

Sydney Askins

Period 8

Paper 32 May/June 2015

The historian's overarching approach is that when the NSDAP formally accepted political power in Germany, the cultural prevalence of eliminationist anti-Semitism was legitimized and thereby "mobilized" to genocidal levels. Following an approach that is not firmly intentionalist, structuralist, or functionalist, the historian modifies aspects of each to conclude that while the motivation of the holocaust resides with the "broad" acceptance of eliminationist anti-Semitism, the eventual realization of the Holocaust was multi-causal, cyclically fueled by a Messianic leader, cultural fear, and a sore lack of cultural identity that forced Germany along a "singular path."

The historian immediately establishes strong functionalist thought that "German anti-Semitism" was not only "sufficient" but "necessary" for genocide. The historian, however, rejects the functionalist notion of complacent complicity first by condemning all Germans with reference to "broad German participation," and then by identifying that the Germans' failure to oppose Nazi genocidal policy would have been hypocritical when juxtaposed with their resistance to the NSDAP's de-Christianization and Euthanasia Programme if the German people had not the eliminationist ideology of Hitler and his echelon. Here, the historian directs attention to the German Gentiles' opposition to Nazi de-Christianization (directed by Goebbels, Bormann, and Himmler), which took the form of Palm Sunday readings of Pope Pius XI's 1937 encyclical and the formation of the Bekennende Kirche ("Confessing Church"), both of which condemned German Christian "messianism" toward the Führer, prompting a Kirchenkampf ("church struggle") that – as the historian suggests – prompted Hitler to drop the prohibition of Catholics from joining the Nazi Party in his 1933 Reichstag Speech. The historian corroborates the anti-structuralist assumption that the German people were capable of acting independently of the Third Reich with reference to the Aktion T4 euthanasia programme, which Hitler verbally cancelled on August 24, 1941 after two years of private protests from Protestant and Catholic churchmen – including NSDAP members – to the Reich Chancellery and the Ministry of Justice. These references augment the historian's approach that the German people were *capable* of collectively opposing the Nazi power structure if they desired, therefore underscoring that the German Gentiles demonstrated a complicity of *consent* and *intent* and that the NSDAP's ideological structure was not so rigid as to ignore Gentile objection, if it had occasion to arise. The historian's initial approach therefore adopts components of functionalism and intentionism – the latter through the claim that Nazi leadership exemplified specific "eliminationist ideals" – to achieve the overarching perspective that German anti-Semitism was a force that was allowed expressed through channels formed by the Nazi accession to power.

The historian then moves to ascribe the distinctness of the Holocaust to the singularity of German's particular, "virulent" breed of anti-Semitism, inherently providing a cause-and-effect link between the "motivation" of the Holocaust as eliminationist anti-Semitism and the "provider" as the structuralist channels in the Nazi power structure. Through this, the historian rejects the functionalist notion of *ad hoc* anti-Semitism and genocidal tendencies, narrowing the focus to "eliminationist" ideology, which implies that Germany's particular racial anti-Semitism was imbued with calculated,

specific genocidal motives. The historian's willingness to interpret Germany's eliminationist anti-Semitism as a salient identifier of German culture – as seen through the propensity of the German Gentiles to blend intellectualism with racial hygiene theory through academic research conducted by German physician Virchow and at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics, est. 1927 – identifies the historian's sub-approach that eliminationist anti-Semitism was not solely for racial extremists but for the ordinary Gentile, acting as a cultural adhesive that did sought out *purpose* and *intent* rather than *expression*, as that had already been demonstrated through Kristallnacht of November 1938 and the willing indoctrination of Hitler's Youth. The historian therefore uses the “unique[ness]” of the Holocaust to confirm the first paragraph's thesis that the affirmation of Hitler's power in January 1933, the establishment of the Third Reich, and the promulgation of the racially anti-Semitic ideas of a “criminal regime” engaged and “mobilized” a German collective. Through reference to the “non-killing actions of the perpetrators,” the historian extends the analysis that eliminationist anti-Semitism was a culturally compulsive acceptance of the New Order that implied a dual consent to the elimination of the Jews and other *Lebensunwertes Leben* (“Life unworthy of life”), a direct condemnation of involvement in the eyes of the historian.

The historian's initially firm-functionalist introduction to Germany's eliminationist anti-Semitism is modified here to see the Holocaust as multi-casual, manifested by the reaction in which the NSDAP structure was as essential as the fertile anti-Semitism in which it found judicial and executive roots. In a dilution of both functionalist and intentionalist thought, the historian's link to “German culture” – developed in the second paragraph and expanded in the third – introduces the thematic nuance to *Sonderweg* that the German eliminationist anti-Semitism and the resulting genocide were a result of the German need for a unified German identity, a product of dilatory unification and cultural disjointedness that isolated Germany in a state of delayed adolescence. To the historian, this allowed a collective, pseudo-religious idolization of Hitler to engender their latent genocidal behavior, where National Socialism became the fodder for both the eliminationist anti-Semitism and their growing need for cultural affirmation of Hitler's Aryan supremacist concepts outlined in *Mein Kampf*. To extend the thought that functionalist concepts were responsible for the manifestation of structuralist and functionalist factors, the historian recognizes that the normalization of anti-Semitism normalized the concept of the Bolshevik Jew (allegedly intent on fueling a global Communist revolution) and the Plutocratic Jew (allegedly bent on destroying the German middle class through capitalist gains), thus ensuring that *Volkish* identity and safety were defined in relation to the “pernicious image” of the Jew to the extent that, according to racial ideologist Eugen Fischer, eliminationist anti-Semitism was the path that would protect the Aryans from extinction.

To affirm the significance of the *Sonderweg* in the context of the intricately defined and fearful *Volk*, the historian encourages a coalescence of the previous threads of intentionalist and structural-functionalist ideology. Through the assertion that Hitler's NSDAP was “bent upon” designing “state-organized genocidal slaughter” (meaning that there existed a ruthless intent), the historian provides the essential, intentionalist distinction to Germany's anti-Semitism: although their anti-Semitism was grounded in a tortured history of Jewish emancipation and Gentile oppression during the French Revolution, the 1916 Judenzählung, and the Christ-killer prejudices, it was the ability of the Gentiles' eliminationist anti-Semitism to become a *political* force that ultimately precluded the possibility that the Holocaust could find expression elsewhere, despite the mirrored fear of Bolshevism in the Ukraine, Latvia, and Lithuania. By referring to the fact that the “anti-Semitic movement” “openly and rabidly” “was elected to power” – i.e. the fact that the Nazi party

became the largest party in the Reichstag with the elections of July 32, 1932 – the historian solidifies the approach that the Nazi gain of power (a structuralist concept) legitimized the public expression of eliminationist anti-Semitism, a concept which the historian further confirms with reference to the “calls for...extermination,” as in Julius Streicher’s call for Jewish extermination in *Der Stürmer* in 1933.

The historian therefore reconstructs traditional functionalist interpretation of German complicity and anti-Semitism to introduce a cause-effect relationship in which the “motive” of eliminationist anti-Semitism found genocidal expression when the NSDAP gained power. A result of this approach is the historian’s conclusion that the convergence of these two factors underpins *Sonderweg* theory and classifies the genocide as a phenomenon. The historian nuances his modified-structuralist consideration of the NSDAP with the assertion that the party’s framework both sanctioned and catalyzed the use of this anti-Semitism as a force to define the Aryan-self and to protect a culture that was historically bound by a prevalent, anti-Semitic fear.