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Headline: Chancellor and Cardinal

Text: Several days ago the former Marxist Reich Interior Minister, Sollmann, who had been ousted from the Stresemann Cabinet, used this striking turn of phrase in a speech or talk: Christianity and Socialism must work together to help the Fatherland out of the present emergency. This sudden acknowledgement by a cabinet minister who has been obligated for decades to follow the party program of religious indifference and the party practice of hostility to religion, has a remarkable enough ring to it, but it can also be taken as a veiled warning to the Center Party against helping their red coalition partners back into the saddle so as to restore to them their lost dominance over the left-wing oriented masses. The exchange of letters between the Chancellor and the Cardinal, however, indicates the possibility that Sollmann’s expression was made under a particular understanding and that he was perhaps informed of certain efforts undertaken by Herr Stresemann to engage the influence of the Church for the rescuing of the current system. When matters are seen from this general perspective, the concerted actions of Stresemann’s comrades are not so unappealing. The Chancellor needs help from all sides and now he is falling back upon the Church. There are certain parallels in the past. The great French Revolution with its cult of reason – somewhat comparable to our worship of economics as the savior from all crises and the ruler of the world – nevertheless called upon the old God, and Frederick the Great ascribed the following words to his Minister of Culture and Worship: May He bring me back religion in the land!

Crisis teaches prayer, and waves are threatening to crash upon the Crisis-Governors of Weimar. Like a second Noah, Stresemann is sending out his dove, but it has not yet returned with an olive branch in its beak as the sign of emerging highlands, and the rainbow of peace is spanning neither between Berlin and Paris, nor between Berlin and Munich.

For the Munich Cardinal’s reply letter is actually a refusal. It is essential, if one wants to understand things in their entire interrelationship, and trace the Chancellor’s intentions all the way to the innermost wrinkles of his statesmanlike heart, to distinguish between what the Chancellor wants to attain for the Reich, and what he wants to attain for its relationship with Bavaria. The meaning of Stresemann’s letter to Faulhaber is not apparent on the surface, and one is left to go by conjectures – albeit ones of high probability. According to those, the Chancellor, based on statements by the Cardinal about the current state of Germany, encouraged him to expound his thoughts about the moral renewal of the Volk as the basis of a political and social mission for Germany. If one considers this line of thought to be at the basis of Stresemann’s letter, as reflected in the Cardinal’s reply letter, then it yields the following:

The Cardinal is rejecting the Chancellor’s end-justifies-the-means proposal for sound reasons and based on concepts of Church law. This rejection is grounded in considerations that are rooted in the somewhat weakened physical constitution of the Cardinal since his trip to America and general overwork, together with his high position as a Prince of the Church. Apparently the Cardinal does not himself see that the way is opportune, since he as a clever man knows well that in the burning questions that await a solution, the purely political question of the decisive battle between Nationalism and Marxism stands before us, and that the current system, embodied yet in the rump cabinet of Stresemann, can only be rescued by means of his powerful word, because it is ripe for its downfall. But the Cardinal comes to the Chancellor in a realm that has been turned into a real battlefield.

The recent appeals of the Reich Government, like those of the parties in the previous coalition, express the need to gather all powers to rescue Reich and Volk. It is comprehensible from a human and party-political point of view, that for the authors of these appeals, the hopes for rescuing the Fatherland are bound up with their ardent wishes themselves to help, personally and party-politically, to bring salvation from the monstrous crisis. The realization has penetrated far into the masses of workers that Marxism has enslaved, taken away rights, robbed and devastated, in foreign and domestic policy, in the economy and cultural life, and that it must be replaced through outward-directed activity, inward-directed peace among Reich, States, interests and social classes, opportunity for work, bread for body and soul. It is the tragedy of Stresemann and the bourgeois parliamentary parties of the coalition, that they are still not able, even today, to recognize the necessity of this fundamental change, that they still continue to think that they themselves are able to rescue the situation, the system, by means of parliamentary twists and turns, powers without conviction, with tricks and treats. One after another they have tried everything, and we have experienced the amazing spectacle of the Red International and internationalist democrats even becoming nationalistic. Now they, these sworn anti-Christians, have resorted to religion, and the Cardinal of Munich, as the most outstanding exponent of the Catholic Church in Bavaria and the Reich, is supposed to exorcise the approaching storm. The once so abhorred mixing of religion and politics suddenly becomes a necessity of state. How times change.

The foregoing reflections would be incomplete for anyone who does not want to ignore the import of some of the especially significant things that should be seen as program points in the Cardinal’s letter. Dr. von Faulhaber turns against civil war, and he takes up the cause, even more pointedly than in his All Souls Day sermon that made such a stir, of the “Israelite fellow citizens” and other ethnic groups, with respect to which it still remains uncertain whether he means thereby Marxists, or the citizenry who are threatened by them in body and life. The Cardinal sharply raises yet three more challenges: The need for a revision of the Weimar Constitution in the interest of greater federalism, the preservation of the denominational school, and self-determination for Bavaria in the question of whether to have a monarchy.

Here the Cardinal’s distinctively Bavarian program is combined with the overall series of concepts that he develops for the avoidance of civil war and for bringing peace to the Reich, and here there are also total and halfway contradictions. The Jewish question is closely bound up with solving the problem of Marxism, and solving it radically and decisively in the sense of an overall purification of the Reich from those dangerous elements from the East that plunder our country and Volk; this is one of the first priorities for reestablishing our mission. The Cardinal’s letter says here only what should not be allowed, but not what must surely be done according to the Cardinal’s conviction expressed in previous talks. In the domestic and cultural-political program, the majority of the Bavarian Volk, including those who stand outside parliamentary circles and have grown powerful , want to combine decisive forces for the formation of the will of the Volk with this concept of an active federalism; in that regard, however, it must be emphasized to the utmost that the nationalist circles in Bavaria that are unbound to political parties and have nothing to do with the parliamentary blundering and bungling under the Weimar Constitution, want to build rather from the ground up. The advocacy for a Bavarian monarchy is actually more a mental reservation for possible future development, than a postulate for the moment.

The Cardinal, in his reply to the Chancellor . . .

Matters are rushing to a resolution, and the way is open for those men who alone can save Germany!