

Ashley Nguyen

Crihfield

AICE American History (A)

02 May 2016

**9389\_s15\_qp\_32**

Using evidence that isolates eliminationist German anti-Semitism from the rest of western anti-Semitism, the historian unifies two ideas in this excerpt in order to warrant the occurrence of the Holocaust. First, the Holocaust was caused by the eliminationist anti-Semitism that was unique to German identity and culture. The historian's rhetoric lends credence to the concept that anti-Semitism in Germany was solely eliminationist, thus condensing anti-Semitism into a singular ideology with a radical view. Second, he asserts that these eliminationist ideologies were enabled by the Nazi regime's ascension to power, thus narrowing his focus on the nuances of the relationship between the Nazi government and its constituents.

As the author begins, the diction apparent within the first paragraph separates German anti-Semitism from average European anti-Semitism. It is precisely this distinction that drives the rest of the excerpt, as the “uniqueness” of German eliminationism was a strong enough impetus for the Final Solution. The historian introduces a functionalist train of thought, stating that German anti-Semitism was strong enough to cause the Holocaust. Using this anti-Semitism, the blame for the Holocaust is placed on two entities- the German people and its leadership, both possessing strictly eliminationist ideals. Rather than blaming the Holocaust's occurrence on complicity, the author assigns the German people with a motive incentivized by their blood-thirsty moral beliefs, thus leading the Volk to actively seek participation in genocide. Painting the Nazi regime as enablers rather than leaders, the author asserts that the government institution bent to the will of the people, incorporating evidence from the Action T4 program and Christian persecution as instances of Nazi hesitation when faced with public opposition. German people saw Nazis as regular politicians who carried out the will of their constituents, implying that there was no ideological conflict between Nazi and ordinary civilian. This lack of distinction between ideological beliefs is the crux of the first section, as the historian extends the idea that cooperation between Nazi and constituent was crucial in maintaining a road to genocide.

Further extending the warrants and explications of the claims in the first paragraph, the author begins the second section by emphasizing the nature and development of German anti-Semitism. It is important to note that the historian's depiction of “long-incubated” anti-Semitism is purely eliminationist, developing multiple centuries earlier on the basis of religion and then becoming secularized by the Nazi State. Such an interpretation of anti-Semitism has been supported by studies confirming that medieval German localities that displayed violence against Jews were most likely to demonstrate that same kind of violence during the Nazi's reign. Thus, due to the consistency of violence throughout the development of German anti-Semitism, this kind of hatred became ingrained in the psyche of German culture. This eliminationist sentiment was not exclusively character trait of German culture, but also in Nazi politics. The

eliminationist anti-Semitism consistently mentioned by the historian is force that allowed German civilians and Nazi politics to intersect. This intersection, spurred on by the support the Nazis garnered from an adoring public, allowed the Nazis to secularized anti-Semitism and led to the wiping out of the Jews. The historian goes on to shift the focus from the German people to the Nazi “criminal regime.” With Hitler at the helm of the Nazi party, the historian argues that Hitler invigorated Nazi anti-Semitism, refreshing it with a formal genocidal program, and then presenting that idea to a supportive public. This implies that Hitler was a driving force behind the establishment of these programs, which lends credence to intentionalist thought, as the historian discusses the commitment to extermination programs. Such commitment was displayed by Hitler through the redirection of war funds towards death camp development and the establishment of T4. This commitment formed the trusted relationship between government and constituent that was essential to the persecution of the Jews. As he continues, even though the author introduces a more top-down approach, implying that anti-Semitism was always prevalent in the higher ranks of Nazi officials, the overarching idea is that anti-Semitism, as its own entity, developed so quickly and in a brutal fashion that it motivated killing. Thus, Nazis and the German people did not seek out anti-Semitism as excuse for genocide, but rather, Nazis and the German people were intrinsically incapable of staving off eliminationist ideals.

Acknowledging that anti-Semitism alone did not cause the Holocaust, the historian more explicitly clarifies his second reasoning for the cause of the Holocaust – the election of the Nazi Party and their ascension to power. The state eventually becomes responsible for a path to genocide, and does so not only to appease the sentiments of its constituents, but their own ideological beliefs. Continuing to isolate Germany as a unique case, the historian discusses the Nazi Party’s function and activities as characterizing traits of German identity, specifically referencing the Sonderweg theory in order to illustrate the crux of his “uniqueness” argument. The Sonderweg theory, which conceptualizes Germany’s road to modernity as a “special path” involving top-down reforms, bureaucracy, authoritarian government, and militarism carries the negative connotation that Germany is intrinsically weak as a country. Thus, the incorporation of this specific theory supports the idea that the German people were weak and unable to combat the pervading sense of eliminationism in their culture. Seeing the Jews as a physical threat to the Volk, the Volk was faced with two objectives. First, they had to conquer living space to provide for further population growth. Second, they had to preserve the purity of German blood. The author’s claims support the idea that the pursuance of these two objectives was what caused Jews to be perceived as the largest threat to the Volk, and thus why actions against Jews were so ‘deadly in content.’ Going to, again, isolate German literature from the rest of western literature, the historian touches on propaganda as a factor that propelled eliminationism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, asserting that the cruel and bloodthirsty attitude towards the Jews in German literature was available to a country susceptible to genocidal rhetoric.

Essentially, the historian condenses German anti-Semitism into the eliminationist umbrella, asserting that thousands of years of unique anti-Semitism pertinent to the German identity raised a generation of people that easily accepted a culture of violence and murder. With the Nazi ascension to power enabling the entirety of the nation to actively participate in

genocide, the occurrence of the Holocaust was possible in conjunction with the German willingness to kill.