

Nadja Messerschmidt*

MINORITY POLICY AND SOCIOLOGY IN GERMAN AND POLISH DEMOCRACY IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD

Introduction

When I use the term *Minority Sociology* I use a term by German authors Kern (1982), Heckmann (1992), Estel/Mayer (1994), Imhoff (1994), which means nationality studies – certain sociological empirical research – in the mixed population areas after the First World War on the German and Polish side. These studies are rather unknown subjects in history of sociology in Germany mainly because of the lack of connection the between historical and sociological research on the German side and because of the foreign Polish language and the lack of connection with international policy on the Polish side. Therefore the term *Minority Sociology* is only a hint; Kern (1982), for example, summarizes this tradition of social science generally under the term of social technique – and the contents and political aims of German minority research as well as the empirical studies during the Interwar Period by Humanistic sociologists, their intentions and especially the differences not mentioned.

My subject opens up the field of Interwar Period Sociology for further research. In this paper I would like to begin by giving some known historical facts for the installation of new sociological institutes in Interwar Period in German Reich and Poland too. Secondly, I would like to discuss some main German studies in this scientific field. What kind of minority policy can we learn from these studies? Thirdly, I will give an overview of the institutional defence against Polish nationality research on the German side. Finally, I would like to show the matter of official representation of Polish Minority Sociology as enemy-propaganda (Auslandspropaganda), which we can reconstruct based on German sociological studies and archival materials.

*Nadja Messerschmidt – PhD in sociology, Berlin, nadja_messerschmidt@web.de

1. The installation of new sociological institutes in German Reich and Poland after the First World War

In the Interwar Period – after the recognition of the Second Polish Republic – many new sociological institutes for empirical research were installed in German Reich and Poland. The common aim of these new founded sociological institutes was strengthening the national minority rights. The main German institutes were: Hochschule für Politik, Berlin/Politisches Kolleg und Institut für Grenz- und Auslandsstudien (M. H. Boehm), Geographisches Seminar, Universität Breslau (R. S. Steinmetz), Institut für Agrar- und Siedlungsforschung, Berlin (M. Sering), Institut für Statistik der Minderheitsvölker, Universität Wien (W. Winkler). The main Polish institutes were: Instytut Sociologii, Poznań (F. Znaniecki), Instytut Gospodarstwa Społecznego, Warszawa; Instytut Badań Spraw Narodowościowych, Warszawa; Naukowy Instytut Żydowski; Instytut Śląskiej, Katowice; Instytut Bałtycki, Toruń.

These institutes had their subjects on minorities on the lost or gained territories with their mixed-population areas on the German and Polish side firstly because of the changed territorial map:

Poland regained its old territorial borders, nearly like those from the period before the first partition. In fact, there were many regions formed as nationally mixed regions: German-Polish, Ukrainian-Polish, White Russian-Polish and Lithuanian-Polish regions as the borders with German Reich, Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

Secondly, the political order changed: The *Wilson's 14-Point-Programme* after the First World War recognized the international Independence of the Second Polish Republic and its free and guaranteed admittance to the Baltic Sea with the international administration of Danzig; the *Locarno Treaties* intended the stabilization of the western borders of German Reich with the Entente; the struggle for minority rights in the eastern border regions between German Reich and Poland was supposed to be solved by the *League of Nations* and its *section of minority right* within Germany and Poland was represented from 1926 until 1933; we know the enforcement of riparian state policy by Stresemann and Briand until 1926. Moreover, we know about the international Movement of *Pan-European Union* by Coudenhove-Calergi from 1926 until 1932 with the aim to stabilize the eastern border of Central Europe by France, which was to play the same role as Great Britain in the West by Treaties of Locarno (so-called Locarno II) and their connection with the sociological research¹.

¹To the Pan-European Movement s. Chodorowski 1999, Ziegerhofer-Prettenthaler

Thirdly, the economical order changed: Germany had to afford reparations according to the Dawes plan from 1924.

Fourthly, there were strong nationalist movements in the Interwar period in Germany and Poland as well: the Polish Socialists intended the assimilation of the German minority in Poland by passive political instruments – like agricultural laws – and the reconstruction of Jagellonian Union connected with historical claims against Lithuania, Ukraine, White Russia within a federal multi-confessional state. The National Democrats had historical claims against the East *and* the West and that is why they were in conflict with the Socialists and their only claim to the East within a Polish national state. They intended the territorial closure of Great Poland (Posen, West and East Prussia, and Silesia) and the western expansion as the historical mission by Piast legitimation, which was to reach the reslavization of East Prussia; it should have become a relatively autonomous republic with the help of a strategic pact with Russia aiming at the expansion to Prussia and Galicia and loosing its German minority by active political instruments, whereas from 1926 the reconstruction of Jagellonian Union within a central national state was intended without this pact².

German nationalist pressure groups on the other side – so-called *Deutschtumsverbände* – undermined the League of Nation with the policy of revision. But what kind of policy was it? What were the patterns of this policy of revision?

My main thesis is: The mentioned institutes in German Reich and in the Second Polish Republic were rooted in different – old and new – political contexts: in the context of the old policy proclaimed by anti-republican circles in Germany in the connection with the First World War and in the context of the Pan-European movement in Poland (and other countries too). This difference – the difference between old and new contexts – generated the conflict between Minority Sociology in Germany and in Poland and their aims. As a result it led to the conflict between two types of empirical research according to intended Minority policy and resulted in the defence and displacement of Polish empirical sociological research.

What do the German minority studies tell us about this conflict? Why and how were the Polish studies mentioned and represented, and what do the German archives especially tell us? Why were Polish sociologists seen as the representatives of enemy propaganda – so-called *Auslandspropaganda*?

2003, also „Europäische Einigungsbewegungen”, in: Brockhaus Enzyklopädie 1972: 780.

²S. Krasuski 1975: 130, Lawaty 1986: 56-60, 74-83, Roos 1986: 62 f., 118 f., Kotowski 1998: 83-85, 96-116, Walicki 2000: 12-46, Gehrke 2001: 115-127, 258-266, 302-339, 341 f., also Boysen 1998: 120-123.

When we analyze the German sociological studies in this field we can find out the Minority policy which is inscribed into those studies. That is the political-historical level of my subject. What kind of minority policy and global aims can we read from the studies? Furthermore: both sides used different concepts, terms and methods within different international political contexts. That is the scientific-historical level of my subject. What concepts, terms, data and methods were used; especially how was the term *nationality* on the German side defined and used?

2. German Minority policy against Poland

People's land registry, Census of Deutschtum and the Nationality statistics of Wilhelm Winkler, Settlement-research of Max Sering and other studies belonged to the so-called eastern-research (*Ostforschung*) with its long tradition in the 19th century³. After the First World War this kind of *Deutschtumsforschung* (the research about German minorities in East-European countries and Russia too) was reinstalled under the leadership of *Deutscher Schutzbund* – a pressure group and product of the First World War. This pressure group proclaimed the „East German Republic” and „East state” in 1918/19, organized the plebiscites in 1920 and integrated many national pressure groups and scientific institutes in the Interwar Period – especially the research on topics like German damages because of territorial losses: juristic, ethnographical, geographical, cultural, economical, historical, statistical research – and included its own sociological institutes⁴.

Until 1933 under the leadership of *Deutscher Schutzbund* – the former *Deutschtumsforschung* – adopted a very aggressive form of Ethno policy and had – as its practical side – its own structures of organizations, own communities with own political, cultural and economical aims, the so-called *Deutschtumsarbeit*⁵ with its main centre in Bromberg (so-called 5er Ausschuss der Deutschen Partei) around the *Deutschtumsbund zur Wahrung*

³The term „Ostforschung” is mainly located in the Historian Sciences, s. especially Zernack 1979, Zernack 1992, Voigt 1959, 1978, Kuebart 1980, Oberkrome 1993, Mühle 1997, Burkert 2000; in the German Historiography in 19th and 20th century s. Zernack 1979, Hellmann 1979, Wippermann 1981; in the so-called „Osteuropaforschung” during the Weimar Republic and Nationalsocialism s. Kleßmann 1984, Burleigh 1988; also Krekeler 1973, Fahlbusch 1994, Kocka 1994. – In Sociology the terms „Minderheitensoziologie” or „Soziologie der interethnischen Beziehungen” are used like mentioned above. In this paper the subject here is the German sociological tradition of the so-called „Volks- und Deutschtumsforschung” which was defined during the Interwar Period as nationality sciences, s. Robinson 1928.

⁴S. Schulze 1970: 123-163; s. also Krekeler 1973.

⁵The term „Deutschtumsarbeit” was mainly used as a synonym for „Volkstumsarbeit” or „Deutschtumpflege” for the cultural and economical support of the German minori-

der Minderheitenrechte in Polen supported from the German Reich and the *Volkstumsbund* supported from Austria.

The first example I discuss here is people's land registry ordered from Deutscher Schutzbund in 1927 of German settlements in Galicia, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Slovakia, later of a part of Romania (Siebenbürgen), whole Poland and parts of Soviet Union as descriptions of populations⁶. The data was handled as „statistical primary data” (so-called Stammrollen or statistisches Urmaterial) and later the Nazis could use it. How did the registers work?

The people's land registry used the census of Pomeranian people by Franz Semrau (1927) as model⁷. This census defined Pomerania as a room of German culture in the comparison and against the Polish census in 1921. This census described the *nationality* by belonging to the state and faith – that census defined a *language nation*. The census handled objective dates of mother language and confessional dates as subjective dates of belonging to a German cultural community. In this way Cashubes, Masurian People and Czechs were included as Germanized people. The census data of the Minority census of 1910 and protestant and catholic church register as basic data, and described with a various criteria the organization of the „legal” (located and displaced) people in comparison to the Polish official census of 1921. The people's land registry of Galicia, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Slovakia now – in 1927 – were installed to give a picture of the real and the expected relations of power according to the growing or declining danger of Polonization and Slavization.

The people's land registry used two questionnaires:

1. The first questionnaire gave a description of the economical and social situation of German minority in Galicia against the danger of Polonization because of the conflict between Polish and Ukrainian people.

ties, s. Krekeler 1973. S. especially documents in the Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes/Abteilung VI: Kultur – Deutschtum im Ausland (PAAA): Denkschrift Deutscher Schutzbund und Deutsche Stiftung über die Regelung der Arbeit für das Deutschtum im In-, Grenz- und Ausland, 27.07.1921, in: PAAA R 60434; Denkschrift des Deutschen Schutzbundes vom April 1922, „Die Deutschtumspflege. (Vorschläge für eine einheitliche Regelung der gesamten Deutschtumsarbeit im In- und Ausland)”, in: PAAA R 60435; Boehm 1928: „Die nationale Bedeutung des deutschen Vereinswesens” (in: Die im Deutschen Schutzbund zusammengeschlossenen Verbände und ihre Veröffentlichungen. Eine Übersicht von H. Praesent, 1928, Deutscher Schutzbund Verlag), in: PAAA R 60356.

⁶S. document: Richtlinien für die Aufstellung von Ländergrundbüchern, Loesch/Freytag, 07.07.1927, in: PAAA R 60318. The authors were Franz Heckel and Victor Wagner.

⁷S. document: Semrau (1927) „Das Deutschtum in den Wojewodschaften Posen und Pommerellen”, in: PAAA R 31012; s. also Zieliński 1996: 101-124.

Census data of Polish, Ukrainian, German, Jewish people in all districts was collected; the movement of population was described by age, faith, absolute and relative dates of birth and death; the data for the social economical and cultural organization was the number of children, illnesses, schools and business.

2. The second questionnaire gave a description of the social organization in South Slavia (Yugoslavia) against the dangers of Slavization and Hungarian integration. Serbs, Croats and Slovenians were seen as *State nations* and got separated from the German population defined as *minority* because of another language and faith. The relation between State nation and minority was described with scales from the „pure” German settlement to „mixed” settlements and their comparison; national leaders, German organizations, business movements and the closeness of population in comparison to the state nations gave a picture of measures of Germanization.

Why were these masses of data collected?

Firstly: The collection of demographical and sociological materials should strengthen the cultural autonomy of German minorities in Poland and other countries too. This aim was legitimated by the law of cultural autonomy of Estonia in 1917⁸; the construction of „überstaatliche Volksgemeinschaft”⁹ as a subject of international law was discussed by the European Nationality Congress (Hannah Arendt (1951) mentioned it). The archival materials about the *Deutschtumsbund zur Wahrung der Minderheitenrechte in Polen* (1921-1932, during the First World War *Deutscher Volksrat*, later *Deutsche Partei*, from 1923 *Deutsche Vereinigung für Sejm und Senat*; Pendantorganization *Volksbund* in Austria) tell us, that on this basis a whole organization of Deutschtum – as German cultural community – was installed in Poland with its own vote systems, national leaders and special rank administration¹⁰.

⁸S. Kelmes 1958: 45-58. The law of cultural autonomy of Estonia is published in: Kraus 1927: 188-199, 199-208.

⁹The term „überstaatliche Volksgemeinschaft” was introduced by Deutscher Schutzbund in 1920 and used by Europäischer Nationalitätenkongreß in petitions adressed to the League of Nations in 1920, 1928, 1930, 1931 and 1933, s. Kelmes 1958: 50, 168-189, 225-239; s. also Michaelsen 1984. S. also Ammende 1931 and documents: Deutsche Beschwerden, Polen, in: PAAA R 60561 ff, PAAA R 95677.

¹⁰These are the following documents in Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde (BABL)/Abteilung II: Vorschlag einer Neuorganisation des deutschen Volkstums in Polen, 1923/24; Richtlinien für die Schaffung einer deutschen Kulturautonomie, 19.12.1924; Kirchenverfassung, 1925; Organisation des deutschen Volkstums, Wegener,

Secondly: The strength of the cultural autonomy of German minorities in Poland and other countries was planned against Russian expansion in Central Europe. The actual political background was the Treaty of Rapallo, the Baltic policy of Stresemann, the entrance of Germany and Poland into the League of Nations and the closer connections of the National Democrats with France from 1926. So the people's land registry accompanied the constructive Baltic policy of Stresemann to give this policy an expansive, aggressive direction. The archival material from 1927 tells us under the terms of *European* and *German aims* about the aims of this research: the exclusion of a French-Baltic-union by the help of implantation a closed room of settlement together with the whole group of *Auslandsdeutschtum* and the economical leadership of *Great Germany*. A new order of Europe was planned on the basis of a corporate ethnic group right, which could guarantee the claim of that state and its borders. – We can say, that the common aim of the government and nationalist pressure groups to exclude a French-Baltic-union combined with the projected change of territories during this time – Lithuania and Memel against Danzig and Weichselcorridor – legitimized this kind of research. Later the studies were used against the *Auslandspropaganda* of the Poles in France by the Stiftung für Volks- und Kulturbodenforschung¹¹.

Thirdly: The Deutscher Schutzbund underlined the key role of German bor-

18.3.1925, in: BABL R 8043/133.

¹¹S. Hiden 1991: 69-81. S. documents: Ostbesprechung Deutscher Schutzbund, 1927, Europäische Zielsetzung, 17.03.1927, Deutsche Zielsetzung, 17.03.1928, in: PAAA R 60319; Reichminister des Innern/Reichsverkehrs-minister, Abschrift: Wissenschaftliche Bearbeitung der Grenzziehungsfolgen, 27.07.1927: „Die Arbeit des Deutschen Schutzbundes, mit dem ich in volkspolitischen Fragen ständige Verbindung halte, ist im wesentlichen politisch eingestellt und dient vorwiegend Aufklärungszwecken. Die auf dem Gebiete der Deutschumsforschung tätigen Universitätsprofessoren können sich daher um der Objektivität der Wissenschaft halber in der Regel an dieser Schutzbundarbeit nicht beteiligen. Ich vermag hiernach den DSB für die wissenschaftliche Bearbeitung der Grenzziehungsfolgen nicht heranzuziehen. Im übrigen ist jedoch sein Vorsitzender Mitglied der Stiftung für deutsche Volks- und Kulturbodenforschung in Leipzig und dadurch die Möglichkeit, die Endergebnisse der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit dieser Stiftung für die politische Tätigkeit des Schutzbundes nutzbar zu machen (gegeben). (D)ie polnischen Gelehrten haben sich jüngst in Warschau zu einer Gegenarbeit gegen die deutsche Wissenschaft zusammengeschlossen, um durch Herausgabe von Gegenschriften in französischer Sprache die Wirkung der deutschen Aufklärung wieder wettzumachen. Bei dem Rückhalt, den die polnische Wissenschaft in Genf und den Internationalen wissenschaftlichen Organisationen in Paris hat, ist die Folge solcher Arbeit nicht gering zu achten. Ich lege daher Wert darauf, unbeeinflusst von politischen populären Strömungen die Ergebnisse der Forschung ausschließlich durch die Stiftung in Leipzig gewinnen zu lassen“, in: PAAA R 60318. S. also document: Denkschrift Schutzbund 10.01.1927, in: PAAA R 60317.

der minorities and installed a complete structure of propaganda into the Deutsche Reich.¹² In this context the constitution of Estonia – the law of cultural autonomy – was seen as a model for the aim of the constitutional restoration of Poland. The main aim was a unitary federal state under the German hegemony with its basis on German border minorities – ethnic, racial and faith difference would be overcome and a Polish buffer state against the Soviet Union should include Poland into this concept by the occasion of a conflict. Polish people would become Germanized. – Therefore the other term *Europe between* (*Zwischeneuropa*) defined a closed united settlement room between the German and Russian border which could have been used as the basis for the unity of Germany and Austria¹³. In this way Germany would be a stronger and more reliable partner for the allies than a homogenous Polish national state or a Pan-European union, which would dissolve the European world of states in a split federal structure¹⁴.

The second example I discuss here is the *Nationality statistics* by Wilhelm Winkler at the University of Vienna. This sociological instrument was developed and used from 1923 as a so-called „Fight-“ or „Struggle statistic“ for the expected entrance of Germany into the League of Nations¹⁵. It was developed as an alternative form of census and functioned in competition to the official Polish and Czech census. The Nationality statistics wanted to correct this census data. How, what were their main terms and measures?

Firstly: „Volkstum“ was defined as a language-, descent- und cultural community; the term defined the German minorities as a whole collective.

Secondly: Winkler raised the question „What nationality do you feel you belong to?“ In the First World War this question was developed due to the problem of bilingual speakers; later, plebiscites used the same question in the Nationality statistics and made in such a way subjective decisions to an object of international law. Winkler handled the answers as subjective

¹²S. document op. cit.: Denkschrift über die Regelung der Arbeit für das Deutschtum im In-, Grenz- und Ausland, Deutscher Schutzbund und Deutsche Stiftung, 27.07.1921.

¹³The term „Zwischeneuropa“ was mainly used by Stiftung für Volks- und Kulturbodenforschung and by settlement researches and politicians, s. documents in Stadtarchiv Leipzig (SAL) in: Stiftung für Volks- und Kulturbodenforschung, Kap. 4 Nr. 30 (ab 1926), Kap. 36 Nr. 174 (ab 1927); Denkschrift Sering, Das Nationalitätenprinzip, 1918, in: Bundesarchiv Koblenz (BAK) N 210, Bd. 56. S. also Jaworski 1992: 38 f, Battaglia 1954, Palmer 1970, Burleigh 1988: 3-43.

¹⁴S. document: Burkhardt, Die politische Aufgabe der deutschen Minderheit in Polen, Denkschrift vom 11.04.1925, in: BABL R 8043/133.

¹⁵S. Winkler 1923. To the tradition of Language Statistic s. Kleeberg 1915, to the use of the results by Europäischer Nationalitätenkongress s. Winkler 1952.

confessions. The principle of a subjective confession was used for nationality census and was combined with the descriptions of masses (the comparison of a mother language, colloquial speech, national belonging and religious confession described the relation between the Nation (majority) and minority (nationality) and socio-economical structures between them. The objective data of a language and subjective data of nationality-belonging (confession) broke off social or economical influences and handled this category as a category of justice. By means the term nationality was introduced as a category of international law and policy.

Thirdly: This kind of census was the basis for the description of minorities as collectives. Winkler saw the reason for that necessity in the difference of language and state-frontiers. German minorities were seen as language islands or groups. The frontiers of a language were described within the new state-borders and this was evident in the relation of majorities and minorities. This kind of census method was able to describe the German cultural community and its development in opposition to the state. Especially this method was the basis for the defined differences between minorities: so-called expansive (Eroberungs-), immigrant (Einwanderungs-) and home (erbgessesene) minorities – and only the last should have got minority rights – the others were to lose their rights. The census data was seen in comparison to Polish and Czechoslovakia official census of 1921 and wanted to install petitions for minority rights into the League of Nations; they were seen as statistics for the description of the development of *Deutschtum* and used as the right of veto against the integration of German minority in the new East European states. The method of Nationality statistics was varied for many regional studies, for example in former Congress Poland.

It is evident, that the German Minority policy of Interwar Period translated the aims of German and Austrian War policy – the foundation of a Polish buffer state against Russia /Soviet Union – under the new political circumstances in terms of culture and as political aims. Border revisions were mentioned, but this was not the main and direct aim. The unity of the German cultural nation and the enforcement of minority rights were the topics. So the methods of research have to explain the connection of German ethnic groups and the connection with their mother or homeland.

3. Institutional defence against Polish expansion to the West and minority research on the German side

The commission *Landeskundliche Kommission*, founded by von Beseler, the governor-general of Warsaw in 1915, marked the beginning of scientific works – especially economical, ethnographical and historical works – about Poland with the aim to cut off the connection with Russia¹⁶. Which international context was the German nationality research in Interwar Period placed?

From 1923 the Pan-European policy – a large movement with prominent members by the diplomat Coudenhove-Calergi and supported by Stresemann and Briand until 1932 – planned a federal pact of European states from Portugal to Poland against the expected weakening of Europe because of the growing conflict between Great Britain and Russia in terms of their influence upon Central Europe. In the largest frame this federation wanted to make Europe stronger against the influence of USA and Asia. That is why especially the German-French-question (about Rhine, Saar, reparations, colonies and the Polish Corridor too) had to be solved and its solution could only be reached via the German-Polish agreement. So the Pan-European policy wanted to loosen the German-French question upon the corridor out of dual relations and move it on a higher, international level, where Poland got a new key role for Peace policy in Central Europe¹⁷.

These aims of Pan-European movement gave the reason for the German side to install special practices of defence against the Polish expansion to the West and research. We can reconstruct it with following activities:

- East congress by Deutscher Schutzbund from 1920¹⁸
- Funds for scientific counter-propaganda, from 1922¹⁹

¹⁶S. documents: Schriftwechsel Beseler/Reichskanzler, Erforschung Polens, Warschau, 27.10. 1915, Schriftwechsel Beseler/Penck, in: BAK N 210, Nr. 121, „Aktion zur Förderung der Auslandsstudien“, in: SAL DZA II, Rep. 76, Va, Sekt.1, Tit. VII, Nr. 84; Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 36 und Nr. 69; Sekt. 4, Tit. IV, Nr. 50.

¹⁷„The French-German-Polish pact, and Czech automatically too, is the basis of Pan-Europe.“ (original German) in: Coudenhove-Kalergi 1927: 6; s. especially Ziegerhofer-Prettenthaler 2003: 75-84, 131-156, 201-209, 464-473.

¹⁸S. documents: Osttagungen des Deutschen Schutzbundes, ab 1920, in: PAAA R 60317-60319.

¹⁹Einrichtung des Fonds für wissenschaftliche Abwehrpropaganda, 1922, in: PAAA R 60430.

- National political tasks of sciences (K. C. Loesch, 1922)²⁰ – scientific political congress by Mittelstelle für zwischeneuropäische Arbeit / Stiftung für Volks- und Kulturbodenforschung
- cultural and scientific political outlines east-central-European cultural policy (M.H. Boehm, 1927)²¹
- General cultural political outlines (K. C. Loesch, 1928)²²
- antitheses works by the Publikationsstelle Dahlem, which had to watch all new Polish works together with Ostforschungsinstitut/Ostlandberichte²³.

4. The official representation of Polish minority sociology as enemy-propaganda – „Auslandspropaganda”

From 1926 the Pan-European frame created the National Democrats possibility to put Polish interests over the German ones, because Poland got the French protection of its Eastern borders. Behind this nationalistic background the German-Polish conflict was focused upon Pomerania and the Polish Corridor, which was seen as the basis for the development of Poland by Polish politicians, historians and sociologists too. If on the other hand now – accordingly to German interests – the territorial belonging of Pomerania to Poland was modified, then the border definitions of the Entente would lose their character as compromise, a danger and expectation formulated by Florian Znaniecki in „The sociology of the struggle for Pomerania” (1934/translated from Polish 1931):

„Poland does not only tend to maintain Pomerania, but to utilize it for a free political and economic expansion by way of the Baltic Sea. Pomerania has, thus, not only the usual significance of a fragment of the state territory, but it plays also the role of a special instrument for the development of the state group. (...) If the expansive tendencies of the Polish state by way of Pomerania are really spontaneous and strong, then an inevitable effect of

²⁰S. documents: wissenschaftlich-politische Tagung der Mittelstelle für zwischeneuropäische Arbeit - Die national-politische Aufgabe der Wissenschaft, Loesch 1922, in: PAAA R 60380.

²¹S. documents: Grundlagen und Ziele ostmitteleuropäischer Kulturpolitik, Boehm 1927, in: PAAA R 60319.

²²S. documents: Allgemeine kulturpolitische Richtlinien, Loesch, 1928, in: PAAA R 60318.

²³S. documents: Ostlandberichte, 1928, in: BABL R 8043/991.

the German tendency to take Pomerania in order to gain immediate contact with Danzig and East Prussia will be the growth of a Polish tendency to take the rest of the Baltic shore from Colberg to Memel. If the conflict between the states continues, it must become as a matter of sociological necessity a struggle for the entire shore. The present borders are an attempt at a compromise which the aggressiveness of Germany is turning into a failure".²⁴

From those years we find documents about Polish scientific activities in German archives generally summarized under the term of *Auslandspropaganda*: *Firstly* we find documents from 1925 about:

1. the foundation of the Baltic Institute in Thorn in 1925 and the membership of Florian Znaniecki in its commission – the institute, which formulated the aims of West-research as an applied science in 1925 with the topics of:
 - the inseparable connection of Pomerania and Poland,
 - the support of Polish research about the Baltic Sea,
 - the research about East-Prussia in contrast to the German research about the Polish Corridor²⁵.

Secondly – during the decline of Pan-European policy from 1931/32 – we find

2. the whole programmes of conferences, so-called *Pommerellenkundliche Tagungen* between 1930 and 1939²⁶;
3. reports about the sociographical commission of the Shlesian Institute in Kattowitz in 1933/34, 1936, 1938 and the translation of the study by Józef Chałasiński to the voting behaviour in Uppershlesia, 1935 (The German-Polish Antagonism in the manufactory settlement Kopalnia in Uppershlesia)²⁷;

²⁴S. Znaniecki 1934 (1931): 37 f.

²⁵S. documents: Programmatik und Übersicht über die Kommissionen und die Publikationen des Baltischen Instituts Thorn 1925, in: BADH R 153/1837.

²⁶S. documents: Programme der Pommerellenkundlichen Tagungen des Baltischen Instituts Thorn, 1930-1939, in: BADH R 153/35.

²⁷S. documents: Bericht über die Soziographische Kommission des Schlesischen Instituts Kattowitz, 1933/34, Bericht über die Soziographische Kommission des Schlesischen Instituts Kattowitz, 1936, Abschrift P. Rybicki, Das Schlesische Institut Kattowitz, 1938, in: BADH R 153/36, 1839, 1966.

4. the paper reports about connected Institutions: for example the Conational of Poland, the Institute for mental cooperation of the League of Nations and the Lednicki-group of the Pan-Europaen Union 1932²⁸.

Conclusions

This paper discusses the matter of official representation of Humanistic sociology in German archives with its topic of German-Polish relation under the title of *Auslandspropaganda/Westforschung* and their general displacement. Based on the analysis of German archival and scientific material themselves – two German studies are exemplarily discussed there – this paper shows their reasonably German-nationalist political forces.

In a historical and comparative perspective the archival documents can show us the relation of a competition between two kinds of empirical nationality research and help us to explore the reasons of negotiation and displacement of Polish nationality research²⁹. A special question here is: was there a simple relation of a competition between the so-called German East- and Polish West-research, where the Polish sociology was represented? Or do we have to complete this antithesis by the correction? The more general question here is: Are there any traditions in the social and cultural sciences, which can be taken up for a multi-ethnic Minority policy of integration of modern national societies today?

The Polish scientific centres were destroyed by the Nazi-Regime; the German nationality research itself as a part of German East-research was dissolved after 1933, because it was not necessary any longer. The mentioned archival documents can help us to reconstruct and understand the complicate historical background of Interwar Period and especially the greatest worth and significance of Polish nationality research, which intended the sociological analysis and social weakening of polarizing political forces based on a modified self perception of the Polish noble nation and the representation and recognition of the Polish nation as a historical cultural nation within an international political field.

²⁸S. documents: Polenpropaganda/Westforschung, in: BADH R 153/32.

²⁹To the terms „Polish West-research”, „Poznan’s School of West”, „nationality studies” s. Kwilecki 1975, Symonowicz 1943/44: 57-125; also Robinson 1928. Four nationality studies are discussed in my PhD monograph (Messerschmidt, 2006): Orsini-Rosenberg 1928, Znaniecki 1931, Chałasinski 1935, Duda-Dziewierz 1938.

Literatura

- AMMENDE E. (1931), Die Nationalitäten in den Staaten Europas. Sammlung von Lageberichten. Hrsg. im Auftrage des Europäischen Nationalitätenkongresses, Wien/Leipzig.
- ARENDT H. (1951), Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft, München/Zürich.
- BOYSEN J. (1998), Der Geist des Grenzlands. Ideologische Positionen deutscher und polnischer Meinungsführer in Posen und Westpreußen vor und nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg; in: Krzoska, M., P. Tokarskie (Hrsg.) (1998), Die Geschichte Polens im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Osnabrück, 104-123.
- BROCKHAUS Enzyklopädie, 1972(17), Bd. 5.
- BURKERT M. (2000), Die Ostwissenschaften im Dritten Reich. Teil I: Die schwierige Gratwanderung der Ostwissenschaftler zwischen 1933 und 1939, Wiesbaden.
- BURLEIGH M. (1988), Germany turns eastwards: a study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich, Cambridge.
- CHAŁASIŃSKI J. (1935), Antagonizm Polsko-Niemiecki w osadzie Fabrycznej „Kopalnia” na Górnym Śląsku, in: Przegląd Socjologiczny, Poznań, 1935, 3, 1-2, 146-278.
- CHODOROWSKI J. (1999), Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi: jego doktryna zjednoczenia Europy, Poznań.
- CONZE W. (1951), Nationalstaat oder Mitteleuropa? Die Deutschen des Reichs und die Nationalitätenfragen Ostmitteleuropas im Ersten Weltkrieg; in: Deutschland und Europa. Festschrift für Hans Rothfels, Düsseldorf 1951, 201-230.
- CONZE W. (1958), Polnische Nation und Deutsche Politik im Ersten Weltkrieg, Köln.
- COUDENHOVE-KALERGI R. N. (1923), Pan-Europa, Wien.
- COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, R. N. (1927), Krieg oder Frieden?, in: Paneuropa 1927, 3,1, 1-6.
- DUDA-DZIEWIERZ K. (1938), Wieś małopolska a emigracja amerykańska. Studium wsi Babica powiatu Rzeszowskiego, Warszawa/Poznań.
- DULCZEWSKI Z. (1992), Life and Work of Florian Znaniecki, Poznań.

- ESTEL B., MAYER T. (1994), *Das Prinzip Nation*, Opladen.
- FAHLBUSCH M. (1994), „Wo der deutsche ... ist, ist Deutschland!": Die Stiftung für Deutsche Volks- und Kulturbodenforschung in Leipzig 1920-1933, Bochum.
- FORST de Battaglia, O. (1954), *Zwischeneuropa*. Teil 1: Polen, Tschechoslowakei, Ungarn, Frankfurt a. Main.
- GEHRKE R. (2001), *Der polnische Westgedanke bis zur Wiedererrichtung des polnischen Staates nach dem Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges. Genese und Begründung polnischer Gebietsansprüche gegenüber Deutschland im Zeitalter des europäischen Nationalismus*, Marburg.
- HALAS E. (2000), *Florian Znaniecki's sociological theory and the Challenges of 21th century*, Frankfurt a. Main.
- HECKMANN F. (1992), *Ethnische Minderheiten, Volk und Nation. Soziologie interethnischer Beziehungen*, Stuttgart.
- HELLMANN M. (1979), *Zur Lage der historischen Forschung des östlichen Europas in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*; in: *Jahrbuch der historischen Forschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1979*, Stuttgart 1980, 13-38.
- HIDEN J. (1991), *Minderheiten, Diplomaten und Wirtschaft. Die deutsche Außenpolitik im baltischen Raum in der Zwischenkriegszeit*; in: Hecker, H. (Hrsg.) (1991), *Nationales Selbstverständnis und politische Ordnung*, Bonn, 69-81.
- IMHOFF K. (1994), *Minderheitensoziologie*; in: Kerber, H., A. Schmieder (Hrsg.) (1994), *Spezielle Soziologien*, Hamburg, 407 ff.
- JAWORSKI R. (1992), *Ostmitteleuropa – zur Tauglichkeit eines Hilfsbegriffs*; in: *Westmitteleuropa Ostmitteleuropa. Vergleiche und Beziehungen. Festschrift für Ferdinand Seibt zum 65. Geburtstag*, v. Eberhard, W., H., Lemberg 1992, 37-45.
- KELMES E. (1958), *Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß*, Köln.
- KERN H. (1982), *Empirische Sozialforschung. Ursprünge, Ansätze, Entwicklungslinien*, München.
- KLEEBERG R. (1915), *Die Nationalitätenstatistik, ihre Ziele, Methoden und Ergebnisse*, Weida i. Thüringen.
- KLESSMANN C. (1984), *Osteuropaforschung und Lebensraumpolitik im Dritten Reich*; in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 1984, Bd. 7, 33-45.
- KOCKA J. (1994), *Sozialgeschichte – gestern und heute*; in: Kowalczyk, I. S. (1994), *Paradigma deutscher Geschichtswissenschaft*, Berlin, 15-31.

- KORENBLAT S. (1978), *The Deutsche Hochschule für Politik. Public Affairs Institute for a New Germany 1920-1933*, Chicago.
- KOTOWSKI A. (1998), *Polens Politik gegenüber seiner deutschen Minderheit 1919-1939*, Wiesbaden.
- KRASUSKI J. (1975), *Stosunki polski-niemiecki 1919-32*, Poznań.
- KRAUS H. (1927), *Das Recht der Minderheiten. Materialien zur Einführung in das Verständnis des modernen Minoritätenproblems*, Berlin.
- KREKELER N. (1973), *Revisionsanspruch und Geheime Ostpolitik der Weimarer Republik. Die Subventionierung der deutschen Minderheit in Polen*, Stuttgart.
- KUEBART F. (1980), *Zur Entwicklung der Osteuropaforschung in Deutschland bis 1945*; in: *Osteuropa*, 1980, 30, 657-672.
- KWILECKI A. (Publ.) (1975), *Florian Znaniecki i jego rola w socjologii*, Poznań.
- LAWATY A. (1986), *Das Ende Preußens in polnischer Sicht*, Berlin/New York.
- MESSERSCHMIDT N. (2006), *Minderheitenpolitik und -soziologie in der deutschen und polnischen Demokratie der Zwischenkriegszeit*, Berlin.
- MICHAELSEN R. (1984), *Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß 1925-1928*, Frankfurt a. M.
- MÜHLE E. (1997), *Ostforschung. Beobachtungen zu Aufstieg und Niedergang eines geschichts-wissenschaftlichen Paradigmas*; in: *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, 1997, 46/3, 317-350.
- OBERKROME W. (1993), *Volksgeschichte. Methodische Innovation und völkische Ideologisierung in der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft 1918-1945*, Göttingen.
- ORSINI-ROSENBERG S. (1928), *Zagadnienia styczne polityki gospodarczej i technologii społecznej ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem ziem wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej*, Warszawa.
- PALMER A. (1970), *The Lands Between. A History of East-Central Europe since the Congress of Vienna*, London.
- ROBINSON J. (1928), *Das Minoritätenproblem und seine Literatur. Kritische Einführung in die Quellen und die Literatur der europäischen Nationalitätenfrage der Nachkriegszeit, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des völkerrechtlichen Minderheitenschutzes*, Berlin/Leipzig.
- ROOS H. (1986), *Geschichte der Polnischen Nation 1918-1945*, Stuttgart.

- SCHULZE H. (1970), Der Oststaat-Plan 1919; in: Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 1970, 18,2, 123-163.
- SYMONOLEWICZ K. (1943/44), The Studies in Nationality and Nationalism in Poland between the two wars (1918-1939); in: Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1943/44, 2, 1, 57-125.
- VOIGT G. (1959), Methoden der „Ostforschung“; in: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, 1959, 7, 8, 1781-1803.
- VOIGT G. (1978), Otto Hoetzsch, 1876-1946, Berlin.
- WALICKI A. (2000), The troubling legacy of Roman Dmowski; in: East European politics and Science, 14, 1, 12-46.
- WINKLER W. (1923), Die Bedeutung der Statistik für den Schutz der nationalen Minderheiten, Leipzig/Wien, Schriften des Instituts für Statistik der Minderheitsvölker an der Universität Wien, hrsg. von Wilhelm Winkler 1. Heft.
- WINKLER W. (1952), Lebensgeschichte eines Statistikers, Innsbruck (Sonderdruck aus: Österreichische Rechtsund Staatswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen).
- WIPPERMANN W. (1981), Der deutsche Drang nach Osten. Ideologie und Wirklichkeit eines politischen Schlagworts, Darmstadt.
- ZERNACK H. O. (1979), Osteuropa. Eine Einführung in seine Geschichte, München.
- ZERNACK H. O. (1992), Deutschland und der Osten als Problem der historischen Forschung; in: Hausen, R., W. Ribbe (Hrsg.) (1992), Geschichtswissenschaft in Berlin im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, New York, 571-593.
- ZIEGERHOFER-PRETTENTHALER A. (2003), Botschafter Europas. Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi und die Paneuropa-Bewegung in den zwanziger und dreißiger Jahren, Wien/Köln/Weimar.
- ZIELIŃSKI Z. (1996), Mniejszość niemiecka w Polsce: jej zadania w dobie Locarno i Traktatu z Polską o nieagresji (1925, 1934 r.), in: Sprawy Narodowościowe, 1996, 1, 8, 101-12.
- ZNANIECKI F. (1931), Miasto w świadomości obywateli, Poznań.
- ZNANIECKI F. (1934 (1931)), The Sociology of the Struggle for Pomerania, Toruń.

Nadja Messerschmidt

POLITYKA WOBEC MNIEJSZOŚCI A SOCJOLOGIA W NIEMCZACH I POLSCE W OKRESIE MIĘDZYWOJENNYM

Streszczenie

W artykule omówiony został konflikt polityczny, który wyłonił się w dwudziestoleciu międzywojennym, pomiędzy dwiema tradycjami uprawiania tzw. socjologii grup mniejszościowych: niemiecką *Deutschtumsforschung* oraz polską socjologią humanistyczną i jej empirycznym podejściem uprawianym w Poznaniu przez Floriana Znanieckiego. Te dwie tradycje socjologiczne były zakorzenione w dwóch odmiennych kontekstach politycznych: w kontekście starej polityki głoszonej przez antyrepublikańskie kręgi w Niemczech w związku z I wojną światową oraz w kontekście ruchu paneuropejskiego w Polsce (i w innych krajach).

Ta różnica – różnica pomiędzy starym i nowym kontekstem – wywołała konflikt pomiędzy socjologią dotyczącą mniejszości w Niemczech i w Polsce oraz jej celami. Doprowadziło to w efekcie do konfliktu pomiędzy dwoma typami badań empirycznych, a co za tym idzie, do sporu na temat planowanej polityki wobec mniejszości. W rezultacie pojawiła się konieczność obrony polskiego ujęcia empirycznego i pewne zmiany w obrębie tego nurtu.

Zatem w niniejszej pracy omówiono przede wszystkim niemiecką obronę instytucjonalną wobec podejścia badaczy polskich oraz ich obecność w archiwach niemieckich. Artykuł zawiera również argumenty polityczno-historyczne, aby zwrócić uwagę na potrzebę głębszych analiz dotyczących polskiej socjologii w okresie międzywojennym.*.

*Ten artykuł jest poprawioną wersją mojego wykładu na konferencji: Teoretyczne Podstawy Socjologii Wiedzy – edycja III, Sesja tematyczna: Zastosowania, Rekonstrukcje (Zielonogórski Instytut Socjologii) 7/8.12.2010 i jest oparty na mojej pracy doktorskiej (Messerschmidt 2006) o tym samym tytule.