Ignore Thy Neighbor: Christian Apathy and the Holocaust

Megan A. Moyers

2009-2010
Abstract

Raphael Lemkin was the first to coin the term “genocide” to describe the intentional annihilation of any ethnic group’s ways of life, culture, political or economic faculties, dignity, freedom, and/or existence. Perhaps the most well-studied illustration of this definition is the Nazi Holocaust of World War II. The purpose of this essay is to evaluate Christianity’s role in this cold-blooded genocide by examining the responses of various factions and theologians of the Protestant Church in Germany as well as those of the Roman Catholic Church. This paper concludes that, overall, Christianity’s response to the extermination of millions of human lives was that of marked indifference punctuated by rare instances of self-serving encouragement/resistance. The current genocide in the Sudan offers an immediate opportunity to achieve both Lemkin’s desire to put an end to genocide by giving it name and to break Christianity’s long-standing apathy in the face of bloodshed.
When Raphael Lemkin published *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* in 1944, in the midst of the European Holocaust, he introduced the term “genocide” to provoke outrage and stir forcible action, to give definition and meaning to a previously nameless offense. He believed that a new descriptor was needed because “new conceptions require new terms.” While his appellation was indeed novel, the reality behind “the destruction of a nation or ethnic group” was not new. From the mass tribal killings of Biblical times to the devastating tactics employed in the settlement of the Americas to the Armenian massacres that marred the early conscience of Lemkin, the practice of genocide suffuses human history under many names.

Though history is rife with instances of mass killing, perhaps the most well-known and extensively researched genocide is the Holocaust. The study of this horrific chapter in the human narrative is foundational to the understanding of the nature of genocide and confronting the profoundly human, stunningly normal face of its perpetrators. While the images associated with the Nazi Holocaust are undeniably horrific—grainy photos of emaciated bodies tumbled like broken matchsticks in mass graves, images of crumbling gas chambers and smoking crematoria, documents enumerating ghastly medical experiments—the systematic genocide of over 6 million Jews was the not the work of monsters but of “ordinary men.” That the perpetrators must certainly have been average people is suggested by the sheer number of participants; anywhere from 100,000 to 500,000 killers were required in the Final Solution. Disturbingly, the average, the norm, in Europe during the Holocaust was Christianity. Hitler’s Germany was approximately 95% Christian (55% of these were Protestant; the remainder, Catholic). As such, the vast majority of citizens who bore witness to Hitler’s rise to power received compulsory religious education, attended church, and referred to themselves as Christian. Poland, which housed all six of the Nazi extermination camps, boasted one of the largest Roman Catholic populations in Europe.
That Germany and its conquered territories were primarily Christian cannot be denied. What is questionable is the role that this Christian presence played in the perpetration of this genocide—conspirator, bystander, or dissenter? This paper will argue that the majority of the overwhelmingly Christian population in Germany and throughout Europe did not actively resist, and in some cases encouraged, the rise of Hitler and were primarily apathetic to the plight of the European Jewry. To support such a troubling argument, this paper will examine certain components of the Christian religious tradition (most prominently, anti-Semitism) and evaluate proximate socio-political factors in Germany which coalesced to inhibit Christian denunciation of Hitler and genocide. Furthermore, the responses, or lack thereof, of factions of the Protestant Church and Roman Catholic Church to the genocide will be examined.

At first glance, it seems that a strong Christian presence and the rise of a dictatorial, murderous regime should be mutually exclusive. Certainly, the basic tenets of Christianity are in stark opposition to mass slaughter. One assumes that Christians would have fiercely protested the flagrant violation of one of their most basic commandments: God’s charge, “Thou shall not kill.” Yet it is a historical fact that Christians did not vehemently protest the exclusion of Jews from German life or provide much token resistance to Jewish oppression. The majority of Christians and their clergy were not opposed to the rise of the Nazi party and their anti-Semitic policies; indeed, “support of the regime was common among Christians, and the vast majority failed to raise any objection to Jewish persecution” and the bulk of “church leaders expressed praise and enthusiastic support for the ‘rebirth’ of German under Hitler’s authority”\(^\text{vii}\). The Churches’ tacit policy of non-opposition persisted even after they knew the ultimate fate of the Jews. Armed with facts about the decimation of the Jewish population, the majority of Christians remained, at best, indifferent to the Final Solution.

It is a widely held belief that Hitler’s charisma and oratory prowess enabled him to persuade millions of Germans that Jews were the enemy; in reality, Hitler’s antipathy toward the Jews was not unlike
what Christian churches had preached for millennia. From the time of the crucifixion, through medieval Christianity, to the Reformation and beyond, the Jews frequently encountered Christian hostility and were recurrently targeted as the “other,” humanity’s scapegoat. Because of their complicity in the legal proceedings involved in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the Jews were repeatedly “diabolized…as…murderers, or deicides.” The New Testament itself provided the justification for such vilification, denouncing the Jews who “killed the Lord Jesus…and [please] not God, and are contrary to all men.” Jews personified, in effect, “an abstract compound of fear and loathing, the quintessential other.”

The Medieval Christians continued the marginalization and demonization of the Jews. They accused Jews of murdering Christian children and using their blood in Passover bread, and Christian mobs burned “blasphemous” Talmudic scrolls. When the Black Plague decimated Europe, many held that the epidemic raged because Jews “cast poison into the wells…in order to sow the plague and poison Christendom.”

The founder of the Protestant Reformation, Martin Luther, spent a significant portion of his theological life attempting to convert Jews to his new, reformed Christianity. Luther’s rage and frustration at the overwhelming refusal of the Jews resulted in the publication of “On the Jews and Their Lies,” “an attack on Jews virtually unsurpassed in its brutality.” Luther’s advice for how true Christians should deal with the Jews included calls to “set fire to their synagogues,” destroy Jewish homes, and deprive them of their holy books. Martin Luther himself was a product of medieval anti-Semitism, and he contributed much to the shaping of anti-Semitism in the Protestant tradition. Clearly, there was a recurrent strain of anti-Semitism within Christianity, one often exacerbated in times of hardship (the Plague, etc.) when Christians required a scapegoat.

Nevertheless, by the 18th and 19th centuries, Germany had come to grudging terms with its Jewish population, though “the Jews had never been accepted or integrated into German society.” World War I and its aftermath upset this tenuous racial balance. Germany was utterly devastated by its loss in the war.
The resulting Versailles Treaty forced Germany to accept responsibility for causing the war, pay enormous reparation fees, and relinquish lands and large sectors of their military.\textsuperscript{xvii} Germany was internationally disgraced and extremely resentful. Simultaneously, the Weimar Republic and its liberal constitution were dissatisfactioning to the majority of Germans both because they blamed it for the Versailles Treaty and because of its liberal, Western make-up. The Weimar Constitution called for universal suffrage and equality for all, Jews included.\textsuperscript{xvii} Churches in particular chaffed under this new government which they felt was increasingly secular, modernist, and morally weak.\textsuperscript{xix} Most ecclesiastical leaders disliked the “fast lifestyle of the roaring twenties or the open, democratic practices of Weimar Germany.”\textsuperscript{xx} That the introduction of the Weimar government coincided with the most devastating inflation in German history and the Great Depression seemed to the German people further proof of the ineffectiveness of democracy. Hitler was thus able to gain his foothold in Germany because he a) proposed to reinstate Germany as a thriving world power and b) was able to exploit the historical anti-Semitism of his predominantly Christian audience and unite them against a familiar scapegoat: the Jews. Hitler laid the blame for the rampant inflation, failing economy, and degradation of Germany at the feet of the Jews, a people whom Christians had never particularly championed and indeed had historically denounced.

Over half of the population in Germany identified as Protestant, and though many factions existed within this Protestant community, each expressed apathy towards the plight of the Jews (though certain splinter groups actively encouraged Jewish oppression). An examination of well-known Protestant theologians in post-WWI Germany provides insight into the opinions of religious academics (who were often household names in Germany) as Hitler rose to prominence. In 1934, Paul Althaus, one of the more famous Protestant theologians, the president of the Luther Society in 1926, and a well-respected theologian at Erlangen University, claimed “Protestant churches have greeted the [rise of Hitler] as a gift and miracle of God.”\textsuperscript{xxi} Althaus additionally placed great importance on the German Volk, an enigmatic term
encompassing “the community of blood or race…[having] to do with a specific, closed, blood relationship”\textsuperscript{xxii} shared by Germans. He felt the German Volk was blessed by God and should be kept separate from the “disintegrating and demoralizing”\textsuperscript{xxiii} Jewish Volk. Althaus’s concept of the Volk was compatible with Hitler’s desire to isolate a pure German, Aryan race from the contamination of the Jews. Indeed, Althaus declared “we Christians know ourselves bound by God’s will to the promotion of National Socialism, so that all members…of the Volk will be ready for service…”\textsuperscript{xxiv} Though Althaus contributed little to the Nazi Party after 1938 (perhaps out of distaste for the tangible brutality of Kristallnacht which, incidentally, took place on November 10, 1938—Martin Luther’s birthday), he never retracted his past endorsement of the regime or the need to purify the German Volk.

Another prominent Protestant thinker, Emanuel Hirsch, a theologian at Gottingen University and a renowned Kierkegaard scholar, was also a committed Nazi. He “was extremely conversant with the Protestant theological tradition”\textsuperscript{xxv} and took pride not only in Protestantism but also in the Germanness of the Protestant faith and Luther. Hirsch saw nationalism and the sanctity of the German Volk to be encouraged by God and considered both to be threatened by the Versailles Treaty. Hitler’s hypernationalism and commitment to racial purity appeared to Hirsch to be akin to “a sunrise of divine goodness after endless years of wrath and misery.”\textsuperscript{xxvi} Unlike Althaus, Hirsch continued to advocate the Nazi regime and its anti-Semitic policies after 1938; he supported the adoption of the Aryan Paragraph, published his own claims that Jesus was an Aryan, and, to sum up, did “at no time before or after 1945…indicate convincingly that the anti-Semitism of the Hitler era violated his wishes.”\textsuperscript{xxvii}

It is inherently difficult to assess whether Althaus and Hirsch’s opinions were completely emblematic of the attitudes of the 46.5 million Protestants in Germany at this time\textsuperscript{xxviii}. Certainly, they were not seen as radicals nor ostracized from their theological community for supporting the Nazi party. In many ways Althaus and Hirsch possessed many traits typical of Christians in Germany during this period: they
were “conservative, antidemocratic, and…most Germans tended to be hypernationalistic.” While it would be presumptuous to say that Althaus and Hirsch spoke for the majority of Protestants, it stands to reason that they at least shared certain common denominators, and their opinions did not fall too far outside the Christian norm.

At the extreme end of German Protestantism were the “German Christians,” or Deutsche Christen (the German term will be employed in this analysis to avoid confusion with general Christian citizens who espoused the Christian faith). This movement was officially established in 1932 and grew to include over 600,000 members. The Deutsche Christen were committed to removing all Jewish influence from Christianity and desired to amalgamate Nazi ideology and Protestantism. The Deutsche Christen “represent[ed] an explicit attempt to accomplish what most Germans did implicitly: reconcile their Christian tradition with National Socialist ideology.” They “created an ecclesiology defined by race and desired a racially pure church based on blood. To the Deutsche Christen, as to the Nazis, “Jewishness” was both a religious and racial/biological distinction. As one crude Deutsche Christen placard read, “Baptism may be quite useful, but it cannot straighten a nose.” Thus, the Deutsche Christen were the extreme enhancement of classical Christian anti-Semitism. The movement instigated a campaign to remove all remnants of Judaism from Christianity. The Deutsche Christen “rejected the canonicity of the Old Testament, denied the Jewish ancestry of Jesus, and expunged Jewish words…from hymns.” Ludwig Muller, a member of the Deutsche Christen who eventually became Reich Bishop, stated categorically that “Christianity did not grow out of Judaism but developed in opposition to [it]... There is no bond between them, rather the sharpest opposition.”

While a minor Protestant faction, the Deutsche Christen enjoyed, briefly, a degree of political influence that belied their small rosters. They utilized massive rallies and “churned out newspapers, broadsheets, and scholarly monographs,” as propaganda for their goal of a racially pure, Aryan church.
Because the *Deutsche Christen* message so paralleled the Nazi position, Hitler himself endorsed the *Deutsche Christen* party in Protestant church elections in 1933. The party won two-thirds of the votes and enjoyed the fleeting public support of the Nazi government. Indeed the *Deutsche Christen* were also able to appoint Germany’s first national bishop: Ludwig Mueller. With time, the Nazi party’s relationship with the movement cooled because they did not share the *Deutsche Christen* commitment to a powerful state church. The Nazis withdrew their support, as evidenced by the 1933 declaration of neutrality in church affairs.

The Confessing Church was a Protestant response to the attempts of the *Deutsche Christen* and the Nazi party to utilize Christian churches as tools of politics and propaganda. This coalition of Protestant clergy and lay Christians opposed the *Deutsche Christen* attempts to cull remnants of Judaism from Christianity and politicize the Church. The Confessing Church is often characterized as the staunch resistor of Hitler and proof that Christianity did not sanction the Holocaust. In fact, what the Confessing Church primarily took issue with in 1934 was political encroachment on church autonomy and tampering with Scripture. The defining document of the Confessing Church, the Barmen Declaration, denounced the actions of the *Deutsche Christen*, stating “We reject the false doctrine, as though the Church were permitted to abandon the form of its message and order to its own pleasure or to changes in prevailing ideological and political convictions.” The Confessing Church refuted what they saw to be heresy and the utilization of the Church as a tool of the State; however, the Barmen Declaration did not refer to the poor treatment of Jews, denounce Hitler, or question the legitimacy of the Third Reich. It was, therefore, possible to be both a good Nazi party member and subscribe to the teachings of the Confessing Church. Though in opposition to the Nazification and dejudaification of Christianity, the Confessing Church “could not conceal the instinctive anti-Semitism that continually prevented [it] from challenging anti-Jewish persecution.” In summary, the Confessing Church opposed the expansion of Nazism for reasons of
biblical integrity and church autonomy, not to champion the cause of the Jews. Whatever their issues with the *Deutsche Christen*, the Confessing Church was still part of the Protestant faith and “given the anti-Semitism that shaped the outlook of this overwhelmingly conservative movement, the persecution of Jews could not generate sustained protest from an opposition focused principally on the preservation of the church.”

In all, Protestant factions did not actively resist the rise of the Nazis or oppose Hitler on the grounds of his legislation against the Jews; however, Christian apathy to and/or support for the instatement of an anti-Semitic government is not synonymous with indifference to /complicity in the Holocaust itself, though the former certainly allowed for the latter. To make the claim that Christians as a whole did not protest the Final Solution, this paper must attempt to pinpoint when churches, clergy, and the German laity were aware of the fate of the Jews and assess whether Christian stances changed as a result. In 1938, Kristallnacht was a glaringly public display of the potentiality for violence against Jews. Afterward, there was not a collective Christian outcry over the destruction of Jewish businesses and synagogues; the transition of Nazi anti-Semitic rhetoric into violent practice was, for the most part, unremarked upon. In 1939, Hitler starkly prophesized that “if international Jewry should succeed…in precipitating nations into a world war, the result will [be]…the extermination of the Jewish race.” Indeed, Hitler’s Final Solution began in earnest in 1941 with massive deportations of Jews to various ghettos and concentration camps. In early 1942, the six Polish death camps were fully operational; shootings and gassings began to occur with more devastating regularity and death tolls. Such large-scale, systematic killing conceivably attracted outside notice. As early as May 18, 1942, the New York Times reported that the Nazis had machine-gunned over 400,000 Jews throughout the Baltic territories, Poland, and Russia. In late June, the New York Times and the London Daily Telegraph reported that over one million Jews had already been murdered by the Nazis. It is possible to establish a reasonable estimate, as renowned Holocaust
scholar Robert P. Ericksen does, that the average German knew or had strong suspicions about the true nature of the Final Solution by 1942. Yet there is no corresponding increase in Protestant resistance after this date. Neither of the theologians mentioned above retracted their pro-Nazi, anti-Semitic statements; Hirsch remained a staunch proponent of Nazism throughout the war. The Deutsche Christen did not temper their fervor for a church defined and sanctified by blood. Indeed, the “war brought fulfillment of many Deutsche Christen aims...” Their continuing goal of separating non-Aryans from German Christianity was “realized by default, through the deportation and systematic murder of...Jews.” Additionally the Confessing Church failed to supplement the Barmen Declaration with any vehement denunciations of the deportations and murders. In summary, little changed after 1942. Knowledge of the murder of Jews failed to spark vehement protest from the 46.5 million Protestants in Germany.

The discussion of Christianity’s role in the Holocaust necessitates an examination of the Catholic Church, which accounted for 40% of the German populace and the bulk of European Christians. Unfortunately, like their Protestant counterparts, the Catholic Church failed to mobilize its congregants against the National Socialist movement and at times appeared in agreement with it. When the Catholic Church was alerted to the Final Solution, it failed to take any public opposition to Nazism. As with the Protestant churches, the Catholic Church did not protest as Hitler gained his foothold in German politics. The Pope largely took his cues from and was “to a considerable extent influenced by the behavior of his ‘constituency’ within Germany,” and German Catholicism, though it came into conflict with the Nazis on a variety of issues, did not take umbrage with anti-Semitism and the ostracism of Jews from German society. Indeed, in 1933, an eminent German clergyman, Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber, proclaimed that the Catholic Church did not “object to the endeavor to keep the national characteristics of a people...pure and unadulterated.” In similar fashion, a 1939 pastoral letter written by German Archbishop Conrad Grober reaffirmed the Churches’ conviction that “the Jewish people...were guilty of the murder of God and had
been under a curse since the day of the crucifixion." The Archbishop's language is decidedly anti-Semitic; he characterizes Jews as “atheistically perverted.” Such language and sentiment from Archbishop Gröber, Cardinal Faulhaber, and a multitude of high ranking clergy opened the proverbial floodgates of anti-Semitism on the part of the lower Catholic dignitaries.

Clearly, Hitler's anti-Semitism did not concern the Catholic Church. What did alarm the Catholic Church, as with the Confessing Church, was the Nazi threat to Church autonomy in Germany. To prevent such encroachment, the Catholic Church entered into an agreement with the Third Reich: the Nazis would preserve the autonomy of the Catholic Church in exchange for the Church's promise not to interfere with Nazi policies. The Reichskonkordat of 1933 secured the “freedom of profession and public practice of the Catholic religion.” In return, the clergy who authorized the Concordat swore that all bishops would swear “an oath of loyalty either to the Reich governor of the state…or to the President of the Reich,” all Church services would include “a prayer…for the welfare of the German Reich and (German) people,” and all Catholic teachers would instruct their children in patriotic love of Nazi Germany. For similar reasons, the Church even agreed to supply information on the religious background of its own members, including birth records, in order to “lend its help to the Nazi state in sorting out people of Jewish descent.” The Church continued to perform this service for the Nazis “right through the war years when the price of being Jewish was…deportation and outright physical destruction.”

Knowledge of the Final Solution reached Germany Catholics and the papacy around the same time as it did Protestants. In 1942, reports about the mass extermination of Jews filtered down to bishops from Catholic military officers in Russia and Poland. According to Guenter Lewy, by the end of 1942 “the German episcopate was possessed of quite accurate knowledge of the horrible events unfolding.” Yet the Vatican remained silent. Diplomatic representatives to the Vatican began urging the Pope to issue a denunciation of the extermination of the Jews; the Pope was, however, determined to maintain neutrality.
The Papal Secretary of State held that “the Holy See, in line with its policy of neutrality, could not protest particular atrocities and had to limit itself to condemning immoral action in general.”\textsuperscript{lxii} In 1943, 8,000 Italian Jews were rounded up and deported almost literally beneath the Pope’s window, but he issued no formal or blatant protest.\textsuperscript{lxiii} Such silence from the Vatican even after presented with the facts of the Final Solution is an indictment in itself. After stirring sermons by high ranking Catholic officials and countless publications and pastoral letters encouraging anti-Semitism, after high profile public agreements between Church and the Nazis, after all the published photographs of priests and SS officers with arms raised in mirroring “Heil” salutes, what were lay Catholics to conclude when the truth of Jewish extermination was met with no harsh words and no action from Rome? It follows that the majority of Catholics in Germany and throughout Europe would presume that the Church accepted the results of the Final Solution.

The papacy and Pius XII have been criticized for remaining silent in the face of the genocide of 6 million Jews. As one of the most influential, wealthy, and widespread religions, the Catholic Church had myriad resources at its disposal with which to intervene or at the very least verbally denounce the Holocaust. Almost none was invoked. The Vatican also had the capabilities to compile information “by drawing disparate accounts together from its diplomats stationed throughout Europe…the Holy See could have played a vital role in accelerating the process of Holocaust knowledge.”\textsuperscript{lxiv} In this way, the Vatican missed an integral opportunity to use its resources to bring international attention to the horrors of the Holocaust. Many have condemned Pius XII for not using his position as Supreme Pontiff to publically oppose the Nazi regime, for not offering money and sanctuary to fleeing Jews, and for not threatening Nazi sympathizers and perpetrators with excommunication. While such action may not have prevented the Holocaust, it certainly would have brought more pressure to bear on the perpetrators of this genocide (and, again, focused international attention on the situation). Nevertheless, Pope Pius XII was not willing to risk alienating the majority of German Catholics. He “knew that the German Catholics were not…willing to incur
the wrath of their Nazi rulers for the sake of the Jews, whom their own bishops for years had castigated.” In the end, the Catholic Church and its Pope were more concerned with preserving the autonomy and unity of the Catholic Church in Europe than in protecting the Jews; this indifference and non-opposition predominated Catholic response to the Final Solution.

Churches as a whole protected their autonomy and the sanctity of their holy books with a greater degree of fervor than the lives of their 6 million Jewish neighbors. While most of the Christian factions discussed here took issue with the “dejudaization” of the Bible or Nazi encroachment on Church authority, they almost invariably failed to actively dispute Hitler’s anti-Semitic policies and, at times, furthered such antipathy toward Jews by means of their own religious propaganda or ecclesiastical teachings. The existence of an historical anti-Semitism in conjunction with rampant discontent in Germany certainly made Hitler and his promises of renewal and revitalization understandably attractive to the predominantly Christian German populace. There was an almost universal lack of opposition from both the clergy and lay Christians to the rise of the Nazi government and its institution of anti-Semitic policies. Disturbingly, when later presented with fairly conclusive evidence that the Jews were being exterminated by the hundreds of thousands, Christian officials did not significantly deviate from their apathy toward the plight of the Jews. At no point from 1942-1945, a period in which almost 4.8 million Jews were slaughtered, did Churches successfully mobilize their adherents against the Final Solution or even significantly vocalize protests to the genocide.

The general indifference of Christianity to the perpetration of this systematic, chillingly ordinary genocide of the 20th century sets a devastating precedent. Though not necessarily a parallel case (as millennia old prejudices were not at play, and Christianity was a more recent cultural addition), the Rwandan genocide, which occurred a mere 50 years after the Holocaust, took place in one of the most heavily Christianized countries in Africa. There, Churches again failed to play the role of “agents of
resistance to genocide.”\textsuperscript{lxvi} Lemkin held that the “significance of a policy of genocide to the world order and to human culture is so great as to make it imperative that a system of safeguards be devised.”\textsuperscript{lxvii} He additionally wrote that “genocide is too disastrous a phenomenon to be left to fragmentary regulation. There must be an adequate mechanism for international cooperation in the punishment of the offenders.”\textsuperscript{lxviii}

Nearly seventy years after Lemkin penned those cautionary words, the international community continues to lack a well-equipped, rapidly-responding, genocide prevention organization. Perhaps Christianity should strive to fill this void. In a world in which genocide currently rages anew in the Sudan, there is no better time for Christians to rediscover their belief in a moral imperative, their active commitment to the divine calling of good. The time is most certainly past for Christianity to prove it can be more than indifferent, to prove it can do something more than apologize in the aftermath of genocide.
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