

# The Dilemma of Dual Loyalty. Werner Hasselblatt and the Rise and Failure of Baltic German Minority Politics in the Inter-War Period

---

JÖRG HACKMANN

*Szczecin / Greifswald*

German minority politics in the Baltic states during the inter-war period has regained significant scholarly attention since the 1990s, when the Estonian concept of cultural autonomy from 1925 was rediscovered as a strategy for solving post-1989 minority conflicts as well as addressing issues of multiculturalism. The case of the Baltic German politician Werner Hasselblatt, who is in the focus of this text, however, reveals a Janus-faced political approach: On the one hand, he had a significant share in the implementation of the law on cultural autonomy in Estonia, and he was also a major actor within the Congress of European Nationalities. On the other hand, from 1933 onwards Hasselblatt turned into an expert of Nazi resettlement and population politics, contrary to his earlier positions. Here, a critical analysis of his approach towards loyalty is undertaken, in order to discuss the tilting point in his political activities. My argument is that his attitude towards loyalty was based on the assumption of an irreconcilable conflict of dual loyalty to the 'host' state and the 'kin' nation. Whereas Hasselblatt regarded loyalty to German *Volkstum* not as a matter of individual choice for Baltic Germans and thus as not negotiable, he saw loyalty towards the Estonian state as connected to the fulfilment of the German minority's political claims. Such an instrumental approach towards loyalty together with Hasselblatt's primordial understanding of nationality in contrast to citizenship may be identified as crucial issues that led his concept of constructive minority politics tilt towards the destructive notion of 'dissimilation'.

**Keywords:** National minorities, loyalty, Estonia, cultural autonomy, Baltic Germans

## **Introduction**

Baltic German minority politics during the inter-war period, which had been formed after Estonia and Latvia emerged as independent states from the Russian Empire in the aftermath of the First World War, was a largely forgotten issue during the Cold War. It has re-gained significant scholarly attention, however, since the 1990s, when the Estonian concept of cultural autonomy was rediscovered as a strategy for solving post-1989 minority conflicts as well as addressing issues of multiculturalism.<sup>1</sup> Even if one leaves the question aside to what degree such a reference to the past could be used for solving contemporary political issues,<sup>2</sup> the biography of the Baltic-German journalist and politician Paul Schiemann (1876-1944)<sup>3</sup> from Latvia provided a positive image of liberal, non-nationalist minority politics and a counter-narrative against *völkisch* irredentism, which finally led to the resettlement of the Baltic Germans in 1939-1940. Studies of Schiemann's fellowmen in minority politics, Ewald Ammende (1893-1936) and Werner Hasselblatt (1890-1958) from Estonia, however, have revealed indications for such a proximity to Nazi politics.<sup>4</sup> In the claim by Erhard Kroeger, the leading Nazi representative among the German minority in Latvia, that he suggested Heinrich Himmler the evacuation of the Baltic Germans in October 1939,<sup>5</sup> one may see an evidence for the final failure of Baltic-German minority politics. The resettlement of the Germans from the Baltic States thus raises the question of inter-connection: Can Baltic-German minority politics be separated from the resettlement and connected to such a counterfactual hypothesis that under different historical circumstances the Estonian model of cultural autonomy could have expanded its international relevance by being adopted in other states as well?<sup>6</sup> Or should one hold an attitude of 'emotional obstructionism instead of intelligent adaptation'<sup>7</sup> – to refer to Leo Lundin's thesis formulated under fresh impressions from the Second

World War – among the Baltic Germans in Estonia and Latvia accountable?

The concept of loyalty will be used here as an analytical tool in order to discuss these questions. Loyalty here is not understood as a normative concept of describing the relations between a state and its citizens or inhabitants, but as a term that encompasses multi-level relations between social groups and institutions.<sup>8</sup> Referring to Albert Hirschman's influential study,<sup>9</sup> loyalty may be understood in the context of national minorities as one form of action besides protest and emigration. In the context of national minorities in the Baltic region, here understood as the territories of the Estonian and Latvian state, loyalty focuses on dispositions of acceptance of the new political order and on practices of integration and participation. This paper will concentrate on the Baltic German minority politician Werner Hasselblatt and his role in shaping minority politics in Estonia in the inter-war period as well as population politics in Nazi Germany. However, this paper does not intend to reiterate the facts on Estonian minority politics in detail, which have already been presented and discussed elsewhere.<sup>10</sup> Nor will it delve deeply into the biography of Werner Hasselblatt,<sup>11</sup> but focus at the most obvious facts of his Janus-faced political approach. On the one hand, he was the leading politician among the Baltic German minority to implement and promote the law on cultural autonomy in Estonia in 1925 and also a major actor in establishing the 'Congress of the Organised National Groups in the States of Europe', later known as Congress of European Nationalities, in the same year.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, he also pursued a diverging agenda of cooperation with Berlin as well as German *Volkstum* organizations in order to coordinate politics towards German minorities in Eastern Europe, even before he became a legal advisor to the German minorities in Berlin in 1931. Finally, he turned into an expert in resettlement politics who could be counted to the 'Vordenker der

Vernichtung', to quote the well-known term by Götz Aly and Susanne Heim.<sup>13</sup>

The main aim of this text is to identify in Baltic German minority politics fault lines and tilting points between practices based on loyalty and obstructive strategies with regard to the post-1918 states. I will concentrate mainly on Estonia and Werner Hasselblatt here, but include connections to the situation in Latvia. In order to discuss these issues, I focus first on the legacy of pre-World War I politics, second on the issue of loyalty in post-war Estonia, and then address constructive and deconstructive features in Werner Hasselblatt's approach towards minority politics. In the conclusions it will be argued that his instrumental approach towards loyalty, focusing only on the interests of the minority, was crucial for the turn from constructive minority politics towards destructive German nationalities politics.

The first point to be addressed refers to the question of path-dependency or the legacy of German minority politics going back to the pre-1914 period. Some authors, partly with a Baltic German background in the inter-war period, have regarded the *Deutsche Vereine*, which existed between 1905/06 and 1914, as a predecessor of German minority politics.<sup>14</sup> There was, however, not a direct organizational connection for several reasons. First, these associations were formed under the still restrictive rules of the tsarist empire after the revolution of 1905, and they did not reappear after their forced dissolution by the tsarist authorities in August 1914, neither under German occupation of the region nor in the new states after the war.<sup>15</sup> The reasons for this discontinuation could still receive further attention, but there are at least two tentative explanations: First, the enthusiasm of the revolutionary period that drove Baltic Germans into a rather spontaneous social mass movement did not replace earlier structures of sociability and diminished already before 1914, before seeing only a short revival during the war, when the German army occupied Riga in September

1917.<sup>16</sup> Second, a major issue of these *Deutsche Vereine* – apart from the maintaining of German-language schools – was the struggle with the politics of russification, which had lost its relevance after 1915, when the German army established the military administration of Ober Ost. Nevertheless, one thread of continuation may be identified. As Gert von Pistohlkors has argued already in 1972,<sup>17</sup> the revolution of 1905 marked the beginning of a process of the Baltic Germans’ transition from the leading class to a national minority. Despite the fact that they undisputedly formed an ethnic or linguistic minority in quantitative terms, they were convinced to constitute not a “minor” but the culturally hegemonic group in the region. Thus, the idea behind the formation of the *Deutsche Vereine* to transform the Baltic Germans into a coherent national group that levelled previous social distinctions, met with strong mental reservations among their elites, who were unwilling to accept this change, before and after the First World War.

Having noticed this mental resistance of adapting to the social and political dynamics that led to the loss of the leading social position raises the issue of loyalty as a crucial aspect. In general, loyalty to the Tsar was shaped by the notion of traditional faithfulness and had not been fundamentally shattered among the Baltic Germans until 1917,<sup>18</sup> although some, in particular in Courland and in Riga, during the First World War saw an option to have the region incorporated into the German Reich.<sup>19</sup> At the end of the war such plans, however, quickly collapsed and another problem emerged: the threat of a Bolshevik occupation of the region. In Estonia, which had come under German occupation only in February 1918, during the interruption of the peace negotiations in Brest-Litovsk, the military situation after the collapse of the Kaiserreich brought the Baltic Germans to a cooperation with the Estonian Salvation Committee under Konstantin Päts. The agreement of 26 November 1918 about establishing a voluntary regiment – the *Baltenregiment* – tackled with the problem of loyalty in two respects: It

not only signalled Baltic German acceptance of the new Estonian authorities they had not recognized before, but also addressed the distrust and fear among Estonians of a German separatism, hence the absence of loyalty.<sup>20</sup> Different from the *Baltische Landeswehr* in Latvia, which directly intervened in political struggles when unseating the Latvian government of Kārlis Ulmanis in April 1919, the *Baltenregiment* in Estonia remained a military, non-political formation. Whereas its contribution to defending the 'Heimat' was emphatically praised in Baltic German discourse, Estonian attitudes instead remained ambivalent.<sup>21</sup> The perception and the discursive use of loyalty clearly differed. Whereas the German praise of the *Baltenregiment* was meant as a proof of loyalty to the new power that should lead to political participation in the post-war order, the Estonian public remained sceptical towards the reliability of the former hegemon. But even if perceptions of loyalty differed, there are indications that, even after the battle with the *Baltische Landeswehr* at Cēsis in June 1919, the Estonian government's estimation of the *Baltenregiment's* loyalty did not change fundamentally.<sup>22</sup>

Political interactions between Baltic Germans and Estonians based on expectations and declarations of loyalty, however, reach back to the beginnings of Estonian statehood. A Baltic German representative, the lawyer Max Woldemar Bock, participated in the provisional Diet of the autonomous province of Estonia after the February Revolution (*Maapäev*) in 1917-1919, although the *Ritterschaft* rejected cooperation and there were still competing Baltic German political projects.<sup>23</sup> In December 1918, a German party formed first as *Deutsche Partei in Estland* and then as *Deutsch-Baltische Partei* led by the Tallinn journalist Christoph Mickwitz, who had already been a leading figure in the *Deutscher Verein in Estland*.<sup>24</sup> Bock and two other Baltic German representatives, Herrmann Koch and Johannes Meyer, participated in the Estonian Constitutional Assembly (*Asutav Kogu*) in 1919-1920.

However, the Baltic-German Party abstained from reaffirming Estonian independence in June 1919. Against the mistrust stimulated by this position, Bock acknowledged the Estonian Republic in a speech on 29 August 1919.<sup>25</sup> This German reluctance re-appeared in 1920, when the party also abstained from approving the constitution, although Werner Hasselblatt in 1929 claimed that the party must be credited for successfully bringing minority protection into the draft constitution.<sup>26</sup> The fault line for the Baltic Germans had become the agrarian reform of October 1919 in Estonia. It comprised more than 50% of agricultural land, which had been in the hands of about 1,200 (mostly Baltic-German) noble landowners and was put first under state ownership, with c. 50% then subsequently distributed to already existing or newly created Estonian farmsteads. Initially, no compensation for the landowners was foreseen, and they could only apply for getting back 50 hectares of their land. Only in 1926 a modest compensation law was agreed upon by the parliament.<sup>27</sup> As a result of emigration and the social-economic change accompanying the agrarian reform, the Baltic Germans in Estonia underwent a deep social and economic change after 1918. They turned into a more urban group, with urban professionals instead of noble landowners now beginning to dominate the political life of the Baltic Germans, a significant difference to the situation before 1914. However, there were also signs of political and cultural adaptation to the new situation. On a cultural level, Arnold Hasselblatt, a journalist from Tartu and father of Werner, has to be mentioned: Under his presidency the Learned Estonian Society (*Õpetatud Eesti Selts*) in Tartu revoked the pre-war attempt to change the focus of the society from Estonian language and culture to the German history of the Baltic region, and the society subsequently became the predecessor of the Estonian Academy of Sciences.<sup>28</sup>

Political cooperation of the Baltic Germans continued in the first legislative period of the Parliament (*Riigikogu*), when four

representatives of the Baltic-German Party were elected. In the second *Riigikogu*, the Baltic-German Party received three seats, with the number shrinking to two from 1926 to 1935, in later years as part of a German-Swedish election group. In 1923, Werner Hasselblatt, who had been working as a lawyer after the war, took one of the seats of the Baltic-German Party and remained a member of parliament until 1932. According to the studies by Raimo Raag, Hasselblatt became the most active non-Estonian parliamentarian with more than 350 statements (of 881 altogether made by minority representatives) in Estonian and German language during his tenures.<sup>29</sup> The exact distribution of German and Estonian language use in Hasselblatt's statements is not given by Raag, but based on his general figures, they must have been predominantly in Estonian.<sup>30</sup> Raag also indicates that the use of language among those non-Estonian members of parliament, who spoke Estonian, depended on which audience they were addressing.<sup>31</sup>

When turning to the implementation of cultural autonomy for the national minorities in Estonia, the question was raised several times, why it took until 1925 to pass the law. Given the initial declaration to guarantee national minority rights in Estonia already in the declaration of independence from 24 February 1918, an argument often brought forward is that among ethnic Estonians a negative attitude towards Baltic Germans kept prevailing,<sup>32</sup> also after the defeat of the Bolsheviks and the *Landeswehr* and the implementation of the agrarian reform in 1919. Thus, anti-German voices met those arguing that the agrarian reform could only be introduced as expropriation without compensation in order to avoid revolution among the peasants.<sup>33</sup>

Parliamentary negotiations about the implementation of cultural autonomy proved to be complicated due to several reasons: a lack of legal models, the internationalisation of minority issues at the level of the League of Nations, the reluctance of leading Estonian politicians to introduce minority protection, and the German protest against the

agrarian reform. A general agreement between the People's Party of Jaan Tönnison and the Baltic German Party in 1924 paved the way towards an agreement about the core elements of the law, but it was only the attempted communist coup of December 1924 that finally changed the attitude in the *Riigikogu* towards a quick acceptance of the law.<sup>34</sup>

The political situation since 1924 then pushed a constructive disposition towards minority protection to the foreground: Preparing the law on cultural autonomy obviously was Hasselblatt's major parliamentary occupation, but according to his own account he was also active afterwards on other fields of legislation as religious communities and monuments protection.<sup>35</sup> Concerning cultural autonomy, Hasselblatt credited himself with being the responsible person. This opinion was also mirrored by his German fellowmen as well as German historians, but interestingly not by Estonian voices, neither before 1940 nor afterwards. Karl Aun in his post-war book cites Hasselblatt only twice in footnotes, thus underlining the existence of a parallel Estonian national discourse on cultural autonomy. The main arguments were that this was a project of the Estonian parliament, not one by a single national minority, and that it addressed individuals, but not a specific group. In addition, the connection with the December coup was questioned as well.<sup>36</sup> Actually, these two threads of the debate did not merge, although Hasselblatt praised the activity of Estonian politicians as Konstantin Päts, Karl Einbund (later Kaarel Eenpalu), and Eugen Maddison (later Maddisoo) on the official opening of the German cultural self-administration and claimed that the Baltic Germans are not only focusing on their own welfare but of the whole state.<sup>37</sup> In his publications since 1925 and also in his unpublished book manuscript, which was intended to summarize his notion of cultural autonomy,<sup>38</sup> Hasselblatt, however, left no doubt that he regarded cultural autonomy first and foremost as a German project. In addition, his point of international reference was a narrowly limited one, as he neither mentioned the Austro-Marxist

tradition of Otto Bauer and Karl Renner nor the preceding Ukrainian law of 1918.<sup>39</sup> Neither did Hasselblatt react to the Estonian perspective, but stressed the impact of the Austrian scholar Rudolf Laun in a short article he published in 1948.<sup>40</sup> It should also be added that Hasselblatt was far from being the only person to address and push forward the notion of cultural autonomy, even when looking at the German discussion in Estonia.<sup>41</sup>

In the making of the law, Hasselblatt departed from some of his basic positions: First of all, he accepted a quantitative definition of minorities as a precondition of cultural self-administration as well as the principle of individual confession, which could, however, be disputed by representatives of the ethnic group. Hasselblatt had openly supported more compulsory regulations because he was convinced that belonging to a minority was not based on individual choice and hence could not be changed. In this connection, Hasselblatt also addressed – although rather indirectly – the question of loyalty of the minority towards state institutions, arguing that it should be in the state's interest to provide such conditions that would give no grounds for complaint on the part of minorities and would thereby foster positive attitudes towards the state among the minorities. In this perspective, loyalty was less seen as a legitimate demand by the state, but as a result of respecting the minorities' interests.<sup>42</sup>

In the face of this positive image of constructive minority politics, the question arises, when did the perception start to change and when did political actions tilt. A simple explanation concerning Hasselblatt would be to link the change of perspective to his new job in Berlin. A major argument for such a hypothesis would be the observation that he was seemingly no longer pursuing to finish his manuscript on cultural autonomy.<sup>43</sup> However, a closer look at this work as well as at texts published by Hasselblatt since 1926 on cultural autonomy show a different picture. There, Hasselblatt tried to stress that the

implementation of nationality rights for the Germans in Estonia – in contrast to the already mentioned opinions of Estonian politicians – was not based on negotiations with Estonian politicians, but on an autonomous decision by the German *Volksgruppe* itself. In 1929, when reviewing the parliamentary work of the German minority in Estonia, he expressed a criticism, which explicitly followed Carl Schirren's notion of a mental predisposition towards *Ausharren*<sup>44</sup> from the 1860s: Repression from the state allegedly had deprived the Baltic German of the responsibility for administering the land. As the Baltic Germans' commitment to *Stamm* and *Heimat* had been challenged, they were pushed into a position to decide between remaining in the Baltic *Heimat* on the one hand or opting for German *Volkstum* with the consequence of emigration on the other hand.<sup>45</sup> According to Hasselblatt, attacks on the Germans since 1918 came not only from the Bolshevists, but also from anti-bolshevist Estonians. This was to explain, why the German representatives of the *Asutav Kogu* abstained from accepting the constitution.

It can also be noticed that Hasselblatt's convictions in crucial points dissented from the principles of the law on cultural autonomy. This refers not only to the rejection of the term of 'minority' as an application of quantitative reasoning, which Hasselblatt denounced as neglecting the cultural values and historical and sociological situation of different nationalities. Hasselblatt's position was based first of all on assumptions that *Volkstum* is not a matter of choice or individual decision, but invariably inherent to every nationality. Recording nationality in a national cadastre could thus not be seen as a policy of exclusion or separation that is limiting individual decisions, but as a reflection of non-negotiable facts. Resulting from this, national minorities could not be organized as a kind of voluntary association, but only as a corporative institution, which obliges its member as well as the state. In addition, Hasselblatt also criticized a crucial element of the law on cultural

autonomy: the limitation of the minorities' self-administration to cultural aspects. Hasselblatt's critical stance towards the Estonian state manifests itself throughout his manuscript, where he expressed a fundamental criticism of the post-war political order in Central and Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, and this underlines the Janus-faced character of Hasselblatt's disposition, he still published positive assessments of the cultural autonomy around 1930.<sup>46</sup>

Thus, one clearly sees an argumentation along two different lines in Hasselblatt's activities. The second, critical line appeared already as early as 1926, when the implementation of cultural autonomy in Estonia opened Hasselblatt access to German ministries as well as organizations taking care of *Deutschtum*. He did not only promote cultural autonomy as best practice for the national minority groups united in the Nationalities Congress, but in particular as an appropriate means for the German government to protect German minorities in Eastern Europe and to strengthen the influence of the German Reich in the region. In a paper directed to the German minister of the interior, Hasselblatt argued already in June 1926 that the concept of cultural autonomy was perfect for German minorities and would thus only be of limited utility for other groups. Hence, it could be used by the German government in order to strengthen the international role of Germany by emphasizing the international importance of minority protection.<sup>47</sup> In this regard, the stress on cultural autonomy as a German contribution to the solution of minority problems could be combined with a sharp criticism of the new nation states in Eastern Europe and of the policies of the Western powers.

What has to be concluded here is that Hasselblatt addressed different audiences in divergent ways and put his arguments in contradictory frameworks: first, as loyal and constructive Estonian citizen during his work in the *Riigikogu*,<sup>48</sup> second, as a loyal member of the German nation (and not only the German minority in Estonia), and third as an expert in

international affairs. So, if one would apply Hirschman's categories,<sup>49</sup> it becomes clear that 'voice' and 'exit' referred to the Estonian state, with the option of 'voice' being limited by the threat of 'exit', whereas the notion of loyalty was used in a specific, double-faced way, shaped by bindings that were contradictory and excluding each other.

The tilting point, as I would argue, was Hasselblatt's postulated dilemma between *Heimat* and *Volkstum* that would only allow to choose one of both,<sup>50</sup> as it entailed the negative scenario for (German) minorities of either emigration or assimilation. According to Hasselblatt, this dilemma could only be solved by a powerful leader, who could transcend state borders and be a leader to the whole nation. Such an assertion clearly limited his commitment to civic loyalty and opened up – first with a focus of the Sudeten German problem – the question of future border revisions related to minority issues.<sup>51</sup>

Closely connected was a second crucial issue of Hasselblatt's thinking: the dichotomy between minority and nationality: In fact, Hasselblatt always rejected the German term *Minderheit* and preferred *Minorität*, but actually *Nationalität* (nationality) in the sense of a transborder community always had been dominant. Hasselblatt suggested such changes of terms in various institutions, first of the organization of German minorities from the 'Ausschuss deutscher Minderheiten im Ausland' to the 'Verband der deutschen Volksgruppen in Europa' in 1928,<sup>52</sup> then of the Nationalities Congress and also in the subtitle of the journal *Nation und Staat*, where Hasselblatt replaced *Minoritätenproblem* by *Nationalitätenproblem*, after becoming the journal's editor in June 1938.<sup>53</sup>

There are further aspects underlining the tilting moment in Hasselblatt's understanding of nationality. First, there is a striking Germanocentrism in his attitude: He did not see any obvious connection to similar models of nationalities rights, neither in Britain and Switzerland nor in the

Habsburg monarchy prior to 1918. The same is true of his comparisons with the situation of other ethnic groups and minorities, which he addressed in discussions within the European Nationalities Congress: these other cases for him were secondary to the fate of German minorities. Second, his book manuscript reveals a fundamental criticism of the nation state and the making of new borders after 1918, which according to him dominated over categories of space, economy, and history.<sup>54</sup> Third, his understanding of ‘assimilation’ and ‘dissimilation’ has to be mentioned, which was informed by the *Volkstheorie* of Max Hildebert Boehm.<sup>55</sup>

Whereas the turning around of concepts was still pending before Hasselblatt’s relocation to Berlin, he quickly became involved in the planning of Nazi *Volkstum* politics. Already in March 1933, he had talks with Alfred Rosenberg and Hitler, and some weeks later he submitted a memorandum reflecting on a possible negative impact of Nazi anti-Jewish politics on German minorities in Eastern Europe.<sup>56</sup> There, Hasselblatt addressed the question, whether the exclusion of Jews from German civil service could provoke similar repressions against German minorities abroad. Hasselblatt suggested as an argument that assimilated German Jews could not be regarded as a distinct national group and therefore, categories of minority rights could not be applied here, because a minority, according to him, must be characterized by a disposition of ‘dissimilation’.<sup>57</sup> A similar argumentation Hasselblatt brought forward with regard to Jewish minority representatives in the Nationalities Congress since 1933.<sup>58</sup> Hasselblatt, thus, clearly tried to immunize minority politics with a focus on German minorities from possible collateral damage resulting from the deprivation of rights of the German Jews.<sup>59</sup> Hasselblatt, however, also went one step further, as his negative disposition towards giving priority to the individual confession of nationality and his preference for registering national groups in a cadastre provided an argument that the exclusion of Jews from public life

in Germany based on external criteria on the one hand and the support of German minorities by Nazi authorities on the other hand had its origin in the notion of 'dissimilation'.<sup>60</sup> The character of the national cadastre thus had changed from an instrument for maintaining cohesion with the German minority in Estonia to an instrument that could be used for registering such groups that should be deprived of fundamental rights.

Having outlined Hasselblatt's leading ideas two further aspects need to be discussed: First, the impact of Estonian nationalism and second a comparison with Ammende's and Schiemann's notions of minority politics. When we saw Hasselblatt already during his time in Estonia operating with diverging arguments depending on his audience, a similar observation also could be made with regard to Estonian approaches towards cultural autonomy. There are many hints that parts of the Estonian public had a negative disposition towards the Baltic Germans, particular on their historical as well as their socio-economic impact on the region.<sup>61</sup> The authoritarian period after 1934 saw no general change of the fundamental minority laws but tendencies increased that limited the use of non-Estonian languages or interfered into institutions of the German minority. Such a perspective of limiting the German Baltic social impact on the Estonian society can be connected to further social and political trends in inter-war Estonia such as Estonizing surnames.<sup>62</sup> One more aspect, which was already briefly mentioned, comes from Estonian publications on cultural autonomy. There, the impact of Hasselblatt is seen on a totally different level compared to his self-presentation as the driving force of the law in the second *Riigikogu*: Hasselblatt is hardly mentioned, neither in contemporary Estonian publications nor in post-war publications.<sup>63</sup>

Concerning the relation of Hasselblatt's positions to the other prominent Baltic German minority politicians, the fundamental differences to Schiemann are evident<sup>64</sup>: Schiemann supported the concept of an 'a-national state', meaning that it should refrain from interference into the

national identity of its citizens. Such a position was fully contradictory to Hasselblatt's conviction of the primacy of the nation or *Volk* over the state. More complicated is the case of the cosmopolitan Ewald Ammende, who was active first in organizing the 'Verband der deutschen Volksgruppen in Europa' and then as secretary of the Nationalities Congress. Ammende – as states Martyn Housden – had all national minorities in Europe in the focus of his activities and stressed unequivocally the necessity 'that German minority groups should remain completely loyal to the states they inhabited'.<sup>65</sup> According to Housden the standpoints of Ammende and Hasselblatt in the time of the implementation of the cultural autonomy were still similar,<sup>66</sup> but Ammende's positions were seemingly less coherent than those by his colleagues. In distinction to Hasselblatt, Ammende also argued for a concept of *Volksgemeinschaft* comprising a nation state and its national minorities including the right of cross-border cooperation in the sphere of culture.<sup>67</sup> Thus, notwithstanding Ammende's anti-Soviet attitude and his partial collaboration with Nazi authorities, he largely kept to the basic principles of constructive minority politics. Regarding their attitude towards the issue of loyalty, neither Schiemann nor Ammende followed Hasselblatt's postulated dilemma of *Heimat* vs. *Volkstum*. Loyalty in Schiemann's understanding – as well as of the Nationalities Congress before 1933 – had to be differentiated between one oriented towards the state and one towards the nation.<sup>68</sup> Ammende still in the 1930s underlined the necessity 'to find a mechanism permitting loyalty to both the state and their nationality'.<sup>69</sup>

## Conclusions

Three issues remain to be discussed in the concluding remarks. First: Was there a common thread or a tilting moment in Hasselblatt's political notions? Martyn Housden and Xosé Núñez Seixas have argued that his

corporatist understanding of minorities as well as his priority of *Volksgemeinschaft* over state preformed his path to Nazi politics.<sup>70</sup> Although it is obvious that Hasselblatt's support for the individual confession of belonging to a national minority was limited to the defence against assimilation, the corporatist understanding of minority also shaped the Moravian Compromise of 1905, and thus did not directly lead to a *völkisch* understanding. In addition, there are – so far – no hints of a close cooperation between Hasselblatt and Nazi representatives among the Baltic German minorities. I would, therefore, argue that the tilting towards his *völkisch* understanding of nationalities and an instrumental use of minority politics appeared already as early as 1926 in Hasselblatt's contacts with Berlin and under the influence of Boehm's notion of dissimilation, which – although developed already during the First World War – gained strength in the early 1930s.<sup>71</sup>

Second: What were the political implications of loyalty in the case of Werner Hasselblatt and Estonian politics towards the German minority? In distinction between public confirmations of or demands for loyalty towards the 'host' state on the one hand and expressions of distrust or of diverging bindings to the 'kin' state on the other hand, loyalty was obviously conceived and practised situationally and negotiated on both sides. If in the beginning the Estonian declaration of independence as well as the constitution intended to secure the German minority's loyalty towards the new state through political integration, this goal partly clashed with the socio-economic interest in implementing an agrarian reform in order to distribute land to the ethnic Estonian population. Nevertheless, securing Baltic German loyalty was based on the common goal of preventing Bolshevik rule in Estonia. The level of Bolshevik threat seemingly decided about the waves of relevance of Baltic German loyalty from an Estonian perspective. The issue lost political relevance after the peace treaty of Tartu in 1920 but reappeared on the political agenda after the coup attempt of December 1924. It then once again lost

political relevance in the 1930s under the authoritarian rule, although at the same time *völkisch* tendencies emerged among the German minorities, which challenged previous attitudes and perceptions of loyalty. However, an unambiguous shift of loyalty towards Nazi Germany did not take place among the Baltic German minorities. In addition, the political dimension remained limited in its scope in the Baltic region, as the limitation of self-administration and autonomy to the cultural sphere was not fundamentally challenged. Based on the attitudes by Schiemann and Ammende it also becomes clear that dual loyalty to the 'host' state and the 'kin' nation did not pose a fundamental problem, as long as the political order was respected by all sides. This notion, however, became increasingly challenged by Hasselblatt, although less with open statements but with hints that loyalty might be directed to another institution, if the situation of a minority might worsen. Actually, Hasselblatt had no decisive impact in pursuing the 'Heim ins Reich' policy,<sup>72</sup> but his writings leave no doubt about his support. At the same time Hasselblatt had unambiguously shifted his focus from the Estonian state to Nazi Germany. So, when we reiterate the questions asked at the beginning, it becomes clear that any positive assessment of Baltic minority politics cannot be based on the suggested counterfactual narrative that separates cultural autonomy from the politics of Nazi Germany.<sup>73</sup> If the fate of Paul Schiemann indicates his powerlessness after 1933, then the case of Werner Hasselblatt highlights that the momentum of an instrumental disposition towards loyalty finally destroyed the prospects of inter-war minority politics.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> See in particular the special issue of *Ethnopolitics* 6 (2007), no. 3, on 'The Theory and Practice of Cultural Autonomy in Central and Eastern Europe'; and

---

also D. J. Smith & J. Hiden, *Ethnic Diversity and the Nation State. National Cultural Autonomy Revisited* (New York, 2012), 43. On the restoration of inter-war minority politics in Estonia see C. Hasselblatt, *Minderheitenpolitik in Estland. Rechtsentwicklung und Rechtswirklichkeit 1918-1995* (Tallinn, 1996). Further references will be given below.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the skeptical remark by S. David, *Cultural Autonomy in Estonia. A Relevant Paradigm for the Post-Soviet Era?* (ESRC 'One Europe or Several?' Working Paper, 2001), 43.

<sup>3</sup> In particular in John Hiden's biography: J. Hiden, *Defender of Minorities. Paul Schiemann, 1876-1944* (London, 2004); see also J. Hiden, 'A Voice from Latvia's Past: Paul Schiemann and the Freedom to Practise One's Culture', in: *Slavonic & East European Review* 77/4 (1999), 680-699.

<sup>4</sup> M. Housden, 'Ambiguous Activists. Estonia's Model of Cultural Autonomy as Interpreted by Two of its Founders: Werner Hasselblatt and Ewald Ammende', in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 35/3 (2004), 231-253; M. Housden, *On Their Own Behalf: Ewald Ammende, Europe's National Minorities and the Campaign for Cultural Autonomy 1920-1936* (On the Boundary of Two Worlds: Identity, Freedom, and Moral Imagination in the Baltics, 37) (Leiden, 2014). In these publications Housden revised his former, more positive image of Ammende in: M. Housden, 'Ewald Ammende and the Organization of National Minorities in Inter-War Europe', in: *German History* 18/4 (2000), 439-460. The first to draw attention on Hasselblatt in this connection was S. Myllyniemi, *Die Neuordnung der baltischen Länder 1941-1944. Zum nationalsozialistischen Inhalt der deutschen Besatzungspolitik* (Dissertationes historicae, 2) (Helsinki, 1973); for further information see my publications mentioned in footnote 11.

<sup>5</sup> See his apologetic text: E. Kroeger, *Der Auszug aus der alten Heimat. Die Umsiedlung der Baltendeutschen* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Deutsche Nachkriegsgeschichte, 4) (Tübingen, 1967), 49-54; on the resettlement: J. v. Hehn, *Die Umsiedlung der baltischen Deutschen – das letzte Kapitel baltischdeutscher Geschichte* (Marburger Ostforschungen, 40) (Marburg, Lahn, 1984); and D. A. Loeber (ed.) *Diktierte Option. Die Umsiedlung der Deutsch-Balten aus Estland und Lettland 1939-1941* (Neumünster, 1972).

<sup>6</sup> See the arguments listed by M. Garleff, 'Zwischen Loyalität und Verweigerung. Zur Autonomie der Deutschbalten in Estland und Lettland', in: B. Störkuhl, J. Stüben & T. Weger (eds.), *Aufbruch und Krise. Das östliche Europa und die*

---

*Deutschen nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Schriften des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im Östlichen Europa, 41) (Munich, 2010), 301-302.

<sup>7</sup> L. Lundin, 'The Road from Tsar to Kaiser: Changing Loyalties of the Baltic Germans, 1905–1914', in: *Journal of Central European Affairs* 10 (1950), 255.

<sup>8</sup> This understanding is formed by: J. Osterkamp & M. S. Wessel, 'Texturen von Loyalität: Überlegungen zu einem analytischen Begriff', in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 42/4 (2016), 553-573; and M. Schulze Wessel, '„Loyalität“ als geschichtlicher Grundbegriff und Forschungskonzept: Zur Einleitung', in: M. Schulze Wessel (ed.), *Loyalitäten in der Tschechoslowakischen Republik. Politische, nationale und kulturelle Zugehörigkeiten*. (Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, 101) (Munich, 2004), 1-22; See also J. Osterkamp & M. Schulze Wessel (eds.), *Exploring Loyalty* (Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, 136) (Göttingen, 2017); and P. Haslinger & J. v. Puttkamer, 'Staatsmacht, Minderheit, Loyalität. Konzeptionelle Grundlagen am Beispiel Ostmittel- und Südosteuropas in der Zwischenkriegszeit', in: P. Haslinger & J. v. Puttkamer (eds.), *Staat, Loyalität und Minderheiten in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa 1918–1941* (Buchreihe der Kommission für Geschichte und Kultur der Deutschen in Südosteuropa, 39) (Munich, 2007), 1-16.

<sup>9</sup> A. O. Hirschman, *Exit, Voice and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Cambridge, MA, 1970), 76-105; cf. Osterkamp & Wessel, 'Texturen', 556.

<sup>10</sup> Apart from the literature mentioned above see K. Laurits, *Saksa kulturomavalitsus Eesti Vabariigis 1925–1940. Monograafia ja allikad* (ad fontes, 16) (Tallinn, 2008); V. Vasara, 'Das estnische Parlament und die Deutschbalten. Zu den Debatten bis zur Verabschiedung der Kulturautonomie 1925', in: *Nordost-Archiv N.F.* 4/2 (1995), 479-500; K. Alenius, 'The Birth of Cultural Autonomy in Estonia: How, Why, and for Whom?', in: *Journal of Baltic Studies* 38/4 (2007), 445-462.

<sup>11</sup> See my earlier publications with more detailed information: J. Hackmann, 'Werner Hasselblatt on Cultural Autonomy – a Forgotten Manuscript', in: M. Housden & D. Smith (eds.), *Forgotten Pages of Baltic History. Diversity and Inclusion* (On the Boundary of Two Worlds: Identity, Freedom, and Moral Imagination in the Baltics, 30) (Amsterdam, 2011), 147-160; J. Hackmann, 'Concepts of German Nationalities Policy in Eastern Europe during the Second

World War: The Case of Werner Hasselblatt', in: D. Gaunt, P. A. Levine & L. Palosuo (eds.), *Collaboration and Resistance during the Holocaust: Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania* (Oxford et al., 2004), 95-110; J. Hackmann, 'Werner Hasselblatt. Von der estländischen Kulturautonomie zur nationalsozialistischen Bevölkerungspolitik', in: M. Garleff (ed.), *Deutschbalten, Weimarer Republik und Drittes Reich* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna, 2008), 71-107.

<sup>12</sup> X. M. Núñez Seixas, 'Internationale Politik, Minderheitenfrage und nationale Autonomie: Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß (1925-1938)', in: H. Timmermann (ed.), *Nationalismus und Nationalbewegung in Europa 1914–1945* (Dokumente und Schriften der Europäischen Akademie Otzenhausen, 85) (Berlin, 1999), 39-70; X. M. Núñez Seixas, *Entre Ginebra y Berlín. La cuestión de las minorías nacionales y la política internacional en Europa, 1914-1939* (Akal universitaria, Serie Historia contemporánea, 216) (Madrid, 2001); not always reliable is S. Bamberger-Stemmann, *Der Europäische Nationalitätenkongreß 1925 bis 1938. Nationale Minderheiten zwischen Lobbyistentum und Großmachtinteressen* (Materialien und Studien zur Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung, 7) (Marburg, 2000); see also U. v. Hirschhausen, 'From Minority Protection to Border Revisionism: The European Nationality Congress, 1925–38', in: M. Conway & K. K. Patel (eds.), *Europeanization in the Twentieth Century: Historical Approaches* (London, 2010), 87-109.

<sup>13</sup> G. Aly & S. Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung. Auschwitz und die deutschen Pläne für eine neue europäische Ordnung* (Frankfurt/M., 1993).

<sup>14</sup> G. Kroeger, 'Die Deutschen Vereine in Liv-, Est- und Kurland 1905/06-1914', in: *Jahrbuch des baltischen Deutschtums* 16 (1969), 39-49; G. Kroeger, 'Zur Situation der baltischen Deutschen um die Jahrhundertwende', in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 17 (1968), 601-632; J. v. Hehn, 'Das baltische Deutschtum zwischen den Revolutionen von 1905 und 1917. Einige Bemerkungen zu Forschungsaufgaben und Forschungsproblemen', in: A. Ezergailis & G. v. Pistohlkors (eds.), *Die baltischen Provinzen Rußlands zwischen den Revolutionen von 1905 und 1917 / The Russian Baltic Provinces between the 1905/1917 Revolutions* (Quellen und Studien zur baltischen Geschichte, 4) (Cologne, Vienna, 1982), 43-57.

<sup>15</sup> J. Hackmann, 'Nachholende Nationalisierung. Das kurze Leben der Deutschen Vereine in den russländischen Ostseeprovinzen (1905–1914)', in: J. Hackmann (ed.), *Vereinskultur und Zivilgesellschaft in Nordosteuropa. Regionale Spezifik und europäische Zusammenhänge. Associational Culture and Civil Society in North*

*Eastern Europe. Regional Features and the European Context* (Quellen und Studien zur baltischen Geschichte, 20) (Vienna, Cologne, Weimar, 2012), 387-418.

<sup>16</sup> M. R. Hatlie, 'Flags and Bayonets. Mass Celebrations in Riga 1910–1920', in: *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 51/4 (2002), 475–499; M. R. Hatlie, *Riga at War 1914–1919. War and Wartime Experience in a Multi-Ethnic Metropolis* (Studien zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung, 30) (Marburg, 2014).

<sup>17</sup> G. v. Pistohlkors, 'Führende Schicht oder nationale Minderheit? Die Revolution von 1905/06 und die Kennzeichnung der politischen Situation der deutschen Balten zwischen 1840 und 1906 in der zeitgenössischen deutsch-baltischen Geschichtsforschung', in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 21/4 (1972), 601-618; K. Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht zur nationalen Minderheit. Zur Klärung der Rolle der estländischen deutschen Minderheit bei der Begründung der Republik Estland 1918-1919', in: *Nordost-Archiv N.F.* 4/2 (1995), 453-478.

<sup>18</sup> See A. Henriksson, *The Tsar's Loyal Germans. The Riga German Community: Social Change and the Nationality Question, 1855-1905* (East European Monographs, 131) (Boulder, New York, 1983).

<sup>19</sup> See the contributions by A. von Taube and K-H. Janßen in: J. v. Hehn, H. v. Rimscha & H. Weiss (eds.), *Von den baltischen Provinzen zu den baltischen Staaten. Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Republiken Estland und Lettland 1917-1918* (Marburg/Lahn, 1971); H.-E. Volkmann, *Die deutsche Baltikumpolitik zwischen Brest-Litovsk und Compiègne. Ein Beitrag zur "Kriegszieldiskussion"* (Ostmitteleuropa in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, 13) (Cologne, 1970); G. v. Rauch, *Geschichte der baltischen Staaten* (Hannover-Döhren, 1986).

<sup>20</sup> Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht', 462-463; E. v. Dellingshausen, *Im Dienste der Heimat! Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart, 1930), 349-350.

<sup>21</sup> Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht', 464.

<sup>22</sup> Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht', 468-471.

<sup>23</sup> Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht', 472; O. Arens, 'The Estonian Maapäev during 1917', in: V. S. Vardys & R. J. Misiunas (eds.), *The Baltic States in Peace and War 1917–1945* (London, 1978), 19-30, 198-201. See also: Meie parlament ja aeg. Fakte, sündmusi, dokumente, inimesi, ed. Marge Allandi, Eesti

---

Rahvusraamatukogu sotsiaalia ja parlamendiraamatukogu, <https://meieparlamentijaeg.nlib.ee/1917-maapaev/> [26/02/2021].

<sup>24</sup> Mickwitz (1850-1924) was a teacher and newspaper editor as well as president of various associations; cf. P. Schiemann, *Zwischen zwei Zeitaltern. Erinnerungen 1903-1919* (Schriftenreihe der Carl-Schirren-Gesellschaft, 3) (Lüneburg, 1979), 26-27.

<sup>25</sup> W. Hasselblatt, 'Zehn Jahre deutsch-baltischer Politik in Estland', in: *Jahrbuch des baltischen Deutschtums in Lettland und Estland* (1929), 66-70; M. Garleff, 'Die deutschbaltische Volksgruppe zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand bei der Staatsgründung der Republik Estland', in: *Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised. Ühiskonnateadused* 40 (1991), 4-15 (7-8).

<sup>26</sup> Hasselblatt, 'Zehn Jahre', 68; cf. however Hasselblatt, 'Minderheitenpolitik', 35.

<sup>27</sup> G. v. Pistohlkors, 'Inversion of Ethnic Group Status in the Baltic Region: Governments and Rural Ethnic Conflicts in Russia's Baltic Provinces and in the Independent States of Estonia and Latvia, 1850-1940', in: D. W. Howell, G. v. Pistohlkors & E. Wiegant (eds.), *Roots of Rural Ethnic Mobilisation* (Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850-1940, 7) (Aldershot, 1993), 169-219 (198-199); T. Rosenberg, 'Agrarfrage und Agrarreform in Estland 1919: Ursachen, Voraussetzungen und Folgen', in: *Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised. Humanitaar- ja sotsiaalteadused* 43/3 (1994), 326-335; I. Lipping, *Land Reform Legislation in Estonia and the Disestablishment of the Baltic German Rural Elite, 1919-1939* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland) (College Park, MD, 1980); Laurits, *Saksa kultuuroromavalitsus*, 128-136.

<sup>28</sup> For details see: J. Hackmann, 'Von der „Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft“ zu „Õpetatud Eesti Selts“. Verein und Nation in Estland', in: N. Angermann, M. Garleff & W. Lenz (eds.), *Ostseeprovinzen, Baltische Staaten und das Nationale. Festschrift für Gert von Pistohlkors zum 70. Geburtstag* (Schriften der Baltischen Historischen Kommission, 14) (Münster, 2005), 185-211.

<sup>29</sup> R. Raag, 'The Multilingual Parliament: Language Choice by Non-Estonian Members of Parliament in Parliamentary Debates in Estonia 1919-1934', in: B. Metzälä-Kangere (ed.), *The Ethnic Dimension in Politics and Culture in the Baltic Countries, 1920-1945* (Södertörn Academic Studies, 18) (Södertörn, 2004), 92-120; publications from that period listed in: M. Garleff, 'Deutschbaltische

Publizisten. Ewald Ammende – Werner Hasselblatt – Paul Schiemann', in: *Berichte und Forschungen* 2 (1994), 189-229.

<sup>30</sup> Of the 881 statements by non-Estonian members of Parliament more than 500 were given in Estonian, whereas the c. 300 statements by Russian members were given exclusively in Russian language, see Raag, 'The Multilingual Parliament', 102, 105.

<sup>31</sup> Some of Hasselblatt's speeches were printed in German language newspaper, for details see: Garleff, 'Deutschbaltische Publizisten'.

<sup>32</sup> Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht', 468.

<sup>33</sup> Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht', 474; J. Uluots, *Grundzüge der Agrargeschichte Estlands* (Tartu, 1935), 180-192; Rosenberg, 'Agrarfrage', 330.

<sup>34</sup> See Vasara, 'Parlament', for details; this connection, however, has also been disputed, see below.

<sup>35</sup> Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 77.

<sup>36</sup> K. Aun, *Der völkerrechtliche Schutz nationaler Minderheiten in Estland von 1917 bis 1940* (Hamburg, 1951); see also K. Aun, 'On the Spirit of the Estonian Minorities Law', in: J. Olvet-Jensen (ed.), *Apophoreta Tartuensia* (Stockholm, 1949), 240-245; K. Aun, 'Vähemusrahvuste kultuurautonoomia Eestis. Tagapõhjast ja teostumisest', in: *Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised. Ühiskonnateadused* 40/1 (1991), 61-66; O. Angelus, *Die Kulturautonomie in Estland* (Detmold, 1951); cf. Laurits, *Saksa kulturomavalitsus*, 57.

<sup>37</sup> For details see Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 77.

<sup>38</sup> See Hackmann, 'Cultural Autonomy'.

<sup>39</sup> Hints on the Ukrainian law: M. M. Laserson, 'Das Minoritätenrecht der baltischen Staaten', in: *Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht* 2 (1931), 401-429; Aun, 'Spirit'; Aun, 'Vähemusrahvuste'; Laurits, *Saksa kulturomavalitsus*, 45.

<sup>40</sup> W. Hasselblatt, 'Kulturautonomie. Ein Erinnerungsblatt für Professor Rudolf Laun', in: G. C. Hernmarck (ed.), *Festschrift zu Ehren von Professor Dr. jur. Rudolf Laun, Rektor der Universität Hamburg anlässlich der Vollendung seines 65. Lebensjahres am 1. Januar 1947* (Hamburg, 1948), 32-35.

---

<sup>41</sup> See 'Revaler Bote' on February 23, 1925; *Gesetze und Verordnungen betreffend die deutsche Kultur selbstverwaltung* (Reval, 1926); H. Kraus, *Das Recht der Minderheiten. Materialien zur Einführung in das Verständnis des modernen Minoritätenproblems* (Stilkes Rechtsbibliothek, 57) (Berlin, 1927), 189-208; A. Spindler, *An die Gegner der Kulturautonomie der völkischen Minderheiten in Estland* (Reval, 1924); on the role of Spindler see also Smith & Hiden, *Ethnic Diversity*, 36-38, 46.

<sup>42</sup> Hackmann, 'Cultural Autonomy', 152.

<sup>43</sup> For more details on the fate of the text see Hackmann, 'Cultural Autonomy', 148-149.

<sup>44</sup> Hasselblatt, 'Zehn Jahre', 67.

<sup>45</sup> Similar claims were made by Hasselblatt several times, see Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 79; Hackmann, 'Cultural Autonomy', 154..

<sup>46</sup> W. Hasselblatt, 'Hat sich die Kulturautonomie in Estland bewährt?', in: *Nation und Staat* 4 (1930-1931), 441-448.

<sup>47</sup> Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 77-78; excerpts from the paper are quoted in Bamberger-Stemmann, *Nationalitätenkongreß*, 51, 253.

<sup>48</sup> Following the findings by Raag, 'The Multilingual Parliament', one might however need to analyze Hasselblatt's statements more closely.

<sup>49</sup> Hirschman, Exit, see above footnote 9.

<sup>50</sup> This antithesis appears in many of his writings, see for instance: Hasselblatt, 'Zehn Jahre'; and W. Hasselblatt, 'Die nationale Autonomie als Ziel der europäischen Nationalitätenpolitik. Festvortrag zur Feier der Deutschpolitischen Arbeitsamtes', in: *Zehn Jahre Deutschpolitisches Arbeitsamt* (Veröffentlichungen des deutschpolitischen Arbeitsamtes, 32) (Prague, [1930]), 7-21; for more information see: Hackmann, 'Cultural Autonomy', 151-154.

<sup>51</sup> W. Hasselblatt, 'Überstaatliche Volksgemeinschaft', in: *Baltische Monatshefte*, (1932), 1-6; W. Hasselblatt, 'Überstaatliche Volksgemeinschaft – eine Panbewegung', in: *Nation und Staat* 5 (1932-1933), 438-445.

<sup>52</sup> Hasselblatt claimed that this was his idea, see Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 73, 95.

<sup>53</sup> See Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 74. Actually, Hasselblatt already earlier opposed a first title of the journal as *Deutsche Zeitschrift für die Minderheitenfrage*, see M. Garleff, 'Nationalitätenpolitik zwischen liberalem und völkischem Anspruch. Gleichklang und Spannung bei Paul Schiemann und Werner Hasselblatt', in: J. v. Hehn & C. J. Kenéz (eds.), *Reval und die baltischen Länder. Festschrift für Hellmuth Weiss zum 80. Geburtstag* (Marburg, Lahn, 1980), 113-132 (118).

<sup>54</sup> Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 78.

<sup>55</sup> On Boehm see U. Prehn, *Max Hildebert Boehm: radikales Ordnungsdenken vom Ersten Weltkrieg bis in die Bundesrepublik* (Hamburger Beiträge zur Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte, 51) (Göttingen, 2013); U. Prehn, 'Metamorphosen radikalen Ordnungsdenkens im "europäischen Großraum". Ethnopolitische und "volkstheoretische" Konzepte Max Hildebert Boehms vom Ersten bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg', in: M. Garleff (ed.), *Deutschbalten, Weimarer Republik und Drittes Reich* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna, 2008), 1-70.

<sup>56</sup> Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 80, 96.

<sup>57</sup> Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 80.

<sup>58</sup> Núñez Seixas, 'Internationale Politik', 55.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. here also Housden, *On Their Own Behalf*, 291.

<sup>60</sup> Hackmann, 'Kulturautonomie', 80.

<sup>61</sup> See the examples given by: Brüggemann, 'Von der führenden Schicht'; Hasselblatt, *Minderheitenpolitik*; Rosenberg, 'Agrarfrage'.

<sup>62</sup> For details see Hasselblatt, *Minderheitenpolitik*, 68-72.

<sup>63</sup> See above, footnote 36.

<sup>64</sup> They were already discussed by: Garleff, 'Nationalitätenpolitik'.

<sup>65</sup> Housden, 'Ammende', 449. In his later texts, however, Housden changed his opinion on Ammende, cf. fn. 4.

<sup>66</sup> Housden, *On Their Own Behalf*, 61.

<sup>67</sup> Housden, 'Ammende', 449; Housden, 'Ambiguous Activists', 241-242; Housden, *On Their Own Behalf*, 58.

<sup>68</sup> Smith & Hiden, *Ethnic diversity*, 89.

<sup>69</sup> Housden, *On Their Own Behalf*, 186.

<sup>70</sup> Housden, 'Ambiguous Activists', 246; X. M. Núñez Seixas, '¿Autodeterminación o autonomía cultural? Debates ideológicos en el Congreso de Nacionalidades Europeas (1925-1939)', in: *Hispania* 57/3 (1998), 1113-1151 (1147-1151).

<sup>71</sup> Prehn, *Max Hildebert Boehm*, 273-294.

<sup>72</sup> Although his attitude to Konrad Henlein's activities might receive further attention, cf. Bamberger-Stemmann, *Nationalitätenkongreß*, 71; and Garleff, 'Loyalität'.

<sup>73</sup> See above, footnote 6.