
MODERN GERMANY

A Study of Conflicting Loyalties

By PAUL KOSOK, PH.D.

Assistant Professor of History, Long Island University



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

COPYRIGHT 1933 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED JULY 1933

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Broadly speaking, the common purpose of these inquiries in eight modern states has been that of examining objectively the systems of civic education, of determining the broad trends of civic training in these nations, and of indicating possibilities in the further development and control of civic education. In two of these cases, Italy and Russia, striking experiments are now being made in the organization of new types of civic loyalty. Germany, England, the United States, and France present instances of powerful modern states and the development of types of civic cohesion. Switzerland and Austria-Hungary are employed as examples of the difficulty experienced in reconciling a central political allegiance with divergent and conflicting racial and religious elements.

The series includes the following volumes:

Civic Training in Soviet Russia, by Professor Samuel N. Harper, Professor of Russian Language and Institutions in the University of Chicago.

Great Britain, by Professor John M. Gaus, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy, by Professor Oscar Jászi, formerly of Budapest University, now Professor of Political Science in Oberlin College.

Making Fascists, by Professor Herbert W. Schneider, Professor of Religion in Columbia University, and Shepard B. Clough, Instructor in History in Columbia University.

Modern Germany, by Professor Paul Kosok, Long Island University, New York City.

Civic Training in Switzerland, by Professor Robert C. Brooks, Professor of Political Science in Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

France, by Professor Carleton J. H. Hayes, Professor of History in Columbia University. (This is a part of the Columbia University series of "Studies in Post-War France" and is included here because of its intimate relation to the other volumes in the series.)

Civic Attitudes in American School Textbooks, by Dr. Bessie L. Pierce, Professor of History in the University of Chicago.

The Duk-Duks, by Dr. Elizabeth Weber, Professor of Political Science, Hunter College, New York City.

The Making of Citizens, by Professor Charles E. Merriam, Professor of Political Science in the University of Chicago.

Wide latitude has been given and taken by the individual collaborators in this study, with the understanding, however, (1) that as a minimum there would be included in each volume an examination of the social bases of political cohesion and (2) that the various mechanisms of civic education would be adequately discussed. There is inevitably a wide variation in point of view, method of approach, and in execution of the project. Investigators differ as widely in aptitude, experience, and environment.

Of the various investigations the questions may be asked: What part do the social groupings play in the spirit of the state? What is the attitude of the economic groups which for this purpose may be considered under certain large heads, as the attitude of the business element, of the agricultural group, or of labor? What is the relation of the racial groups toward the political group whose solidarity is in question? Do they tend to integrate or disintegrate the state? What is the position of the religious factors in the given society, the Catholic, the Protestant, the Jewish? How are they related to loyalty toward the political unit? What is the place of the regional groupings in the political unit? Do they develop special tendencies alone or in company with other types of groupings already mentioned? What is the relation of these competing loyalties to each other?

It cannot be assumed that any of these groups has a special attraction or aversion toward government in general; and the analysis is not conducted with any view of establishing a uniformity of interest or attachment in any type of group, but rather of indicating the social composition of the existing political units and authorities. It may well be questioned whether there is any abstract loyalty, political or otherwise. These political loyalties are determined by concrete interests, modified by survivals that no longer fit the case and by aspirations not yet realized. The cohesion is a resultant of conflicting forces, or a

balance of existing counterweights, a factor of the situation. All these factors may change and the balance may be the same, or one may change slightly and the whole balance may be overthrown. It is the integration of interests that counts, not the special form or character of any one of them.

Among the mechanisms of civic education analyzed are those of the schools, the rôle of governmental services and officials, the place of the political parties, and the function of special patriotic organizations; or, from another point of view, the use of traditions in building up civic cohesion, the place of political symbolism, the relation of language, literature, and the press, to civic education, the position occupied by locality in the construction of a political loyalty; and, finally, it is hoped that an effective analysis may be made of competing group loyalties rivaling the state either within or without.

In these groups there is much overlapping. It would be possible to apply any one or all of the last-named categories to any or all of the first. Thus the formal school system may and does utilize language and literature, or symbolism, or love of locality, or make use of important traditions. Symbolism and traditions may and do overlap—in fact, *must* if they are to serve their purpose; while love of locality and language may be and are interwoven most intimately.

In the various states examined, these devices were traced and compared. The result by no means attains the dignity of exact measurement but supplies a rough tracing of outlines of types and patterns in different cities. It is hoped, however, that these outlines will be sufficiently clear to set forth some of the main situations arising in the process of political control and to raise challenging questions regarding the further development of civic education.

It may be suggested that the process by which political cohesion is produced must always be considered with reference to other loyalties toward other groups in the same society. Many of the devices here described are common to a number of competing groups and can be more clearly seen in their relation to each other, working in co-operation or competition, as the situa-

tion may be. The attitude of the ecclesiastical group or the economic group, or the racial or cultural group, or any of them, profoundly influences the nature and effect of the state's attempt to solidify political loyalty; and the picture is complete only when all the concurrent or relevant factors are envisaged.

These devices are not always consciously employed although they are spoken of here as if they were. It often happens that these instrumentalities are used without the conscious plan of anyone in authority. In this sense it might be better to say that these techniques are found rather than willed. At any rate, they exist and are operating.

These eight or nine techniques are only rough schedules or classifications of broad types of cohesive influences. They are not presented as accurate analyses of the psychology of learning or teaching the cohesive process of political adherence. They presuppose an analysis of objectives which has not been made, and they presuppose an orderly study of the means of applying objectives; and this also had not been worked out in any of the states under consideration.

Nowhere is there available richer material for the study of civic cohesion than in modern Germany. This volume by Professor Paul Kosok is based on six years' study of the nature of political allegiance in that nation. Some two years were spent in Germany in the assembling of data, and the remaining part of the time, in preparation and revision of the manuscript. The background of the study was laid, indeed, by Dr. Lasswell who made a preliminary review of the field in 1924, and who has assisted in putting the material in final form.

The study of Professor Kosok differs from some of the others in this series in the strong emphasis placed on the economic factors in the system of political cohesion, and in the greater attention to the growth of communist civic education as distinguished from the identical process of cohesion in other groups. From this point of view the German system as described in Kosok may well be read alongside of Harper's study of *Civic Training in Soviet Russia*, where the elaborate efforts to develop civic education in the Soviet state are fully described and analyzed.

In Germany, competing systems of civic education—democratic, fascist, and communist—may be seen in operation side by side, battling for position within the limits of the existing political order, and struggling for mastery in the same society. Obviously the task of producing national cohesion and loyalty in a situation where two of the three important groups profess the desire to overthrow the existing political order presents many difficulties, and it is precisely these conflicts which Kosok has undertaken to describe. A particularly pertinent chapter written by Isidor Ginsburg is that dealing with the struggle of the competing groups for the creation and operation of a dominating symbolism (chap. xvi).

CHARLES E. MERRIAM

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

Fascism has triumphed in Germany. Its victory has brought to a close the short-lived parliamentary régime established in 1919. While the present dictatorship marks a new step in the historical development of Germany, it is at the same time the logical outcome of various forces at work during the parliamentary régime—forces which were rooted in the structure of pre-war German society. What characterizes the development of these forces is the increased emphasis upon loyalty to the national state, that is, the increased subordination of all other loyalties to this supreme central loyalty. A study of the forces that have brought about the establishment of the present Fascist dictatorship thus becomes identical with the study of all those forces that have strengthened or weakened national and civic loyalty in the past. Such a study the present volume attempts to present. The procedure has been not merely to present a cross-section of the methods of civic training of the post-war period but to examine the historical origin and development of the concept and contents of civic and national training. To this end it has also been necessary to analyze the anti-civic and anti-national forces against which civic training is employed.

This study is based upon material gathered during a stay of two and a half years in Germany. A further understanding of the problem, as well as additional material, was derived from an earlier unpublished study of the German Revolution of 1918-19, which was made by the author during a previous two-year stay in Germany. Much material was gathered in various German libraries, of which the Preussische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin proved most useful. The New York Public Library likewise contributed much material. Additional information was gained through contacts with officials of numerous organizations who gave generously of their time. Information gained in these ways was supplemented by conversations with private German citi-

zens of all classes. To all of these the author wishes to convey his sincerest thanks.

The original draft of this volume was written in German on a much larger scale. Later developments made it necessary to publish the volume in English, to condense it considerably, and to re-write it from the viewpoint of the American rather than of the German reader. As a result it was found necessary to write what practically amounted to a new book on the basis of the original material. Further exigencies of space caused a considerable shortening of many of the chapters of this English version. As a result, much factual material had to be eliminated. This gives to many of the generalizations found in this volume an apparently didactic character which they originally did not possess. Other chapters had to be entirely eliminated. These dealt with such subjects as sports organizations, charitable organizations, the rôle of German women and the German home, music, literature, etc., as well as a theoretical and historical analysis of the problem of civic training itself. The author hopes to publish this material separately in the near future. The bibliography presented lists only a small portion of the books and pamphlets consulted. Many important works had to be omitted and it was often difficult to decide upon which books should be listed.

Throughout the recasting of this volume in English the author has had the good fortune to have the collaboration of Mr. Isidor Ginsburg of the College of the City of New York. He not only gave of his time without stint, but laid aside his own research activities to see the work through. His thorough understanding of German history and German affairs and his exceptional analytical powers were of great aid to the author, who discussed with him at length the theoretical problems entailed in the study as well as the organization and presentation of the material. The author has a pleasant memory of the often heated but fruitful discussions of every aspect of the problem—discussions which have given the volume its present character. Many of these discussions were conducted pencil in hand, following a pre-arranged outline. In this respect the work may be called a

complete collaboration. Since it was not possible to arrive at a complete agreement in all of these discussions, however, the author cannot avoid the responsibility for the interpretations here offered.

In addition to this general collaboration, Mr. Ginsburg contributed the trenchant chapter on national symbolism, in which he has utilized a new approach to this involved problem.

Thanks are due to my colleagues Professor Philip D. Jordan, for his reading and criticism of the completed manuscript; and Mr. Rubin Gotesky for his general criticisms as well as for his assistance in the final drafting of chapters viii and ix. The book owes a great deal to the continued encouragement of Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University and to the painstaking examination which he made of the entire manuscript. To Professor Charles E. Merriam, editor of the series, the author tenders his thanks for his constant advice and guidance and his endless patience. Professor Harold D. Lasswell, who planned the original project, also gave many valued suggestions as a result of his careful scrutiny of the manuscript and aided in the final editing of the volume. Thanks are also due to Leonard Mins for many of his criticisms and suggestions.

I owe much to my wife, whose research and secretarial assistance during the entire work was indispensable.

PAUL KOSOK

INTRODUCTION

The present volume has been divided into three parts. In the first, a study is made of the objective social and economic conditions that produce a civic or anti-civic mentality. In conjunction with this, various economic measures are taken up that have been passed to weaken disloyalty or strengthen loyalty. The second part is a study of the character of the present state and the various organizations by which it attempts to inculcate loyalty. In the third section the different non-state organizations and elements are considered in relationship to our problem. These, as will be seen, often co-operate with the state in their activities.

The method of approach used in the first section has been to make a historical analysis of the rôle of the various social and economic classes of German society in developing civic loyalty. The necessity for this need hardly be stressed; the class nature of German society and of German civic training as we have just indicated it makes this indispensable. Such an analysis shows the existence of two main classes, the upper or ruling class—the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie—and the lower or ruled class—the industrial and agricultural proletariat. The middle classes in town and country have likewise been given separate treatment because of their size as well as their strategic position between the upper and lower classes.¹

Each class in turn shows the presence of many different strata, though these cannot always be treated separately because of lack of space. Furthermore, differences between certain strata of one class and those of another cannot always be as sharply distinguished in actual life as this study might indicate.

¹ The term "middle classes" is used throughout this book to correspond to the German term "*Mittelstand*" or the French term "*petite bourgeoisie*." It is not used in the same sense as the English term "middle class" which would also include the bourgeoisie. For a discussion of the character and the composition of the middle classes see chap. iii.

Nevertheless, these class differences are not exaggerated. The main class lines and even the distinctions between the various strata are very clearly marked and observed by the classes themselves. For these class differences are not merely of an economic nature but pervade the whole structure of German society.¹ They are present in the army, the police, the bureaucracy, the schools, the church, the sport organizations, the youth movement, and many other social and cultural activities. In fact, there is hardly any form of activity in which they are not present. They color the whole of German life in a way unknown in this country. And, what is most important, their existence is not denied by anyone. Not only is a man's position in life definitely determined by his class affiliation, but he is made conscious of it in his daily life. Railroads, subways, hospitals, burials, and even public comfort stations are openly labeled first, second, and third class.

What may be most important of all is that these class divisions are quite rigid. It is very difficult for a member of a lower class to rise to a higher one. Such changes do take place, but they are of a slow, protracted nature. This gives German society a semi-caste-like nature. All these factors must be continually kept in mind, for they profoundly affect the character of civic training in Germany.

¹ See, in general: Paul Mombert, "Die Tatsachen der Klassenbildung" in *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, Jahrgang 44, pp. 93-122; Georg Albrecht, *Die sozialen Klassen* (1926); Karl Kautsky, "Klasseninteresse, Sonderinteresse, Gemeininteresse" (in *Neue Zeit*, XXI², p. 240 ff.); August Pieper, *Berufsgedanke und Berufsstand im Wirtschaftsleben*.

CONTENTS

PART I. THE MAIN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ALIGNMENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE BOURGEOISIE	3
II. THE INDUSTRIAL PROLETARIAT	16
III. THE MIDDLE CLASSES (<i>Mittelstand</i>)	31
IV. THE LANDED ARISTOCRACY	41
V. THE AGRICULTURAL PROLETARIAT	54
VI. THE PEASANTRY	64

PART II. THE STATE

VII. THE POLITICAL PARTIES	75
VIII. THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUREAUCRACY	100
IX. THE ARMY	123
X. THE SCHOOLS	149

PART III. NON-STATE ORGANIZATIONS AND ELEMENTS

XI. THE CHURCH	189
XII. THE YOUTH MOVEMENT	208
XIII. LOCALISM AND SECTIONALISM	227
XIV. THE GERMAN AND THE NON-GERMAN	249
XV. PRESS, RADIO, AND FILM	266
XVI. NATIONAL SYMBOLISM (by <i>Isidor Ginsburg</i>)	292
XVII. CONCLUSION	325

INDEX

INDEX	337
-----------------	-----

PART I.
THE MAIN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC
ALIGNMENTS

CHAPTER I

THE BOURGEOISIE

Of the various classes of society it will be necessary first to take up the bourgeoisie for it is the class which has evolved the status of the "citizen" and the concept of "civic" training. An attempt will be made to show how the objective (i.e., the social and economic) conditions of the early bourgeoisie produced a civic concept which forced it to negate feudal state and society and to support the growth of absolute monarchy. It will then be necessary to show how the further growth of the bourgeoisie brought it into conflict with the feudal elements of this absolute state and how it gradually transformed the latter into a bourgeois state. And, finally, an attempt will be made to indicate how the bourgeoisie has then made use of the state not only directly to further its economic interests but also to suppress all attempts to destroy the existing régime.¹

In making a short analysis of the interests of the bourgeoisie we must first distinguish between those of the industrial, the commercial, and the financial bourgeoisie, even though they have become increasingly integrated during the last decades. Common to all is, of course, the basic prerequisite of bourgeois private property (*bürgerliches Privateigentum*) as opposed to both feudal property and socialized proletarian property. The secondary prerequisites for the growth and expansion of the bourgeoisie center around the problems of production and marketing. It must be able to get sufficient capital, cheap labor power, and sufficient cheap raw material to be able to develop production. It must further be able to secure as large as possible a market for its goods and to sell them at a price which will yield maximum profits. The commercial bourgeoisie is interested in these demands in so far as increased production also means in-

¹ See *Grundrisse der Sozialökonomik*, Vol. IX¹ and Vol. IX² (1924). These two volumes contain a series of important sociological studies of the various classes and strata of society.

creased commercial activities. Nevertheless, it has often come into conflict with the industrial bourgeoisie, especially concerning the demand of the latter for protective tariffs, which are, of course, a hindrance to increased international trade. Bank capital is also interested in these conditions in so far as they increase the opportunities for new investments.

The early struggle of the bourgeoisie against feudal society¹ was a struggle for the establishment of the security of bourgeois private property (*bürgerliches Privateigentum*) and for the accumulation of capital as against the arbitrary rule of the feudal lords—a struggle which necessarily forced the bourgeoisie in its early stages into an alliance with the monarchy in order to establish a state with absolute powers over these lords. The absolute state was a fulcrum from which the bourgeoisie could better oust the feudal nobles from their position of political power and establish a *bürgerliche Rechts- und Wirtschaftsordnung*. It is well known that up to the end of the eighteenth century the various absolute rulers of Germany favored the development of commerce and industry, and thus helped to strengthen the bourgeoisie without, however, granting it political rights or detracting from the privileges of the nobility.

During this whole period, when the absolute monarchy was being aided by the bourgeoisie in its struggle against the dominance of feudal forms of property as well as in its struggle against foreign competitors it is quite obvious that the civic concept of the bourgeoisie contained as an integral part the support of the absolute monarchy. Even though the bourgeoisie possessed no political rights in the absolute monarchy, nevertheless it gave its political allegiance to it, just as the monarch gave considerable support to the economic development of the bourgeoisie. While feeling themselves as *citizens* in their relationships among themselves, the members of the bourgeoisie

¹ For details see, among others, Oskar Schwebel, *Deutsches Bürgertum. Von seinen Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1808* (1883); Heinrich Johann Sieveking, *Grundzüge der neueren Wirtschaftsgeschichte vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (1923); Gustave Huard, *L'évolution de la bourgeoisie Allemande* (1919); Werner Sombart, *Der moderne Kapitalismus* (1924); Werner Sombart, *Der Bourgeois. Zur Geistesgeschichte des modernen Wirtschaftsmenschen* (1923).