Introduction

On 31 August 1939, Nazi SS (*Schutzstaffel*) agents carried out a ploy to disguise Hitler's imminent attack on Poland as a defensive measure. In this legendary subterfuge, armed SS men dressed in Polish military uniforms broke into the German radio station in Gleiwitz (Gliwice), located near the border with Poland in Upper Silesia. (Some historians believe they were actually dressed in civilian clothing.) After holding up the station's personnel, the fake soldiers went on air to announce that the station was in Polish hands. On the next fateful day, as the Wehrmacht attacked Poland, the Nazi Party's newspaper, *Völkische Beobachter*, reported the Gleiwitz incident as an attack on "German soil" by members of the "Polish volunteer corps of Upper Silesian insurgents." Yet the incident went unmentioned as one of "fourteen border incidents" the previous night in Adolf Hitler's war declaration speech before the Reichstag on 1 September 1939. Perhaps "the Führer" chose not to draw attention to an incident whose logistical feasibility should have puzzled anyone familiar with Gleiwitz at the time. Just to reach the radio station, the "Polish invaders" would have had to make their way through a well-patrolled border, not to mention a densely populated city full of German soldiers preparing to invade Poland.[1]

Nonetheless, a Polish attack on German soil seemed at least plausible to residents of the industrial border city. That summer, as for nearly twenty years, Polish paramilitary members organized by a government-sponsored Insurgent League had marched with firearms to the German-Polish border, vowing to use force to "recover" the western (German) part of Upper Silesia for Poland. Long before the Gleiwitz incident, Nazi propaganda had been using such theater, as well as exaggerated stories of Poland's persecuted German minority, to persuade the public of their neighbor's aggressive threat to Germany. Even in Upper Silesia, where locals often questioned the regime's exaggerated anti-Polish rhetoric, observers of the public mood in Gleiwitz in May 1939 noted that "the anti-Polish agitation is beginning to gain influence even among leftist-oriented people," and "that it is quite possible that in the event of a real outbreak of war against Poland Hitler could indeed win over large masses for such a war."[2] Well-versed in the irredentism endemic to this borderland and other eastern territories, Nazi borderland

specialists wrapped their propaganda in the publicly familiar discourses and symbols of the long-standing German-Polish conflict over Upper Silesia.

Since Germany's defeat in 1918, followed by territorial losses in the Treaty of Versailles, even proponents of the Weimar Republic and fervent opponents of Nazism and nationalism as well as defenders of international peace, moderation, and diplomacy gave lip service to the notion that, in the words of historian Erich Marcks, "the current borders" were "just impossible."[3] Thus, the republic's defenders commonly agreed with its opponents in calling for the "recovery" of the "German east." Similarly, long before the Nazis seized power, ordinary Germans had become activists on behalf of saving the "bleeding border" from "Polonization."[4] In Upper Silesia and the other "lost" eastern provinces whose cause he had inherited, Hitler found a valuable grievance around which to rally German support for his own imperialist dreams of military expansion.

To win domestic and international sympathy for the invasion of Poland, Hitler's 1 September war declaration speech consciously avoided appeals to such Nazi principles as Germany's need for *Lebensraum* (living space) and the mixture of social Darwinism and racism that justified the right of the stronger. Rather, he invoked a more traditional line of argument that affirmed Germany's right as a nation-state to its eastern borderlands. At the outset, he underscored that these provinces "were and remain German," and that although they "owe their cultural development exclusively to the German people," they "had been annexed by Poland," where "the German minorities living there [have been] ill-treated in the most distressing manner!"[5] These phrases reflected a familiar language of popular irredentism that long before the Third Reich had been endorsed by the Weimar Republic's supporters and opponents alike.

The Gleiwitz incident—a sideshow in Hitler's invasion of Poland—drew its symbolic power from a deeply entrenched irredentist culture that emerged from post–World War I territorial conflicts between Germany and Poland. By "irredentist" and "irredentism" (and interchangeably "revisionist" and "revisionism"), I refer to the politics of contesting and claiming territory in general, whether based on purely historical and geopolitical or ethnic arguments or, more commonly, ones of a mixed sort.[6] Indeed, I make a claim for the inherent similarity of irredentist politics between two nations that long contested control over Upper Silesia, the geographical focus of this book. This holds true despite changes in governments and across different time periods. The area of primary interest is known as the "industrial district," a cluster of densely populated industrial urban centers, one of them being Gleiwitz. This center of coal mining and metallurgy made the larger region one of Central Europe's most industrially valuable areas. Moreover, in 1922, the League of Nations drew the German-Polish border—an object of unrelenting quarrel and contestation—right through this industrial district, making it the most coveted area to each of the two nation-states.

Throughout the interwar era, governments in Germany and Poland struggled against one another to reacculturate landscapes and renationalize inhabitants in the district and larger region. Each side deployed its own cadre of borderland nationalists (activists supported by the government, including state agents, para-militants, scholars, folklorists, literati, and other specialists of irredentist politics) dedicated to promoting to its locals, its nation, and the international community its own irredentist myth that the borderland "always was and remained" German or Polish. These nationalists waged a cultural contest over this borderland in reaction to, and in imitation of, one another's "cultural propaganda," namely, discourses, propaganda tactics, and nationalization policies. They were spread through traditional written media, the new technologies of radio and film, politi-cally symbolic enclaves such as architecture, urban planning projects, museums, mass rallies, education, and other venues.

This book represents a transnational history of irredentism as a popular cul-ture, and its promotion at the grassroots.[7] It aims not only to give equal attention to both sides of the conflict but also to demonstrate how they interacted with one another in disputes over territories, spaces, and symbols, as well as with the locals they sought to mobilize to actively support their side of the struggle. I utilize this interactive transnational approach to highlight my main argument, namely, that although claiming to be emphatically opposed to one another, both of the conflicting (German and Polish) national camps and their propaganda enterprises were actually but two sides of one political culture, in which the poli-cies and discourses of each were not only strikingly similar, but also inherently interwoven. Interaction, mutual reaction against one another's policies and pro-paganda, and even mutual influence between both national camps formed the basis of this irredentist culture and the territorial conflict that it sustained. This culture played a central role in Upper Silesia's multiple territorial "recoveries"—successive renationalizations by Germany and Poland following border revisions in 1922, 1939, and 1945. Between 1922 and 1953, the book's primary focus, it evolved over several historical periods and under German and Polish govern-ments of diverse ideological orientations. Since the early 1920s, regional and national governments on each side of the border—liberal and authoritarian alike—profited politically from borderland nationalism. They found it helpful for boosting Upper Silesia's national importance, legitimizing authoritarian rule, and, in the cases of the German National Socialists and Polish Communists, for building "ethnically cleansed" societies.

Between 1939 and 1950, the institutions, discourses, policies, and proponents of this transnational irredentist culture served the acculturation goals of larger forces working to forge ethnic and political homogeneity in the borderlands. Thus, this culture became an essential instrument for social engineering projects that employed violence, expulsion, resettlement, forced assimilation—and in the case of the Nazis, genocide. Upper Silesia was part of the larger politics of

constructing utopian societies—in the annexed territories for the Nazis and in the western borderlands for the Communists. Each of these projects occurred under unique circumstances and employed different if also similar means. Whereas the Nazis focused on "re-Germanizing" the eastern parts of Upper Silesia that had belonged to Poland during the interwar era, the Polish Communists worked to "re-Polonize" the formerly German western part.

Yet each treated the vast majority of locals in its new territory as "recovered peoples" who needed to be renationalized, that is, reengineered as its model "new man." For this purpose, each drew heavily on the transnational irredentist culture, and even appropriated and repurposed the "other's" institutions—for example, museums, conservatories, institutes—for its own nationalizing work. By analyzing these commonalities, this book contributes to recent scholarship that breaks down the conceptual border between the imperialist policies of Nazism and communism in East-Central Europe.[8] On a broader scale, it aims to contribute to the history of the contestation and nationalization of borderlands, and more specifically with regards to German-Polish relations, but also to studies of regionalism and a phenomenon more recently described as "national indifference."

Borderland Nationalism

World War I clearly revealed the destructive potential of nationalism and the chauvinism, militarism, and racism—in this case, cultural racism[9]—that accompanied it. At the same time, by hastening the end of four multinational conglomerations—the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman empires—the war created opportunities for a number of previously unacknowledged nations to assert their own territorial claims. Calls for the "liberation" and "recovery" of "stolen" territories, or for their "return" to their proper national "motherland," resounded beyond Germany's borders. Rogers Brubaker characterized this politics of claiming a "homeland" beyond one's nation-state borders as "external homeland nationalism."[10]

This irredentism was particularly strong in multiethnic Central Europe, where the victorious Allies tried to accommodate Woodrow Wilson's ideal of the congruity of peoples and "their lands" in their task of drawing and redrawing borders. Thus, if a nation has a right to territories inhabited by its own people, then it followed that "an independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations."[11] As a basic tenet for rebuilding the continent's postwar political order, Wilsonian principles thus reinforced the dominance of nationalism in European politics. The conflict between these ideals and demographic realities often led to brutal territorial wars and population exchanges between successor states of the fallen monarchies.[12]

The mass mobilizing potential of territorial conflicts made grassroots irredentism a characteristic feature of interwar diplomacy. By the end of World War I, territorial conflict ceased to be the concern only of diplomats and government elites. Government agents strove to mobilize the broader public around disputed borderlands, made more graphic by irredentist symbols and slogans. Radio and film, still new media technologies, played a pivotal role in providing both informative and entertaining ways to bring irredentist discourses to the masses.[13]

The Hungarian-Romanian conflict over Transylvania offers a case study in irredentist mass politics. Holly Case has recently described how Hungary accompanied its annexation of the northern part of this region in 1940 with a whole "language and science of legitimacy" that identified the new territory as a "liberated" or "reannexed" Hungarian province, thereby promoting a "sense of interrupted continuity being restored." Social scientists, such as ethnographers, racial anthropologists, and geographers, along with natural scientists, such as climatologists and botanists, worked to create a myth of this region's "national belonging." Urban planners, architects, and builders assisted in this enterprise by giving Transylvania's capital, Koloszvar, a Hungarian appearance. State cultural politics aimed to resocialize the masses to accept this national identity by creating symbolic spaces and staging mass rallies that celebrated "liberation" and "reannexation." Thus, Case argued, the territorial conflict "between Hungary and Romania ran much deeper than high diplomacy, saturating domestic politics, social science, cultural institutions, and ideas of statehood."[14]

This popular irredentism was part of a larger innovation in mass politics in twentieth-century Europe, where, as Philipp Ther argued, "nationalism had been transformed from a political ideology into a social reality."[15] This process began in the second half of the nineteenth century with what Rogers Brubaker referred to as "the nationalizing nation-state."[16] Early nation-building policies involved a degree of cultural homogenization, as exemplified by the German chancellor Otto von Bismarck's Kulturkampf, a cultural struggle to cripple the political influence of Catholicism in the newly united Germany. According to Brian Porter, by the fin de siècle, a new nationalism had emerged, which in reaction to the liberal model of an inclusive multicultural nation based on patriotic ideals defined the nation by exclusivist ethnic and linguistic criteria.[17] Exemplified by the Pan-German League and Roman Dmowski's (Polish) National Democracy, the new nationalists worked to standardize the physical and cultural characteristics of the essential (or core) elements of their respective nations, their particular peoples (*Volk* in German, *lud* in Polish), and their territories. (From *Volk* comes the commonly used *völkisch* for these politics.) Their insistence that the state should safeguard the supremacy of its core people, who often inhabited areas of Central Europe that extended beyond the borders of one nation, gained enormous political influence in the midst of postwar revolutions and dislocations.

Wilsonianism strengthened "the spell" of building homogenous nation-states in Central Europe.

In its role as social engineer, the nationalizing nation-state often employed procedures that have come to be known as "ethnic cleansing"—defined by Norman Naimark as "the removal of a people and *all traces of them* from a concrete territory."[18] By promoting "population exchange" between Greece and Turkey, the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) formally made expulsion an internationally endorsed "solution" to the "problem" of diversity within a given nation, particularly in contested border areas. Moreover, mass migrations—in Brubaker's words, the "unmixing" of populations—followed post-World War I border revisions, usually in response to more informal cultural and economic pressures in nationalizing nation-states. Hitler's extreme nationalism and ethnic cleansing policies emerged within this broader context.[19]

Fearing irredentist aggression from an adjoining nation-state, governments of multiethnic borderlands often resorted to "cleansing," "unmixing," and nationalization. Caitlin Murdock's work on the Saxony-Bohemian borderland (separating Germany and Austria-Hungary and, later, Czechoslovakia) demonstrates that postwar state authorities imposed unprecedented control and surveillance over frontier regions. Nation-states categorized the inhabitants of these areas along ethnic-national lines and demanded that they constantly reaffirm their identity with and loyalty to the nation-state. A specific "borderland rhetoric" reinforced these politics by positing the politically constructed "borderland" as an "endangered" and "bleeding" entity that at the same time represented the nation's "fortress."[20] This ideology, which I refer to as borderland nationalism, legitimated an intrusive politics of nationalization and homogenization. For example, restrictions on border crossing threatened the traditional rhythms of local life in regions that prior to their classification as "borderlands" were marked by unimpeded movement and nonnational identities.[21] As Tara Zahra's work has demonstrated, such policies even invaded family life in cases where national activists pressured parents to send children to schools that instructed in "their" language.[22]

The German-Polish Borderlands

Following the post–World War I territorial settlements, the German government increased control over its remaining, but now "endangered," eastern provinces, to which the new nation-states of Poland and Czechoslovakia laid continuing claims. Fervent opposition to territorial losses imposed on Germany united otherwise divided Germans of almost all political orientations, and in turn weakened faith in the new Weimar Republic. The "bleeding border"—a term that depicted territorial loss as an amputation of vital parts of the German nation—became

a symbol of national victimization, as did the many displaced individuals, both those who fled their "lost *Heimat*" (local homeland) and those stranded on now Polish territory.[23] Interwar Germany's claims to its *Volksdeutsche*—ethnic Germans who were citizens and inhabitants of other countries—amplified calls for the return of "German cultural soil" (*Deutsche Kulturboden*) on which these groups resided. As Annemarie Sammartino demonstrates, this irredentist discourse presupposed an official conceptualization of citizenship along the specific ethnic and cultural lines of "Germanness"—itself a result of border revision.[24]

Throughout the interwar period, Germany posed the greatest threat to the territorial integrity of the new Polish state. Long before the Nazis assumed power, the Weimar Republic explicitly called for the return of Poland's most vital territories: Danzig and the Polish Corridor, which provided Poland's only access to the sea, and eastern Upper Silesia, its only center of industry. This perceived threat provided a justification for the discriminatory treatment of Germans and the persecution of German minority organizations in Poland.[25] These groups helped fan the flames of Polish irredentism, which aimed not just to defend the republic's existing borderlands, but also to expand them with claims to territories in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and other neighboring states.

The brutality of the Third Reich's acts of territorial aggression has long cast a shadow on the historical memory of the irredentist politics of other nations during the interwar era, particularly on the part of those who became Hitler's main victims. Defending and expanding "endangered" borders was integral to the irredentist political culture common to most countries of Central Europe. The new Polish state—born of six territorial military conflicts against its neighbors and plagued by the resulting grievances—serves as a prime example of how the quarrelling successor states of the former Habsburg Empire contributed to making Central Europe a powder keg for World War II.[26] In the end, the establishment of the German-Polish border by western European statesmen at Versailles was met with protests from political elites within *both* nations. Interest in the "struggle" to protect and expand the borderlands aroused widespread and serious interest among the publics of both Poland and Weimar Germany. Like the *Volksdeutsche* in Poland, so Poles in Germany's borderlands had their own minority organizations, which became the state's tools for irredentist politics.[27] Poland's invasion and annexation of the Czechoslovakian border region of Teschen Silesia (Těšin or Zaolzia) in the wake of Hitler's annexation of the Sudetenland following the Munich Conference in October 1938 marked a culmination of this irredentist fervor. Hungary followed suit that November by taking territory in southern Czechoslovakia, including Carpathian Ruthenia. Clearly, Germany's annexation of the Sudetenland—however great its iconic role as a premonition of the war to come—represented broader discontent over Central Europe's borders.

Responsibility for the war that enveloped Europe clearly rested with the Nazi regime's unilateral determination to build a continental German empire

stretching even into Soviet Eurasia, not with this widespread irredentist fervor. Nevertheless, in Munich Hitler was able to exploit the internationally accepted ideal of a nation's "right" to "its" territories in order to sufficiently disguise his imperialist aims to suit the European appeasers.[28] Although this ruse failed in the case of Poland, the Nazis portrayed their invasion as a struggle to "recover" territory and "liberate" its *Volksdeutsche*."[29] For many ordinary Germans, including some who may not have been Nazis, this notion conferred moral value to at least the initial phase of the Third Reich's military aggression. Persuaded by these ideals—the subject of Elizabeth Harvey's work on women's activism in these regions—they zealously engaged in the work of "Germanizing" the annexed formerly Polish western borderlands, which were also known as the "recovered lands" (*wiedergewonnene Länder*).[30] The German myth of "recovering" lands that "were and remain German" functioned as a more familiar and traditional, culturally as well as regionally based nationalist discourse. Part of a larger narrative of the "German east" that legitimated German hegemony over its wider eastern European "sphere of influence," it applied specifically to the formerly Prussian borderlands of interwar Poland.[31] Working in tandem with a more esoteric Nazi discourse on racial hygiene, this mainstream irredentist language legitimized the "Germanization" of the annexed territories through ethnic cleansing, which included acculturation, expulsion, resettlement, and genocide.

Upon liberating Poland from Nazi German occupation in 1945, the Soviet Union installed a Polish Communist regime to govern the country. Likewise, Poland's borders were redrawn to incorporate Germany's eastern provinces (the so-called Oder-Neisse territories, named for the rivers that formed the new border), such as Pomerania, eastern Brandenburg, and Silesia. Indeed, the expulsion of millions of Germans followed. As Hugo Service argues in his work on postwar Silesia, while Poland's westward territorial shift was formally decided only by the "Big Three" Allied leaders (the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR), it marked the realization of the long-standing dreams of Polish nationalists, particularly followers of Roman Dmowski, the original author of claims to these lands. Working with the Communist regime to ensure the success of their longed-for western border, they helped promote the regime's own "recovered territories" myth to rationalize the annexation. Indeed, in some respects similar to how the German territorial myth had functioned as an alternative to Hitler's racism, the Polish counterpart offered a nationalist ideology as a substitute for a widely detested Marxist-Leninism to legitimate Poland's new political order. Borderland nationalists working with the Communists used this myth to justify the expulsion of Germans, to idealize the "recovery" of "Poles from Germany," and to glorify the engineering of an ethnically homogenous society in these provinces.[32]

German and Polish myths of "recovered territories" functioned as the ideological backbone of two inherently interwoven irredentist cultural-political

enterprises, whose development stemmed from the conflict fostered by the shared post-1919 border. Throughout the interwar era in particular, cultural politics were at the center of what I will refer to as a territorial *cold war* (or a state of heated political tension but not actual war) between these nations, waged by propaganda and acculturation policies. During the war and immediate post-war era, these cultural-political enterprises worked to nationally (re)integrate the "other's" borderlands and their populations. By focusing on one of Central Europe's most hotly contested borderlands, Upper Silesia, across a number of decades, this book examines successive episodes of border redrawings during the heyday of war and nationalism in Europe from a (trans)national political as well as a local "everyday life" perspective. It is also meant as a contribution to the more recent shift in scholarly interest—particularly with regard to the 1939–50 era—from the politics of exclusion (e.g., genocide and expulsion) to inclusion (e.g., resettlement, nationalization, acculturation).[33]

The Struggle over Upper Silesia

The economic importance of Upper Silesia's industrial district made the region a particular flash point in German-Polish relations. The resulting conflict was fully as fierce as the more celebrated dispute over the Polish Corridor and its port city of Danzig. The bilateral national struggle over the region grew particularly fierce from the late winter through the summer of 1921. Although propaganda played a key role in this conflict, Upper Silesia was the only region in which the Allies' prescription of a plebiscite to resolve the territorial question was followed by open war, which began with a Polish armed offensive. The so-called third Silesian insurgency of May and June 1921 aimed to take the borderland by force after the Germans had won the majority of votes in the plebiscite. It remained the fiercest armed conflict between Germany and Poland until World War II.

The League of Nations resolved the conflict to Poland's advantage, essentially annulling Germany's plebiscite victory. To the great dismay of both Germans and the region's locals, in 1922 it drew a border right through the industrial district, separating residential districts, coal mines, roads, waterways, and railways. Poland received the bulk of the industrial district, one of Central Europe's centers of coal mining and metallurgy. Just as the Polish Corridor represented the country's sole outlet to the sea, eastern Upper Silesia was its only industrial province. Given that Germany retained several ports and richer industrial areas, its stake in these territories was more a matter of honor than of economic necessity. Indeed, holding onto them was also a means for Germany to maintain its foothold in East-Central Europe. Intensifying Germany's sense of grievance, the Upper Silesian decision came after Poland had been awarded all the other

formerly Prussian eastern provinces that the German government had hoped to retain. The league's seemingly arbitrary, antidemocratic, and punitive partition of Upper Silesia fueled the already strong public resentment in Germany against the Treaty of Versailles, the Allied Powers, and Poland, thus helping to undermine the legitimacy of the Weimar Republic, which had signed these agreements. Revision of the Upper Silesian border to their respective advantages remained the official policy of both Poland and Germany throughout the interwar era.[34]

As the site of a bloody armed conflict, Upper Silesia became a particular repository of irredentist symbolism, as well as a breeding ground for militant nationalism in both officially revisionist nations. The transnational irredentist culture that dominated regional politics for the next decades had its origins in the propaganda and armed hostilities of 1921, which forged cadres of German and Polish borderland nationalists devoted to advancing their separate nation-state interests at the regional level. These included Weimar Germany's Upper Silesian Homeland Patriots (Vereinigte Verbände heimattreuer Oberschlesier, or VVHO) and Nazi Germany's *Ostforschung* (eastern research) academic network, as well as the League of the German East (Bund Deutscher Osten), and their Polish counterparts, the Western Territories Defense League (Polish Western League/Polski Związek Zachodni) and Western Borderland Thought (Myśl Zachodnia). While these nationalists did not necessarily represent the political views and identity of Upper Silesian society at large, they functioned as the arm of national politics in the region. Whereas the governments and regimes they served came and went, irredentist activism remained constant across the tumultuous decades between 1921 and 1950, when the conflict raged most fiercely, and for at least twenty years thereafter, when it lingered on, albeit with less intensity. Indeed, it was not until 1990, with the collapse of the Soviet Bloc and the reunification of Germany, that the struggle over Silesia and other borderlands formally ended.

In working against each other, German and Polish borderland nationalists together constructed an irredentist culture that represented regional identities as more homogenous—along ethnic/national lines—than they were in actuality. Each nationalist camp denied Upper Silesia any connection to the "other," and indeed vilified the other group. At best, under the politically dominant and formally nonnationalist regional branch of the German Center Party, irredentist agents in interwar western Upper Silesia recognized local (German-Polish) bilingualism but refused to acknowledge the region's connections to Polish history and heritage.[35] Under Polish authoritarian, Nazi German, and postwar Communist regimes, these nationalists conceptualized diversity only in a negative light, as part of their common depiction of Upper Silesia as an eternal "land of struggle" between Germans and Slavs. Nonetheless, for most of the era before World War I, the locals of Upper Silesia—like their counterparts in other would-

be hotbeds of ethnic conflict—lived in relative peace and tolerance. Endorsed by state financial, institutional, and political power, German and Polish irredentist networks collaboratively succeeded in overshadowing this reality, particularly in the eyes of audiences outside these regions. During the wartime (World War II) and postwar eras, the transnational irredentist culture (along with its border-land nationalists, institutions, discourses, and "invented traditions") became the ideological and cultural-political precursors to the Nazi German and Polish Communist use of force, population politics, and social engineering to "recover" the borderlands.

In a number of respects the German-Polish contest over Upper Silesia dif-fered from other borderland conflicts. In crafting this book, I was inspired by Gregor Thum's cultural history of how, after World War II, Poland annexed and renationalized the city of Breslau (Wrocław), former capital of the prov-ince of Lower Silesia, which until 1945 belonged to Germany's Prussian eastern territories.[36] The population of Lower Silesia, which adjoined Upper Silesia to the west, was largely German both linguistically and in terms of ethnic/national identity; indeed, it first became a seriously contested borderland only when Poland claimed it after the war. In contrast, Upper Silesia's largely multilingual (German, Polish, Silesian dialects) local population lacked a stable patriotic loy-alty to either nation. Known for its economic resources and its long and fierce history of national conflict (since 1919), the region was often deemed "prob-lematic" by state officials due to the locals' "indifference" to the desired national patriotism. In 1945 Polish officials in Lower Silesia were able to make a "clean sweep" between "unwanted" (German) and "desired" (Polish) populations.[37] In Upper Silesia, by contrast, none of the three episodes of border revision (1922, 1939, and 1945) facilitated a clean separation. Under both the Nazis and the Communists, the economic need for critical industrial labor, as well as the ideo-logical conviction that Upper Silesia's inhabitants were really "lost" Germans or Poles whom the nation needed to "recover," kept the majority of the population in place.

The region's political masters turned to cultural politics to create the ethnic population they desired, whether German or Polish. As a newly contested terri-tory after World War I, this industrialized "land of work and no culture" suddenly attracted archeologists, ethnographers, and historians, among other scholars, who set up research institutes and created narratives on the identity of the territory's "unknown" population and landscapes. Architects and urban planners decorated the previously mundane or imperial German landscapes with some of Europe's first skyscrapers and other early modernist buildings, as well as awe-inspiring monumental structures. Polish and German folkloric performers, public events coordinators, and museum workers competed to provide entertainment that also instructed the local population on its designated official identity. International law accommodated this irredentist culture by giving each side a plausible right to

claim the borderland as "theirs" and by protecting minority organizations—one of the agents of this politics—against persecution.

World War II changed this situation. Whereas previous governments sought to convince local, national, and international communities that the borderland "is and remains" either German or Polish, in 1939—and again after 1945—the new regimes implemented more forceful policies of acculturation and (re)nationalization. Aided by their own border nationalists, both Nazi and Communist regimes worked to integrate the region's locals as a "recovered people." Each regime surveyed and verified its population's backgrounds, enforced "accepted" speech and ideas, and strongly promoted adult education courses that taught locals how to be "good" Germans or Poles.[38] Terror and coercion were inherent to renationalization under both regimes, although in many respects the mainstream Catholic population suffered more under the Communists than under the Nazis.[39] Without competition from the opposing camp, borderland nationalists appropriated the "other's" cultural institutions, architecture, and national monuments for their own purposes. Ironically, however, each nationalist camp found that their success required them to preach the continuing threat from the "other"; indeed, this was so even after the enemy had been militarily defeated. Thus, irredentist myths forged during the interwar era became a basis for creating a new official regional identity.

Despite all its particularities, Upper Silesia bore strong resemblances to irredentist culture in other German-Polish borderlands. For one, German *Ostforschung* and Polish Western Borderland Thought conceptualized individual regions within the larger traditions, narratives, and symbols common to all these borderlands. Characterized by mass cultural elements such as rallies, museums, folkloric performances, architecture, radio auditions, and films, among other elements, the cultural politics of territorial contestation in Upper Silesia were certainly comparable with those in other German-Polish border areas, such as Lower Silesia and eastern Brandenburg/Wielkopolska, as well as other parts of Europe.[40] Although far more widespread, Upper Silesia's strong regional/local sentiment, ethnic fluidity, and indifference to nationality was also a notable feature of Pomerania and Masuria.[41] Nazis and Polish Communists introduced more or less standard policies to win over "recovered peoples" in all the German-Polish borderlands: the Deutsche Volksliste (German Ethnic List) and its Polish counterparts, "verification" and "rehabilitation," and various acculturation schemes.[42] Not just a study of one economically critical borderland that displayed a uniquely widespread sense of "national indifference" among its locals, this book is also intended as a case study of the processes and politics behind the reannexation and renationalization of European borderlands that made irredentism a popular-cultural and grassroots phenomenon.

Regionalisms and "National Indifference"

This book also contributes to the growing historical literature on the role of regionalism in nationalism. More than a decade ago, Christina Applegate and Alon Confino demonstrated that both these identity categories were inherently modern, thus dispelling the view that regionalism represented a remnant of premodern society that would inevitably yield its place to this more recent successor. Disputing the once dominant assertion that the two concepts had a necessarily incompatible and contentious historical relationship, they argued instead for coexistence, even mutual support and reinforcement.[43] More recent research has built on their work to demonstrate that the late nineteenth century, the heyday of nationalism and nation building, was also an era of flourishing regionalism and local sentiment. Indeed, regional "imagined communities" were constructed with the same media (e.g., museums, films, the press) and customs (e.g., language and folk traditions) as their national counterparts, and the two often shared inherently interconnected and overlapping myths and historical narratives. In Germany, the entrenched concept of *Heimat* (local homeland)—one of the most frequently studied subjects for scholars of regionalism—served as the glue between the individual, locality, province, and nation.[44]

After World War I, European governments continued to nurture local traditions, symbols, and landscapes. The interwar years, according to Eric Storm, marked "the golden age of regional popular culture" in Europe, a trend that Shanny Peer called a "folklore vogue."[45] Governments endorsed regionalism as a way of promoting nationalism. Cultural activists meanwhile highlighted folklore—the nation's "rich cultural heritage"—as a vehicle for emotionally bonding the local individual to the larger nation. In France, regional folklore exhibits received significant attention at the Paris Exposition of 1937. Since the late 1920s German radio promoted *Heimat* traditions to the larger nation as a way of eliciting pride in its treasure of local cultures.[46]

This book serves to shed light on the nature of regionalism in contested borderlands. In these areas, the inherently intertwined nature of nationalism and regionalism is evident in the fact that border conflicts become a part of regional traditions. Indeed, the discourses and symbols of borderland nationalism infiltrate at least the official identity of region and locality. At its center are narratives of political and cultural struggle against the national (or "racial") "other," which reinforce myths of these areas as the nation's zones of crisis and struggle in past and present. Indeed, in some cases, the identities of disparate contested borderlands are tied together by overarching narratives, the most typical example being interwar Germany's discourses that depicted the various eastern regions both inside and outside national boundaries as "bleeding borders" and the "German east." Examples of how nationalism shapes regionalism on the one hand, such provincial narratives are also fundamental to the identity of the entire nation

on the other. In this regard, borderlands typically symbolize the nation's "bulwarks" within its current boundary lines against the "other" in its neighboring borderlands. Yet simultaneously these borderlands represent "bridges" to its cultural and political affiliations in these neighboring areas, which form the basis of its territorial claims.[47]

Contested territories are also arenas for multiple official regionalisms, whose narratives and traditions symbolically function to mutually exclude one another, even though they remain inherently entwined and interwoven. In Upper Silesia, regionalisms served as weapons in territorial conflicts. German and Polish Silesianisms each used folklore, rural history, and other aspects of local culture to forge what Andrew Demshuk has called an "imagined regional community" with inseparable ties to the nation.[48] In their effort to portray the region as solely German or Polish, both camps of borderland nationalists invented what I call national regionalisms, which reinterpreted local traditions, whether existing or newly invented, in ways that connected them to traditions in the nation's other provinces but excluded any "foreign" associations. This reflected another characteristic common to contested regions, where nation-state actors—for example, governments and irredentist activists—carefully edited, reshaped, manipulated, and monitored these enclaves of discourses, narratives, and symbols to make sure they buttressed not only the region's *official* national identity, but also the irredentist agenda.

Aside from national regionalisms, unofficial nonnational concepts of local and provincial identity also take part in conflicts. In Alsace, one of the most famous contested borderlands, various groups of Alsatians cultivated different regional identities, which competed both against one another as well as against the one-sided regional identities and traditions promoted by rival French and German nation-state actors.[49] By contrast, Upper Silesia had no political parties explicitly devoted to promoting nationally indifferent regionalism—except for a few short-lived autonomy movements. In part, this reflected the regional intelligentsia's national orientation, the ability of nationally oriented regionalist parties, such as the German Center Party, to accommodate nationally indifferent locals, and also German and Polish government measures to combat "separatism."[50] Nevertheless, nonofficial regional identities expressed themselves in the actions, gestures, and opinions of the Silesian in the street. They are evident to us today largely through the records of national officials, who expressed frustration in dealing with locals' "national ambiguity," "national indecisiveness," or even "asocial behavior." Only after the fall of communism were some locals able to designate themselves as "Silesian" on official censuses—with other options being Pole *and* Silesian, German *and* Silesian, Pole, or German. Some chose to declare no ethnic or national identity. Such census results have led many to call for regional autonomy within Poland.

The phenomenon that historians have called "national indifference" has recently attracted scholarly attention to Upper Silesia. Although easier to

characterize than to define, it refers primarily to locals who identify less with a particular nation than with some alternative collective identity, such as region, confession, or social class. Their tendency to "switch sides," or engage in what Winson Chu calls "interethnic accommodation,"[51] particularly following the redrawing of borders, also reveals an attitude ultimately indifferent to nationality, and has led Chad Bryant to refer to them as "amphibians."[52] This attitude has been observed in other regions, such as Catalonia, Alsace, Tyrol, the Sudetenland, other parts of formerly Habsburg-ruled Central Europe, and even metropolitan areas, such as Łódz.[53] Tara Zahra, a prominent scholar who has worked on flexible loyalty, singled out Upper Silesia as "the most famously nationally indifferent region in world history."[54] James Bjork identified the role of influential Catholic clerical leaders in averting Upper Silesia's potential for total breakdown into antagonistic German and Polish factions.[55] Tomasz Kamusella, in a broad synthetic work, attributed Upper Silesians' resistance to nationalization to their being an ethnic group of their own, with a shared historical, religious, cultural, and linguistic consciousness.[56] Similarly, Brendan Karch, in a microstudy of the city and suburbs of Oppeln in western Upper Silesia, concluded that during the interwar era both camps of nationalists failed to turn Silesian locals into stable national categories of either Germans or Poles.[57]

One of my arguments here is that the borderland struggle—contrary to the intent of its protagonists—actually helped to perpetuate "national indifference." Strong regional identities do not necessarily suffer "natural extinction" when provinces are incorporated into a nation-state, nor are they unique to contested border areas. However, it is no coincidence that they have been most visible where such conflicts are intense. Because periodic border changes in Upper Silesia destabilized any existing sense of "national belonging," locals had to rely on alternative identities that seemed stable and reliable. The violence, lawlessness, uprooting, ethnic segregation, and expulsion campaigns that often accompanied shifting frontiers made the political contingency of nationality all the more apparent. As Hugo Service argues in his study of postwar Upper Silesia, the locals reacted to forceful "Polonization" efforts not so much with displays of German national pride as with "local patriotism."[58] Indeed, plebiscites and the agitation to support one nation or the other were less brutal, but they presented national identity as a choice, not an innate characteristic.

German and Polish borderland nationalists were aware of, and perplexed by, the slippery slope of promoting regionalism, even if overlaid with nationalism. Both camps expressed concern that by endorsing Silesian identity and reviving old and promoting new regional traditions, as well as by deploying social sciences and new media technology to lend legitimacy to a unique provincial culture, they might swing the balance too far in the direction of regional consciousness. Ultimately, however, regionalism offered greater appeal to locals than did traditional nationalism.

The first chapter of this book provides a historical background of Upper Silesia from the late nineteenth century to the eve of World War II. Chapters 2 and 3 examine the resulting cultural conflict between the two new border societies, as well as the related internal politics of Germany and Poland, during the interwar era. The final two chapters examine Upper Silesia's successive annexation and renationalization under the Nazis and then the Polish Communists, with a focus on acculturation politics and local reactions to them. A postscript takes the Upper Silesian story from the Cold War years to the present, with attention to the role of Upper Silesian expellees in West Germany's Cold War politics. This book is based on extensive research in primary documents in national and regional state archives in Germany, Poland, and Russia—including police records and accounts by political dissidents—as well as on contemporary publications (books, pamphlets, newspapers), in addition to films.

Notes

1. Jürgen Runzheimer, "Der Überfall auf den Sender Gleiwitz im Jahre 1939," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 10, no. 4 (1962): 408–22.

2. These locals, who were opponents of the Nazis, served as informers for the police on the Polish side of the borderland. Situation report (SR), May 1939, Archiwum Państwowe w Katowice (APK), 38 (Policja Województwa Śląskiego), 176, 21ff.

3. Quoted from Ewa Waszkiewicz, *Doktryna hitlerowska wśród mniejszości niemieckiej w województwie śląskim w latach 1918–1939* (Wrocław, 2001), 44.

4. Annemarie H. Sammartino, *The Impossible Border: Germany and the East, 1914–1922* (Ithaca, NY, 2010); Elizabeth Harvey, *Women and the Nazi East: Agents and Witnesses of Germanization* (New Haven, CT, 2003).

5. "Der Führer spricht," *Ostdeutsche Morgenpost* 241 (2 Sept. 1939): n.p.

6. The concept of "irredentism" I use here comes from Markus Komprobst, *Irredentism in European Politcs: Argumentation, Compromise, and Norms* (Cambridge, 2009), 23–24. While the work of Winson Chu distinguishes "revisionism" (also "supra-revisionism") from "irredentism" (also "ethnic irredentism"), this book uses the terms interchangeably to refer to claims to both parts of Upper Silesia—and the common German-Polish borderlands in general. Even as Chu irons out the nuances that distinguish these terms quite well—essentially, that "revisionism" refers to claims to territory, while "irredentism" concerns peoples/ethnic groups—he also asserts that "in practice, of course, there was considerable room for revisionism and irredentism to overlap and to piggyback on one another." This book aims to demonstrate that the overlap was particularly striking in the struggle over Upper Silesia. Thus, I refrain from strictly categorizing the relevant political actors in this case study according to the one term or the other. See Winson Chu, *The German Minority in Interwar Poland* (New York, 2012), 32, 28ff.

7. The most similar work examines the popularization of German and Polish irredentist politics in the media and through rallies and commemoration events in Upper Silesia, mostly during the interwar and early postwar eras, and from a comparative perspective: see Juliane Haubold-Stolle, *Mythos Oberschlesien: Der Kampf um die Erinnerung in Deutschland und Polen, 1919–1956* (Osnabrück, 2008). Otherwise, similar approaches to irredentist politics in regard to German-Polish borderlands

have focused on geopolitical thought and thinkers: see Michael Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastwards: A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich* (New York, 1988); Eduard Mühle, *Für Volk und deutschen Osten: Der Historiker Hermann Aubin und die deutsche Ostforschung* (Düsseldorf, 2005); Markus Kroska, *Für ein Polen an Oder und Ostsee: Zygmunt Wojciechowski als Historiker und Publizist* (Osnabrück, 2003); Jan M. Piskorski, Jörg Hackmann, and Rudolf Jaworski, eds., *Deutsche Ostforschung und polnische Westforschung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik* (Osnabrück, 2002). Other works focus on politics and diplomacy: see Perti Ahonen, *After the Expulsion: Western Germany and Eastern Europe, 1945–90* (Oxford, 2003); Debra J. Allen, *The Oder-Neisse Line: The United States, Poland, and Germany in the Cold War* (Westport, CT, 2003); T. David Curp, *A Clean Sweep? The Politics of Ethnic Cleansing in Western Poland, 1945–1960* (Rochester, NY, 2006). Recent works that also examine acculturation politics include Gregor Thum, *Uprooted: How Breslau Became Wrocław during the Century of Expulsions*, trans. Tom Lapert and Allison Brown (Princeton, NJ, 2011); Hugo Service, *Germans to Poles: Communism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Cleansing after the Second World War* (Cambridge, 2013). See also works cited in notes 31 and 40 below.

8. See Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin* (New York, 2010).

9. By "cultural racism," I refer to what Eric Weitz described as the imposition of "indelible, immutable, and transgenerational" culturally defined characteristics imposed on a societal group, and serving to legitimate its discrimination or persecution. See Eric Weitz, "Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 7; George M. Friedrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton, NJ, 2002), 137.

10. Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge, 1996), 107–78.

11. Woodrow Wilson, "Fourteen Points," http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1918wilson.html (accessed 27 April 2015).

12. See Aviel Roshwald, *Ethnic Nationalism and the Fall of Empires: Central Europe, Russia and the Middle East, 1915–1923* (London and New York, 2001), 163–96; Perti Ahonen et al., eds., *People on the Move: Forced Population Movements in Europe in the Second World War and Its Aftermath* (New York, 2008).

13. See Peter Fischer, *Die Deutsche Publizistik als Faktor der deutsch-polnischen Beziehungen, 1919–1939* (Wiesbaden, 1991); Peter Polak-Springer, "Jammin' with Karlik: The German-Polish 'Radio War' and the 'Gleiwitz Provocation,' 1925–1939," *European History Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (Apr. 2013): 279–300.

14. Holly Case, *Between States: The Transylvanian Question and the European Idea During World War II* (Stanford, CA, 2009), 2. See also Miklós Ziegler, *Ideas on Territorial Revision in Hungary, 1920–1945*, trans. Thomas J. DeKornfeld and Helen D. DeKornfeld (New York, 2007).

15. Philipp Ther, "The Spell of the Homogeneous Nation-State: Structural Factors and Agents of Ethnic Cleansing," in *Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel, and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Rainer Münz and Rainer Ohliger (London, 2003), 85.

16. Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed*.

17. See Brian Porter, *When Nationalism Began to Hate: Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth-Century Poland* (New York, 2000).

18. Norman Naimark, *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, MA, 2001), 4, emphasis mine.

19. On the renationalization of borderlands, see Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven, CT, 2003); Kate Brown, *A Biography of No Place: From Ethnic Borderland to Soviet Heartland* (Cambridge, MA, 2004); Ahonen et al., *People on the Move*; Eagle Glassheim, "Ethnic Cleansing, Communism, and Environmental Devastation in Czechoslovakia's Borderlands, 1945–1989," *Journal of Modern History* 78 (March 2006): 65–92.

20. Caitlin E. Murdock, *Changing Places: Society, Culture, and Territory in the Saxon-Bohemian Borderlands, 1870–1946* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2010), 1–13, chap. 4, esp. 128.

21. Ibid., 1–13, chap. 4.

22. Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 2008).

23. The term *Heimat* refers not just to the small locality, but to the local area that Germans call home and to which they are usually emphatically attached. Indeed, "local homeland," although an approximate English equivalent, often does not express connotations that underscore personal attachment and a sense of belonging.

24. Sammartino, *The Impossible Border*, 10–13, 102–3.

25. See Richard Blanke, *Orphans of Versailles: The Germans in Western Poland, 1918–1939* (Lexington, KY, 1993).

26. See Alexander Victor Prusin, *The Lands Between: Conflict in the East European Borderlands, 1870–1992* (Oxford, 2010); Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations*, chaps. 3 and 7.

27. See Chu, *The German Minority*; Blanke, *Orphans of Versailles*. On the Polish minority of German Upper Silesia, see Brendan Karch, "Nationalism on the Margins: Silesians between Germany and Poland, 1948–1945" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2010).

28. Mark Mazower, *Hitler's Empire: How the Nazis Ruled Europe* (New York, 2008), 54–56.

29. See Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East, 1800 to the Present* (New York, 2009), 190–91.

30. See Harvey, *Women and the Nazi East*; Otto H. Spatz, *Wiedergewonnenes deutsches Land* (Munich and Berlin, 1941).

31. The term was also used for Alsace-Lorraine, which had been returned to France after World War I. On the myth of the "German east," see Liulevicius, *The German Myth*; Gregor Thum, ed., *Traumland Osten: Deutsche Bilder vom östlichen Europa im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2006).

32. See Service, *Germans to Poles*, 9, chap. 2; Grzegosz Strauchold, *Myśl Zachodnia i jej realizacja w Polsce Ludowej w latach 1945–1947* (Toruń, 2003).

33. The long-standing scholarly interest in the Nazi policies to exclude Jews, Slavs, and other groups from the *Volksgemeinschaft* has recently shifted to a greater focus on their efforts to include and integrate populations; see, e.g., Catherine Epstein, *Model Nazi: Arthur Greiser and the Occupation of Western Poland* (New York, 2010); Gerhard Wolf, *Ideologie und Herrschaftsrationalität: Nationalsozialistische Germanisierungspolitik in Polen* (Hamburg, 2013). Similarly, the previous strong focus on the expulsion of Germans from Poland's postwar, formerly German borderlands—see, e.g., Sebastian Siebel-Achenbach, *Lower Silesia from Nazi Germany to Communist Poland, 1942–49* (New York, 1994)—has shifted to a stronger interest in resettlement and reassimilation. See, e.g., Thum, *Uprooted*; Service, *Germans to Poles*.

34. On the conflict over Upper Silesia, see Timothy Wilson, *Frontiers of Violence: Conflict and Identity in Ulster and Upper Silesia, 1918–1922* (Oxford, 2010); T. Hunt Tooley, *National Identity and Weimar Germany: Upper Silesia and the Eastern Border, 1918–22* (Lincoln, NE, 1997); James Bjork, *Neither German nor Pole: Catholicism and National Indifference in a Central European Borderland* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2008).

35. Brendan Karch draws a similar conclusion in his analysis of German Center Party *Heimat* propaganda in interwar western (German) Upper Silesia in "Nationalism on the Margins," 34, chap. 5.

36. See Thum, *Uprooted*.

37. See Curp, *A Clean Sweep*.

38. For a comparison of German and Polish citizenship politics in wartime and postwar Upper Silesia, including the bureaucratic categorization of locals as Germans or Poles, see Adam Ehrlich, "Between Germany and Poland: Ethnic Cleansing and the Politicization of Ethnicity in Upper Silesia under National Socialism and Communism" (PhD diss., University of Indiana–Bloomington, 2006).

On language politics, see Matthais Kneip, *Die Deutsche Sprache in Oberschlesien: Untersuchungen zur politischen Rolle der deutschen Sprachen* als *Minderheitensprache in den Jahren 1921–1998* (Dortmund, 1998).

39. On postwar renationalization, see Tomasz Kamusella, "Ethnic Cleansing in Upper Silesia, 1944–1951," in *Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe*, ed. T. Hunt Tooley, Béla Várdy, and Agnes Huszár Várdy (New York, 2003), 293–310; Philipp Ther, *Deutsche und polnische Vertriebene: Gesellschaft und Vertriebenenpolitik in der SBZ/DDR und in Polen, 1945–56* (Göttingen, 1998); Piotr Madajczyk, *Pryłączenie Śląska Opolskiego do Polski, 1945–1948* (Warsaw, 1996); Bernard Linek, *Polityka antyniemiecka na Górnym Śląsku w latach 1945–1950* (Opole, 2000); Service, *Germans to Poles*.

40. See Peter Oliver Loew, *Danzig und Seine Vergangenheit: die Geschichtskultur einer Stadt zwischen Deutschland und Polen* (Osnabrück, 2003); Peter Oliver Loew, Christian Pletzing, and Tomas Serrier, "Zwischen Enteignung und Aneignung: Geschichte und Geschichten in den 'Zwischenräumen Mitteleuropas,'" in *Wiedergewonnene Geschichte: Zur Aneignung von Vergangenheit in den Zwischenräumen Mitteleuropas*, ed. Peter Oliver Loew, Christian Pletzing, and Tomas Serrier (Wiesbaden, 2006), 9–15; Mühle, *Für Volk und deutschen Osten*; Robert Traba, *"Wschodniopruskość": Tóżsamość regionalna i narodowa w kulturze politycznej Niemiec* (Poznań, 2005); Thum, *Uprooted*; Jan Musekamp, *Zwischen Stettin and Szczecin: Metamorphosen einer Stadt von 1945 bis 2005* (Wiesbaden, 2010); Mateusz J. Hartwich, *Das Schlesische Riesengebirge: Die Polonisierung einer Landschaft nach 1945* (Vienna, 2012).

41. See Richard Blanke, *Polish-Speaking Germans? Language and National Identity Among the Masurians since 1871* (Cologne, 2001).

42. See Michael Esch, *Gesunde Verhältnisse: Deutsche und polnische Bevölkerungspolitik in Ostmitteleuropa, 1939–1950* (Marburg, 1998); Epstein, *Model Nazi*; Wolf, *Ideologie und Herrschaftsrationalität*; Service, *Germans to Poles*.

43. See Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley, CA, 1990); Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871–1918* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1997).

44. See Joost Augusteijn and Eric Storm, eds., *Region and State in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Nation-Building, Regional Identities, and Separatism* (Houndsmill, UK, 2012). For connections between locality and nation in Poland, see Keely Stauter-Halsted, *A Nation in a Village: The Genesis of Peasant National Identity in Austrian Poland, 1848–1914* (Ithaca, NY, 2001); Patricia Dabrowski, "Constructing a Polish Landscape: The Example of the Carpathian Frontier," *Austria History Yearbook* 39 (2008): 45–65.

45. Eric Storm, *The Culture of Regionalism: Art, Architecture, and International Exhibitions in France, Germany, and Spain, 1890–1939* (Manchester, 2011), 11; Shanny Peer, *France on Display: Peasants, Provincials, and Folklore in the 1937 Paris World's Fair* (Albany, NY, 1998), 135–36, 140–46.

46. Adelheid von Saldern, "*Volk* and *Heimat* Culture in Radio Broadcasting during the Period of Transition from Weimar to Nazi German," *The Journal of Modern History* 76 (June 2004): 312–46. See also Samuel Godfellow, "Fascism and Regionalism in Interwar Alsace," *National Identities* 12, no. 2 (June 2010): 133–45.

47. See Jeffrey K. Wilson, "Imagining a Homeland: Constructing *Heimat* in the German East, 1871–1914," *National Identities* 9, no. 4 (Dec. 2007): 331–49; Andreas Kossert, "Masuren als 'Bollwerk': Konstruktion von Grenze und Grenzregion von der wilhelmischen Ostmarkenpolitik zum NS-Grenzland- und Volkstumskampf, 1894–1945," and other essays in *Die Grenze als Raum, Erfahrung und Konstruktion: Deutschland, Frankreich und Polen von 17. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Etienne Francois, Jörg Seifarth, and Bernhard Struck (Frankfurt and New York, 2006); Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz, "Coexistence and Violence in German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands," in *Shatterzones of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg,*

Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands, ed. Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz (Bloomington, IN, 2013), 10–22; Gregor Thum, "Megalomania and Angst," in *Shatterzones of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, ed. Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz (Bloomington, IN, 2013), 42–60.

48. Andrew Demshuk, *The Lost German East: Forced Migration and the Politics of Memory, 1945–1970* (Cambridge, 2012), 78.

49. See Christopher J. Fischer, *Alsace to the Alsatians? Visions and Divisions of Alsatian Regionalism, 1870–1939* (New York, 2010); Samuel Godfellow, "Fascism and Regionalism," 133–45.

50. Ryszard Kaczmarek, Maciej Kucharski, and Adrian Cybula, *Alzacja/Lotaryngia a Górny Ślask: Dwa Regiony Pogranicza, 1648–2001* (Katowice, 2001), 99–242.

51. Winson Chu, "'Volksgemeinschaften unter sich': German Minorities and Regionalism in Poland, 1918–1939," in *German History from the Margins*, ed. Neil Gregor et al. (Bloomington, IN, 2006), 107.

52. See Chad Bryant, *Prague in Black: Nazi Rule and Czech Nationalism* (Cambridge, 2007).

53. On national indifference in these and other regions, see Phillip Ther and Holm Sundhaussen, eds., *Regionale Bewegungen und Regionalismen in europäischen Zwischenräumen seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Marburg, 2003); Blanke, *Polish-Speaking Germans?*; Pieter M. Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA, 2006); Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948*, (Princeton, 2005); Murdock, *Changing Places*; Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*; Winson Chu, "'Volksgemeinschaften unter sich,'" 104–26.

54. Tara Zahra, "Imagined Non-communities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis," *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 93–119.

55. Bjork, *Neither German nor Pole*.

56. Tomasz Kamusella, *Silesia and Central European Nationalisms: The Emergence of National and Ethnic Groups in Prussian Silesia and Austrian Silesia, 1848–1918* (West Lafayette, IN, 2007).

57. Karch, "Nationalism on the Margins." See also Andrzej Michałczyk, *Heimat, Kirche und Nation: Deutsche und polnische Nationalisierungsprozesse im geteilten Oberschlesien (1922–1939)* (Cologne, 2010).

58. Service, *Germans to Poles*, 248–49.