofer, Karl. "Das erwachende Asien." [Awakening Asia]. *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* 24, no. 2 (1926): 97–122.
- Haushofer, Karl. "Das Erwachen des Ostens zu panasiatischen Ideen im XX. Jahrhundert." [The Awakening of the East to Pan-Asian Ideas in the XX. Century]. BArch R 90/131, Bundesarchiv, Berlin-Lichterfelde.
- Haushofer, Karl. "Das Indien von heute." [Present-Day India]. *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* 24, no. 2 (1926): 123.
- Haushofer, Karl. *Der nationalsozialistische Gedanke in der Welt* [The National Socialist Idea in the World]. München: Callway, 1933.
- Haushofer, Karl. "5. Deutsche Zeugen." [5. German Witnesses]. IfZArch, ED 310. Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München.
- Haushofer, Karl. "Geopolitische Breiten- und Längsdynamik." [Geopolitical Dynamism of Latitude and Longitude]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 20, no. 8 (1943): 291–293.
- Haushofer, Karl. *Grenzen in ihrer geographischen und politischen Bedeutung* [Borders in Their Geographic and Political Significance]. Berlin: Kurt Vowinckel, 1927.
- Haushofer, Karl. "Grundzüge der Geopolitik von Groß-Südostasien." [General Outline of the Geopolitics of Greater South-East Asia]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 20, no. 9 (1943): 328–330.
- Haushofer, Karl. Introduction to *Geschichte der Nationalen Bewegung im Orient* [History of the National Movement in the Orient], by Hans Kohn, ix–xi. Berlin: Vowinckel, 1928.
- Haushofer, Karl. *Introduction to Indien in der Weltpolitik* [India in World Politics], by Taraknath Das, 7–13. Translated by Paul Fohr. München: Callway, 1932.

- Haushofer, Karl. *Introduction to Verlorene Herrschaft: Wie England Indien aufgab* [Lost Dominion: How England Gave up India], by Al Carthill, 9–12. Translated by Martha Haushofer. Berlin: Kurt Vowinckel, 1924.
- Haushofer, Karl. “Literaturbericht über den Indopazifischen Raum.” [Literature Review of the Indo-Pacific Region]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik*, Various Volumes and Issues.
- Haushofer, Karl. “Physische Erdkunde als Grundmauer der Geopolitik.” [Physical Geography as the Foundation of Geopolitics]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 5, no. 5 (1928): 441–445.
- Haushofer, Karl. “Südostasiens Wiederaufstieg zur Selbstbestimmung.” [South East Asia’s Resurgence to Self-Determination]. In *Zur Geopolitik der Selbst-Bestimmung in Südost-Asien* [On the Geopolitics of Self-Determination in South East Asia], edited by Karl Haushofer and Josef März, 19–162. München: Rösl & Cie, 1923.
- Haushofer, Karl. “Verpflichtung zum klaren Weltbild.” [Commitment to the Comprehensible Worldview]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 20, no. 1 (1943): 1–7.
- Haushofer, Karl. *Weltpolitik von Heute* [World Politics of Today]. Berlin: Zeitgeschichte, 1934.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von. *Herders sämtliche Werke* [Herder’s Collected Works], edited by Bernhard Suphan. 33 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1877–1913.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von. “Über Schönheit und Nützlichkeit der Geographie (Auszug aus seiner Schulrede).” [On the Beauty and Utility of Geography (Excerpt from His School Speech)]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 10, no. 9 (1933): 564–565.
- Herwig, Holger. *The Demon of Geopolitics: How Karl Haushofer “Educated” Hitler and Hess*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.
- Hipler, Bruno. *Hitlers Lehrmeister: Karl Haushofer als Vater der NS-Ideologie* [Hitler’s Mentor: Karl Haushofer as the Father of NS Ideology]. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1996.
- Hölscher, Lucian. “Von leeren und gefüllten Zeiten: Zum Wandel historischer Zeitkonzepte seit dem 18. Jahrhundert.” [Of Empty and Filled Times: On the Change of Historical Concepts of Time Since the 18th Century]. In *Obsession der Gegenwart: Zeit im 20. Jahrhundert* [Obsession of the Present: Time in the 20th Century], edited by Alexander C. T. Geppert and Till Kössler, 37–70. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- IfZArch MA 619 (Haushofer, Karl und Albrecht). Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München.
- Jacobsen, Hans-Adolf, ed. *Ausgewählter Schriftwechsel 1917–1946* [Selected Correspondence 1917–1946]. Vol. 2 of *Karl Haushofer: Leben und Werk* [Karl Haushofer: Life and works]. Boppard am Rhein: Boldt, 1979.
- Jacobsen, Hans-Adolf, ed. *Lebensweg 1869–1946 und ausgewählte Texte zur Geopolitik* [Life’s Journey 1869–1946 and Chosen Texts on Geopolitics]. Vol. 1 of *Karl Haushofer: Leben und Werk* [Karl Haushofer: Life and Works]. Boppard am Rhein: Boldt, 1979.
- Kapila, Shruti, and Faisal Devji, eds. *Political Thought in Action: The Bhagavad Gita and Modern India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space 1880–1918: With a New Preface*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Koellreutter, Otto. *Grundriß der allgemeinen Staatslehre* [Outline of the General Theory of the State]. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.
- Koellreutter, Otto. “Grundriß der allgemeinen Staatslehre (1933) — (Auszug).” [Outline of the General Theory of the State — (Excerpt)]. In *Rechtfertigungen des Unrechts: Das Rechtsdenken im Nationalsozialismus in Originaltexten* [Justifications of Injustice: Legal Thought Under National Socialism in Original Texts], edited by Herlinde Pauer-Studer and Julian Fink, 263–267. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2014.
- Kohn, Hans. *Geschichte der nationalen Bewegung im Orient* [History of the National Movement in the Orient]. Berlin: Vowinckel, 1928.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* [Future Past: On the Semantics of Historical Times]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995.
- Kuhlmann, Jan. *Subhas Chandra Bose und die Indienpolitik der Achsenmächte* [Subhas Chandra Bose and the India Policy of the Axis Powers]. Berlin: Schiler, 2003.
- Kurlander, Eric. “The Orientalist Roots of National Socialism? Nazism, Occultism, and South Asian Spirituality, 1919–1945.” In *Transcultural Encounters Between Germany and India: Kindred*

- Spirits in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, edited by Joanne Miyang Cho, Eric Kurlander, and Douglas T. McGetchin, 155–169. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Lautensach, Hermann. “Literaturbericht über Werke erdumspannenden und systematischen Inhalts.” [Literature Review of Books of Earth-Spanning and Systematic Content]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 5, no. 5 (1928): 447–452.
- Mackinder, H. J. “The Geographical Pivot of History.” *The Geographical Journal* 23, no. 4 (1904): 421–437.
- Manela, Erez. *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Manjapra, Kris. *Age of Entanglement: German and Indian Intellectuals Across Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Murphy, David Thomas. *The Heroic Earth: Geopolitical Thought in Weimar Germany, 1918–1933*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1997.
- Murphy, David Thomas. “Space, Race and Geopolitical Necessity: Geopolitical Rhetoric in German Colonial Revanchism, 1919–1933.” In *Geography and Empire*, edited by Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith, 173–187. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Noyes, John K. *Herder: Aesthetics Against Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.
- Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. “The Postmodern Geopolitical Condition: States, Statecraft, and Security at the Millennium.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, no. 1 (2000): doi:10.1111/0004-5608.00192.
- Ó Tuathail, Gearóid, and Simon Dalby. *Introduction to Rethinking Geopolitics*, edited by Gearóid Ó Tuathail and Simon Dalby, 1–15. London: Routledge, 1998.
- PA AA, RZ 504 (Wissenschaft), R 64066. Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes, Berlin.
- Peukert, Detlev. *Die Weimarer Republik: Krisenjahre der klassischen Moderne* [The Weimar Republic: Crisis Years of Classical Modernity]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1987.
- Plöckinger, Othmar. *Geschichte eines Buches: Adolf Hitler’s “Mein Kampf” 1922–1945* [History of a Book: Adolf Hitler’s “Mein Kampf” 1922–1945]. München: R. Oldenbourg, 2006.
- Prinzing, Albert. “Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus: 7. Vortrag der Reihe ‘Deutschland und Italien’ des Deutschen Auslandswissenschaftlichen Instituts 3. März 1942.” [Fascism and National Socialism: 7th. Lecture in the Series ‘Germany and Italy’ by the German Institute of Foreign Studies March 3, 1942]. BArch R 4902/1581 (Deutsches Auslandswissenschaftliches Institut). Bundesarchiv, Berlin-Lichterfelde.
- Ramaswamy, Sumathi. “Visualising India’s Geo-Body: Globes, Maps, Bodyscapes.” *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 36, no. 1&2 (2002): 151–189.
- Rohrbach, Paul. *Erwachendes Asien: Geschautes und Gedachtes von einer Indien- und Ostasienreise 1932* [Awakening Asia: Visions and Thoughts from a Trip to India and East Asia 1932]. München: F. Bruckmann, 1932.
- Rosenberg, Alfred. *Der Mythos des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts* [The Myth of the Twentieth Century]. München: Hoheneichen, 1939.
- Rosenboim, Or. “The Emergence of Globalism: Competing Visions of World Order in Britain and the United States, 1939–1959.” *PhD diss.*, University of Cambridge, 2014.
- Ross, Colin. “Kolonien? Erinnerung an eine Südseefahrt.” [Colonies? Memories of a South Pacific Cruise]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 10, no. 5 (1933): 257–269.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *Creative India: From Mohenjo Daro to the Age of Ramakrsna-Vivekananda*. Lahore: Motilal Banarsi Dass, 1937.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *Die Lebensanschauung des Inders* [The Indian View of Life]. Leipzig: Markert & Petters, 1923.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *Economic Development*. Madras: The Kesari Printing Works, 1926.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *The Futurism of Young Asia and Other Essays on the Relations Between the East and the West*. Berlin: Julius Springer, 1922.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. “Grundfragen der Geopolitik,—angewandt auf das indische Volk.” [Basic Problems of Geopolitics,—Applied to the Indian People]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 16, no. 8/9 (1939): 631–637.

- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *The Hitler-State: A Landmark in the Political, Economic and Social Remaking of the German People*. Calcutta: The Insurance and Finance Review, 1933.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *The Politics of Boundaries and Tendencies in International Relations*. Calcutta: N.M. Ray Chowdhury, 1926.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *The Sociology of Population*. Calcutta: N.M. Ray-Chowdhury, 1936.
- Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. "Von Herder zu Hitler: Nach einem Vortrag über Jung-Deutschland am 14.06.1933 in Calcutta: Einführung und Übersetzung von K. Haushofer." [From Herder to Hitler: Based on a Lecture on Young Germany on 14/06/1933 in Calcutta: Introduction and Translation by K. Haushofer]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 10, no. 9 (1933), 526–530.
- Sartori, Andrew. "Beyond Culture-Contact and Colonial Discourse: 'Germanism' in Colonial Bengal." In *An Intellectual History for India*, edited by Shruti Kapila, 68–84. Cambridge: Foundation Books, 2010. doi:10.1017/UPO9788175968721.006.
- Schlögel, Karl. *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit: Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik* [We Read Time in Space: On the History of Civilisation and Geopolitics]. München: Carl Hanser, 2003.
- Schroeder, Leopold von. *Bhagavadgita: Des Erhabenen Sang* [Bhagavad Gita: Song of the Sublime]. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1912.
- Sen, Satadru. *Benoy Kumar Sarkar: Restoring the Nation to the World*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2014.
- Sen, Sudhir. *Deutschland und die indische Wirtschaft* [Germany and the Indian Economy]. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Encke, 1937.
- Smedley, Agnes. "Indien als entscheidender Faktor der Weltpolitik." [India as a Decisive Factor in World Politics]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 2, no. 6 (1925): 385–403.
- Smith, Neil. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Smith, Woodruff D. *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Spang, Christian W. *Karl Haushofer und Japan: Die Rezeption seiner geopolitischen Theorien in der deutschen und japanischen Politik* [Karl Haushofer and Japan: The Reception of his Geopolitical Theories in German and Japanese Politics]. München: Iudicium, 2013.
- Sprengel, Rainer. *Kritik der Geopolitik: Ein deutscher Diskurs 1914–1944* [Critique of Geopolitics: A German Discourse 1914–1944]. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.
- Starr, Harvey. "On Geopolitics: Spaces and Places." *International Studies Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2013): 433–439. doi:10.1111/isqu.12090.
- Stoddard, Theodore Lothrop. *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1920.
- Technische Hochschule München. *Unterrichtsplan 1930/31 (1930)* [Curriculum 1930/31 (1930)]. Munich: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Dr. C. Wolf & Sohn, 1930.
- Thiel, T. A. "Die großen Mächte in Ostasien." [The Great Powers in East Asia]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 5, no. 11 (1928): 946–955.
- Vowinckel, Kurt. "Geopolitik als Wissenschaft: Gedanken zum Beginn des dritten Jahrzehnts deutscher Geopolitik." [Geopolitics as Science: Thoughts at the Beginning of the Third Decade of German Geopolitics]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 21, no. 1 (1944): 19–29.
- Vowinckel, Kurt, ed. *Indien in Einzeldarstellungen* [India in Single Depictions]. 8 vols. Heidelberg: Vowinckel, 1942–1943.
- Vowinckel, Kurt. *Kurt Vowinckel Verlag 1923–1973: In fünfzig Jahren ... ist alles vorbei* [Kurt Vowinckel Press 1923–1973: In fifty years ... it's all Over]. Neckargemünd: s.n., 1973.
- Vowinckel, Kurt. "Zum Begriff Lebensraum." [On the Concept of Living Space]. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* 16, no. 8/9 (1939): 638–639.
- Wiersbitzky, Kurt. *Südostasien: Ein Kampffeld der Zukunft zwischen Weiß, Rot und Gelb* [South East Asia: A Future Battlefield Between White, Red and Yellow]. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1938.
- Wirth, Kurt. *Das größere Ostasien* [Greater East Asia]. Berlin: Kurt Vowinckel, 1942.
- Zachariah, Benjamin, "A Voluntary Gleichschaltung? Perspectives from India Towards a Non-Eurocentric Understanding of Fascism." *Transcultural Studies*, no. 2 (2014): 63–100. doi:10.11588/ts.2014.2.15554.

All translations from the German are my own.