

From the Carpathian Mountains in Europe, the Vistula River heads north and winds through several cities in Poland, including Kraków, Warsaw, Toruń and Bydgoszcz; then, the Vistula approaches the Baltic Sea and, en route to open waters, descends towards one last important stop: the port city of Gdańsk.

Today, Gdańsk is populated by ethnic Poles. However, the same city once housed a predominantly German population. For many years, the city was part of the German-speaking realm and commonly known by its German name, which is Danzig; nonetheless, in 1920, the city was put into a special service arrangement with Poland. The city became part of a semi-autonomous city-state known as the Free City of Danzig, and Poland gained access to the city's seaport.

The Free City arrangement was supposed to set up a rewarding business relationship between Poland and Danzig. However, Poland and Germany opposed the plan and adopted policies towards the Free City which were in their own best interests instead of the best interests of the new arrangement's functionality. Additionally, the Free City arrangement left the leaders of Danzig, a German-dominated city, and Poland, a Polish-led state, fighting one another over control of the Free City's affairs. These conditions fostered the growth of ethno-national tensions between the Germans and the Poles which, in

time, led to a tariff war, economic sanctions and an atmosphere of hostility that put the city's commercial livelihood in danger.

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, there were several attempts to get rid of the Free City of Danzig and replace it with a new territorial understanding. However, Germany and Poland both considered Danzig rightfully theirs and were reluctant to accept a new plan that could compromise their power in the Baltic.¹ Consequently, discussions between the Germans and Poles failed to produce tangible results and the Free City arrangement remained intact until 1939, the year Poland was invaded by Germany. After the invasion, the controversy over Danzig quickly disappeared from view. It would not be looked at the same way again.²

Today, the invasion of Poland is considered to have been part of a conflict known as the Second World War, and the war is said to have been about Germany's ambitions to conquer Europe. Not surprisingly, in scholarship, the conflict over Danzig is usually depicted as little more than something Germany had cooked up as a pretext for the invasion of Poland.³ Furthermore, Germany's leader during the war, Adolf Hitler, is often portrayed as not just the main actor in the movement to reverse the Free City arrangement, but as the inventor of the whole controversy.⁴ As a result, the controversy's place in

historiography is often limited to a place along a timeline of "Hitlerite aggression."⁵

While it is true that Hitler and his regime played an important role in the escalation of the crisis over the Free City, a comprehensive analysis of the Free City's history, as well as a concrete understanding of the long-running conflict over the Danzig region, would reveal that there was much more to the Danzig situation than what the "Hitler legacy" appears to have left behind.⁶ The truth is, five hundred years before Hitler's impact on world affairs, ethnic German and Polish leaders were already at odds over control of the Danzig region. But the debate over "rightful ownership" went back even further; the Poles claimed, as they still do, that their Slav ancestors had founded the city of Gdańsk by establishing a stronghold there around the 10th century AD. However, as early as the 4th century BC, the ancestors of the German-speaking peoples had come from the Scandinavian isles across the Baltic Sea and started living along the Vistula.⁷ In fact, etymologists and historians have proposed that the Germanic settlement "Gothiscandza" (Gothic Scandinavia), established at the mouth of the Vistula sometime before the 1st century AD, may have been the original word from which the Polish word "Gdańsk" evolved from.⁸

In any case, for the next five hundred years after the

founding of Gothiscandza, most of the Baltic, and, indeed, much of Europe, could be argued to "belong" to the Germanic peoples.⁹ This period was later romanticized by German sources as a time when, from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea - and as far west as the Maas and Rhine rivers - the only threat to the Germanic cultures came from the Roman Empire to the south and east. This threat was minimized in 9 AD, with the victory of the Germanics over the Romans at the Battle of Teutoberg Forest. The Germanic peoples also had neighbors to the east, the Balts, but they kept east of the Vistula.¹⁰ Needless to say, it was only a matter of time until the face of the Europe changed forever.¹¹

In the 4th century AD, the Huns arrived from across the Black Sea and started ravaging the Germanic lands. Around the same time, north of where the Huns appeared in Europe, the Slavs came onto the scene from the unknown wilderness of the east.¹² Little evidence exists to show how much the arrival of the Huns or Slavs spurred the migration of the Germanic peoples. Nonetheless, by 700 AD, the Germanic peoples had moved west and the Huns had been pushed out of Central Europe by the Slavs.¹³ When the dust had cleared, Slav influence extended from present-day Russia to the Elbe River, and nearly as far west as the present-day city of Hamburg; accordingly, the Slavs had spread out across roughly sixty percent of present-day Germany, and the

heart of the European subcontinent had been split into two distinct halves from which two separate, Slav-influenced and Germanic-influenced worlds began to develop.

In the year 810 AD, the division between the Slavic and Germanic peoples became less abstract; after subduing numerous Germanic tribes and uniting them under Christianity, the leader of the Frankish Germanic people, Karl the Great, ordered the construction of a wall to mark the eastern limits of his vast empire. Called the Saxon Wall, or the Limes Saxoniae border, it ran along the course of the Slavo-Germanic ethno-linguistic divide, starting just east of a newly-built stronghold at Hamburg. On the other side of the wall lived the Obotrites, the Slavs who had fought alongside the Frankish Germanics.

Through their alliance with the Frankish Germanics, the Obotrites had gained land and protection, both of which they were expected to pay tribute for. However, after Karl the Great's death in 814 AD, the Germanic world fell into disunion and was not even capable of protecting itself. By the 10th century, the likely descendants of the Huns, the Magyars, had begun terrorizing the Germanic lands. No longer willing to pay tribute, in 915 AD, the Obotrites rebelled against Germanic influence, breached the Saxon Wall and laid waste to Hamburg. The Germanic lands were in trouble.

In 919 AD, Heinrich "the Fowler" became King of the

Germans. Heinrich's aspiration was to rebuild Karl the Great's realm, as well as secure and expand the limits of German civilization. Nonetheless, the Magyars continued to wreak havoc across the German lands until Heinrich's son, Otto the Great, led a campaign that, in 955 AD, pushed the raiders back; that same year, Otto's forces defeated the Obotrites at the Battle of Recknitz. Both events were an important step towards Heinrich's vision, and an important development in European history.

Whereas the victory over the Magyars gave Otto the clout and muscle to bind the eastern third of Karl the Great's realm into what later became the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, the victory over the Obotrites led to an increased presence of German-speaking peoples east of the Saxon Wall. Afterwards, the land of the vanquished Slavs was carved up into provinces called marches. Within each march, Otto appointed German officials to impose direct rule. German planters were also encouraged to resettle in these areas. Thus, the limits of German civilization expanded eastward.

Throughout the Medieval Era, German resettlement continued, and migrants set out for increasingly further destinations in the east; these developments had little to do with the imperatives of the Holy Roman Empire. Settlers in the east arrived almost exclusively upon invitation from the local Slav rulers, who used the migrants to help tame the wilderness and

foster the growth of new settlements. The procedure was very profitable for all who were involved.¹⁴

According to the late American historian T. Walter Wallbank in the best-selling *Civilization Past and Present*, German migration into Eastern Europe embodied much of the same "pioneer spirit" that is often portrayed as the backbone of European settlement in the American West.¹⁵ Most German migrants were simple planters who, under their own power, had left their overcrowded domains behind to find open and cultivatable land. Nevertheless, by the time the trend of German resettlement had spread to the Vistula, the nature of resettlement had changed. To begin, migration to the lower Vistula region was not possible until a bloody Christianizing crusade had been carried out by Slav and German rulers against the locals; secondly, that same crusade brought the Knights of the Teutonic Order to the Baltic.

The Teutonic Order was a German Roman Catholic organization loyal to both the Holy Roman Empire and the papacy in Rome; it was founded to assist Christian pilgrims, protect Christian settlements and conduct Christianizing crusades in the Middle East.¹⁶ However, in 1226, the leader of the Masovians petitioned the Order to come to the Baltic and crush the indigenous pagan Balts. The Masovian Slavs were having trouble protecting some of the territory they had seized. After the Pope approved of

the assignment, the Kulmerland, a tiny strip of land along a beleaguered Masovian frontier, became the Order's new home.¹⁷ Once the region was secured, it became a springboard for further "crusading" activity.¹⁸

The Masovians were not the only Christianized Slavs to wage war against the pagans. Already, for over two hundred years, another group had been sending crusaders into the Baltic to spread the Gospel and the boundaries of an emerging empire. These Slavs, the Polan Slavs, eventually became known as the Poles. In the late 10th century, they had built a stronghold near the mouth of the Vistula, in Pomerelia, and subjugated the local Pomeranian Slavs. The settlement remained calm until the "heavy-handed" rule of a Polish noble named Sieciech sparked an uprising in 1090. However, in 1308, the region rebelled again - this time, the circumstances were more complicated.

In 1308, Poland's nobles were arguing over the Crown and Poland was without a true leader. Some of the people living near the mouth of the Vistula, including German immigrants from the Holy Roman Empire, had decided to take advantage of the vacuum of power and break from Poland. They elected to become part of Brandenburg, a march belonging to the Holy Roman Empire. Incidentally, March Brandenburg was led by Waldemar the Great, a German who, through royal intermarriage, was ironically from the

same family line that was feuding over the Polish Crown. In any case, he agreed to support the rebels and sent troops to the Vistula river delta region, in Pomerelia, on behalf of Brandenburg.

To put down the rebellion in Pomerelia, the Polish royals hired the Knights of the Teutonic Order. The Knights cleaned house. However, it was not long until the Poles and the Order started to quarrel over the spoils of war and the region became what historian Eugene van Cleef has called a "storm center of rival aspirants."¹⁹ After much deliberation, the Poles refused to pay the Teutonic Order what it wanted for its work, and the Order decided to hold onto the settlement near the Vistula river delta as compensation. The Knights also took a few surrounding settlements and agreed to pay for the land. The Polish nobility, however, was not the recipient of the money - Brandenburg was. For a sum of 10,000 silver marks, Waldemar of Brandenburg signed an agreement acknowledging the validity of the Knight's territorial claims.

As the Order took control of the Vistula river delta, Władysław I the Elbow-high, the soon-to-be king of a reconstituted Poland, petitioned the Pope in Rome. The Polish leader demanded that action be taken against the Order, which was under papal authority. Władysław's petition claimed that, in the process of taking the settlement near the Vistula river

delta, the Knights had killed over 10,000 people; centuries later, this accusation continued to haunt German-Polish relations, and became part of the controversy over the ownership of the settlement near the Vistula river delta - a settlement that, as it obtained more and more German immigrants, eventually became known as Danzig.

During the 15th century, amidst a period of extended conflict between the Poles and the Teutonic Order over control of the Baltic, Polish historian and diplomat Jan Długosz wrote about the takeover along the Vistula delta region as a "slaughter of Polish nationals regardless of condition, age or gender."²⁰ Ostensibly, he was suggesting that the region's inhabitants in 1308 had been "Polish nationals" because the region had been controlled by a Polish leader; alternatively, Długosz may have been implying that the Pomeranians were the settlement's majority population in 1308 and, therefore, the inhabitants were "Poles" because the Pomeranians were Slavs like the Poles and spoke a Slavic tongue that was similar to Polish. In any case, both arguments lead to the conclusion that the events of 1308 constituted an attack on "the Polish nation", which became a common theme in Polish scholarship dealing with the takeover of 1308.

During the 1920s, amidst discussions about the future of

Danzig, the Poles brought up the "10,000 figure."²¹ When Germany invaded Poland in 1939, Polish propaganda declared that, by taking full control of Danzig, Germany was "repeating what the Germans had done in 1308". Another contemporary account stated that "the Germans of today are the worthy successors" of the Knights who "massacre ten thousand souls."²² All were clear examples as to how, during the early 20th century, the Poles viewed their shared history with their German neighbors. Finally, after the war, Polish politician Jędrzej Giertych proclaimed that "justice had been served" in the post-war arrangements, because Poland had been given full control over Danzig. In Giertych's opinion, the city was "rightfully" Poland's city because it had been under Polish control before the Knights arrived. According to Giertych, the Knights had "approached the Polish forces as allies, turned arms against them and then murdered everyone in sight - including Danzig's men, women and children."

What actually occurred during the events of 1308 in Danzig is not certain; however, after the protestations of Władysław I the Elbow-high, the Knights were expelled from the Catholic Church and a papal court ruled that the Knights' purchases in the Baltic were not legitimate. Still, no further action was taken, and the two initial rulings were later reversed by the

Pope. Thus, the Knights were exonerated of all charges and their territorial claims were acknowledged. Poland, on the other hand, refused to acknowledge the Order's territorial claims, and continued to fight the Order over its claims and control of the Baltic until the Treaty of Kalisz was signed in 1343.

The Treaty of Kalisz brought an era of peace between Poland and the Order; however, in 1409, the two powers started butting heads once again, which led to the Battle of Tannenberg, in 1410.²³ For nearly another half-century after the battle, the Kingdom of Poland and the Teutonic Order continued to wage war against one another. However, the events at Tannenberg became the symbol of the Order's general conflict with the Polish Crown, and the crushing defeat at Tannenberg became representative of the Knight's failure to defeat the Poles. The confrontation also had a lasting effect on the German and Polish collective social consciousness; for example, in 20th century history texts, Polish schoolchildren read that the Order was responsible for the battle and had attacked Poland to procure the Baltic lands for itself. Comparisons were drawn between the attack and what the Poles perceived to have happened in Danzig in 1308.²⁴ The indirect conclusion was that the Germans were, as a whole, a "race of imperializers from the west" who were not to

be trusted.²⁵

Of course, neither the Poles nor the Germans were in the Baltic prior to their own respective resettlements or state expansionisms. Furthermore, although the Order had declared war on Poland and launched the battle of 1410, the Poles had provoked the conflict. The path to war began in 1409, when Lithuania had tried to assist a coup against the Order, and the Order moved to attack Lithuania. In response, Poland threatened to invade the Order territories, which led to the Order's declaration of war against the Kingdom of Poland and, ultimately, the conflict of 1410. Nevertheless, in determining how future generations learned to see their neighbors and were inclined to interact with them, what mattered most was not whether history had been recounted accurately, but what the public took away from it. As it were, Polish patriots earmarked stories about the Battle of Tannenberg and the takeover at Danzig in 1308, and used them to lecture their fellow countrymen that compromises and negotiations with the German people would be followed by betrayal.

The Germans did not forget the events surrounding Tannenberg either; when the German Army stood firm against the invading armies of the Russian Empire at the beginning of the First World War, the Germans proclaimed the event to be a "Second Battle of Tannenberg." They saw the victory as revenge

for what had happened more than five hundred years earlier, in 1410, after the Knights had squared off against "the Slavs" to determine the future of the German-speaking and German-administered Baltic lands - and lost.

The defeat in 1410 had tremendous repercussions. For example, it eventually led to an agreement which, financially and militarily, reduced the Order to fief - little more than a viscerally independent, yet fully-obligated servant of Poland. The agreement, called the Second Treaty of Thorn, was signed in 1466. It gave the Polish Crown sovereignty over the stretch of the Baltic extending from the Holy Roman Empire to just beyond the eastern banks of the Vistula River. Within this region was Danzig, which had been administered by the Order since the takeover of 1308.²⁶ The territory given up by the Order also included the major Order settlements at Elbag and Lidzbark, as well as the rest of Marienburg and Warmia, plus the Kulmerland to the south. As a result, German planters were put under Polish control and German administrative influence came to an end in all of the above-mentioned regions. In the 20th century, when arguments for rightful possession of Danzig defaulted to discussions about past ownership, these developments became particularly important, and buttressed Poland's claims of "rightful ownership" in the Baltic.²⁷

The results of the Second Treaty of Thorn also gave root to the very ethnographic controversy that the 20th century conflict over Danzig was associated with. The regions reserved for the Kingdom of Poland lost most of their budding German character; however, the regions where the Order was allowed to continue its colonial ventures did not. Thus, the conditions were ripe for the areas controlled by the monastic Order State to become one isolated, German-speaking region along the Baltic, cut off from the rest of the German-speaking world (ex: the Holy Roman Empire) by an area that, after the Second Treaty of Thorn, had been administered by the Kingdom of Poland and influenced by Polish socio-political forces. These are the exact changes that began to occur; then, in the midst of those changes, a new dimension was introduced to the territorial conflict in-the-making.

In 1517, Albert of Brandenburg-Ansbach, the 37th Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, led the Order State in rebellion. Albert's first move was to try to reacquire some of the territory for the Order that had been lost after the Second Treaty of Thorn. Therefore, when Lithuania was attacked by the Russians and the Poles came to Lithuania's aid, Albert ignored the Order's obligation to provide assistance to Poland and, instead, formed an alliance with the Russians against the Poles. The idea was to use the alliance to gain diplomatic leverage and

pressure the King of Poland into giving up territory to the Order State. However, the effort failed. The Polish king refused to negotiate with Albert and issued a declaration of war against the Order State. A new conflict began.

When the fighting between Poland the Order ended in 1521, the status of the Order's territories remained unchanged. However, both sides were tired of sparring, and Albert resolved to try to improve the Order State's fortunes by attending to other matters. In 1525, Albert severed the Order's ties to the Holy See and eliminated all papal direction. Inspired by the Reformation and the teachings of Martin Luther, Albert also proclaimed himself a Lutheran Protestant and changed his title from "Grand Master" to "Duke". The Order State became the "Duchy of Prussia", which the Kingdom of Poland still controlled in a condition of suzerainty.²⁸ Dynasty rule began in Albert's state. Oddly enough, in relation to the 20th century conflict over Danzig, this last point became an extremely important detail.

In 1618, the last capable ruler in Albert's direct family line died and Albert's son-in-law, who was already the elected ruler of March Brandenburg, became the new "Duke of Prussia"; consequently, Brandenburg and the territory of Ducal Prussia came together under the influence of the same authority. Still, the two regions were hardly "together" in a literal sense;

whereas Brandenburg still answered to the collective decisions of the Holy Roman Empire, the Duchy of Prussia was still a fief of the Polish Crown. Thus, the new entity, called Brandenburg-Prussia, had little sovereignty.

Incidentally, the early 17th century was a very bad time to confront the Polish king about relinquishing its control over the Duchy. The Kingdom of Poland was in its Golden Age. In union with Lithuania, Poland had built a vast empire known as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Commonwealth stretched as far to the east as the cities of Kiev and Smolensk, in present-day Ukraine and Russia, respectively. Nevertheless, fate reared its head in the mid 17th century, and the Elector of Mark Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia at the time, the "Great Elector" Friedrich Wilhelm, received an incredible hand to play in the fight for Brandenburg-Prussia's independence.

In the midst of the Northern War between Sweden and Poland, the Swedes seized control of the Baltic, and Ducal Prussia became a Swedish fief. Friedrich Wilhelm was forced to aid his Swedish conquerors. However, as the Swedish offensive against the Poles stalled in 1656, Sweden became desperate for help, and the "Great Elector" upped his price for future support. He demanded that he be named the sovereign of Ducal Prussia, including Warmia.²⁹ Sweden accepted. Later, the Poles made the same offer, but demanded Warmia. The "Great Elector" agreed

and, as promised, took his Brandenburg-Prussia out of its alliance with Sweden to help the Poles. Polish control over Brandenburg-Prussia came to an end.

Though independent from Poland, Brandenburg-Prussia was not yet fully "together"; territory belonging to the Poles, including Danzig, as well as Warmia, the Kulmerland and Marienburg, sat in the state's lap and divided it into two unconnected parts. This created numerous problems in terms of logistics and defense. However, Brandenburg-Prussia, which came to be known as just Prussia, was still too weak to directly confront Poland about territorial reform.

Nevertheless, as the 17th century came to an end, so did the Golden Age of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In partnership with the Holy Roman Empire, the forces of the Commonwealth had managed to drive the Islamic Ottoman Empire invaders out of Vienna and from mainland Europe in 1683; however, a series of costly campaigns against the Russians had that same century not ended as well for the Poles and had drained the treasury just the same. The Ukrainians had also rebelled against Polish rule, and turned to the Russian Czar for support. As a result, the Commonwealth lost control of the eastern portion of its empire.

By the 18th century, the democratization of Poland's government had also become a symptom of the Commonwealth's

decline. Poland's parliamentary system was pulling the empire in conflicting directions and disputes between the merchant classes, upper nobility and the royalists in parliament had given the Russians the green light to intervene in Poland as mediators. Under these conditions, Poland was pulled in a new direction: east. In 1768, Poland became a vassal state controlled by the Russian Czar.

Fearing a full Russian takeover, the rulers of the Austrian Empire and Kingdom of Prussia sent military forces into Poland; it was a clear sign that the Russians could either risk war over control of the collapsing republic or agree to split the land. The Russian Czar chose the latter and, in 1772, Austria, Prussia and Russia agreed to the First Partition of Poland. Prussia was finally able to solve its territorial discontinuity problem, but only at the expense of the Commonwealth. Consequently, the partitions became the foundation of yet another issue creating bitter blood between the Germans and the Poles.³⁰

Later generations of nationalistic Poles noted that the expansion of Prussia and German power had coincided with the gradual disappearance of the Poles' vast empire, and they were right; however, their observations completely ignored the devastating poverty, disintegrating leadership and corrupt nobility which had characterized the Commonwealth prior to its partitioning and, thus, falsely identified the outcome of the

Commonwealth's decline - the collapse of the Commonwealth - as the reason for the decline. Furthermore, in arguing that the Poles' vast empire constituted the "rightful" boundaries of a Polish state, the Polish nationalist crowd also failed to take into consideration that the Commonwealth was a multi-national empire of subjugated peoples, including the Kashubians, Belarusians and Ukrainians, as well as Germans, Livonians and Jews. Just as importantly, after two more partitions and the end of Polish autonomy in 1795, most of the Commonwealth's Polish population came under Russian control, not German control.³¹ Nevertheless, in the 20th century, at a time when scholarly instruction closely coincided with state interests, what mattered in many Polish texts was that "the Germans" had played a role in the Polish state's gradual disappearance from the map of Europe.³² The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a symbol of Polish power and autonomy; not surprisingly, during the Golden Age of the Commonwealth, Poland had maintained access to the sea and been in possession of Danzig.³³ Even after the First Partition of Poland, which connected the state of Prussia nearly along the entirety of the Baltic coast, Danzig had remained within the Polish realm as an isolated port serving Poland, completely surrounded by Prussia and open waters.³⁴

Still, since the Medieval Era, the Danzig region had housed

Germans; even more importantly, with the Second Partition of Poland, the region became part of a single, German-populated entity that extended the greater length of the Baltic seacoast.³⁵ This changed only briefly, when the city's fate was dictated by France during the Napoleonic Wars. Incidentally, after the war, as German migration to the east continued, the Baltic seacoast became even more thoroughly German. Moreover, the Prussian State entered its own golden age and expanded rapidly to the west to incorporate much of German-speaking Europe. Then, in 1871, German unification took place and Prussia became the cornerstone of a united German state that stretched "from the Maas to the Memel" - from a region past the western banks of the Rhine River to the distant coastlines of eastern Prussia. Inevitably, a partial dissection of this German colossus had to occur if a Polish state were to be resurrected and again be granted an outlet the sea as the Polish people intended. It was not clear how this could be done, yet most politicians supported the idea.

As Europe's Polish-speaking population was relatively the same size as Spain's population, most 20th century statesmen were of the opinion that an independent Polish state should have access to oceangoing trade.³⁶ Unbeknownst to most people, even Adolf Hitler had expressed this opinion in several speeches

given before the German parliament in the Reichstag. In one speech, he had called "unreasonable and impossible" to deny the Polish population an outlet to the sea.¹ This stance was also reflected in his attempted port-for-port negotiations with Poland in the late 1930s.² One of Hitler's proposals would have delivered the outlying port city of Memel into Polish hands, thus causing the smallest possible dismemberment of the German State while giving the Poles access to a major seaport along the Baltic. However, the Poles rejected the proposal. Not only did the Polish people distrust Hitler and the Germans but, as events at the Paris Peace Conference suggested, the Polish government had its own plans for the Baltic.³

In 1919, representatives from the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as France and several smaller nations, met at the Paris Peace Conference to discuss the future of Europe. Germany had just been defeated in the First World War, and the victors were about to carve up the map of Europe without consulting the German people. The conferring powers already had a consensus to create a Polish state, and guest delegates representing the Polish people were present at the conference. The delegation proposed that the Polish state include East

¹ "No. 2: Reichstag Speech, May 21, 1935" and "No. 13: Extract from Herr Hitler's speech to the Reichstag on April 28, 1939" *Documents Concerning German-Polish Relations*, 2, 21.

² *Ibid*, 2, 21.

³ Rothfels," 56.

Prussia, the unquestionably German region along the Baltic that included the core of the old Teutonic Order state.³⁷ According to the Polish plans, all of East Prussia was to be absorbed by Poland, save the large industrial city of Königsberg, which was to be put into a customs union and serve the Poles.³⁸

With their proposal to obtain control of East Prussia, the Poles were asking for quite a lot - and quite a large-sized chunk of territory at that. Nevertheless, the French accepted the Poles' plans because they wanted Germany stripped of as much territory and power as possible. The British, on the other hand, objected, and warned the French about the danger of creating another eternal conflict over a border territory a la "Alsace-Lorraine".³⁹ The British were aware of what a Polish-controlled East Prussia meant: either the Germans in East Prussia would have to be put in service to Poland, or alternatively, the entire German population in East Prussia would have to be uprooted and moved somewhere else; if the latter, then Germany's population at the time, more than twice the size of Europe's Polish population, would have to be crowded into a country reduced to nearly the same size that the Poles wanted their Poland to be.⁴⁰

Needless to say, the representatives at the Paris Peace Conference did not allow the Poles to take East Prussia.

Instead, it was proposed that the Polish State be formed mainly from the territory south of East Prussia, known as Greater Poland, the "birthplace" of Polish civilization. A region to the east, inhabited by the Belarusians, Ukrainians, Russians and the Poles, was also to be included in the Polish state. Both regions had been controlled by the Russian Empire which, by 1920, was defunct. Only later did the Soviet Union emerge as the "unofficial successor" of the Russian Empire; consequently, the transfer of the above-mentioned territories went into affect without a great deal of state resistance.

But the new Polish State was also to receive the areas to the west and southwest of East Prussia, which housed large German minorities, small German majorities and, in some major cities, German majorities. These areas had been part of the German Empire. News of their transfer to Poland sparked outrage across Germany. Protests also struck Danzig. Incidentally, here was a city that was, more than any other city, affected by the Paris Peace Conference and the treaty it produced, known as the Treaty of Versailles.

In 1920, in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles, Danzig became a semi-autonomous city-state known as the Free City of Danzig. The move addressed the needs of the Polish people, the fears of those who wanted the ethnic Germans and Poles separated into self-containing boxes, the dreams of those

who wanted self-determination and the interests of those who called for anti-German helotism. To begin, it was decided that the Poles needed their own state; this coincided with self-determination - the vision of the "people's democratic will" deciding state borders.⁴¹ Following the logic of self-determination was argued to be a critical element for a lasting peace. Had this logic been applied universally, the German people from South Tirol, as well as those living in what became Austria and Czechoslovakia, would have also had the option of having their communities become part of a unified German state.⁴² However, the United Kingdom and France wanted to redraw the map of Europe in order to limit the strength of the German State, not increase it. Furthermore, the fixing of the Polish-German border that the conferring powers went with actually incorporated much of the same "self-rule" logic as self-determination, and did so without increasing Germany's strength.

Although in 1920, Danzig was an indisputably German city, the area in between Danzig and Brandenburg, a long-time possession of the Kingdom of Poland, had a vast Slavic population that identified itself as Polish.⁴³ In fact, this "between region" between Danzig and Brandenburg, which came to be known as the Polish Corridor, had the thickest concentration of Poles to be found along the entire Baltic coast. Giving it

to Poland split Germany in two, thus debilitating the German Empire according to the wishes of the French and other attendees at the Paris Peace Conference.⁴⁴ At the same time, this transfer of territory allowed a large port city along the Baltic, Danzig, to be wriggled free from the vast German-inhabited Baltic Coast, since it was directly next to the Corridor. Danzig could then be used by the Polish people who lived along Poland's main waterway, the Vistula River, a central artery for the Poles' economic livelihood. Lastly, in line with the "self-rule" ideology, Danzig did not go to Poland; it instead became the semi-autonomous Free City of Danzig, which eliminated the "need" for large-scale population transfers and enabled the Poles to utilize the city much as they had when it was a part of the feudal patchwork of medieval Poland.⁴⁵

Indeed, beginning in 1457, Danzig had operated in accordance with terms set forth in the "Great Privilege", which gave the city considerable autonomy from the Kingdom of Poland. As a result, Danzig had implemented its own coinage, court system and laws, even in regards to commerce with Poland. In return, the city had only had to pay tribute to the Polish king, who was not even allowed to visit the city for more than three days each year. As an early hub of trade, Danzig had also been well-suited to work with Poland. In fact, for centuries, the

city had been a prime exporter of grain and lumber. Both products came from eastern-lying provinces of the Commonwealth and could easily be shipped up the Vistula River towards Danzig and out to sea. This "positive interplay of German Danziger and Polish interests", namely economic interests, had brought success for both peoples.⁴⁶ However, Danzig's success in connection with Poland may have been both a matter of time and circumstance.

After the advent of the Second Industrial Revolution in the 1880s and the emergence of the booming steel industry, Danzig became a second-rate site. Most freighters were too large to travel the length of the Vistula and the port city was too small to evolve into a ship-building site as many European ports had. Nevertheless, on the eve of Danzig's transformation into the Free City, the lingering question was not whether the city could survive economically as a semi-independent state, but whether ethnic nationalism and other political manifestations would interfere with the city's ability to function as it once had.⁴⁷ One thing was clear: in order for the Free City arrangement to function as planned, Danzig had to disengage from German nationalist instruction and neutralize itself in regards to German-Polish political relations. Just as importantly, Germany's people had to let Danzig revert to this state and

refrain from instigative, resistant action.

The problem was the Free City arrangement was established without the consent of the German population in Danzig, or any concurrence on behalf of the post-war government in Germany. Furthermore, in the minds of the German population, the Free City arrangement was associated with the "Harlot's peace" of the Treaty of Versailles, hard post-war economic times, the collapse of German power and the broken promises regarding self-determination after the armistice. In short, one could say the Germans associated the treaty with a miserable foreign dictate.⁴⁸

Additionally, the proponents of the Polish state had played an important role determining Danzig's fate at the Paris Peace Conference. This did little to excite Danzig about having Poland as a primary partner in business. The Germans were also bitter because of what had happened amidst the First World War, just three years before the creation of the Free City. At that time, as the Russians were being pushed back from the German lands by the German army, the Russian war effort had collapsed. Much of Russian-controlled Eastern Europe, including the heart of Poland, came under German control, ending more than a century of Russian rule there. The Germans had hoped to rally the Poles to their side against the Russians in return for their independence after the war. However, the Poles did not trust the Germans and considered them to be little more than a second wave

of occupiers. Under these circumstances, only approximately five thousand troops could be recruited from Poland to help the Germans on the Eastern Front, and this volunteer army failed to win the support of the Polish people. Concomitantly, it is unknown how many of these recruits joined on account of having a partial German background. Thus, it is unclear whether these individuals can even be counted as ethnic Poles who supported the German side.

To keep the Poles in order, the Germans had set up a Polish-led provisional government. However, as the war dragged on, Polish resistance to the provisional government grew. Fearing a general insurrection, the Germans had to take men and material away from the warfront - not just to keep order in Poland, but also to safeguard the supply lines which stretched across the country, and prevent them from being sabotaged by Polish nationalists. In March 1918, Russia signed a peace agreement with Germany. This enabled the Germans to concentrate on defeating the United Kingdom and France in the West. However, Germany had to leave a substantial number of men in the east to prevent riots. Germany's inability to swiftly shift its men and material from the East to the Western Front meant less manpower for the planned German offensive in the west to win the war. In any case, by the end of the year, the Germans' Western offensive had failed and, in the east, the Polish nationalist

forces had staged an uprising. The violence continued until the Paris Peace Conference. Incidentally, the Greater Poland Uprising, as it came to be called, influenced some of the decisions which were made at the Conference. Thus, in 1920, after Danzig had parted ways with Germany, the Germans were interested in revenge. In 1920, Danzig went on strike and refused to unload military aid destined for Poland. The Polish state was at war with the Soviet Union, a war that came as close to Danzig as the Polish capital of Warsaw, but Danzig did not care to help. The League of Nations, the international assembly responsible for protecting and Danzig, responded promptly. British soldiers were sent into the city on behalf of the League to unload the military cargo and do the work that the Danzigers had refused to do.⁴⁹ To streamline the flow of military supplies into the city, the League even considered placing Danzig under the temporary status of military occupation and putting the city in a state of lockdown to prevent German sabotage and secure the docks of Danzig.⁵⁰

Poland was not happy with the situation. The Polish government felt that the Danzigers were demonstrating a complete lack of respect and understanding during Poland's greatest time of need.⁵¹ The strike also became a hotly-contested issue in the media, where some argued that the Danziger resistance had been

organized with Germany's help and by nationalists who sought to sabotage the Free City arrangement before it could even begin.⁵²

On the other hand, Dr. Hans Adolf Harder, a political analyst, published a report in which he argued that the Danzigers had been betrayed by the League of Nations. In his opinion, the handling of the Danzig boycott made it clear that what little authority the Free City had over its own affairs disappeared as soon as the League decided other things were more important.⁵³

The Poles, he argued, could do whatever they wanted in the Free City as long as the League approved, and Danzig's opinion about what the Poles were doing in the city did not appear to matter.

Next, the Germans discovered that the Poles were stockpiling weaponry in the Free City and had moved troops into the area. The League of Nations had not permitted these military actions, nor had the city of Danzig. The maneuvers did not seem to pertain to Poland's economic allowances towards the Free City, either.⁵⁴ Consequently, the Danzigers complained to the League of Nations. After a brief deliberation, the League took Poland's side. The League ruled that the circumstances brought about by the war excused Poland's actions.⁵⁵ Poland was also given clearance to utilize the Westerplatte Peninsula just beyond the harbor to store munitions and other supplies.

Incidentally, the area became the site of the Polish Military

Transit Depot, which remained in Polish hands even after the Polish-Soviet War ended. Nearly two decades later, some of the first exchanges between the Germans and the Poles took place here during a German naval bombardment just as the Second World War began. Thus, in a sense, the Free City arrangement had begun just as it would end: as a center of conflict and controversy.

Poland's influence over Danzig was supposed to be limited to matters of trade, customs inspection and foreign representation, but the extent to which these concepts could be applied continued to be a concern long after the Polish-Soviet War.⁵⁶ In another case brought before international courts, it was decided that the port city's population could not opt for their city to join the International Labour Organization.⁵⁷ One result was that Danzig's local merchants were not protected against "state-subsidized and state-controlled syndicates" or conglomerate competition from Poland. Danzig was not permitted to be associated with the ILO because the city could not fulfill necessary delegation requirements due to its lack of independent control over economic matters.⁵⁸ It was just another example of Danzig not being able to exercise its democratic will.

There were other examples of Danzig not being in control of its own fate. The rail lines leading into the city and the

dikes surrounding the Vistula were considered matters of "welfare and upkeep" and supposed to be maintained by administrators from Poland. However, the Danzigers complained that these duties were neglected.⁵⁹ The upkeep of the dikes along the Vistula was a serious matter. The Vistula had a reputation for flooding and the dikes were critical to the city's protection. The difference in elevation between the Vistula river delta and its arms was upwards to twenty feet. As a result, on account of melting ice and snow, there was a "constant battle with nature" that needed to be regulated. Incidentally, high water problems were one of the reasons the Poles had argued for complete control of the entire length of the Vistula up to Danzig in the first place, in order to best regulate the river's water levels.⁶⁰

It is difficult to assess how many complaints of Polish negligence are legitimate and just how thoroughly discontent Danzig's population was. It is also not certain how strongly Danzig's German nationalist movement was able to influence Danzig's affairs. However, in order for the Free City to have worked, Germany needed to let the Free City resort to its earlier role as Poland's special port. Of course, Germany wanted Danzig back and had everything to gain from not letting the city re-assimilate. Firstly, stirring up the bitter

relations between Danzig and Poland and building on German nationalist sentiment in the city could reopen the revisionist question; if the Free City did not work, there was little that could be done to solve the administrative question aside from returning the city to Germany. Secondly, if bitter German-Polish relations were to spoil the Free City arrangement, it would be impossible for the international elites to expect that German Danzig would perform any better attached to the Polish State than as the state's partner. The only other alternative to the city's reincorporation into Germany, then, would have been to first expel the city's inhabitants and then replace them with Poles. The British government had made it clear why the latter could never be allowed to happen: a "second Alsace-Lorraine".

Of course, Germany was at a tremendous disadvantage in its quest to reclaim Danzig. Whereas Poland needed an outlet to the sea, Germany only wanted Danzig back because the very configurations which spared Poland the misfortune of being landlocked and gave the Poles access to the sea had torn Germany in half and compromised German power. Unfortunately for the Germans who favored territory revisions, Danzig's negative attitude towards the Free City arrangement and German nationalist sentiments were likely to change before Poland's economic and geographic position ever would. Even a half-

functioning business relationship between Danzig and Poland would be enough to spell doom for the movement to reverse the Free City arrangement. Thus, Germany's hopes for regaining Danzig depended entirely on two conditions: the first was that the League had to be shown that the Free City could not be thought of as a permanent solution - the Free City arrangement had to fail or be made to fail. Secondly, Danzig had to remain German; a Polish Danzig would eliminate the reason why the city could not simply be transferred to Poland and, alternatively, it was unlikely that the League would risk putting a city full of Germans in a Polish-ruled state, especially if the Free City arrangement had brought nothing but trouble. Consequently, the preservation Danzig's ethnic spirit and ethnic consciousness was a critical part of the revisionist movement.

The 1920s "Weimar-era" German government hardly concealed its agenda in regards to preserving Danzig's identity. The government made a strong effort stay involved in Danzig's affairs and keep a close and friendly connection with the city's Germans.⁶¹ Even though post-war turmoil and war reparations had depleted the German treasury, Danzig's administration received financial gifts from Berlin.⁶² On the other hand, Danzig's conservative council already supported the idea of reincorporation into Germany and most of the high ranking

officials in the Danzig bureaucracy, former civil servants in Germany, were good friends of the revisionist movement.⁶³

The German Foreign Office padded the salary of Danzig's first bishop in the hopes of drawing him into the national cause. Nationalist, ethnic-German Protestants also reached out to their congregations in Danzig and used the common thread of German Protestantism to build feeling for Germany, the birthplace of the Reformation, and unfeeling for Catholic Poland. In one move, the Danzig senate decided to subsidize the churches in order to concentrate on hardening their German character.⁶⁴ To the other extreme, the Poles tried to use Catholicism to appeal to the Germans in Danzig, build a bond of brotherhood and undermine the efforts to turn Danzig into, essentially, a hotbed of ethnic-nationalist Germans who identified themselves as such, and longed for reunion with Germany.⁶⁵

The way that the struggle for Danzig renewed the Protestant and Catholic conflict deserves further commentary because it shows how issues dividing people in the past, such as religion, were suddenly being exploited to the fullest during the Free City years to tug at heart strings. Both the Germans and the Poles felt that exacerbating existing or nearly-forgotten tensions was a tool to change the way politically-apathetic

people thought of themselves ethnically and, as a result, politically. In the past, the Protestant divergence had been an early force in the polarization of "German" and "Polish" attitudes and had been used to direct the loyalties of the people within each state and build nation-states.⁶⁶ Of course, "Polish" and "German" attitudes did not correspond to the historic Catholic and Protestant battle lines. However, on average, the confessions of the Polish and Baltic German people did. When exploited, these factors contributed to the divide in the hearts and minds of both populations.⁶⁷

During the Polish-Soviet War, leaflets surfaced stating that Poland would try to take advantage of its mobilized military state and seize control of East Prussia.⁶⁸ The German Propaganda Ministry was probably responsible for the effort. However, thanks to revisionist firebrands, it had already become well-known that Poland had been trying to lay claim towards East Prussia at the Paris Peace Conference.⁶⁹ Furthermore, East Prussia had been rendered practically defenseless due to its remote distance from Germany proper and due to the post-war turmoil in Germany.⁷⁰ These two factors alone made the propaganda message and the threat it described seem very real. In any event, the whole situation was said to have struck fear in Danzig's German population, and it gave credence to those who

believed the theory that, at the very least, the Poles would try to challenge the city's independence and control the city as they saw fit.

On the other hand, Poland was not about to march into Danzig and take over the city. In accordance with the Treaty of Versailles, the Free City was protected by the League of Nations and its member nations were under obligation to defend the Free City's sovereignty.⁷¹ The Treaty of Versailles stated that "all property situated within the territory of the Free City of Danzig" would be distributed between the Free City of Danzig and the Polish State "as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers consider[ed] equitable."⁷² This meant the League stood between Poland and Danzig; even if Danzig had no control over how much influence Poland was allowed to exert vis-à-vis the Free City, Danzig was, at the very least, protected against being overrun by Poland, or any foreign power for that matter.⁷³ The League had also introduced legislation which gave the impression that the city's German character would be protected - if only because the League believed that the citizens of Poland should have limited access to the city.⁷⁴ Either way, Danzig law gave an explicit reference to the protections that Polish citizens were entitled to, specifically mentioning the illegality of "discrimination within the Free City of Danzig to the detriment

of citizens of Poland and other persons of Polish origin and speech."⁷⁵ However, Polish citizens could not become Danzigers unless they gave up their Polish citizenry. This created an anomaly where Poland's people, typically ethnic Poles, were made to feel unwelcome, yet they were not to be treated as if they were.⁷⁶ Poland protested, arguing that, despite making every effort to stamp out racial hatred and mistreatment, the law was unfair. The Germans saw the Polish protestations very differently. They deduced that the Poles were making a challenge not to the law, but what the law inherently sought to protect: the city's Germanness.⁷⁷

When the Poles took the issue before the League of Nations, the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague ruled in favor of the Germans. It was decided that in the Free City, the Poles would "have only the right of being treated on the same level with other foreigners."⁷⁸ To understand the court's ruling, it is important to understand why preserving the city's Germanness was something that not only the German revisionists were interested in so they could keep the revisionism question open.

The international community was concerned about an alternation of Danzig's demographics. Over ninety-five percent of the Danzig population considered itself German, but Poland's

population dwarfed that of Danzig; as the Danzig region had a population of just 366,730 in 1923 (348,493 were German), the demographics of the Free City could change very rapidly.⁷⁹ An ethnographic change, especially a rapid one, would likely create tensions between the Germans and the Poles.

Basically, if a majority is willing to make certain concessions on behalf of a minority, that is the majority's choice, and a minority will often adapt to the degree that it must in order to allow for coexistence. Problems most often arise when the population begins to even, conflicting interests emerge, and the roles of "host" and "guest" are not as distinguishable. For this very reason, the issue of citizenship and Germanness - *Deutschtum* - had become very important, and the court's opinion was that naturalized Poles could not feel welcome to roost as more than just guests.⁸⁰

Secondly, the city's semi-autonomous status was not to be threatened by the Polish State. The ultimate protection from Poland's "peaceful penetration" into Danzig's affairs was for Danzig to retain its German character and for those regulating the city and residing within it to be supporters of an independent Danzig.⁸¹ If Danzig remained German, no second Alsace-Lorraine (or, alternatively, Belfast) could be created, and there would be no civil conflict among the people over a

move to incorporate the Free City into Poland. A German Free City would have no interest in such a move.

Of course, the court had another, even more sobering concern: if the Danzigers came to feel betrayed, a Danzig up in arms would present a real obstacle to peace; if conflict broke out between Poland and Danzig, Germany could be expected to enter the fray next. Germany was already looking to make Danzig its own and, considering that Germany's population dwarfed that of Poland, it was unlikely that the Germans would turn down an opportunity to "liberate" the Germans in the city - and reincorporate them into the German Reich. In that event, the member nations of the League of Nations - namely, Britain and France - would have to decide whether to stop Germany. Europe would again be embroiled in a major war.

For the German revisionists, it was critical that Poland had been defeated on the citizenship issue, too. More than anything else, a German Danzig was more likely to become Germany's Danzig if the Free City arrangement failed. Yet the Versailles Treaty actually left the Polish state in a better position to seize Danzig in the midst of any future developments such as an "emergency situation". Again, the Treaty stated that "all property situated within the territory of the Free City of Danzig" would be distributed between the Free City of Danzig and the Polish State "as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers

consider[ed] equitable."⁸² Only an explicit reason why Danzig could not be incorporated into Poland would give the League a reason to ignore what had been decided with the Treaty. For Germany, it was just another reason why Danzig's ethnic spirit and consciousness, the effectiveness of the nationalist propaganda war in Danzig and the ability to set off tensions between the Germans and the Poles were so important. Luckily for those who supported revisionism, the tensions between German Danzig and Poland were not at all artificial - they existed on their own.

Generally, the Poles found the Danzigers to be non-cooperative and accused them of pursuing "every conceivable hindrance to [Poland's] free flow of trade."⁸³ However, the Germans tended to have more complaints, as it was Poland interjecting into Danzig's affairs and not the other way around. Either way, the Free City arrangement required immediate cooperation on behalf of Danzig and Poland and, thus, tried to turn two diametrically opposed communities into instant compliments. Writing on behalf of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Reinhard Haferkorn compared this to trying to "square the circle."⁸⁴

Ongoing tensions were one of many explanations given by Poland to explain why its people began building another seaport

just eleven miles away from the Free City, at Gdynia.⁸⁵ Poland's decision to build a port at Gdynia was a legal course of action, but the Danzigers viewed it as a repudiation of the understanding as to why Danzig had been transferred to Poland in the first place.⁸⁶ Poland had been given the rights to develop Danzig's port, operate the railways used in connection with Danzig's shipping business and utilize the city's communications, docks and channels.⁸⁷ In short, Poland had been given extensive control of Danzig's facilities, as well as the opportunity to invest in the port's further expansion; if Poland was not going to use the city to its full potential and was instead going to direct Polish business elsewhere, it was no longer agreeing to "make full use of the Port of Danzig" as per the Free City agreement.⁸⁸

Some felt that the decision to build the new port was a response to Poland's realization that it would not be getting East Prussia and Danzig would not be enough to satisfy Poland's economic needs.⁸⁹ However, as construction in Gdynia began as early as 1920, the same year that Poland had acquired the Polish Corridor and Danzig became a free city. It is hard to believe that would have been ample time to realize that the Free City could not function as intended. The Poles also claimed that they needed a new port city for a naval base, since the League

of Nations had decided that Danzig could not be used for such purposes. Contrarily, it was Gdynia that ended up competing with Danzig for ocean-bound freight business - and ended up taking over Danzig's business by 1930.

It had been argued that Danzig was too small and would not meet Poland's needs as her only major seaport. On the one hand, Gdynia was better suited for expansion and situated directly along the coastline instead of a bay. Still, the area around Danzig allowed plenty of room for expansion and the city had a thoroughly modern port.⁹⁰ Years of transformation under the authority of the German Empire kept Danzig up with the times; silting had been dealt with, areas had been dredged, new drainage channels had been built and new locking systems had been implemented. Actually, by 1914, Danzig had become one of the deepest harbors in Europe - nine and a half meters - and had sufficient room to be further enlarged.⁹¹ Danzig had itself argued that it was capable of handling not only its own current volume of trade, but Gdynia's as well, including any foreseeable increases in the future.⁹²

Prussia's Frederick the Great once wrote: "whoever holds the course of the Vistula and Danzig is more fully master of [Poland], than the king who reigns over it."⁹³ He was likely referring to Danzig's central role in the Polish economy and the

historic role of the Vistula in mercantile trade. Even today, from Bydgoszcz to Danzig, the Vistula provides an important commercial link. By comparison, Gdynia had no connection to the Vistula; in fact, in 1920, Gdynia was an inconsequential fishing village, a mere proposal for the future that later absorbed most of Danzig's business. In 1920, only a few hundred people lived in Gdynia. Over time, as the city grew, that figure swelled to thirty-eight thousand. Nevertheless, in spite of the claim that Danzig was "insufficient", Danzig (Gdańsk) is the largest and most important seaport in modern Poland, not Gdynia. In other words, the Poles turned down Danzig over an option not yet available - an option which, today, plays second fiddle. This speaks volumes about the relationship between Poland and German Danzig in 1920.

The strongest critics of Poland's Free City-era foreign policy offered another explanation for Poland's behavior. In their opinion, the Poles started building a seaport in Gdynia to demonstrate permanent residency. The argument was that, in building Gdynia, Poland was looking to establish a city with a lasting presence in the Corridor which would leave few possibilities for German territorial revision in this area of the Baltic; it was no different from what the Germans were trying to do in making it known that the Free City was a German city.

Reinhard Haferkorn was of the opinion that Poland was taking advantage of the fall of one Great Power, Germany, to become a Great Power herself. Swedish correspondent Ivar Högbom concurred, stating that "Poland had become a Baltic state in a higher degree than is justified by her geographic condition and position alone."⁹⁴ For Germans and others suspicious of Poland's behavior, solidifying control of the Corridor and giving Danzig the cold shoulder seemed to go hand-in-hand: the less prosperous Danzig was, the sooner the city would also be forced to appeal to Warsaw officials for aid, allowing Poland to gradually establish its authority over the city due to perceived necessity.⁹⁵

Nevertheless, at first, the Free City arrangement actually brought unexpected prosperity to Danzig. Economic life actually improved in the city during the first few years of the Free City arrangement, which opened up new opportunities for the population. In the mid 1920s, Danzig was trafficking 8.6 million tons, more than any other Baltic seaport.⁹⁶ It also ranked third in total shipping tonnage in the northern Europe, directly behind the port cities of Copenhagen and Stockholm, the capitals of Sweden and Norway, respectively.⁹⁷ As the primary asset to Poland's shipping economy, Danzig was experiencing four times the economic growth it had seen in 1913.⁹⁸ In fact, in the

years prior to Danzig's separation from the German Reich, the city had gradually fallen behind giants like Kiel, Lübeck and Wilhelmshaven, particularly due to the steel trade. Thus, Danzig's transformation into the Free City had a number of benefits for the affected populations. Still, mutual distrust and nationalist sentiments helped keep tensions high between Poland and Danzig, even when the two were mutual beneficiaries in trade.

Not surprisingly, relations between Danzig and Poland grew worse when the opportunities for economic advancement disappeared with the onset of the Great Depression. The decline was a sharp turn away from the prosperity which had been felt just a few years before the Great Depression, when Danzig was one of Great Britain's prime suppliers of coal. In 1926, a coal strike had begun in Britain and Danzig's business increased rapidly; the British situation had led to a drastic shift in market shares and a sudden increase in the Free City's outbound trade.⁹⁹ Soaring coal exports had the city experiencing the most prosperous times it had seen for years. However, in the years following 1929, orders were severely cut. Claims of bankruptcy doubled and Danzig's economy was left in ruins.

In addition to the Depression and the sudden end to the advantageous coal situation, there was the issue of Gdynia. A rivalry was born and, just as the hard times hit Danzig, Gdynia

was entering its ninth year of construction and on its way towards full service. It had already begun to steal some of Danzig's business; then, in May 1932, Gdynia's total exports and imports surpassed those of Danzig for the first time, creating a disparity that would remain consistent until after the Second World War.

Furthering the conditions of what the Germans regarded as an "economic war against Danzig", the Poles had put a ban on all Danzig goods in 1931, thus destroying Danzig's hope for any economic revival amidst hard times. The Polish boycott was said to be a response to Danzig's "abuse of privileges in accordance to the Warsaw Convention of 1921", relating to Danzig's intermediary role importing goods sent from Germany. Since 1925, both Poland and Germany had been involved in a high-tension tariff war, seriously reducing the volume of trade in both countries.¹⁰⁰ The reasons for this mutually harmful arrangement were not immediately clear. However, some observers suggested that excess nationalistic fervor had spilled over into the "spirit of trade."¹⁰¹ In any case, the ban on all goods from Germany was devastating to Poland, as it had been almost completely dependent on the German economy for many good beforehand.¹⁰²

Despite the harm done to Polish business by the tariff war,

it was said that Danzig had cost Poland the equivalent of 1.5 million pounds by continuing to do business with Germany and introducing banned goods into Poland. Even more interesting, however, was that Poland had responded to this incident by disciplining the city as if it were Poland's child. Danzig was denied business throughout Poland and a devastating boycott went into effect against the city. The Danzigers were powerless and could only argue that, in regards to foreign relations, Poland was "not entitled to impose a policy on the Free City or take any step in connection with the foreign relations of the city against its will."¹⁰³ One could argue that Poland was in violation of terms by cutting off the Free City's economic relations with German businesses. However, the matter of "sovereignty" in the economic sphere went to Poland, as its own interests extended in this direction.

It had taken several years of experience to test the meaning of the Free City's legal relationship to Poland. However, it was now clear that "economic interests" meant more in practice than it did in theory. Furthermore, if Poland chose to ban certain imports and suffer by its own choice, Danzig was essentially chained to Poland and had to endure the same consequences. Those who felt sympathetic to the Free City protested that, as it was a German city, Danzig's prosperity was naturally connected with German manufacturers and it was unfair

for the Poles to expect Danzig to simply sever the ties it had established over the years.¹⁰⁴ The Poles maintained that Danzigers had experienced over ten years of international status and that was plenty of time to adjust. The situation continued for over a year, until August 1932, when the Polish government agreed to "attempt to stop the boycott." In other words: the government stopped promoting the boycott and the situation was left in the hands of the Polish consumer. Behind the scenes, the boycott continued. Meanwhile, so did the antagonisms which were undermining the business relationship between the Danzigers and the Poles.

Just shy of the 1933 German elections which saw Adolf Hitler and his National Socialist German Worker's Party rise to power, international reporters had actually "grown bored" with the "steady reoccurrences of disputes between Danzig and Poland."¹⁰⁵ In September 1932, a reporter for The Spectator reflected on the latest developments:

"Germany intends to have Danzig and the Corridor; I have no brief for her. I deplore the fact that several million Germans would shed their blood for this cause, but since it is a fact and since the Poles certainly cannot be talked out of their territory, how will the matter be settled except by arms? I

believe there must be a war in Europe; the best we can hope for is that it will soon be over, and that it will not spread.”¹⁰⁶

It is a little-known fact that, during the early years in which Germany was controlled by the National Socialists, the relationship between the Poles and the Germans actually improved.¹⁰⁷ The Polish-German Agreement of January 1934 was a major step towards this change in relations. The pact ended the nine-year tariff war and guaranteed the settlement of “problems of political economic and social kinds” through a “just and fair adjustment of interests for both parties.”¹⁰⁸ The pact enabled a détente between Poland and Germany, which temporarily blunted rising tensions over territorial and economic issues.¹⁰⁹

In the mid-1930s, Hitler and his followers applauded the increasingly positive relationship between Poland and the German Reich, and viewed it as a possible gateway towards further cooperative activities. It seemed that, for a short while, Germany was willing to look past the dispute over the Baltic provinces and trying to invest in an alliance with the Poles in which both powers might have jointly attacked the Soviet Union. However, the Poles refused to join the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1936, and the possibility for such an alliance felt apart.

On the one hand, the Poles could not forget about the

"lessons from the past", which continued to shaped Polish attitudes towards the Germans. On the other, for a variety of reasons, the Poles did not trust Hitler. The Polish were suspicious of Hitler's past association with the Stahlhelm, an organization which published German nationalist material calling for territorial reforms with Poland. In addition, Hitler's political manifesto, *Mein Kampf*, had included the declaration that he "would not waste the blood of a single German soldier on the former boundaries of the Reich." This did little to ease the minds of Poles leaders, or convince them that Hitler would respect the borders of Poland because they included parts of the old German Reich. All Hitler's declaration indicated was that he wanted German Europe united under one, expansive state - its borders unknown. For all of these reasons, Poland feared that, through an alliance, it would become a satellite state. At the same time, the 1934 non-aggression agreement came to be seen by the Poles as a "propaganda pact" aimed more towards gaining the approval of the foreign eye rather than actually improving German-Polish relations.

It should be noted that the period of amiable relations between Germany and Poland was also characterized by a decline in the number of reported atrocities along the German-Polish frontier.¹¹⁰ From this, one can deduce that the Polish-German atrocities which were reported by the Germans in the 20s, early

30s and later 30s may not have been genuine, and were merely an attempt to stir up tensions in the Baltic and convince the Germans, Poles and the rest of the world that territorial revisionism was needed. On the other hand, if many of these accounts were genuine, it is likely that they were only mentioned in the German press when it was advantageous for them to be mentioned. This means that, if there were atrocities which occurred while it was disadvantageous for atrocities to be mentioned - for example, while Germany was trying to build an alliance with Poland - they went unreported. Generally, the attitude of the German press fluctuated given Nazi Germany's situation in international politics, which is why it is difficult to assess how dire the situation in the Baltic was.¹¹¹ The most important thing, however, is to consider the effect that the reported incidents, real or fake, may have had on German-Polish relations in, for example, the Free City of Danzig, especially when people had a reason to believe the reports and fear for their lives.

Still, in spite of all the problems surrounding the Free City arrangement, the Danzig crisis was certainly not the casus belli of the September 1939 war which set into motion the Second World War in Europe. In fact, the deteriorating situation in German Danzig was just one argument for the war with Poland - and part of the illusion of a justified invasion that the

National Socialists had tried to sell to the world. Shortly after the invasion of Poland, Hitler declared that he had "attempted to bring about, by the peaceful method of making proposals for revision, an alteration of [the] intolerable position [in the region]." ¹¹² Hitler had told the truth, but there was one major omission in his statement.

Indeed, Poland had rejected the numerous proposals issued by Germany concerning Danzig; there was an attempt in October of 1938, another during the New Year's holiday of 1939. ¹¹³

There were other, less formal proposals, too; one involved an arrangement for a Memel-for-Danzig exchange, which was only possible after March 1939, when Germany took back the city of Memel. Germany had had to give up Memel as per the Treaty of Versailles but, under Hitler, took it back. ¹¹⁴ Poland would have thus obtained a distant port and Germany would have only had to give up what it only recently re-obtained. Still, other attempts at reform were more modest, and involved Danzig's return to the Reich while guaranteeing Polish rights to use the city, or constructing a one-mile-wide autobahn and rail route across the Corridor, to be administered by Germany. However, these offers came after Germany had engaged in numerous other attempts of re-expansion and expansion: the remilitarization of the Rhineland, the reacquisition of the Saarland, the annexation

of Austria, the incorporation of the Sudetenland and the seizure of Czech lands. All but the latter involved uniting the German people under one empire. However, Germany had played out its cards; its offers were all rejected by a suspicious Poland, though not always in full.

One more proposal to create a new territorial understanding with Poland came in March 1939. It stressed the return of Danzig and the establishment of German control over a route across the Corridor, linking Danzig to Germany proper. The offer was met with another stern rejection from Poland, and the Polish government warned Germany that "further provocation" would result in armed conflict. With that, Poland began to mobilize, expecting the worst. Reflecting this change in political climate, German Ambassador Ernst von Weizsäcker's diary entry from March 27, 1939 reads:

It will no longer be possible to solve the Danzig problem, now that we have used up foreign political goodwill over Prague and Memel. A German-Polish conflict now would trigger an avalanche against us. For the time being the only way we can deal with the Poles' insolent attitude and their high-handed rebuff to the offer we have made to them is by breaking the Polish spirit.¹¹⁵

Three days later, Poland received a vague guarantee from Britain and France that included a promise to defend Polish sovereignty. Interestingly, the minutes from a diplomatic exchange between Paris and Warsaw suggest that Poland hesitated before accepting the offer and worried that the guarantee "would jeopardize Poland's relations with a strong neighbor like Germany and hurl a catastrophe on the world, such as war."¹¹⁶ Indeed, the Poles were worried that the guarantee would be seen by Hitler as a sign that Germany was even less likely to get what it wanted from Poland through diplomacy, since Poland knew that, to some degree, the UK and France were in its corner. At the same time, it was not clear that the UK and France would be waiting in Poland's corner, and Poland feared that Germany would attack before the vague guarantee became a pact, and Poland definitely had the muscle to stop Germany. But Germany's negotiating position had grown much worse with the guarantee. Now that both the UK and France were behind Poland to some degree, Germany had lost its diplomatic edge as the bigger fish and it was hard to imagine that the Poles would be driven to accept an unfavorable deal out of fear of war. Five months of silence between Warsaw and Berlin followed. During this time, Germany tinkered with its plan for the invasion of Poland and tried to figure out a

scenario that would keep the UK out of the conflict.¹¹⁷

If German-Polish diplomacy had simply ended in March as it appeared to, perhaps it would have been true that all peaceful options had been exhausted like Hitler proclaimed them to be. However, this was not the case. On the 25th of August, Poland received France and Britain's full backing. The Poles believed they had nothing to fear if Germany decided to turn its guns on them, and announced that they were ready to return to the negotiating table.¹¹⁸ But Hitler had other plans. His first move was to withdraw Germany from the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. In the opinion of the Kriegsmarine naval leader Karl Dönitz, this maneuver marked the end of Hitler's attempt to work towards better relations with the UK.¹¹⁹ Germany began to prepare for war. Although the UK and France had made it clear that they would defend Poland, Germany was holding onto a secret. Since January, the Germans had been working on a secret pact with the Soviet Union. Finally finalized, the pact guaranteed Soviet support in a war with Poland. All Germany had to do is give the Soviet Union half of Poland and agree not to interfere with the Soviet's plans to attack Finland, Latvia and Estonia. In addition to the Soviet Union's support against Poland, the Germans were also promised the importation of foodstuff and fuel from the Soviets in the event that the UK entered the war and

tried to strangulate Germany by blockading its ports. In a speech before his armed forces commanders-in-chief, just nine days before Poland was attacked, Hitler spoke of his "small war" and confidently declared:

"[British] military intervention is out of the question. No one is counting on a long war. If [Wehrmacht Commander-in-Chief] Herr von Brauchitsch had told me that I would need four years to conquer Poland, I would have replied: 'Then it cannot be done' [.]"¹²⁰

Hitler had given the same report to the Italian Foreign Minister, Count Ciano, on August 12. The Führer was convinced that, even if the war dragged on for an extended period and the British got involved, Germany would receive the materials it needed from the Soviets, and Poland would surely fall before Britain could make a difference in the war.¹²¹ There was only one thing left to do: fool the world.¹²²

First, Hitler prepared his ultimatum, which included the following ideas: Danzig was to return to Germany and the local population in the Corridor was to be asked if it favored reunification with Germany. The final owner of the Corridor

would be determined through a popular vote. Population transfers were to occur shortly thereafter. The event was to be supervised by the British and would only begin after a full year of preparation; all Poland had to do was sign, possibly resolving the lingering issue of ill-defined borders once and for all. It was an overly generous offer. However, the entire process was designed so that it would fail and Hitler would appear before the world as the one who had offered the hand of peace, but was rejected.

Forty-eight hours before the invasion of Poland was scheduled to begin, Hitler ordered a Polish Plenipotentiary to arrive in Berlin in less than twenty-four hours, with the full power to sign a peace agreement. The contents of the overly-generous agreement Hitler had prepared were not yet clear. The Poles wavered and argued amongst themselves. Not just because they had been presented with an ultimatum, but also because they hardly expected the ultimatum to be favorable. Finally, after consulting the British, the Poles decided to send a diplomat. When the diplomat arrived in Berlin, he admitted that he was not authorized to sign. The British ambassador to Germany, Sir Neville Henderson, had represented one of the least critical, German-friendly voices Britain could offer during his tenure. This time, even he was critical:

"There was, in fact, for Herr Hitler only one conceivable alternative to brute force, and that was that a Polish Plenipotentiary should humbly come to him, after the manner of Dr. Schuschnigg [of Austria] or President Hacha [of Czechoslovakia] and sign on the dotted line to the greater glory of Adolf Hitler [...] and even that must happen at once."¹²³

Germany had made a number of proposals regarding Danzig and the Corridor, but this time, its leader had chosen war and dedicated himself to the task of keeping Britain out of it.¹²⁴ In fact, in one of his private briefings, Hitler may have revealed the truth about Danzig, at least according to the typewritten minutes submitted as evidence of Germany's "war conspiracy" during the Nuremberg Trials. The minutes proclaim that Danzig was "not the subject of the dispute at all", that the issue was one of "obtaining living space for Germans in the East." The memo continued: "A mass of 80 million people has solved the problems of ideals, so too, must the economic problems be solved."¹²⁵ The authenticity of this copy of a typed, unsigned letter has been called into question on numerous occasions. Historians still cannot agree on its legitimacy - or whether Germany really

fought Poland and later, the Soviet Union, for Lebensraum in the east. Still, one thing is certain: the war was not about just Danzig.

Without the Polish Corridor to attach Danzig to Germany proper, the port city was just "another port city" within the Reich and an appendage to Germany's already isolated exclave of East Prussia. Germany had no use for another port, either. Yet Danzig was the focal point of Germany's revisionist efforts because it represented the key to open the question of territorial revisionism; not only was there a troubling situation regarding the city that required a new solution, but Germany's claims of "rightful" possession, based on past ownership and ethnography, were stronger in that city than anywhere in the Corridor. Thus, from the first days of the Free City arrangement to the last, the conflict over Danzig was much less about Danzig than it was about Germany's ambitions to reclaim ownership of the Baltic and, through re-expansion and re-unification, to reclaim Germany's former power and glory. The struggle over Danzig was part of a greater struggle between Germany and Poland: two nations at odds over drawing boundaries because each side was looking to increase or, at the very least, maintain its power. The stakes were raised even further, because this was an ethnic conflict derived from over five hundred years of dispute and controversy.

It has been said that the escalation of an ethnic conflict can best be understood by measuring "willingness" and "opportunity."¹²⁶ In regards to Danzig, the Corridor and the entire German-Polish frontier, all of the factors that could help escalate the situation towards conflict were present: "historical conditioning, racial milieu, religious combustibles, political jostles, and economic needs and objectives."¹²⁷ However, whether the population was really willing to go to war over territorial revision was another question.

The social conditioning in Germany had certainly created an atmosphere that contributed to the "willingness" to pursue territorial revisionism once the opportunity arose. At the same time, in Poland, the elements were there to strengthen the will to resist negotiations, which also pushed things in the direction of war. The Poles had their entire history of interactions with the Germans to reflect upon, and knew they had little to gain from renegotiating the Baltic except the comfort of going to bed knowing the Germans would be not attacking them in the morning. On the other hand, for Germany as a whole, territorial revisionism was about mending psychological wounds as much as it was about mending together the nation for the sake of German welfare. The vast German Empire had become a romanticized symbolic of prowess and promise long since lost.¹²⁸

Still, it has been said that the will to war was missing amongst the German population, even on the eve of war.¹²⁹ And generally, the situation was similar to that of 1914, at the start of the First World War: no civilian in Germany was thinking of a World War but everyone in Britain feared it.¹³⁰

Nevertheless, "willingness" must be assessed in an entirely unique perspective, because the "opportunity" for the Germans to pursue territorial revisionism manifested itself in the shape of the National Socialist German Workers Party. Adolf Hitler, the leader of the Party, had vowed to build a Greater Germany "so oder so" - "one way another", as he often said - and was determined to undo the territorial arrangements which had been made after the First World War.¹³¹ At a time when Germany was in economic and social disarray, Hitler's promises became the symbol of hope. The German Nation put its absolute faith in Hitler and, repeatedly, Hitler delivered. For this reason, David Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister who had led Britain through the First World War, wrote in the mid 1930s that Hitler was the "George Washington of Germany."

Since the mid-1930s, on several occasions, Hitler's foreign policy ambitions had brought the German Nation dangerously close to war. Nevertheless, each time, Hitler had emerged triumphantly, and Germany's borders had changed without a fight.

Finally, in 1939, Hitler set his sights on the return of Danzig and an agreement over the Corridor. When the Poles refused to come to terms over the area, Hitler had three options: give up, revise his offer or go to war. These three options were the same three options Hitler had seen every step of way towards completely undoing the Treaty of Versailles. Yet for the first time, it appeared option two had been overplayed and was unlikely to get Germany what it wanted. Under these circumstances, in early 1939, it became clear that the Soviets would support the Germans with men and material in a war against Poland. Thus, option three certainly started to look like the winning hand. Poland, a state sandwiched between Germany and the Soviet Union, had a population only one-third the size of Germany's. In attacking Poland, Germany and the Soviet Union would have the element of surprise, too. The only danger was whether Germany had to risk war with France and the United Kingdom in order to get what it wanted. As Germany's fate rested on Hitler's shoulders, the public's "willingness" to take this chance ceased to be an issue; the public had put its faith in one man, and this man, Hitler, saw "opportunity". He played the hand - and rolled the dice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avalon Project, directed by William C. Fray and Lisa A. Spar.

"Nuremberg Trial Proceedings Vol. 2 - Fifth Day." The
Avalon Project.

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/imt/proc/11-26-45.htm>.

(accessed December 11, 2006).

Carment, David, Patrick James and Zeynep Taydas.

Who Intervenes?: Ethnic Conflict And Interstate Crisis.

Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2006.

Cary, Archibald. Ten Years of War and Peace. Cambridge,

Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Chambers, Mortimer, Barbara Hanawalt, Theodore K. Rabb,

Isser Woloch and Raymond Grew. The Western Experience

Volume II: Since the Eighteenth Century. New York:

McGraw-Hill Companies Incorporated, 2003.

Chisholm, Geo. G. "The Free City of Danzig."

The Geographical Journal. Vol. 55 No. 4. (April, 1920).

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00167398%28192004%2955%3A4>

%3C305%3ATFCOD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L. (accessed January 2, 2007).

Churchill, Winston S. *The Second World War: The Gathering Storm*.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1948.

Ciechanowski, Jean. "German-Polish Relations."

International Affairs

(Royal Institute of Affairs 1931-1939). Vol. 12 No. 3.

(May, 1933). <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1473->

8104%28193305%2912%3A3%3C344%3AGR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E.

(accessed November 3, 2006).

Clark, Elizabeth Morrow.

"Reshaping the Free City: Cleansed Memory in Danzig/Gdańsk,
1939-1952." In *Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe*,
edited by Steven Béla Várdy and T. Hunt Tooley, 191-205.
New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Collection of Advisory Opinions:

Free City of Danzig and International Labour Organization.
No. 18 Series B File F (1930).

[http://www.icjciij.org/cijwww/cdecisions/ccpij/serie_B/B_18/
01_Ville_libre_de_Danzig_ et_OIT_Avis_consultatif.pdf](http://www.icjciij.org/cijwww/cdecisions/ccpij/serie_B/B_18/01_Ville_libre_de_Danzig_et_OIT_Avis_consultatif.pdf).

(accessed December 13, 2006).

de Zayas, Alfred M.

Nemesis at Potsdam: The Anglo-Americans and the
Expulsion of the Germans—Background, Execution and
Consequences.

London: Picton Press, 1977.

Documents Relation to German Foreign Policy. Series D, Vol. VII.

Washington: Government Printing Office, 1956.

Doenitz, Karl. Memoirs: Ten Years and Twenty Days.

United States: Da Capo Press Incorporated, 1997.

French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Diplomatic Documents

(1938-1939) Papers relative to the events and negotiations
which preceded the opening of hostilities between Germany
on the one hand, and Poland, Great Britain and France on
the other hand. New York, 1940.

Friedlander, Saul. Prelude to Downfall: Hitler and the

United States 1939-1941. London: Chatto and Windus, 1967.

Gelpi, Christopher. The Power of Legitimacy: Assessing the

Role of Norms in Crisis Bargaining. Princeton, New Jersey:
Princeton University Press, 2002.

German Foreign Office. Documents and Materials Relating to the
Eve of the Second World War: Volume I, Dirksen Papers
1938-1939. New York: International Publishers Company,
Incorporated, 1948.

German Foreign Office. Documents Concerning the Last
Phase of the German-Polish Crisis. Berlin:
Carl Heymann's Verlag, 1939.

German Foreign Office. The German White Paper: Full Text of the
Polish Documents and the Report on American Ambassador
Bullitt's War Attitude. New York: Howell, Soskin and
Company, 1940.

Goodspeed, D.J. The German Wars 1914-1945. New York:
Bonanza Books, 1985.

Gorski, Ramon S. "The Polish Corridor-Another Alsace-Lorraine?"
Annals of the American Academy of Political and

Social Science. Vol. 174. (July, 1934).

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002->

[7162%28193407%29174%3C126%3ATPCA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9](http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-7162%28193407%29174%3C126%3ATPCA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9).

(accessed November 26, 2006).

Gravina, M. "Utilization of the Port of Danzig By Poland.

Decision of October 26, 1931."

The American Journal of International Law. Vol. 27 No 3.

(July, 1933). <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002->

[9300%28193307%2927%3A3%3C555%3AUOTPOD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T](http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9300%28193307%2927%3A3%3C555%3AUOTPOD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T).

(accessed December 15, 2006).

Great Britain Foreign Office. Documents Concerning

German-Polish Relations, Miscellaneous No. 9.

London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1939.

Great Britain Foreign Office. Final Report by the Right and

Honourable Sir Neville Henderson G.C.M.G. on the

Circumstances Leading to the Termination of his Mission to

Berlin, September 20, 1939. London: 1939.

Hacken, Richard and Jane Plotke, compiled.

"Peace Treaty of Versailles Articles 31 - 117:

Political Clauses and Annexes for Europe."

Brigham Young University Library.

<http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/versa/versa2.html>.

(accessed January 12, 2007).

Haferkorn, Reinhard. "Danzig and the Polish Corridor."

International Affairs

(Royal Institute of Affairs 1931-1939). Vol. 12 No. 2.

(Mar., 1933). [http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1473-](http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1473-8104%28193303%2912%3A2%3C224%3ADATPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A)

[8104%28193303%2912%3A2%3C224%3ADATPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A.](http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1473-8104%28193303%2912%3A2%3C224%3ADATPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A)

(accessed December 23, 2006).

Haffner, Sebastian. The Rise and Fall of Prussia.

London: Butler and Taylor Limited, 1988.

Heineman, John L. compiled and translated.

"Weizsäcker Diary: March, 27 1939"

The Road to War: A Selection of Primary Documents.

<http://www2.bc.edu/~heineman/roadiii.html>.

(accessed December 17, 2006).

Junghann, Otto.

Ethnopolitischer Almanach; ein Führer durch die europäische Nationalitätenbewegung, im Auftrage des Institut für Grenz- und Auslandstudien. Leipzig, Germany: W. Braumüller, 1930.

Kimmich, Christoph M.

The Free City: Danzig and German Foreign Policy, 1919-1934.

New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1968.

Laver, John. Hitler: Germany's Fate or Misfortune?

Wiltshire, Great Britain: Redwood Books, 1995.

Levine, Herbert S.

"The Mediator: Carl J. Burckhardt's Efforts to Avert a
Second World War." The Journal of Modern History. Vol. 45
No. 3. (Sep., 1973). [http://links.jstor.org/sici?](http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2801%28197309%2945%3A3%3C439%3ATMCJBE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9)

[sici=0022-2801%28197309%2945%3A3%3C439%3ATMCJBE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9](http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2801%28197309%2945%3A3%3C439%3ATMCJBE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9).

(accessed December 23, 2006).

Macfarlane, L.J.

"Hands Off Russia: British Labour and the Russo-Polish War,
1920." The Past and Present Society

Oxford University Press. No. 38. (December 1967).

<http://past.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/38/1/126.pdf>.

(accessed December 21, 2006).

MacMillan, Margaret.

Paris 1919: Six Months That Changed the World.
New York: Random House, 2003.

Makiewicz, Tadeusz.

"The Goths in Greater Poland." Council of Europe.
<http://www.muzarp.poznan.pl/archweb/gazociag/title5.htm>.
(accessed November 25, 2006).

Mason, John Brown. The Danzig Dilemma. Stanford, California:
Stanford University Press, 1946.

Murray, Williamson and Allan R. Millett.

A War To Be Won: Fighting the Second World War.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of the
Harvard University Press, 2001.

Prazmowska, Anita J.

"The Role of Danzig in German-Polish Relations on the Eve
of the Second World War."
In The Baltic and the Outbreak of the Second World War.
Edited by John Hiden and Thomas Lane.
Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press,
1992.

Rothfels, Hans.

"Frontiers and Mass Migrations in Eastern Europe."

The Review of Politics.

Vol. 8, No. 1. (January, 1946).

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00346705%28194601%298%3A1%3C37%3AFAMMIE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O>.

(accessed December 3, 2006).

Samerski, Stefan.

Die katholische in der Freien Stadt Danzig 1920-1933:

Katholizismus zwischen Libertas und Irredenta.

Cologne: Boehlau, 1991.

Schreiber, Hermann.

Teuton and Slav: The Struggle for Central Europe.

London: Constable and Robinson Limited, 1965.

Taylor, A.J.P. The Origins of The Second World War.

New York: Simon and Schuster Publishing Incorporated, 1996.

Trevor-Roper, H.R., compiled and translated.

Blitzkrieg to Defeat: Hitler's War Directives 1939-1945.

New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Utgaard, Peter. Remembering and Forgetting Nazism.

New York: Berghahn Books, 2003.

van Cleef, Eugene. "Danzig and Gdynia." Geographical Review.

Vol. 23, No. 1. (Jan., 1933).

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0016->

7428%28193301%2923%3A1%3C101%3ADAG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E

(accessed December 3, 2006).

Wallbank, T. Walter and Arnold Schrier.

Living World History 4th Edition. Chicago:

Scott, Foresman and Company, 1974.

Winks, Robin W. and R.J.Q Adams.

Europe 1890-1945: Crisis and Conflict.

Oxford: Oxford Press, 2003.

¹ "Directive No. 1 For the Conduct of War" H.R. Trevor-Roper, comp. and trans., *Blitzkrieg to Defeat: Hitler's War Directives 1939-1945* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), 3. The above text discusses the reasons for the German invasion of Poland.

² In part, because the conflict over Danzig disappeared; Danzig was given to Poland, purged of its remaining German population and became a point some 300 kilometers east of the new German-Polish border. Thus, the conflict was not renewed outside of the context of its brief moment of importance alone a timeline about the Second World War. For more information about Danzig's fate after the war, see: Alfred M. de Zayas, *Nemesis at Potsdam: The Anglo-Americans and the Expulsion of the Germans—Background, Execution and Consequences* (London: Picton Press, 1977), 52. see also: Manfred Zeider, *Kriegsende im Osten. Die Rote Armee und die Besetzung Deutschlands oestlich der Oder und Neisse* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1996), 65, 207.

³ The notion that the German invasion of Poland was only part of a program of aggressive expansionism led Great Britain into war with Germany; it is also part of the debate concerning "functionalism vs. intentionalism". For the onset of the Anglo-German conflict see: Great Britain Foreign Office, *Final Report by the Right and Honourable Sir Neville Henderson G.C.M.G. on the Circumstances Leading to the Termination of his Mission to Berlin, September 20, 1939* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1939), 2. For functionalism vs. intentionalism see: John Laver, *Hitler: Germany's Fate or Misfortune?* (Wiltshire, Great Britain: Redwood Books, 1995), 69-72.

⁴ For an example of the assessment that Hitler was the "initiator" rather than the "aggravator" see: Christopher Gelpi, *The Power of Legitimacy: Assessing the Role of Norms in Crisis Bargaining* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002), 92.

⁵ A "place" directly after the acquisitions of the Sudetenland in 1938 and the Memelland in 1939, directly before a handful of war-time acquisitions once the Second World War began. See Laver, 69-72. for examples of Danzig's traditional treatment in historiography see: Mortimer Chambers, et al., *The Western Experience Volume II: Since the Eighteenth Century* (New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Incorporated, 2003), 1063. see also: D.J. Goodspeed, *The German Wars 1914-1945* (New York: Bonanza Books, 1985), 322-325.; Winston S. Churchill, *The Second World War: The Gathering Storm* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1948), 340-401.

⁶ For a survey of the flaws in grand narratives and diachronic scheme, see: John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*, (Harlow, Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited, 2002), 153-157.

⁷ Ptolemy, *Geography*, III 5. 21. Jordanes, Charles Christopher Mierow, ed., *Getica* 25

⁸ Martin Steinkühler (Author), Hans J. Schuch (Editor). (1997) *Von Gothiscandza zu Danzig: Aus über 1000 Jahren wechselvoller Geschichte*. Westpreussisches Landesmuseum: Münster-Wolbeck, Germany, pp. 12-23
Jordanes, Charles Christopher Mierow, ed., *Getica* 25

⁹ Hans Rothfels, "Frontiers and Mass Migrations in Eastern Europe," *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 1. (Jan., 1946): 37, <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00346705%28194601%298%3A1%3C37%3AFAMMIE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O> (accessed December 3, 2006).

¹⁰ Cunliffe, Barry. *The Ancient Celts*, pp. 39-67. Penguin Books, 1997.

¹¹ Tadeusz Makiewicz, "The Goths in Greater Poland," *Council of Europe*, <http://www.muzarp.poznan.pl/archweb/gazociag/title5.htm>. (accessed November 25, 2006).

¹² Tadeusz Makiewicz, "The Goths in Greater Poland," *Council of Europe*, <http://www.muzarp.poznan.pl/archweb/gazociag/title5.htm>. (accessed November 25, 2006).

¹³ Sabaliauskas, A., Mes Baltai / We, the Balts, (1995) Science and Encyclopedia Publishers, Vilnius, Lithuanian, p 80

¹⁴ Wallbank and Schrier, 102.

¹⁵ Ibid, 102.

¹⁶ The Teutonic Order of the Teutonic Knights was a powerful Germanic guild organized in the High Middle Ages, dedicated to the spread of Christianity. The Order played an important role in German resettlement. From the Baltic to the Black Sea, the migratory Germans founded more than 350 towns and the Order was involved in the establishment of twenty-five percent of the larger German settlements. see: Sebastian Haffner, *The Rise and Fall of Prussia*, (London: Butler and Taylor Limited, 1988), 6. see also: Rothfels, 39.

¹⁷ Desmond Seward, *Mnisi Wojny*, Poznań 2005, p. 100.

¹⁸ Edward Henry Lewinski Corwin *The Political History of Poland*. 1917, The Polish Book Importing Company p45.

¹⁹ Eugene van Cleef, "Danzig and Gdynia," *Geographical Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1. (Jan., 1933): 101,

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0016-7428%28193301%2923%3A1%3C101%3ADAG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E> (accessed December 3, 2006).

²⁰ Raphael Lemkin, Samantha Power, "Axis rule in occupied Europe: laws of occupation, analysis of government, proposals for redress," *The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd.*, 2005, 154. includes an excerpt of *Dlugosii Joanni canonii Cracoviensis Historiae Polonicae*, fn.1

²¹ Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych, Poland, *Dzieje miast Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej: Polska w słowie i obrazach*, Nakładem wydawn. Dzieje miast Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej śp. z ogr. odp., 1928, v. 2;v. 4, p.11

²² Poland Ministerstwo Informacji, "The German Invasion of Poland: Polish Black Book Containing Documents, Authenticated Reports and Photographs," Pub. by authority of the Polish ministry of information by Hutchinson & co. ltd., 1941, 10

²³ Rothfels, 45-46.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 42.

²⁵ Haffner, 10.

²⁶ Ramon S. Gorski, "The Polish Corridor-Another Alsace-Lorraine?," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 174. (Jul., 1934), 127, <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-7162%28193407%29174%3C126%3ATPCA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

(accessed November 26, 2006).

²⁷ *Ibid*, 10.

²⁸ Vierhaus, Rudolf (1984) (in German). *Deutschland im Zeitalter des Absolutismus (1648-1763)*. Deutsche Geschichte. **6** (2 ed.). Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, p. 169

²⁹ Shennan, Margaret (1995). *The Rise of Brandenburg-Prussia*. Routledge, 19-20.

³⁰ Haffner, 15.

³¹ Wallbank and Schrier, 140.

³² Jean Ciechanowski regarded Poland's partitioning as one of the "greatest crimes in history" but one should note his failure to acknowledge all aspects of the partitioning. At the same time, the close connection between his view of Poland's partitioning and his stance on Germany's territorial dismemberment after the First World War is noteworthy. see: Jean Ciechanowski, "German-Polish Relations," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of Affairs 1931-1939)*, Vol. 12 No. 3. (May, 1933): 347, <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1473-8104%28193305%2912%3A3%3C344%3AGR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E> (accessed November 3, 2006). for the German view: "11th Document: Report of the Polish Ambassador in Paris, Jules Lakawiesicz, to the Foreign Minister in Warsaw on March 29, 1939" *The German White Paper: Full Text of the Polish Documents and the Report on American Ambassador Bullitt's War Attitude* (New York: Howell, Soskin and Company, 1940), 51.

³³ For the Polish view of Danzig's service to Poland see: Ciechanowski, 347.

³⁴ Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919: Six Months That Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2003), 498.

³⁵ The exception was from 1807 to 1815, when Danzig was an official city-state due to the influence of Napoleon and his pan-European command. One should not read too far into this arrangement, as Napoleon simply used Danzig and its resources as a springboard for his attack on Russia. With his defeat, the city once again became a Prussian holding and Prussia itself began to grow rapidly in size and influence.

source: Adam Zemoyski, *Moscow 1812: Napoleon's Fatal March* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2004), 79, 81-82.

³⁶ MacMillan, 207.

³⁷ MacMillan, 167-168, 216.

³⁸ Rothfels, 50.

³⁹Alsace-Lorraine, a historically German-inhabited territory along the old French-German border, lies west of the Rhine River. In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia brought it under French control and the German population suffered. Many opted to leave the region. By the time the Germans got Alsace-Lorraine back, it bore French influence and France considered it hers as much as the German State did. As a result, the French government was bitter and motivated for war, which only led to more bloodshed in the First World War. The British hoped to avoid a similar situation in regards to East Prussia. see: Wallbank and Schrier, 314.

⁴⁰ This figure takes into account a generous estimate of 30,000,000 for Poland's population in 1932. Germany's well-established, pre-expansionist population was 66,000,000 in 1930. At the time, there were roughly 1,215,000 Germans living in Poland. source: Otto Junghann, *Ethnopolitischer Almanach; ein Führer durch die europäische Nationalitätenbewegung, im Auftrage des Institut für Grenz- und Auslandstudien* (Leipzig, Germany: W. Braumüller, 1930).

⁴¹ Prazmowska, 75.

⁴² MacMillan, 133.

⁴³ Robin W. Winks and R.J.Q Adams, *Europe 1890-1945: Crisis and Conflict* (Oxford: Oxford Press, 2003), 102, 220-222.

⁴⁴ In lieu of the Versailles Treaty, one of the most infamous statements to have come out of France after the First World War was that Germany had a population of "twenty million too many." France's Prime Minister, George Clemanceau made the statement. British politician Sir Edward Geddes said that Germany should be "squeezed [like a] lemon" in post-war policy until "the pips squeak". As reported in the *Cambridge Daily News*, December 11, 1918, Geddes' speech was read in the Guildhall in Cambridge, England. for discussions of the Versailles Conference and its observed failings see: Archibald Cary, *Ten Years of War and Peace* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927), 173. for Clemanceau's statement see also: "German Colonies," *Time Magazine*, June 23, 1924, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,718551,00.html> (accessed: December 13, 2006).

⁴⁵ Clark, 193.

⁴⁶ "No. 15: Speech made by M. Beck, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs in Parliament on May 5, 1939"

Documents Concerning German-Polish Relations, 30.

⁴⁷ Rothfels, 50.

⁴⁸ A.J.P. Taylor, *The Origins of The Second World War*, (New York: Simon and Schuster Publishing Incorporated, 1996), 48.

⁴⁹ "Report dated August 3, 1920 by Sir Maurice Sankey On His Visit to Warsaw" from Cabinet Papers 1724, London Public Record Office. see: L.J. Macfarlane, "Hands Off Russia: British Labour and the Russo-Polish War, 1920" *The Past and Present Society Oxford University Press*, No. 38. (Dec., 1967): 133, <http://past.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/38/1/126.pdf> (accessed: December 21, 2006).

⁵⁰ Macfarlane, 33.

⁵¹ Prazmowska, 77.

⁵² John Brown Mason, *The Danzig Dilemma* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1946), 13.

⁵³ Hans Adolf Harder, *Danzig, Polen und der Voelkerbund* (Berlin: Georg Stiltke, 1928), 114.

⁵⁴ MacMillan, 198.

⁵⁵ "Utilization of the Port of Danzig By Poland. Decision of October 26, 1931," *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 27, No 3. (Jul., 1933): 556.

⁵⁶ Kimmich, 128.

- ⁵⁷ "Advisory Opinion No 18: Free City of Danzig and International Labour Organization on August 26, 1930" *Collection of Advisory Opinions: Free City of Danzig and International Labour Organization*, No. 18 Series B File F (1930): 9, http://www.icjci.org/cijwww/cdecisions/ccpij/serie_B/B_18/01_Ville_libre_de_Danzig_et_OIT_Avis_consultatif.pdf (accessed: December 13, 2006).
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 15.
- ⁵⁹ Gorski, 130.
- ⁶⁰ Kimmich, 68.
- ⁶¹ Kimmich, 142.
- ⁶² Kimmich, 27.
- ⁶³ Heinrich Sahn, *Errinerungen aus meinem Danziger Jahren, 1919-1930* (Marburg, 1958). cited in: Clark, 193.
- ⁶⁴ Stefan Samerski, *Die katholische in der Freien Stadt Danzig 1920-1933: Katholizismus zwischen Libertas und Irredenta* (Cologne: Boehlau, 1991),136.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 121.
- ⁶⁶ Rothfels, 47.
- ⁶⁷ Rothfels, 47-48.
- ⁶⁸ Gorski 130
- ⁶⁹ Haferkorn, 228.
- ⁷⁰ Mason, 24.
- ⁷¹ Christoph M Kimmich, *The Free City: Danzig and German Foreign Policy, 1919-1934* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1968), 53.
- ⁷² "Article 107: Treaty of Versailles," comp. Richard Haken and Jane Plotke.
- ⁷³ Prazmowska, 76.
- ⁷⁴ Peter Utgaard, *Remembering and Forgetting Nazism* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), 188-189.
- ⁷⁵ Geo. G. Chisholm, "The Free City of Danzig," *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 4. (Apr., 1920): 306.
- ⁷⁶ Clark, 193.
- ⁷⁷ Harder, 112.
- ⁷⁸ Permanent Court of International Justice, Series A/B, No. 44.2, The opinion of the court was given on 4 February, 1932. as cited in: Reinhard Haferkorn, "Danzig and the Polish Corridor," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of Affairs 1931-1939)* , Vol. 12 No. 2. (Mar., 1933): 228, <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1473-8104%28193303%2912%3A2%3C224%3ADATPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A> (December 23, 2006).
- ⁷⁹ "Article 102: Treaty of Versailles" comp. Richard Hacken and Jane Plotke, "Peace Treaty of Versailles Articles 31 - 117: Political Clauses and Annexes for Europe," *Brigham Young University Library*, <http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/versa/versa2.html> (accessed: January 12, 2007).
- ⁸⁰ Clark, 193.
- ⁸¹ Haferkorn, 226.
- ⁸² "Article 107: Treaty of Versailles," comp. Richard Haken and Jane Plotke.
- ⁸³ Gorski, 130
- ⁸⁴ Haferkorn, 226.
- ⁸⁵ Gorski, 130.
- ⁸⁶ "Utilization of the Port of Danzig By Poland. Decision of October 26, 1931," 556-557.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 555-556. see also: "Article 4, Clause 4: Treaty of Versailles," comp. Richard Haken and Jane Plotke.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 555.
- ⁸⁹ Haferkorn, 225-226.
- ⁹⁰ Mason, 13.
- ⁹¹ Haferkorn, 555.
- ⁹² van Cleef, 107.
- ⁹³ *Ibid*, 101.

- ⁹⁴ van Cleef, 106. see also: Ivar Högbom, "Polens ekonomisk geographiska läge," *Geographika Annaler*, Vol. 12. (1930): 215-253.
- ⁹⁵ Mason, 164.
- ⁹⁶ Ciechanowski, 351-352.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 351-352.
- ⁹⁸ Gorski, 130.
- ⁹⁹ van Cleef, 105.
- ¹⁰⁰ Gorski, 127.
- ¹⁰¹ van Cleef, 105.
- ¹⁰² Prazmowska, 77.
- ¹⁰³ "Advisory Opinion No 18: Free City of Danzig and International Labour Organization on August 26, 1930,"¹³.
- ¹⁰⁴ Haferkorn, 229-230.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 224.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*.
- ¹⁰⁷ Prazmowska, 77-78.
- ¹⁰⁸ "Text of German-Polish Agreement of January 26, 1934" *Documents Concerning German-Polish Relations*, 1.
- ¹⁰⁹ Gorski, 127.
- ¹¹⁰ Gorski, 126.
- ¹¹¹ "The German newspapers...which towards August 22 stressed the desire of Germany to obtain satisfaction by peaceful methods, have in the last few days devoted themselves to showing that Germany has nothing to fear even from a general conflict, which, they declare, would find her in a much more favourable position than in 1914." source: "No. 176: M. De Saint-Hardouin, French Chargé d'Affaires in Berlin, to M Georges Bonnet, Minister for Foreign Affairs. Berlin, August 1, 1939" French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Diplomatic Documents (1938-1939) Papers relative to the events and negotiations which preceded the opening of hostilities between Germany on the one hand, and Poland, Great Britain and France on the other hand* (New York, 1940).
- ¹¹² "Speech by Herr Hitler to the Reichstag on September 1, 1939" *Documents Concerning German-Polish Relations*.
- ¹¹³ Herbert S. Levine, "The Mediator: Carl J. Burckhardt's Efforts to Avert a Second World War," *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 45, No. 3. (Sep., 1973): 451, <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2801%28197309%2945%3A3%3C439%3ATMCJBE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9> (accessed December 23, 2006).
- ¹¹⁴ Memel, a historic German city on the Baltic Sea, was given to Lithuania following the Versailles Treaty of 1919. Lithuania agreed to return the city to Germany in 1939, after the Nazis began to flex their muscles and demand the return of the city.
- ¹¹⁵ "Weizsäcker Diary: March, 27 1939" John L. Heineman, comp. and trans., *The Road to War: A Selection of Primary Documents*, <http://www2.bc.edu/~heineman/roadiii.html> (accessed: December 17, 2006).
- ¹¹⁶ "Report of the Polish Ambassador in Paris" German Foreign Office, *Documents Concerning the Last Phase of the German-Polish Crisis* (Berlin: Carl Heymann's Verlag, 1939), 51.
- ¹¹⁷ Germany began to draw up the plans for what would become known as Case White - the invasion of Poland - April 3, 1939.
- ¹¹⁸ "No. 64: Speech by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on August 24, 1939" *Documents Concerning German-Polish Relations*, 107-112.
- ¹¹⁹ Karl Doenitz, *Memoirs: Ten Years and Twenty Days*, (United States: Da Capo Press Incorporated, 1997), 41.
- ¹²⁰ Saul Friedlander, *Prelude to Downfall: Hitler and the United States 1939-1941* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1967), 17. see also: "Hitler's Speech to the Commanders-in-Chief, Aug 22, 1939" *Documents Relation to German Foreign Policy*, Series D, Vol. VII (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1956), 200.

¹²¹ Williamson Murray and Allan R. Millett, *A War To Be Won: Fighting the Second World War* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 2001), 15.

¹²² "Official German Statement published on August 31, 1939, at 9 p.m. containing the Proposal for a settlement of the Danzig and the Polish Corridor Problem, as well as of the question concerning the German and Polish Minorities" *Documents Concerning the Last Phase of the German-Polish Crisis*, 31.

¹²³ Final Report by the Right and Honourable Sir Nevile Henderson, 17-18.

¹²⁴ Friedlander, 17.

¹²⁵ International Military Tribunal, *Trial of the major war criminals before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945-1 October 1946* see: The Avalon Project, directed by William C. Fray and Lisa A. Spar, "Nuremberg Trial Proceedings Vol. 2 - Fifth Day"

The Avalon Project, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/imt/proc/11-26-45.htm> (accessed December 11, 2006).

¹²⁶ David Carment, Patrick James and Zeynep Taydas, *Who Intervenes?: Ethnic Conflict And Interstate Crisis*, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2006), 3.

¹²⁷ Gorski, 126.

¹²⁸ Haferkorn, 225.

¹²⁹ Doenitz, 477.

¹³⁰ "Churchill's Memorandum of His Conversation with the Head of the Danzig Fascists Förster on July 14, 1938" *Documents and Materials Relating to the Eve of the Second World War: Volume I, Dirksen Papers 1938-1939* (New York: International Publishers Company, Incorporated, 1948), 136.

¹³¹ H.R. Trevor-Roper, introduction to *Blitzkrieg to Defeat: Hitler's War Directives 1939-1945*, xvi.