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1. Topic, structure and objectives of the dissertation

This dissertation (doctoral thesis) is focused on Nazi nationalities (ethnic) policy in the Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia and particularly on Nazi attempts to strengthening the German element in Bohemian and Moravian inland. With the creation of the Protectorate the local Germans became the elite stratum. Unlike the former Bohemian and Moravian borderland (mostly Sudetenland, the rest was divided among the other Gaue of Nazi Germany), the German population represented approximately 3% minority.

It was therefore in terms of Nazi policies need to obtain German nationality for most other people. Given that the Nazis have calculated that roughly half of the Czech population is assimilable, they had to „fill“ the remaining half, which would replace the "non-Germanizable" Czech population which was to be displaced. Nazi officials tried to increase the share of the German population in the Bohemian-Moravian inland using a variety of methods.

The aim of the thesis is to assess the extent to which the Nazis succeeded or failed (according to their own "jargon") to "strengthen" and "consolidate" Germanness in the Protectorate during the six years of occupation. Based on his research the author will be able to define and justify their particular difficulties and reflect some success in the broader perspectives of Nazi doctrines and ideologies. In this regard, we cannot ignore the objects of this kind of social engineering - the individuals as objects of Nazi "national support".

The dissertation text is divided into six chapters. In the first part the author characterizes the basic axioms of Nazi nationalities policy and its goals, discusses the history of German settlement in the Protectorate and he will analyze the settlement areas of the Protectorate Germans.

The second chapter focuses on the concept of national (ethnic) identity in the Protectorate. Firstly, it will be the concept of "Germanness", and the problems with its definition. Special attention will be paid to understanding the nation as a “biological” entity in the spirit of Nazi racial ideology.

The third chapter focuses on population policy, which was aimed at increasing the number of German inhabitants in the Protectorate. The records of Germans organized by the occupation administration in 1939–1940 will be described in detail. Furthermore, the author will focus on the important issue of mixed marriages between Germans and Czechs in terms of Nazi ideology and real politics. The efforts of the occupiers to regulate the citizenship and marriage agenda, which resulted in the introduction of racial selection in 1941, will then be discussed.
In the crucial fourth part of the dissertation we will deal with practical "Volkstumspolitik" in particular areas of support of the German element in the Protectorate. First of all, the author discusses in detail the penetration of the Germans into local and district governments as well as the influence of NSDAP structures on communal politics. The development of the German judiciary, education, cultural policy, social and health care as well as agriculture and trade will be discussed.

The fifth chapter will focus on the project of German colonization in the Protectorate, which should contribute to the Germanization of the Czech-Moravian area.

The last part of the dissertation will be devoted to the balance and evaluation of "Volkstumspolitik" in the Protectorate. The situation of the Germans at the end of the war will not be forgotten either. The issue of post-war expulsion of the German population will also be discussed marginally, while the author will mention some lesser-known concrete cases. In order to supplement the text of the dissertation and to revive it, the author prepared a total of four excursions dealing with the special different fates of the subjects of Nazi nationalities policy in the context of the period of occupation and post-war “settlement”.

2. Previous research

Nazi nationalities and Germanization policy became a subject of interest for historians since the 1950s and especially the 1960s. One of the basic sources was the findings of the postwar Nuremberg trials revealing the nature of the Nazi plans to build the "new Europe" and their implementation during the war. Later historical studies on this topic focused on occupation policy in Poland and Eastern Europe. This focus was not only typical for historians of the former Eastern bloc, but also for western historiography. Already in 1957, Robert L. Koehl’s work on the Nazi resettlement and population policy and the office of the Reich Commissioner for the strengthening of Germanness was published. At the same time, a study by the German historian Robert Herzog on the occupation administration in eastern and south-eastern Europe was published.

1 EČER, Bohuslav, Poučení norimberského soudu pro Slovany, Praha 1947.
The German occupation policy in the Soviet Union was discussed by Alexander Dallin and Nazi plans for Eastern Europe by Ihor Kamentsky. The Nazi policy towards the Poles and the position of ethnic Germans in the General Government were analyzed in the 1960s by German historian Martin Broszat.

Significant works on Nazi Germanization plans and projects (*Generalplan Ost* and *Generalsiedlungsplan*) as well as on Nazi occupation policy in Poland were submitted by the well-known Polish historian Czesław Madajczyk, who published mainly in the 1960s to 1990s. The Czechoslovak Communist historian Václav Král attempted to synthesize Nazi Germanization policy in Europe in the 1960s. The Nazi interest in the so-called Eastern Studies was dealt with by British historian Michael Burleigh in one of his first works. Various partial studies on the topic of Nazi Germanization and nationalities policy were also published during the 1990s; by German historian Georg Hansen, who focused on school policy in occupied Poland. At the turn of the millennium, interest in one of the important aspects of the Nazi's Germanization plans - racial policy towards the subjugated peoples of Europe - also increased. At that time, John Connelly's study of the perception of Nazi racial ideology on the Slavs and their practical racial policy towards them was published. An outstanding achievement was a very extensive monograph by German researcher Isabella Heinemann from 2003 on Nazi Germanization policy and

---

practical racial selection of the population in the Bohemian lands, Poland, Alsace and Lorraine, Ukraine, but also in other countries seized by Germany during World War II. She also focused on the resettlement of ethnic Germans from Eastern and Southeastern Europe to newly acquired territories. The theoretical foundations of racial policy were discussed by Christopher Hutton.

Nazi nationalities policy in occupied territories and support for German minorities has been the subject of systematic study by many younger historians over the past decade. Pertti Ahonen dealt with the "settlement projects", and the selection of ethnic Germans was dealt by historians Markus Leniger, Andreas Strippel and Maria Fiebrandt. Martin Grasmannsdorf, in turn, concentrated on the settler camp in Württemberg. Astrid Gehrig pursued a lesser-known Nazi nationalities policy in Lorraine.

The occupational and Germanization agenda of the occupation administration in the Protectorate was described in a number of monographs and studies. However, the question of building a “German community” remained largely a marginal topic. He was the first to address Nazi nationalities policy in the Protectorate of Gerhard Jacoby in his book Racial State: The German Nationalities Policy in the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia, which was published in 1944, before the war ended. Jacoby defined three layers of
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20 GEHRIG, Astrid, Im Dienste der nationalsozialistischen Volkstumspolitik in Lothringen: Auf den Spuren meines Großvaters, Münster 2014.
the Protectorate population with different rights: Germans, Czechs and Jews. Of course, the author did not have archival materials at his disposal, so he started from open sources. However, this does not diminish some of the pioneering potential of this now forgotten work. In 1946, a book by Emil Sobota was published, entitled Co to byl protektorát, which he wrote before his execution in April 1945. Sobota dealt with Czechoslovak ethnic policy and relations with minorities. The file outlined the basic parameters of nationalities politics in the Protectorate, but the author could only draw from normative sources and his own experience from the occupied Bohemian lands.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the essential work of the aforementioned Václav Král was published on the Protectorate social and economic history, as well as on Germanization policy in the Bohemian lands. Despite his ideological bias, his books are still considered to be basic works on the social history of the Protectorate and, for a long time, on nationalities policy. Factographically, they are at a fairly good level, but they are already outdated.

In 1969 and 1975 the then young German historian Detlef Brandes published his two-part monumental work Die Tschechen unter deutsch Protektorat, which could only be published in Czech after the fall of the communist regime. For many decades his synthesis has become a fundamental work in the history of the Protectorate, especially for the professional public abroad. The author had the opportunity to study archival sources in Prague at the end of the 1960s, but after the August occupation in 1968 he was prevented from doing further research, which was to a certain extent reflected in a particularly second volume of the monograph. Brandes paid great attention to German nationalities policy and the support of Protectorate Germans.

Foreign authors have been interested in the history of the Protectorate, especially with regard to nationalities policy, since the beginning of the 21st century. Isabel Heinemann mentioned the racial policy towards the Czech population in one of her partial studies. The author, however, confined from the Czech archives only to study in the former State Central Archives in Prague,
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22 SOBOTA, Emil, Co to byl protektorát, Praha 1946.
which caused a certain shallowness in relation to the Bohemian lands. A very interesting achievement was the book by American historian Chad Bryant *Prague in Black*, which was published in 2007. Bryant focused directly on ethnic policy and Czech-German relations, focusing on ethnic identity. He devoted considerable attention to mixed marriages and Protectorate Germans. He conceived the matter quite unusually for Czech readers. However, he approached the subject impartially and brought a completely new perspective to the history of the Protectorate. He then elaborated partial aspects of nationalities policy in the Protectorate in his journal studies. The author had the opportunity to research in some regional archives, which he used as one of the few foreign researchers. Tara Zahra also addressed the question of nationalities in relation to children.

The German historian René Küpper contributed to a deeper understanding of Nazi ethnic policy in the Protectorate with his monograph on K. H. Frank's politics. As one of the few authors, he very consistently processed material from both “Frank funds” deposited in the National Archives. This gave him the opportunity to process a large amount of archival material to act for most of the time the most powerful man of the Protectorate. He dealt with nationalities policy quite broadly, thus building on Brandes and Heinemann. Some factual errors and misinterpretations reduce the value of an otherwise good work.

In 2012, a new monograph by Detlef Brandes “Umvolkung, Umsiedlung, rassische Bestandsaufnahme” was published, in which the author supplemented his pivotal work with new knowledge in the field of national and racial policy towards the Czechs. Brandes could have started from sources to which he had
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no access since the 1970s. He paid most attention to the racial selection of the Czech population, committing misleading interpretations in this regard, although he himself corrected the shortcomings of Küpper's work. However, he also devoted himself to the issue of Protectorate Germans and “national work” as well as colonization projects in Bohemia and Moravia. Despite some shortcomings, the book represents a solid interpretation of Germanization policy in the Bohemian lands and a welcome addition to Bryant's studies.

Modern Czech historiographic production also deals with national issues in the Protectorate, but rather focuses on partial aspects of the overall problem, but thoroughly. Of the Czech works of synthesis on the Protectorate, the issue of Protectorate Germans was only outlined by Jan Gebhart and Jan Kuklík in the 15th Volume of the *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české*. These works, however, focus more on the repressive component of the occupation apparatus, the Protectorate administration, politics and domestic and foreign resistance. Ethnic policy is discussed rather marginally.

The national question in relation to Germanization was dealt with in the 1990s by Petr Němec. The issue of German citizenship in the territory of the Protectorate has so far been addressed by František Emmert. The author of the dissertation in his studies focused on the activities of the SS Race and Settlement Main Office dealt with the application of racial standards for the acquisition of German nationality and for permitting ethnically mixed
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marriages. He also published two studies on health aspects in nationalities and racial policy in the Protectorate.

Jiří Doležal dealt with German education and culture in the Protectorate. Tomáš Staněk then focused on the German minority in the Bohemian lands, while the core part was, of course, devoted to Sudeten and not to the Protectorate Germans. The historian of science and medicine Michal Šimůnek has published several articles on racial hygiene, ethnic policy in relation to children, German health and health policy in the Protectorate. He also devoted himself to the exhibition of elite Nazi schools NPEA in the Bohemian lands.

In recent years, two interesting book studies on the topic of Nazi ethnic policy were published by two young Czech historians. The author of the first is Radka Šustrová, who wrote an exhaustive work on the program of recovery centers built for children from the Reich in the Protectorate. Šustrová has been engaged in social policy in the Protectorate for a long time, while not forgetting
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38 DOLEŽAL, Jiří, Česká kultura za protektorátu: školství, písemnictví, kinematografie, Praha 1996.


the German minority.\textsuperscript{43} The second publication is a dissertation by Barbora Štolleová focusing on agricultural and land policy in the Protectorate, which largely fulfilled the Germanization role,\textsuperscript{44} which has been dealt with so far by Petr Němec in the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{45} In recent years, in particular, Miloš Hořejš has paid attention to German settlement policy in the Protectorate.\textsuperscript{46}

Although there are few in the domestic production of comprehensive works on Nazi nationalities policy or the German minority in the Protectorate, regional studies have been published that focus on these aspects of Protectorate history. These studies are very valuable for a more general treatment of this topic. Recently, two of them have been devoted to the topic of the Protectorate of Prague and the German community there. The aforementioned Miloš Hořejš published a monograph on Nazi urbanism in Prague in the context of Nazi Germanization policy.\textsuperscript{47} Alena Míšková dealt with the influence of Josef Pfitzner on Nazi politics in Prague.\textsuperscript{48} Lubomír Nenička was interested in Nazi communal politics, specifically on the example of Ostrava.\textsuperscript{49}

Particularly beneficial for the understanding of nationalities policy in the Protectorate are studies focusing on the area of the so-called German language


\textsuperscript{44} ŠTOLLEOVÁ, Barbora, \textit{Pod kuratelou Německé říše: zemědělství Protektorátu Čechy a Morava}, Praha 2014.


\textsuperscript{49} NENIČKA, Lubomír, \textit{Městská správa v době nacistické okupace: Příčiny a důsledky vzniku Velké Ostravy v roce 1941}, in: \textit{Theatrum historiae} 16, 2015, pp. 231–263.
(national) islands. The area of the Iglau (Jihlava) region was concentrated on works by Jarka Vítámvásová and Marta Perůtková, Ulrich Scheinhammer-Schmid and M. Hořejš. Leoš Nikrmajer devoted his attention to the German minority and ethnic politics in the Budweis area. Michaela Zemánková discussed local politics in Wischau (Vyškov) as the center of the German language island. Czech ethnologist Petr Lozoviuk also addressed the interesting question of the small German village of Libinsdorf (Karlov) in the Žďár nad Sázavou region. The author of the dissertation published a study on ethnic policy in the environment of a numerically weak German minority in the Pardubice region and tried to compare it with areas with a larger community of Protectorate Germans. This kind of regional concept is also the subject of some university theses.

In recent years, the post-war expulsion of the German population from the Bohemian lands and thus from the Protectorate has become an important topic.
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of Czech historiography. A number of books and studies have been published on this topic, whether in general or regional terms. Such achievements must be appreciated because they analyze the consequences of Nazi politics in the Bohemian lands, no matter how controversial and still alive the subject is. It should be mentioned, but it is not the ambition of this work to assess the extent to which the forced displacement of Germans was fair or unfair.

3. Research questions

To achieve the goal of the dissertation, the author sets several partial research questions to which he will seek answers. The key to their answer was the emphasis on knowledge of the settlement and social structures of the Protectorate Germans. The author assumes that there were some differences between the Germans in the Protectorate in relation to their geographical distribution and social status. Thus, German society in the Protectorate is not understood as a homogeneous mass, and the term "Protectorate Germans" can only be understood as a certain abstraction. In this work, the basic postulate of heterogeneity of the German population in the Protectorate will be tested. From the partial problems it will be necessary to solve the following questions:

1. What were the theoretical foundations of the Nazi nationalities policy in the Protectorate? Has practical policy always corresponded to Nazi ideology? What were the practical problems in its application and how did the occupation administration solve them?
2. Who could become a German citizen in the Protectorate? How was the German nationality defined in the Protectorate environment? Did the national criteria differ from those applied in other occupied areas? What role did the national identity (self-identification) of the Protectorate Germans play?
3. How did the Nazis treat nationally mixed marriages in terms of ideology and practice?
4. What relations did the Protectorate Germans have with their Czech neighbours? Is it possible to trace certain territorial differences?

5. Was the growth in the number of Germans in the Protectorate sufficient to meet the Germanization goals and the future?
6. What special groups of Germans living in the Protectorate can be defined and what distinguished them (cities versus rural areas, language islands versus almost purely Czech areas,...)? What were the specifics of nationality policy towards special groups of Germans.
7. How high did the Nazis have to incur for the purposes of nationalities policy? Was the pro-German agenda profitable in the light of the results achieved?
8. Was it a stable or dynamic process in the case of the Nazi "Volkstumspolitik"? By which factors was the possible dynamics influenced?
9. To what extent has the course of war influenced the minds of the Protectorate Germans?
10. How did the Nazis try to integrate German immigrants from abroad? What problems did the colonization projects have to face?

4. Methodology

This dissertation is based primarily on the concept of social history of a totalitarian state. This approach in relation to the Nazi regime was used by David Schoenbaum,60 who looked at the problem of the rise of Nazism through the prism of the social revolution and his conclusions were not accepted without reservations.61 To a lesser extent, the author also sought to take a look at the everyday life of Germans living in the Protectorate, which partly brings the work closer to the microhistorical perspective, i.e. the history of “small” (ordinary) people. The work of Frank Grube and Gerhard Richter represents a pioneering work on everyday life in the Nazi state.62

A relatively important aspect of the dissertation is the ethnographic concept. This stems from the notion that the Germans living in the Protectorate represented a peculiar ethnic group that, while naturally mixed with the Czech majority population, still retained its peculiarity, especially in the exposed areas of the language islands. The aim was therefore to cover various groups of the

German population in the Protectorate in terms of territorial (settlement), their origin and social status.

The basic methodological axis of the dissertation is represented by a regional-comparative approach. This is based on settlement-geographical analysis of individual regions and micro-regions in the Protectorate in which ethnic Germans lived. The author emphasized not only the well-known language islands, but also other - often little-known - settlements, in which the Germans formed a significant population. These were some smaller towns or small rural language enclaves. However, areas with a low representation of the German population were not left out either. The author thus incorporated numerous regional probes in his work, which span across individual (sub) topics. The possibilities of a regional approach to the study of the history of Nazi Germany were discussed by the authors of one of the proceedings entitled Nationalsozialismus in der Region, which was published in 1996.63

The methodological challenge is to evaluate the success of the Nazi "Volkstumspolitik" in the Protectorate. It is certainly not an easy task. The prerequisite is the determination of sufficient relevant and objective criteria. Quantitative assessments can only be given to a limited extent.

With regard to the topic with a relatively short time span of only six years, the author tried to conceive the topic primarily of a synchronous approach. He thus focused on individual aspects of the life of the German minority and on instruments or measures of nationalities policy. The chronological line then had its significance within individual thematic units. To a limited extent, the author also used the biographical method and marginally also oral history.64

The dissertation thesis is based primarily on research of archival sources. The archival material comes from the National Archives, the Security Services Archives and especially from the regional archives in Opava, Zámrsk, Třeboň and Brno, as well as from several district archives. The following types of archival sources were used in particular:

- periodical reports by the German occupation authorities,
- studies and memoranda of the occupation administration,
- statistical statements,
- minutes of meetings,

64 VANĚK, Miroslav, Orální historie ve výzkumu soudobých dějin, Praha 2004.
lower-order norms (regulations, circulars, directives),
questionnaires,
routine official correspondence.

To a lesser extent, the author also used contemporary printed sources. First and foremost, these were higher-order norms, even legislative ones - the Reich Code (*Reichsgesetzblatt*) or official bulletins. Some of these printed norms were part of the archival collections. Furthermore, the author used official handbooks, internal publications, political literature (occasionally regional provenance – e.g. publications of regional NSDAP leaders) and scientific monographs or proceedings on studies on national issues.

5. Conclusions

The German minority in the Protectorate was numerically relatively weak, but unevenly distributed. Basically, we can define three basic settlements of Protectorate Germans: 1. compact settlement in language islands, 2. nationally mixed towns or villages with a large German community, and 3. scattered German settlement. There were six larger language enclaves in the Protectorate: Iglau (22,637 Germans), Brünn and the surrounding area (about 50,000), including the former Maxdorf raabization settlement, the Olmütz region (16,500), Wischau (3,500) and Budweis (about 10 000). In addition, there were also small and completely isolated German enclaves such as Libinsdorf, Autschowa, and Auborsko.

Outside the language islands, the Germans lived in large numbers in some towns and villages of the Protectorate, where they were not a majority of the population but a significant minority. Among these important communities those were primarily Prague (over 26,000 Germans), and Mährisch-Ostrau (25,000). About 50,000 Germans then lived scattered throughout the Protectorate. The German settlements in the Protectorate and their location became the basis for planning the Germanization of the Bohemian-Moravian area. The Germanization plans focused mainly on the area of Moravia, where “areas of interest” were defined, which were to form pillars of “national bridges” that would lead across Moravia alongside the language islands. In Bohemia, the “area of interest” was formed to the north of Prague.

The Nazis tried to give their nationalities policy in the Protectorate a legal framework. The Hitler's decree on the establishment of the Protectorate defined two groups of inhabitants - the Germans and the other - protectorate members,
which were mainly Czechs. Both groups had different rights, and the German population was explicitly favoured. This resulted in a legal separation of the German and Czech inhabitants of the Protectorate.

Problematic, however, proved to be exactly defined nationality in order to acquire German citizenship. This issue was regulated by a directive from the end of March 1939 and then a special regulation was adopted in 1941. Legislation was also applied to nationally-mixed marriages, with the entry into force of the provision that the nationality of the children was not determined automatically by the father but by the mother if she was a German citizen. Special regulations then defined specific matters of Protectorate Germans, such as welfare or conscription. It was true that a German citizen also had the same rights as protectorate nationals. This created a certain disproportion.

The fundamental problem of the "Volkstumspolitik" in the Protectorate was the lack of ability to exactly define "Germanness" in this area. The Nazis understood nationality in the spirit of primordial conception. So, it was not just a question of language, of a common culture, but above all of a genealogical or - better to say - biological origin. Thus, “objective” signs were sought to distinguish the Germans from the Czechs. The term 'deutschblütig' was used exclusively in connotation with the Nuremberg Laws and, by definition, should be matched by Czechs of non-Jewish origin.

The subjective characteristics of nationality included self-identification with the German nation. This identity was certainly not shared by all who were considered German. The weakest “national self-consciousness” was found in people from a mixed ethnic background. Indeed, there were also those who tried to avoid calling into the Wehrmacht by declaring themselves Czech or withdrawing their applications for German citizenship. Among the autochthonous Germans, especially in rural areas, the dialect also belonged to the national emblem.

In the Protectorate, however, not only local ethnic Germans lived, but also their Reich and Sudeten fellows who came here as soldiers, clerks or even businessmen. Because the Nazis preferred to occupy leading positions in the state administration to the Reich or Sudeten Germans, some tensions have developed between these groups. Many Protectorate Germans thus felt to be "second-class Germans".

A special group in which the occupiers were very interested was the so-called “national interlayer”, which consisted of people of mostly mixed origin or in a mixed language environment. They were nationally indifferent, but they
spoke Czech rather than German. In any case, they also had German ancestors. Many of these "amphibians" lived in areas near the language border.

After the occupation everyone had to personally register with the German nationality at the locally competent office of the oberlandrat. Nevertheless, local Nazi cells kept lists of alleged Germans, who then put pressure on them if they delayed their application for "German". The occupying authorities then launched a massive campaign to bring as many people as possible to German nationality and, consequently, German citizenship. However, there were no clear and uniform criteria yet, and so it all depended on the individual oberlandräte. In many cases, the application for German nationality was literally spontaneously received. After the victorious campaign of Nazi Germany in Western Europe, various businessmen on the part of the Czechs or open collaborators joined the Germans more and more often. In addition, Roma or various criminal elements also sought German citizenship.

For the purpose of a uniform assessment of “racial competence”, the occupiers introduced racial selection in nationality and marriage matters in the Protectorate. This activity was carried out by the Bohemian-Moravian branch of the SS Race and Settlement Main Office / RuSHA, which was established in February 1941 to carry out racial research of the Czech population. The branch was replaced by Ermin Künzel and Johannes Preuss. The first applications for German citizenship and marriage had been handled by RuSHA since the end of summer 1941.

German nationals in the Protectorate were subject to racial hygiene legislation - especially the so-called Sterilization Law. If they were found to have a hereditary disease, whether genuine or suspected (alcoholism), they were at risk of having to undergo sterilization. In this sense, there are interesting reports of the occurrence of 'inbreeding' symptoms in isolated German language islands.

Practical nationalities policy or “national work” focused on strengthening the positions of German nationality in the Protectorate. It was to create the conditions for the further development of "German". First of all, it was the penetration of the Germans into local governments. The regional leadership and local NSDAP groups had a great influence on the “promotion of Germanness” at regional level. These party structures were supposed to cooperate with appointed German government commissioners or mayors, which was not always successful. Education played a key role in German “national life” in the Protectorate. Before the occupation, German schools existed only in Prague, language islands and cities with larger German communities. However, the
occupation administration has made enormous efforts to open German schools even in the areas of “scattered German” so that no German pupil has to attend a Czech school. Thus, in 1943, more than 300 German primary schools, 60 middle-class schools and more than a hundred secondary schools of various types were in operation.

Cultural policy was also generously subsidized. Various so-called ‘German houses‘ were growing like mushrooms after the rain, representing cultural centers for the Germans in individual towns and villages. Social care was much more generous to Protectorate Germans than in the case of Czechs. This apparently also prompted a number of benefactors to apply for German nationality. In the area of social policy, the authorities dealt primarily with the poor housing situation (4.5 thousand flats were secured for Germans by 1941), support for German families and care for the elderly.

It was clear that the Germanization of the Protectorate could not be achieved "only from its own resources". Therefore, large-scale colonization was envisaged not only by the Reich Germans, but also by their fellows from abroad, mostly from southern and south-eastern Europe. Although large-scale events of this type were to take place after the (victorious) war, colonization was still ongoing to a small extent during the war. The basic prerequisite was sufficient German land for future settlers, which was ensured by the Nazi-seized Land Office, which managed confiscates by Jews and Czechs. The first resettlers from the ranks of foreign Germans appeared in the Protectorate as early as 1940, mainly South Tyrolean and Romanian Germans. They went mainly to the areas of South Moravia, Olomouc and South Bohemia. These were all German “areas of interest” near the language islands. The pilot settlement project was then launched in Košátky near Melnik and Jungbunzlau (Mladá Boleslav).

"Promoting Germandom" was definitely not cost-free. To a large extent, these efforts also reduced the military capabilities of Nazi Germany, although the Protectorate was relatively "neglected" in this respect compared to occupied Poland. In the years 1940-1943 alone, the occupation administration spent nearly 24 million RM on the „Volkstumsfond“.

Around 1944, there would be a population of about 284 360 Protectorate Germans, respectively. those indigenous people who acquired German citizenship. However, the total number of all Germans staying in the Protectorate during the occupation was much higher. These were mainly Reich and Sudeten Germans, who worked here as officials, soldiers, members of the SS and police, but some resorted to other reasons - for example, thousands of German children from the Reich towns threatened by air raids came here.
Overall, around 600,000 Germans could live in the Protectorate, which represented a relatively higher proportion of the total population.

The end of the war meant the practical demise of the German settlement not only in the borderland, but also in the Bohemian-Moravian interior - ie in the territory of the former Protectorate. The existing German language enclaves have been almost completely displaced. As in the Sudetenland, Czechs were sometimes violent towards Germans. There have also been several massacres.

Ethnic policy was pursued in the following respects: admission to the German community, administration, legal environment, ideology, culture, economy, social affairs, health, etc. Thanks to numerous probes the author managed to "penetrate" the situation in seemingly "peripheral areas" the traditional core of the German settlement. Special attention was paid to Neuhaus (Jindřichův Hradec), the area on the Vitoraz border and small language enclaves Libinsdorf, Autschowa and Auborsko.

Nazi nationalities policy was based on firm theoretical foundations, especially racist ideology. Outside, the Prague occupying authorities tried to observe and apply these principles. However, compromises had to be made in the special environment of the Protectorate, where it was not possible for economic reasons to pursue a "rude" Germanization policy (as in occupied Poland or Slovenia). This was also related to the attitude to the local very weak "German". Indeed, the state of the German population was indeed very poor, as evidenced by numerous reports of "biologically weak" communities of Germans. Many Protectorate Germans did not even share a sufficiently strong ethnic belonging and often spoke to each other more Czech than German.

Another problem was the numerous mixed marriages, especially in the mostly Czech environment. The Nazi authorities of course tried to deal with these problems, but not very successfully. There were even opinions that it would be necessary to re-educate the “native Germans” in the Empire. This solution, however, was completely impracticable during the war, and so remained more or less just as desired.

Czech-German mixed marriages were a big topic of Nazi nationalities policy. In general, the Nazis considered them a necessary evil. From an ideological point of view, there were some doubts about race. On the other hand, they had to be accepted because in many areas this was the only way to avoid inbreeding. In any case, the authorization of these marriages were introduced on the basis of racial criteria, but many compromises were made. However, the mixed families would send their offspring to German schools.
In the first years of the occupation, the Czechs treated their German neighbours very hostile, especially in the case of the so-called "scattered Germans". However, where the Czechs and Germans lived together for a long time, the occupation did not have to break these ties. This was especially true in the case of small language enclaves, such as in Libinsdorf or Auborsko, where even local Czechs praised the German mayor from among the local Germans appointed by the Nazis.

Nationalities policy was not a rigid process. While in the early years it was rather fumbling and practical solutions came ad hoc, in the shortly before the arrival of Heydrich, rules based on Nazi ideology began to apply much more. With increasing defeats of the Third Reich, dogmatism began to drop. Ethnic policies have ceased to be a priority - but that does not mean that it has stopped.
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