

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2021-2-1>

## THE LOYALTY-QUESTION OF BALTIC GERMAN MPS TOWARDS THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA (1918–1940) IN GERMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

*Peter Mons,*

*Undergraduate Student of the European Studies Department  
Baltic International Academy, Riga*

**Abstract.** A total of 18 governments took turns during the period of Latvian parliamentarism between 1918 and 1934. In science, the question of a felt loyalty by the Baltic Germans, as an imagined collective, towards the new Latvian state belongs to the more frequently asked discussion. This work focuses on the question of how Baltic German loyalty is perceived in German historiography, ascribed by the activities of their representatives in the national parliament. Their activities are closely related to their minority's overall relation to the Latvian state and evolved over five parliamentary phases. Those will be reevaluated, under consideration of the perception in German historiography, showing that the respective zeitgeist was crucial to understand the Baltic German attitude towards the Latvian state and to finally answer the question of a felt loyalty.

**Key words:** Latvia, Saeima, Baltic Germans, Minority Policy, German Historiography.

### **Introduction**

The disintegrating Russian Empire at the end of WWI confronted Baltic Germans with a new order in which their elitist status was no longer guaranteed. A change of power happened with symbolic character in July 1919 as the People's Council of Latvia (*Latvijas Tautas Padome*) had its first caucus in the 'Ritterhaus', the House of the Livonian Noble Corporation, representing a shift from a leading German nobility to a majoritarian Latvian ruled state.

In science, the question of a felt loyalty by the Baltic Germans, as an imagined collective, towards the new Latvian state belongs to the more frequently asked discussion. This work focuses on the question of how Baltic German loyalty is perceived in German historiography, ascribed by the activities of their representatives in the national parliament at the time of Latvian parliamentarism between 1918 and 1934. For this purpose, the most important contemporary work will be consulted by Benjamin Conrad from 2016 that deals with the question of Baltic German loyalty, identity and political areas in conversion (Conrad, 2016: 1–98). It is mostly based on the expressions of Wolfgang Wachsmuth, a former official at the Latvian Education Ministry and presidium member of the Baltic German minority committee, which is understood as a source of tradition (Wachsmuth, 1951). Nevertheless, Wachsmuth's work is rich and inevitable to consult for today's science. Also Michael Garleff consulted Wachsmuth, but unlike him, he kept the necessary scientific distance to evaluate the activities of Baltic German parliamentarians. Already his dissertation from 1969 was dedicated to their activities and he belongs to the most important thinkers of Baltic German history (Garleff, 1969). Svetlana Bogojavlenska researched the interrelations of minorities in the Saeima of the First Latvian Republic. In her opinion, the history of Latvian parliamentarism is still untold, since its minorities were commonly viewed separately from one another (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 83–98). Her objective was therefore to research the cooperation of German and Russian representatives, as both of them lost their role as leading political and cultural elites 'overnight'. Even if the declaration of independence intended a state for all people of Latvia, it had its own nationalistic imprint that brings us to her assumption; minorities presumably tried to unite forces to fight together for their rights. Of considerable importance is Mads Ole Balling's unique handbook from 1991 that gives statistical access to election turnouts and a biographical index of Baltic German politicians (Balling, 1991: 131–154). It is widely recognised in science for its content-related correctness and provides a general overview of German politicians in Eastern Europe in inter-war times.

A total of 18 governments took turns during the period of Latvian parliamentarianism until May 1934. The German party system existed from 1919 and is closely related to their minority's relation to the Latvian state as such, since it evolved over five parliamentary phases. Those phases will be reevaluated in the following, with respect to the previously mentioned instances in German historiography, showing that the respective zeitgeist was crucial to understand the Baltic German attitude towards the Latvian state and to finally answer the question of a felt loyalty.

### **1918–1919: Time of the Independence War**

From the proclamation of the first Latvian Republic, Baltic Germans were split into Left and Right. Those who opposed a Latvian state were called 'Old Baltic' or 'Right' and sought for a privileged status within the new order, whilst others who placed themselves on the basis of the Republic were called 'Young Baltic' or 'Left' (Conrad, 2016: 21, 26, 76). Hence, only the German liberals were willing to take part in the People's Council and the provisional government under Karlis Ulmanis under the condition that they would respect minority interests in return. It took the Old Baltics until the defeat of the 'Landeswehr' in summer 1919, before they also began to accept the Latvian state. At that time, the inter-ethnic relations between Germans and Latvians were already seriously damaged. To avoid open identification with Latvia the conservatives invented the decisive idea of 'Heimat' (homeland) which was anational and identity spending at the same time. For instance, Latvia protected their homeland from belonging to the Soviet Union, which was unanimously viewed as positive by the Baltic Germans, so they would signal willingness for cooperation in preserving this status quo. However, there was no direct loyalty expressed to the Republic as such. At the same time, Baltic Germans were stylized as foreigners and got their imprint like bishop Albert, seen as invader, intended to help develop a Latvian folk history (Grudule, 2013).

The history of Baltic German parliamentarians in Latvia began with the entry of five members on the 2nd of December 1918 at the third session of the People's Council (Conrad, 2016: 44). To the outside world, the Baltic Germans always demonstrated themselves as a unit, so that the priority of national affiliation over political orientation was the dominant. Surprisingly, even with this outwardly demonstrated unity, political and social attitudes were nevertheless marked by considerable differences and internal personal rivalries (Conrad, 2016: 30). The Baltic German Democratic Party, headed by Paul Schiemann, became the dominant left-liberal oriented force in summer 1919. Schiemann, who as editor-in-chief of the 'Rigasche Rundschau' also played a key role in shaping political opinion and will-making outside the parliament, had become the most important German politician without reservation. His importance lay in the ability to collect almost all Baltic German forces in Latvia under the motto of 'national and social solidarity' (Garleff, 2014: 91). Even beyond Latvia, Schiemann was a leading minority politician of his time, who rejected a privileged status for the Baltic Germans out of democratic conviction. The reason against a collecting party for all Germans was undoubtedly the expectation that Paul Schiemann would have become its chairman. His position would have been additionally strengthened and would thereby marginalize opposing conservative Rights.

In the first legislature of the People's Council, eight German MPs campaigned for the interests of their ethnic group by realizing the legally guaranteed autonomy of German schools (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 84). Their request for autonomy referred exclusively to the interests of their own group and didn't intend to include other minorities. Still, their proposal was a blueprint, used as an example by other minority MPs. According to Bogojavlenska, this example would show that the administrative experienced Germans served the interests of other minorities too and could act as a role model. Moreover, it could be attested that the Germans were even the most active faction compared to other minorities. Even though full autonomy could never be achieved with parliament's approval.

Worth mentioning is that free speech on an item of the agenda was always allowed in Latvian, German and Russian language between 1918 and 1934. It was a concession to the non-Latvian MPs, whose cooperation would otherwise have been impossible due to their poor knowledge of Latvian (Conrad, 2016: 42). A sign of demonstrated tolerance, as the Latvian government tried to stabilize its power base by winning the minorities for them. However, they were nevertheless expected to learn the Latvian language. According to Conrad, the MPs had strong difficulties to actually follow the predominantly Latvian negotiations (Conrad, 2016: 46). When speaking in parliament, the German MPs almost exclusively chose to speak in German, rarely Latvian and never in Russian. As law officers they followed the custom of using Latvian, but the symbolism of the mother tongue usage dominated, even if it had disadvantages in terms of achieving political goals. Only from the 1930s on, the MPs began to make less and less use of German, as it was increasingly perceived as annoying by emerging nationalism.

Latvia's new electoral law passed on the 19th of August 1919 and intended a division of the country into five constituencies (Courland, Latgale, Livonia, Riga and Zemgale). This vision was met with strong criticism from the German MPs, as it was feared that the few Germans in Latgale had no prospect of winning seats. The People's Council nevertheless accepted the law and in summer 1922 it was adopted to the Saeima, which had been reduced to a size of 100 seats. It would influence the upcoming behaviour of the German group.

### **1919–1923: Preservation of Minority Rights**

The second phase of Baltic German parliamentarism was dominated by the preservation of minority rights, in which they mostly acted defensively. When the future list of ministers was read out in the People's Council on the 13th of July 1919, the Germans were denied applause. This symbolic gesture reflected the tensions on the German-Latvian relationship from the recent independence war. Nonetheless, efforts were made by the Baltic Germans not to exclusively represent self-interests alone, but to create trust with a non-partisan understanding of office in order to promote the consolidation of the Latvian state (Conrad, 2016: 65).

The common tensions reached a climax when the Latvian government symbolically declared war on Germany on the 26th of November 1919, due to the activities of the Belarusian Liberation Army with the support of German soldiers. Young Balts like Paul Schiemann supported this measure (Conrad, 2016: 27). After repelling the attack by the Bermondts Army in December 1919, Karlis Ulmanis saw the opportunity to curtail the influence of the Baltic Germans, which was felt troublesome to him. When the cabinet was renewed, the number of minority ministers was reduced from three to two, but since key functions such as the Finance Ministry and the State Controller continued to be occupied by Germans, the parliamentary group spoke out reluctantly in favor of the new cabinet. Within the distribution of seats in the committees, the German minority achieved a concentration in key positions, such as constitution, warfare, finance and budget, nationality issues and agricultural legislation. It shows their special status amongst the other minorities that couldn't achieve the same.

In the Constitutional Assembly (Satversmes sapulce) from 1920 till 1922, the Baltic Germans were represented with 6/150 mandates and got 32.256 electoral votes (Balling, 1991: 138). Furthermore, the following elections for the first Saeima in October 1922 ended with an increased turnout of even 42.088 votes, giving 6/100 mandates in the parliament (considering its reduced size). The minority could fully exhaust its voter potential and was actually overrepresented, supported by returning German migrants to Latvia. Unlike them, the Russian minority had only 3/100 seats, even though having a share of 7.8% of the total population (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 84). It is said that as early as 1922, all German parliamentarians spoke Latvian so well that they were able to give legal presentations (Conrad, 2016: 52). At that time, Germans and Jews in particular showed a great willingness to take responsibility as law officers.

At the beginning of 1923 all minorities got together, caused by the belief that reforms in the national school law would significantly limit their autonomy rights. On the initiative of Paul Schiemann, the first so-called 'Minority Office' was founded with the aim to create a platform in which common issues could be discussed. On this existential occasion, the minority MPs were unanimous and therefore willing to write a joint protest letter to the government on February 7th, the same year (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 85). The following German draft law on cultural self-government and its usage of the German language represented a continuation of the struggle for autonomy, but also a forge ahead. Other applications by Poles and Russians followed in 1924, that of the Jews in 1925, showing that common ties were quite loose. All submitted drafts, especially the Russian, were very similar to the German, or largely adopted. They proposed that citizens shall be registered to belong to a respective minority group and then elect a council that works on the interests of their group. Ultimately, however, none of the submitted drafts were passed by the first Saeima, so that full cultural autonomy of Latvia's minorities was never achieved.

The second parliamentary phase came to an end in 1923. The Germans had to painfully adapt to its situation as representatives of a minority by accepting the common national holiday, the new constitution, the agrarian reform and finally, the removal of the 'Jakobikirche' from their own community. However, successes were also achieved, such as the amnesty law in the war of independence and pragmatic policies, such as the introduction of the Lat under a German minister. On the 5th birthday of the Latvian Republic in November 1923, the German parliamentary group and representatives of the education system came to the request to hang up the national coat of arms in German schools and to let the students sing the national anthem as a sign of solidarity.

### **1923–1929: Normalizing Relationship**

It was followed by a six-year phase of German activism with relative political stability, at which the common relationship to the Latvian state calmed down and normalized. During these years the political integration of German MPs also reached its climax. The parliamentary group was often involved in the formation of the government, providing the Minister of Justice from 1928 to 1929, whilst Schiemann represented Latvia as Deputy Delegate to the League of Nations in 1929. In the elections for the second Saeima in October 1925, Baltic German politicians could even increase their electoral votes to a total amount of 42.248. Though, the first disadvantages of the new election system became visible, since their mandates decreased from six to four (Balling, 1991: 138).

During the 2nd Saeima in particular, a conflict between the German and Russian minority emerged. In April 1926, three Russian MPs voted for the overthrow of the current government under Ulmanis, thereby provoking German MPs who saw it as support for an anti-minority government alternative (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 88). In order to create a political counterweight, an association of minority representatives was founded on the 20th of October 1926, again on the initiative of Paul Schiemann. Despite a divided public opinion about a minority bloc, the amalgamation of the 16 MPs was intended to guarantee the development and preservation of minority cultures that they saw to be endangered. The aim was to discuss issues that affect every minority in Latvia, namely the education law, citizenship and real estate acquisition. However, only after ten days the bloc broke up, due to inconsistencies in the preparation of a thematic catalog. Russian MPs perceived Schiemann's idea of uniform voting as denying their independence whereby the Germans broke off negotiations, so that they ultimately blamed each other to be responsible for the failure. The Russian newspaper 'Slovo' saw the root for conflict on the German side, provoked by the attempt to take the leading role amongst the minorities and to implement their own goals with the voices of others. The Latvian MP Arveds Bergs described the failure of the minority bloc as inevitable (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 91). The Eastern-Russian and Western-German culture would be incompatible and therefore cause an eternal dispute. The Latvian newspaper 'Brīva Tēvija' even saw the reason for failure in the lack of connection between Russians

and Jews with what is considered to be Latvian (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 92). In contrast to them, German history and Baltic Germans in Latvia were seen as part of their own national identity. For Bogojavlenska, this conflict frankly revealed the contradictions and mutual latent hostility that shaped the coexistence of different ethnic groups in Latvia of 1926.

Another example of existing recantiments followed in the same year. After Albering's government fell apart in December 1926, the newly founded Democratic Association, consisting of Jews and Poles, was offered to form a government. With the help of the Social Democrats and the promise of German support, a majority in parliament could be reached. But in the same month, under pressure from the Latvian press, the Democratic Association resigned from its mandate. In media such as 'Pirmdiena', it was called a shame for the Latvian nation not to be able to form a government without the help of the minorities (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 94). A year later, from the 28th of December 1927, Paul Schiemann was also commissioned by President Zemgals to form the new government. The fact that he wasn't even trying with a possible narrow majority was interpreted as a comprehensible political foresight at that time. However, Conrad views it as a missed political chance to send a signal that could have gone far beyond Latvia, especially under the condition that the minority government would anyways have been in office for only ten months, only until the next legislative period was intended (Conrad, 2016: 69). However, the shere gesture to give commission to a minority representative shows that Prime Ministers of non-Latvian nationality were conceivable in the political system back then.

In the elections for the third Saeima in October 1928, once again, the Baltic Germans could increase their election turnout and got a total of 43.352 electoral votes, returning to six mandates in the national parliament (Balling, 1991: 138). A victory could be achieved through an additional reformation of the national election system. Under certain circumstances, citizens were now allowed to cast their votes in another district, which the Germans used for their advantage by transporting them in more promising districts, in order to improve the overall result. In the following November, the 10th anniversary of the foundation of the Latvian Republic was celebrated in the Saeima in which all German MPs took part.

### **1929–1933: Renewed German-Latvian Living Apart**

Competing cultures of remembrance by Latvians and Baltic Germans caused an unprecedented intensity on the 10th anniversary of the conquest of Riga in 1929. The different historical classification of the Landeswehr aroused incomprehension on the Latvian side. With the demolition of the Landeswehr monument and the Landeswehr Act of 1929 a process of renewed alienation by the Germans towards the Latvian state returned, which heralded the fourth phase of parliamentary activity. In November the same year, Schiemann warned in advance that the fragile foundation of common cooperation would get destroyed (Conrad, 2016: 81). The following adoption of the Landeswehr Act by the Saeima on the 22nd of November 1929 with 51 against 39 votes and the subsequent exit of the German parliamentary group from the governmental coalition initiated the final drifting apart of the Baltic German minority from Latvia. Moreover, from March 1931 till the beginning of the next legislative period, Paul Schiemann was absent due to illness and for the first time it can be attested that Young-Balts lost their political vision.

In the elections for the fourth Saeima in October 1931, Baltic German representatives cast a total of 45.098 votes on them, reaching an electoral peak (Balling, 1991: 138). Nevertheless, the grouping continued to be represented by six MPs. The election ended with a shift towards the nationalistic right. For the first time, the peasants' party got an absolute majority, whilst nationalist tones reached unprecedented proportions in the foregone election campaign, in a country that was hit by the global economic crisis. The request to speak by German MPs collapsed and thus lost the longstanding parliamentary primacy over other minorities (Conrad, 2016: 54). In addition, Latvia's lack of regulation

for official languages ended in the wake of increased nationalism in February 1932 with a restrictive law, introduced by Prime Minister Margers Skujenieks by emergency decree. Previously, the German language had already disappeared bit by bit from public space and now finally lost its meaning. The Latvian historian Mara Grudule describes the Baltic German culture as colonial culture, without having a concrete center for cultural development (Grudule, 2013). Despite the loose, but decisive invention of 'Heimat', it can be said, however, that Paul Schiemann until his absence could represent a political center for the Baltic Germans, due to his extraordinary interconnection among the minority.

### **1933-1934: Decisive Internal Conflicts**

From 1933 onwards, this precarious situation, which actually persisted, was overshadowed by the serious internal conflicts within the Baltic Germans. The takeover of power by the Nazis in Germany caused a before unknown sharpness in internal political discourses, which had a paralyzing effect on the joint parliamentary activity. In addition, there were policies of the Skujeniek and Bodniek governments, hostile to minorities, which provoked a decline in interest in advocating for the state by means of Baltic German law officers. Whilst Russian MPs compensated for their own limited abilities to influence the political agenda by the symbolic use of their own language, the Germans reacted with passivity (Conrad, 2016: 54). Furthermore, the absence of Paul Schiemann, who last spoke to the Saeima on the 10th of February 1933, made itself felt due to his renewed illness. Consequently the turning away from liberalism was also reflected in the parliamentary group leadership.

At the beginning 1930s, Schiemann and his presidium colleague Fircks resolutely fought against the emerging Nazi ideology, but its changing seizure of power in Germany also changed the balance within the Baltic Germans. From now on the German Reich directly interfered in Baltic German affairs and acquired a majority stake of the 'Rigasche Rundschau' in March 1933, thereby depriving Schiemann of his own media opportunities. In addition, there was a request from the Jewish community, asking to publicly distance Baltic Germans from the new anti-semitic rulers in Germany, what the Presidium didn't approve (Conrad, 2016: 37). Furthermore, with the rise of National Socialism, opponents saw themselves in the strong position of eliminating Lefts like Schiemann, attempting to bring the Baltic Germans finally into a unity party. With a shift towards the political right and against the set goal of a German unity party, however, the climax of political fragmentation was reached. In March 1934 the German MPs eventually managed to come to a consensus again. Together they cast their votes for Karlis Ulmanis, as ironically shortly later, on the 15th of May 1934, the democratic order in Latvia was overturned by the authoritarian regime they had elected. With the dissolution of parliament and parties, the activities of all German MPs had ended. After Schiemann left, the Baltic Germans lost their overall political vision. Moreover, the constitutional reform that Ulmanis introduced in the autumn of 1933, which tended to work against the rights of minorities, should rather have urged great caution. Very soon, English was introduced as the first foreign language in all Latvian schools (Gibiete, 2011). Since 1934, only Latvian language has been permitted in the filing of state institutions. Furthermore, all management functions could only be carried out by ethnic Latvians.

At the latest after the end of WWII, the Baltic Germans were Germans in Germany. Their formative experience of being a linguistic, cultural and ethnic minority was no longer an everyday occurrence. In fact, the unspoken opinion seems to be that the history of the Baltic Germans as an ethnic group and community came to an end with the loss of their community building invention of 'Heimat'. However, the work of historians like Martin Pabst disprove this approach, referring to cultural associations found in diaspora which prevailed till today (Pabst, 2013).

### **Conclusion**

After the collapse of Baltic German plans in summer 1919, their parliamentary era began with a growing integration of all relevant political streams. A German elite formed early, being ahead of

other minorities which lasted until the early 1930s, only lasting until they finally drifted apart from Latvia. As experienced politicians, they primarily occupied posts in the Parliamentary Presidium, had the most requests to speak and submitted the applications for school and cultural autonomy (what other minorities used as blueprint). In addition, they participated in governmental coalitions the most. The grouping was well structured and able to consequently mobilize more and more voters for themselves, even though their actual political influence stagnated and later consequently decreased.

German historiography has paid little attention to the relationship between Baltic Germans and the presidential elections in Latvia. However, their behavior reflects the self-restraints of all minorities: Their parliamentarians never nominated their own candidates, nor did they support the nomination of candidates from Latvian parties in return. In doing so, they signaled that the position of the first man in state should be reserved for Latvian ethnicity. This behaviour was apparently intended to keep their chances for participation and cooperation with others always open.

The Baltic German parliamentary group was characterized by enormous activism in terms of the desire to participate in the common state. According to Wachsmuth, a decisive intention for contribution was not the felt loyalty to the Republic of Latvia, but the loyalty to one's own 'Heimat' (Wachsmuth, 1943: 355, 364). However, this prescription does not reflect the different time periods, the different political streams and challenges the group had to encounter. Conrad believes that the group's activism was aimed to avoid a more restrictive minority policy by being a cooperative partner (Conrad, 2016: 75). By abstaining from votes of confidence, they could always become a coalition partner for everyone, having the chance to influence the common agenda. Furthermore, the German parliamentary group was characterized by its unity and reliability on the question of contributing to the government.

In German historiography the Baltic Germans were always perceived as a socially and confessionally extremely homogenous group, which is not further questioned. Even though they lacked a concrete center for organization and developing cultural processes upon their minority, believed by Mara Grudule. Bogojavlenska says that the German minority was clearly a role model for the Russian population in Latvia, who always strived to establish unity, but repeatedly failed (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 97). Like others, she names the homogeneous Baltic German group as a reason, who unlike the Russians, wouldn't come from different political and cultural camps. Hence, Conrad refers to non-marginal political streams amongst the Baltic Germans, split into Left and Right, even though they were capable of cooperating with all internal political streams in the 1920's. The impression arises that they were always one step ahead with their ideas compared to other minorities. Own projects were taken over by the other minorities and used profitably to realize self-interests. Clearly, experienced politicians and especially the leading figure of Paul Schieman, with his visions and media influence, were key factors of which the Baltic Germans could make profit. He left a legacy, as historians like Michael Garleff expanded his services for his own ethnic group to that of a minority politician in an international context (Garleff, 2014: 115). It can be attested that Schieman called for a new type of nation state that is faithful to the principles of democracy and simultaneously shares power with minorities, which is still inspiring for European minority politics of today.

Bogojavlenska believes that Baltic Germans were firmly convinced of a state in which all citizens had equal rights, driving them to seek ways of working with the representatives of other minorities (Bogojavlenska, 2015: 97). It should be refused, since especially the Germans always attempted to forge ahead in order to realize the interests of their own group. The Russian perception of a German self-understanding as *primus* amongst the minorities led to the disintegration of the minority bloc. It gives the impression that a compromise with the Latvians was sought, but other minorities were only viewed with secondary importance by the Baltic German MPs.

Ascribed by the previous explanations on the five parliamentary phases, it can be stated that the Baltic Germans were eager to serve for the Latvian Republic as long as they were (at least) met

on eye level, but preferably superior to other minorities, in order to work on common interests. Otherwise they would lack the incentive to seek compromise and common development. Crucial for understanding their attitude is the invention of 'Heimat' as a substitution for expressing loyalty to the Latvian Republic. As such, we cannot speak about Baltic German loyalty to Latvia, since the country could theoretically be replaced by any other entity (like Estonia) in which Baltic Germans find their representation. Therefore, it makes sense to speak about a constructive relation, based on reaching common goals to bring the shared homeland forward.

#### References:

1. Balling M. O. (1991) Von Reval bis Bukarest. Statistisch-Biographisches Handbuch der Parlamentarier der deutschen Minderheiten in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa 1919–1945. Dokumentation Verlag, Copenhagen, Volume 1, pp. 131–154 ["From Reval to Bucharest. Statistical-Biographical Handbook of the Parliamentarians of the German Minorities in East-Central and Southeastern Europe 1919-1945"].
2. Bogojavlenska S. (2015) Deutsche und russische Parlamentarier in Kooperation und Konfrontation in Lettland 1919-1927. – Conrad, Kusber, Maner "Parlamentarier der deutschen Minderheit im Europa der Zwischenkriegszeit", Düsseldorf, Volume 170, pp. 83–98 ["German and Russian parliamentarians in cooperation and confrontation in Latvia 1919–1927", in "Parliamentarians of the German minority in Europe in the inter-war period"].
3. Conrad B. (2016) Loyalitäten, Identitäten und Interessen. Deutsche Parlamentarier im Lettland und Polen der Zwischenkriegszeit. Mainz University Press, V&R Academic, pp. 1–98 ["Loyalties, Identities and Interests. German Parliamentarians in Latvia and Poland of inter-war times"].
4. Garleff M. (1969) Die parlamentarische Tätigkeit der deutsch-baltischen Parteien in Estland und Lettland zwischen 1919 und 1939. Dissertation at the University of Kiel, published under the title "Deutschbaltische Politik zwischen den Weltkriegen. Die parlamentarische Tätigkeit der deutschbaltischen Parteien in Lettland und Estland", Scientific Archive, Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1976 ["The parliamentary activities of the German-Baltic parties in Estonia and Latvia between 1919 and 1939", dissertation at the University of Kiel, published under the title "German Baltic politics between the world wars. The parliamentary activities of the Baltic German parties in Latvia and Estonia"].
5. Garleff M. (2014) Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte Paul Schiemanns. –Deutsch-Baltisches Jahrbuch. Volume 62. Carl-Schirren-Gesellschaft e.V. & Deutsch-Baltische Gesellschaft e.V., pp. 88–115 ["On the reception history of Paul Schiemann"].
6. Gibiete L., Gibiete S. (2011) Die auf ewig verlorene Heimat. Die Zwangsumsiedlung der Deutschbalten aus Lettland 1939–1941. Nord Ost Institut at the University of Hamburg, <https://www.ikgn.de/ubersetzte-geschichte/uebersetzte-geschichte-artikel/umsiedlung-der-deutschbalten.html> (07/11/2021) ["The forever lost home. The forced resettlement of the Baltic Germans from Latvia 1939–1941"].
7. Grudule M. (2013) Die Deutschbalten in der Kulturgeschichte Lettlands und der Letten. Nord Ost Institut at the University of Hamburg, <https://www.ikgn.de/ubersetzte-geschichte/uebersetzte-geschichte-artikel/mara-grudule-deutschbalten-in-der-kulturgeschichte.html> (07/11/2021) ["The Baltic Germans in the cultural history Latvias and the Latvians"].
8. Pabst M. (2013) Deutschbaltischer Neubeginn 1945–1952. – Forschungen zur baltischen Geschichte. Vol. 8. pp. 165–191. Akadeemiline Ajalooselts, Estonia ["Baltic German new beginning 1945–1952"].
9. Wachsmuth W. (1943) Von deutscher Schulpolitik und Schularbeiten im baltischen Raum, von ihren Anfängen bis 1939. Part II, in "Deutsches Archiv für Landes- und Volksforschung VII", pp. 351–396 ["About German school policy and school work in the Baltic region, from its beginnings to 1939"].
10. Wachsmuth W. (1951-1953) Von deutscher Arbeit in Lettland 1918–1934. Ein Tätigkeitsbericht. Materialien zur Geschichte des baltischen Deutschtums. 1st Volume (1951), "Die deutsch-baltische



Volksgemeinschaft 1923–1934”, 2nd Volume (1952), “Die autonome deutsche Schule in Lettland 1920–1934”, 3rd Volume (1953), “Das politische Gesicht der deutschen Volksgruppe in Lettland in der parlamentarischen Periode 1918–1934”, Comel, Cologne. “Of German labour in Latvia 1918–1934. An activity report. Materials on the history of the Baltic Germanness”, 1st Volume, “The German-Baltic national community 1923–1934”, 2nd Volume [“The autonomous German school in Latvia 1920–1934”, 3rd Volume, “The political face of the German ethnic group in Latvia in the parliamentary period 1918–1934”].