

Appendix E - UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM
SENIOR PROJECT - APPROVAL

Name: Michael Livingston

College: Arts and Sciences Department: HISTORY

Faculty Mentor: Dr. Vejas Liutericius

PROJECT TITLE: _____

German Catholic Experience During the First World War;
a review of polemical rhetoric concerning German culture's relation to
Catholicism.

I have reviewed this completed senior honors thesis with this student and certify that it is a project commensurate with honors level undergraduate research in this field.

Signed: , Faculty Mentor

Date: Dec. 11, 2001

General Assessment - please provide a short paragraph that highlights the most significant features of the project.

Comments (Optional):

General Assessment

Michael Livingston's project, "German Catholic Experience During the First World War" examines the intersection of religion, politics, and war in original ways. Michael studied propaganda polemics of French and German writers to illuminate how German Catholics, as a minority in Imperial Germany, found themselves in the crossfire of a battle for public opinion during World War I. His insights into their situation are keen and original, and this well-written thesis could easily serve as the basis for further graduate study, such is its quality.



German Catholic Experience During the First World War
By Michael Livingston

As the First World War raged in Europe in April 1915, a group of French Catholic scholars and ecclesiastics published the book, *The German War and Catholicism*, under the direction of Monsignor Alfred Baudrillart. The book was comprised of a series of essays and was intended for the Catholics of neutral countries. *The German War and Catholicism*, in short, accuses German culture of being anti-Catholic and even anti-Christian. Due to its alleged un-Christian character and the barbaric methods of warfare with which it is accused of practicing, the German war effort is said to be a war against Catholicism and all of Christianity. Thus did the French Catholics hope to win neutral support for their country's war effort.

These accusations were especially difficult for German Catholics. From its inception as a modern nation-state in 1871, Germany had never been a very welcoming place for Catholics. The so-called *Kulturkampf*, which started in 1871 as well, was an attack on the rights and practices of Catholics in Germany. Though it ended a decade after it started, as of 1914 Catholics still did not enjoy equal status with their Protestant brothers and sisters. With the declaration of Papal Infallibility (1871) and the consequent international authority of the Roman Catholic Church, German Catholics were at pains to prove themselves as both Catholics and Germans without the two compromising one another.

Thus, a book such as that published by Baudrillart and his compatriots was a heavy cross to bear. Could devout Catholics around the world accept the French proposition that "Germanism"—German culture and philosophy in general—was anathema to Catholicism and even all Christianity, without also criticizing the faith of a

fellow Catholic, who happened to be German? This paper will examine two German publications that attempt to defend the German Catholic position. These are: *German Culture Catholicism and the World War* (1916), a series of essays published by George Pfeilschifter, and *The German War and Catholicism*.^[sic] *A German Defense Against French Attacks* (1915) by A.J. Rosenberg. Both of these works were published in the U.S., as was the aforementioned French work in an effort to affect neutral opinion.

This paper will focus on two main claims of the French work and their rebuttals by the German scholars. The first was that the practice of German warfare was barbaric in that it held no regard for sacred buildings, priests and nuns, or non-combatants. Related to this also was the German invasion of Belgium. The second French attack was that German philosophy is anti-Christian at its root, particularly the philosophy of Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Nietzsche—and the war was due in large part to the negative influence of this philosophical tradition. The paper will also discuss German politics very briefly and will do so in a manner that will help draw out a similar conclusion as the rest of the discussion. What this paper aims for is an understanding of simply how German Catholics during this time conceived of themselves as both German and Catholic. The paper will also argue that much of the impetus behind the French propaganda was a desire to restore the role of the Catholic Church in France. However, as the German works will show, German Catholics viewed Catholicism as a viable and separate force with German society and culture. As this paper will focus on the rhetoric used by both sides, it should be noted that the issue of the actual atrocities themselves and the validity of these accusations is not of concern here. A recently published work by

John Horne and Alan Kramer explores these issues.¹ However, the conclusions that this paper arrives at will be primarily drawn from the rhetoric.

Baudrillart's book accepts the initial premise that Germany is waging an unjust war. The most glaring of Germany's offenses was the invasion of Belgium, in 1914. A neutral country, small and practically undefended, in comparison with the strength of the German army, Belgium looked like easy prey to the Germans. However, the German authors protest Belgium's rosy-cheeked innocence by accusing Belgium of having collaborated against Germany with France and England. Furthermore, they question the validity of Belgium's territorial inviolability.

Rosenberg claims that, in 1906, Belgium authorities with the British military planned a series of landings of British troops on French soil. These operations were practice for planned maneuvers against Germany. French maps were drawn up in accordance with these plans which were allegedly discovered among "Belgian secret documents."² These were purported to be plans for an intended Anglo-French invasion through Belgium and not just insurance against the potentiality of a German invasion. Otherwise—so the argument—Germany would have been informed of the plans. Thus, "Belgium had altogether surrendered herself into England's hands"³ and could no longer be properly referred to as neutral.

Even so could this be compared to a German invasion through a Belgium that was unwilling to help with the German cause as it was with the British? To the casual observer, there does seem to be a difference between one nation formulating a secret

¹ John Horne and Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial* (Yale UP, 2001).

² A.J. Rosenberg, *The German War and Catholicism. A German Defense Against French Attacks* (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1915) 34.

³ Ibid.

alliance with Belgium and another simply overpowering it. However, the Germans accused England of plotting to land troops regardless of Belgium's approval, according to the same secret documents.

According to this book, Belgium helped the British military develop plans for maneuvers against Germany. When French troops first mobilized on 27 July, 1914, the Belgian government informed the British of its intention to help transport French troops. The government also allowed French troops to move to and fro over its western border.⁴

The Germans complained that these incidents should be considered violations of Belgian neutrality. Seeing as how the government assisted the English and French militaries in regards to potential hostilities against Germany, it opened itself up to the potential for invasion. To the modern ear, the German argument does not hold up: Belgium is a sovereign nation and should be allowed to decide alliances as it sees fit. Such preferences do not compromise a state's fundamental right to existence and inviolability. However, in a world still very much in the grip of nineteenth century thinking, this logic had some appeal. Europe was becoming democratic, but it had not shed all the vestiges of monarchy, and this is true of diplomacy in particular. A nation's sovereignty was more a matter of political consensus or of social construction than one of fundamental reality. Nationalism and the idea of a people's right to determine itself had still not extirpated the power of monarchy. Land and people in the rest of the world were carved up and subjected to European domination. In European diplomacy, rights of states did not really exist fundamentally; they only existed as the fabrications of diplomacy.

⁴ Ibid., 34-5.

In consideration of Belgian neutrality, Rosenberg contends that the Kingdom of the Netherlands was a creation of the Congress of Vienna in 1815. Revolution in 1830 made Belgium independent and the Great Powers then forced neutrality upon it. The Netherlands was formed as a bulwark against a feared French expansion. Regardless of whether or not Belgium had the right to independence, in the light of the treaty, its independence existed solely as an expedient to the more powerful European states. The original treaty of 1815 was said to affirm Belgian inviolability and integrity, while the more recent or “authoritative” one does not. A Belgian professor of Constitutional Law, Ernest Nys, is even cited as saying that “in reality, Belgium obtained a guaranty [sic] of neutrality, but the five Powers did not guarantee her territorial integrity and inviolability. At first they gave the last mentioned guaranty [sic], but later on withdrew it.”⁵ Dr. Nys also claims that Belgium’s granted independence only granted sovereignty, which does not necessarily include territorial integrity. Rosenberg also argues that the German invasion may have violated the idea of neutrality in general, but not a *specific Belgian neutrality*.⁶

The French scholars and ecclesiastics accuse Germany of regarding the treaty, which granted Belgian neutrality, as no more than a “scrap of paper”. They say that, according to German morality, ‘might makes right’. Indeed, this seems to be the case; in Rosenberg’s book, a speech from the Imperial Chancellor, Bethmann Hollweg, is quoted which supports this view. The Chancellor admits that the Belgian invasion does in fact violate international law, but, he says, “necessity knows no law.”⁷ It is odd that Rosenberg would include such a quote, which seems to support the French argument.

⁵ Ibid., 34-5.

⁶ Ibid., 34.

⁷ Ibid., 37.

The Chancellor's justification for the invasion seemed to be rooted more in tactical considerations than in any sort of moral principle. If the French were to attack first and strike at the German's flank along the Rhine it would be devastating to the German chances of survival. Therefore, according to Rosenberg, the invasion was justified. However, the Chancellor did acknowledge that there was something unjust about the invasion and expressed hope that this wrong could be redressed after the war. So, it was not really a matter of Germany defining her own sense of right and wrong through power. There is something wrong with the invasion, but at the same time, Belgian neutrality only existed as an agreement between the Great Powers. Insofar as France and Britain violated this agreement, the treaty guaranteeing Belgian neutrality was no more than a 'scrap of paper'.

The French also accused the Germans of waging a war that was patently evil in its very practice. They were blamed for attacking church buildings⁸ and priests intentionally, as well as for acts of violence against non-combatants. After witnessing the war on the eastern front, the Bishop of Nancy (a Frenchman) was quoted in a pastoral letter as saying " 'This war...leads , by a fatal slope, by its necessary conclusions, to the destruction of the Catholic Church, of its authority, and of its doctrines, and thus the destruction of all religion' ."⁹ A Dutch Protestant pamphleteer, identified only as Mr. Grondijs, confirmed that this nature of the war was the responsibility of the Germans, because they purposefully sent Protestant regiments to the western front of the war, while Catholic soldiers were deployed in the east against the Orthodox soldiers from Russia.

⁸ When referring to objects and ideas of a religious nature, these references will be those of the Catholic faith unless otherwise specified.

⁹ François Veuillot, "The War Against the Churches and the Priests," *The German War and Catholicism*, ed. Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1915) 97.

First, the Germans were accused of purposefully destroying churches out of hatred for the Catholic Church and were thus guilty of violating the Hague conventions on warfare in that they bombarded and destroyed sacred buildings. In his article “The War Against the Churches”, Francois Veuillot quotes the Hague rules: “ ‘During bombardments, prescribes article 27 of the Hague regulation, all necessary measures should be taken to spare as much as possible the buildings consecrated to religion...[sic] on condition that they are not being used at the same time for military ends’ .”¹⁰ According to Veuillot, hundreds of churches have been “ ‘systematically’ ”¹¹ destroyed by the Germans in Belgium and occupied France. German artillery was, in fact, directed mainly at the churches as they were the first things targeted whenever the Germans begin to bombard a town or village. “I have many times had occasion to show that, if the projectiles of the Germans fell so frequently upon churches, this was no unhappy chance, but the result of a prearranged system or faction.”¹² The bishops of Verdun, Arras and Soissons all affirmed this accusation. The desire to destroy sacred buildings was not just a mild predilection; it was said to be a mad thirst. Even when churches were converted into hospitals and adorned with the symbol of the Red Cross, the German artillery rained down as before. It also seemed that the Germans sought out feast days and times of Mass to fire on churches. “At Pont-a-Mousson, the 45th bombardment suffered by the population of this undefended town took place during the vespers of All Saints’ Day when the church was inundated with shrapnel.”¹³ Elsewhere, the Cathedral at Arras was attacked on the eve of the feast of the Theotokos. From the French evidence, it would

¹⁰ Ibid., 100.

¹¹ Ibid., 103.

¹² Ibid., 114.

¹³ Ibid., 115.

seem obvious that the Germans hated Catholicism. The destruction of churches was a goal, not just an unavoidable consequence of war; therefore, the Germans were driven to attack even those churches converted into hospitals. And the belief that churches were targeted especially during Mass times seemed to suggest that the Germans wanted to target these buildings specifically in their role as houses of Catholic worship—their hostility was directed at Catholicism itself.

The Cathedral at Rheims is referenced as a particularly difficult blow to the Catholic esteem. “I will not try to translate the poignant and infinitely sad and deep emotion that oppressed the hearts of the French when, on Sunday the 20th of September, the official report announced that this patrimony of the great family was in flames.”¹⁴ The Germans, in retreat after their defeat on the Marne, were forced out of Rheims, but in apparent vengeance for their loss, took out their suffering on the great cathedral on the 17th-19th of September as they retreated, taking direct aim at the cathedral in order to destroy it. Even though the flag of the Red Cross was raised over the cathedral and even though wounded German soldiers lay there, the German military continued to wreck havoc on the church, desirous of its destruction. Even in the weeks after the German retreat, whenever the army came in sight of Rheims, it sought out the cathedral as a victim for its shells.

The French stressed the German attack on the Cathedral at Rheims, because they claim that it served no military advantage. It was only attacked out of vengeance, because it was such a prominent symbol of the Catholic faith and culture with which France is so deeply intertwined. Professor Paul Clement, who upon reporting for the German government, said “ ‘this unseasonable cult for monuments seems an

¹⁴ Ibid., 105.

extraordinary piece of sentimentality and an anachronism at an hour when the question is one not simply of a limited duel, but of “to be or not to be,” of our whole national existence, of the victory or the fall of German thought in the world’.”¹⁵ The German writer Görres was also quoted one hundred years ago as saying that the Germans should seek to destroy the Cathedral as it was where Clovis had been crowned king of the Franks.¹⁶ The following verses were also quoted from the *Lokal Anzeiger*, a Berlin periodical:

The bells sound no more
In the two-towered dome,
Finished is the benediction...
We have closed with lead
O Rheims, thy house of idolatry!¹⁷

While artillery fire may have been inaccurate enough that the bombardment of churches was unavoidable, Veuillot maintains that the Germans used incendiaries on church buildings on purpose, which could only have been used for their wanton destruction. He lists Louvain, the prominent seminary, along with the churches of Saint-Pierre, Revigny, Mandray, and Villers-aux-Vents, as all having been burned intentionally.¹⁸

Alongside the bombardment and the incendiaries, German Zeppelins and planes also directly attacked churches from the air. The Bishop of Verdun is quoted as saying that the Cathedral at Verdun was the object of deliberate attack from German planes on at

¹⁵ Ibid., 104.

¹⁶ Ibid., 142.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid., 116.

least two occasions.¹⁹ Even though potential attacks by German planes on French and Belgian churches could only have made up a tiny minority of sacred buildings destroyed by the Germans, such attacks would have seemed to support the French claim that churches were fired on deliberately.

As well as destroying and burning churches, German soldiers were also accused of committing gross sacrilegious acts. At a church in Clermont, soldiers were supposed to have played and danced to the church organ while the city burned, before setting fire to the church itself. At Montmacq Germans “ ‘sullied with their excrement the holy water stoup and used the altar-linen as towels’.”²⁰ In another area, they dressed up in the robes of monks in order to amuse themselves, and at several churches, soldiers are accused of having specifically sought out religious statues and relics to destroy.²¹ It is as if anything of a Catholic—nature was ravaged and for no obvious military reasons other than out of pure hatred.

In reply to this, in his article “Art and Sacred Buildings in the War,” Dr. Joseph Sauer complains that the acts of individuals were ascribed to the entire German army, and then, by a “clever trick of dialectic legerdemain,” the whole German people was laid to blame for these atrocities.²² Sauer decries that French Catholics accused the entire German nation of religious hatred, an irony on the part of the French “whose wanton destruction of works of art in prosperous German provinces at a time, which France even now regards as its most brilliant period, is not yet forgotten.”²³ He refers, of course, to

¹⁹ Ibid., 116-7.

²⁰ Ibid., 118.

²¹ Ibid., 118-20.

²² Dr. Joseph Sauer, “Art and Sacred Buildings in the War,” *German Culture Catholicism and the World War*, ed. George Pfeilschifter (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1916) 162.

²³ Ibid., 164.

the Napoleonic era and the ruler whose military success attempted to spread the anti-clericalism of the Revolution to the rest of Europe.

To begin with, Sauer charges the French with simply quoting inaccurate facts. Reports of destruction were widely exaggerated. To the French claim that the writer Görres had cited the destruction of the Cathedral at Rheims as a patriotic duty, because it was the church where Clovis was crowned, Sauer responds that the German historian Finke has searched through the archives of Görres' writings and could find no such mention.²⁴

He also accuses the French writers of assuming the worst motives in the German destruction of sacred buildings. The fact that bombardment of an area stopped after a church steeple had been brought down does not necessarily mean that the German army was firing with the sole purpose of bringing down a church. Instead this suggested to Sauer that there must have been some military purpose in bringing down such objects (a military purpose that would not be alien to the French, who brought down the church steeple in the village Petite-Fosse) because they suspected that a nest of machine guns was present. The French destroyed the monastery at Oelenberg as well, and the church and the steeple were the first to receive fire. Sauer asks whether or not these incidents had been noticed by Baudrillart and his cohorts "and whether they intend writing books about it for the benefit of the neutrals."²⁵ Even the Cathedral at Rheims was believed to be used for military use. German military headquarters reported on the 22nd of September and on the 24th of October, 1914, that its towers were in use by the French

²⁴ Ibid., 166.

²⁵ Ibid., 168.

army.²⁶ The fact was simply that both French and German armies were guilty to some degree of destroying sacred buildings and artifacts, but why should it be assumed that the German army destroyed sacred buildings simply because they were sacred? “*Are ecclesiastical edifices under all conditions inviolable in war?*”²⁷ Is it not a regrettable fact of war that such destruction will take place? Sauer quotes an English artillery officer from the *Times*:

The bombardment of church steeples and other towering edifices is inevitable, and it is absurd to complain of the destruction of tall buildings, whether they be city halls, churches or factories. We fire on them, just as the Germans. Officers of both parties use them as posts of observation. At present it is thus in France; later the same thing may happen to the Dome of Cologne. It would be wiser to stop these loud lamentations lest, in the later event, we be regarded as hypocrites.²⁸

Indeed, Germans purported to have found British military manuals that declare church towers to be especially useful as observation posts.²⁹

As both sides appear to have been equally guilty of demolishing sacred buildings, Sauer looks to the Hague conventions of warfare, in order to better answer French critics as to whether or not the German army incurred another level of guilt. He quotes from the Regulations of Warfare on Land as saying that sacred buildings and institutions should be

²⁶ Ibid., 192.

²⁷ Ibid., 169.

²⁸ Ibid., 170-1.

²⁹ Rosenberg, 48..

spared “*provided that they are not simultaneously used for military ends.*”³⁰ The fate then of such buildings and works of art actually lay in the hands of the enemies, not the Germans. Since absolute safety was impossible in times of war, it was up to the besieged to position himself away from such areas and to refrain from using steeples as military vantage points. It was impossible to spare churches and other cultural monuments when they were being used as military vantage points, and therefore their existence threatened the lives of one’s soldiers.

This belief that churches were only destroyed if they served a military purpose and not out of some kind of religious hatred, was further buoyed by the fact that, in several areas, churches were spared. Veuillot maintains that in the dioceses of Verdun, Nancy, and St. Dié, several churches were destroyed or maimed. However, Sauer points out that, in the same district, several churches were not harmed at all or only slightly: Croix-aux-Mines, Bru, St. Léonard, St. Dié, and Coinches were just a few of these churches. If the Germans had such a bloodlust for their destruction, why would the army not have fired on these churches? Rosenberg also points out that the Germans would not have left so many churches untouched in Brussels and Antwerp as well as in other areas if they had sought such a “systematic” destruction of churches.³¹

However, it is not just against buildings that the Germans were alleged to be waging their war, but also against priests and religious as well. The Dutchman Grondijis also recorded German soldiers proclaiming the death of Catholicism and its priests as they “were being dragged into captivity.”³² One priest reports being approached by German soldiers, apparently during a Mass, and having a revolver shoved under his nose

³⁰ Sauer, 171.

³¹ Rosenberg, 48.

³² Veuillot, 121.

as the soldiers grasped the consecrated host away from him and threw it to the ground. Germans pick out priests from the ranks of war prisoners in order to torture them specifically; in fact, priests were preferable over others to be taken hostage in the first place. “The Bishop of Verdun declares that among his priests forty have been dragged away to prisons in Germany.”³³

Veillot also gives reports of priests being assassinated—“I employ the right word—by German soldiers, acting on the orders of their chiefs.”³⁴ Cardinal Mercier of the archdiocese of Malines claimed that 13 of his priests were killed; the Bishop of Nancy published a list of nine priests who were killed by the Germans. Veillot makes the stringent accusations that these were not just priests killed as the result of the war or imprisonment, but were killed brutally by the Germans. “I have pronounced the word assassination. By what other expression can one qualify these brutal and arbitrary executions, ordered many times without any trial by the hateful or capricious will of a chief, often accomplished without the shadow of a pretext?”³⁵ Veillot mentions cases of priests massacred with their parishioners, lay brothers pulled out of the kitchen while preparing a meal in order to be shot with fellow friars, and another priest who was tied to a cannon in use; afterwards he was dragged along the ground by his feet. Another priest was taken prisoner and when he did not walk fast enough, he was tied to a horse, which dragged him alongside at a gallop; afterwards he was simply shot. These are all crimes of hatred, not military necessity. Sometimes the death of a priest was not enough for the Germans to indulge their hatred of Catholicism: the Curé of Surice, laying dead on the

³³ Ibid., 120-4.

³⁴ Ibid., 133.

³⁵ Ibid., 134.

battlefield, was pummeled with rifle butts by German soldiers until his face was horribly disfigured.³⁶

Aside from all of this, the list goes on. Several nuns were reported to have been “outraged” or raped.³⁷ Even the notebooks of the German soldiers were said to be filled with hateful and outrageous comments about priests, proving that the average German hates the Roman collar. Veuillot quotes one such entry from a Frank Schmidt:

Whilst they drink...they keep their people in ignorance, they forbid them to read and write; from eight years old the children must work; prostitution is widely spread, brothers and sisters live as husband and wife, and further, the women prostitute themselves. The woman enjoys all the rights; the man can say nothing. And yet, these people are not so cruel as one says. They are simply obedient to the priests.³⁸

The accusations of cruelty against priests were also part of the larger French accusation that the German army unjustly took its hostility out on non-combatants as well. The French argued that the Germans had no right to kill civilians indiscriminately. Some civilians were known to have attacked the German army unsuspectingly, and to this the French say it was entirely appropriate to execute such civilians, because “it is the right of war.”³⁹ However, to randomly select the inhabitants of a town and then subject them to torture or death in reprisal for the crimes of a few is wrong. Veuillot says that there was no excuse for such acts, only an explanation. That explanation, to the French,

³⁶ Ibid., 136-7.

³⁷ Ibid., 138-41.

³⁸ Ibid., 122).

³⁹ Ibid., 156.

of course, lay in the belief that Germany is an antichristian and barbarous nation where 'might makes right'.⁴⁰

What then of the French charges, that the Germans targeted, harassed and assassinated priests, and also that the German army murdered and tortured non-combatants, sometimes these being purely innocent?

Rosenberg points out that the means to obtain such evidence against the Germans are not very trustworthy. Citizens were asked to report atrocities, but normally such reports are not checked for credibility. For example, the Belgian press reported that in Sempst, the drayman David Jordens was tortured by several German soldiers and was forced to watch as they tortured and then killed his thirteen-year-old daughter, bayoneted his nine-year-old son and shot his wife. Rosenberg reports that on April 4, 1915, the Municipal Clerk, Paul von Boeckhout, was examined under oath at Sempst and testified that there was no known drayman by the name of David Jordens and that no child under the age of fourteen had been killed in that town during the war. Rosenberg also points out that Professor Bédler, who interpreted several German war diaries for use in Veuillot's article, is a highly unreliable source. Several professors denounce his scholarship, including a former colleague of his at the University of Freiburg, H Grimme. He is quoted as saying that Bédler "'twists and distorts the plainest sentences of the originals until they seem to him to fit in with the tissue of his and his people's slanderous charges against Germany'."⁴¹

What about the innocents killed? It is interesting to see the German reaction to these alleged atrocities. Rosenberg does not deny that such things actually happen, but he

⁴⁰ Ibid., 155-6.

⁴¹ Rosenberg, 47

maintains that the Germans cannot be alone help responsible for atrocities. Instead it is the very nature of the war that all sides are involved with which produces so many deaths. "It would be absurd to deny that the furies of war never demanded innocent victims."⁴² Rosenberg mentions a French author named Bédler who claims that, even though war can be horrible, the French are innocent of ever waging such a war: "'Never has France, mother of arts, arms and laws, been engaged in such a war nor will she ever be'."⁴³ Vile acts do occur, and innocent people die, but such is inevitable in war. Rosenberg does praise the German army for being the best disciplined over any other army in the world, but still, he says, there will be transgressions of the moral law, even in such a highly trained and controlled group of men.⁴⁴

One is reminded of the Rolling Stones 1969 concert at the Altamont Speedway in California. The Rolling Stones staged a free concert with a host of other bands; concert promoters were anxious about the event, because it was feared the free concert would attract over 100,000 people, and indeed it did (300,000, in fact). However, the hippie-era Rolling Stones were eager to prove a point: that a group of thousands could act rationally and responsibly without anyone getting hurt. Of course, the experiment was a failure and violence broke out numerous times. In the end one man was killed. The event has since been cited as the end of the "hippie era." If a group of young people espousing love, peace and toleration can be prone to violence in a large group setting, then it seems natural that a few hundred thousand soldiers in wartime will no doubt have the same experience, only exponentially greater.

⁴² Ibid., 44.

⁴³ Ibid., 44.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 44.

In response to the alleged outrages perpetrated against nuns, Rosenberg writes that the German Governor-General of Belgium wrote to all of the Belgium bishops, asking them to verify such claims. Bishops from Liège, Namur, Ghent and Bruges all deny that any outrages had taken place in their dioceses, and the Archbishop of Malines and the Vicar Capitular of the bishopric of Tournay could not give any conclusive evidence for any such outrages.⁴⁵

The Germans do, however, lay much of the blame for the nature of the war on the Allied forces and they say that the Belgians in particular waged a franc-tireur war on the Germans. Rosenberg says that German soldiers do not wage war against innocents, but that they “would have to sacrifice themselves if they wished to spare the civilian population which offends against international law and raises arms against them.”⁴⁶ Rosenberg relates the death toll of 26 priests in the diocese of Namur and says that it is still unknown whether or not these men participated as franc-tireurs, but he says that franc-tireur warfare is a fact and it cannot be denied that some priests have participated in it.

It was by this type of warfare that the Germans claim they were forced into harsh practices during the war.

“When the German army marched into Belgium, they thought that they were fighting against the armed forces of the enemy. But the bullets that came flying from hedge and bush,

⁴⁵ Ibid., 48.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 48.

from churches and church-towers, taught our soldiers that in many parts of Belgium there was no peaceful population.”⁴⁷

The 23rd Article of the Hague convention prohibits non-combatants from killing or wounding “‘individuals belonging to the hostile nation or army’.”⁴⁸ Yet, in an exhaustive series of appendixes, the Belgian citizenry are accused of attacking German troops in several places such as Liège, Luxemburg, Namur, Hainault, Brabant, and East and West Flanders. In some cases the Germans “were received with a semblance of friendliness by the Belgian civilian population, only to be attacked with arms at nightfall or at other opportune moments.”⁴⁹

There are several reports of specific incidents of this “franc-tireur” warfare; for example, on 21 August, 1914, a German Field Company reported being fired upon by civilian sharpshooters in the town of Dinant.⁵⁰ However, it is not necessary to give an account of every incident. What matters is that the German army claims to have a legitimate reason for its behavior in warfare. Civilians were killed but only because the Germans perceived there to be a real threat originating from this segment of the population. Priests were killed as well; none of the German authors deny this at all, but this was only done when the priests were thought to be guilty of some offense, and not because Germans hate Catholics. Mistakes were made and confessed. Rosenberg reports that a priest of the commune of St. Pierre was shot. The French had used the towers of the commune as a machine gun nest, and the priest was assumed responsible. Only later was it realised that he had nothing to do with the decision to use the church steeple for

⁴⁷ Ibid., 49.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 52.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 52.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 59.

military means⁵¹. His death was a tragic mistake, but it was not motivated by hate. However, Rosenberg relates that some incidents of priests being executed were warranted. He also relates an incident in which a priest in Louvain lured German soldiers into the line of franc-tireur fire. A priest at Etalle is reported to have fired on German soldiers from inside a home.⁵²

Whether or not the claims of the French or the Germans are true, and at times they are obviously and comically exaggerated, it remains that the Germans at the very least have some semblance of a claim as to why innocents and priests were killed. Even if these reasons are not valid enough to justify their actions, they at least show that the actions of the German army do not arise from a special hatred of Catholicism.

However, the French argument did not just lie in the actions of individuals or even a mass of people at a particular time in history; German culture and philosophy as a whole was said to encourage and promote such evil as the war perpetuated. What of these larger French claims, that “Germany is the theoretical and practical enemy of Catholicism, even of all Christianity”?⁵³ The claims that Germany is waging an unjust war and doing it in a murderous fashion are minor compared to the greater charge that German culture is inherently incapable of a correct war, because it is flagrantly anti-Christian. In his article “The Christian Laws of Warfare”, Bernard Gaudeau says:

Modern German thought suppresses even the notion of justice and morality, for the moral law is nothing, if it is not objective and absolute, and German thought admits nothing objective or absolute...the German Ego recognizes none above

⁵¹ Ibid., 63-4.

⁵² Ibid., 67-9.

⁵³ Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, *The German War and Catholicism* (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1915) 11.

itself in the world, no absolute and objective nor religious, moral or judicial rule.”⁵⁴

Immanuel Kant is blamed for separating “Right from Morality.”⁵⁵ Even if Germans still use the words God, Christianity and religion, these are only a façade. The only God that the Emperor invokes when he uses the name “God” is the German Ego—“Germany deified.”⁵⁶ This, of course, is why the Germans can so easily forego the normal laws of just warfare, which are based on Christian ethics, since the German conception of right and wrong should be the most prevalent in their eyes. In January 1903, a Reichstag deputy is quoted as saying “‘Germany should be the moral conscience of the world’.”⁵⁷ Gaudeau laments that Kantian philosophical concepts have already gained ascendancy at most universities in Europe, and fears the result if Germany were to win the war; therefore, the real stake of the war is not just political, but “the reign of God in souls, because it is the restoration or the ruin of the Absolute in human intelligence.”⁵⁸

Georges Goyau accuses Germany of launching two wars on Catholicism. One was in 1871 when Bismarck attempted to weaken the Catholic Church in Germany. Dubbed the *Kulturkampf*, Goyau takes pains to point this out—that Catholicism was considered to be anathema to German culture. He even accuses Germany of trying to export the *Kulturkampf* to France and Belgium. The second war against Catholicism was begun in 1914, the present war, and was again conducted “under the standard of German ‘culture’.”⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Bernard. Gaudeau, “The Christian Laws of Warfare,” *The German War and Catholicism*, ed. Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1915) 37.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 38.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 48.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 38.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 42-3.

⁵⁹ Georges Goyau, “German ‘Culture’ and Catholicism,” *The German War and Catholicism*, ed. Mgr.

Why this war against Catholicism and Catholic culture? First of all, Goyau claims that Protestantism is equivalent to Germanism. To support this he cites the *General Evangelical Lutheran Gazette of Leipzig* in 1871, which stated that Protestant nationalities were dominant in Europe. He also says that this belief is popular among most Protestant pastors. Aside from these, he also finds support in the German sponsorship of Lutheran churches, which were erected in Rome and Jerusalem in the nineteenth century. The Emperor William II himself inaugurated the latter. He accuses Germany of having long pursued the Protestantization of Austria. Supposedly in the last several years, Germany had encouraged Austrians to separate themselves from the Roman church, and the Emperor gladly announced in 1903 the conversion of some 20,000 Austrians to the Protestant Church. Goyau, however, urges a word of caution. Protestant or not, Germans should not be regarded as very Christian, and the desire to spread the Protestant faith and undermine Catholicism is only secondary to an ulterior motive to spread “a creed of Germanic origin...behind their assumed and displayed anticlericalism, an anti-Christianity either conscious or unconscious, proclaimed or unconfessed, can be detected.”⁶⁰

German thought blurs the distinction between right and wrong. As Goyau reads Hegel, the German State represents the Good; therefore, anything committed for its sake, whether good or evil, is permissible.⁶¹ Kantian doctrine denies “the axioms of a transcendental morality”⁶²; pure reason is discarded for practical reason, which Goyau basically equates with an arbitrary will using its rationality to achieve its own self-

Alfred Baudrillart (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1915) 48-9.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 49-56.

⁶¹ Ibid., 57.

⁶² Ibid., 58.

defined goals. Hence, the belief that Germany's desire to expand justified whatever means necessary in the war in order to be victorious.

If German thinking is so patently anti-Christian, what is it then that Germans refer to when they speak of God? Goyau claims that philosophers have come to identify God with the German pagan pantheon: Wotan, Odin, and Thor, to name a few. Indeed, since Germany is the highest good and "God is at the service of Germany and...[not] at the service of any other...it was quite natural that some imaginations more given to enthusiasm than to belief should go back...to the old paganism of Germany, and fall in love with those fables engendered at the dawn of civilization by Germanic imagination"⁶³

In "The French and the German Kulturkampf in their Causes and Effects", Dr. Hermann Platz dismantles the claim that the French *Kulturkampf* was merely an import from Germany. The German attack on the Catholic Church was the work of one man, Otto von Bismarck, while the one still continuing in France was supposedly the result of many people involved in the secular cult of freemasonry. The French attack on religion has a tradition that extends to the Revolution and still continues to today, while in Germany it was just an isolated affair, the effects of which were being repaired.⁶⁴

Dr. Heinrich Schrörs comes down very harshly on Goyau. First of all, he references Goyau's own published history of the *Kulturkampf*, published two years prior, in which Goyau did not agree with the assertion that Germany was an Evangelical Empire. This is a marked contrast to his article in Baudrillart's book, in which Germany and the Protestant faith are portrayed as being as indistinguishable as Rosencranz and

⁶³ Ibid., 59-61

⁶⁴ Hermann Platz, "The French and the German Kulturkampf in their Causes and Effects," *German Culture Catholicism and the World War*, ed. George Pfeilschifter (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1916) 257-67.

Guildenstern.⁶⁵ Dr. Francis Xavier takes this issue up even further in his article “Catholicism and Protestantism in Modern Germany.” Dr. Xavier quotes the Protestant theologian Harnack lamenting the lack of catholicity in the Protestant tradition and also praising the Augustinian influence in the Catholic Church, which had kept alive so well the spirit of St. Paul.⁶⁶ He quotes another Protestant theologian, R. Seeberg, encouraging other academics to investigate the worth of medieval Catholic scholastics such as St. Thomas Aquinas. A quote from a recent edition of “Neuen Kirchliche Zeitschrift”, has a Professor Dunkwald, saying, “Let us beware of scornfully branding Roman piety as anti-German. It would be sheer nonsense to suppose that that Protestant spirit is alone responsible for the victory of the Central Powers. This might have been asserted [before], but after the present war...will be impossible.”⁶⁷ In 1915, the influential Protestant periodical “Christliche Welt” even agreed with Catholic grievances over their imperfect integration into German society.⁶⁸

Also, in his former work, Goyau dismissed as “ ‘fabricators of history’ ” (according to Schrörs) those who claimed that the *Kulturkampf* was a struggle between the Germanic and Romanic cultures, a claim he now boldly makes himself. Furthermore, the claim is dismissed as absurd that the present world war is only a continuation of the *Kulturkampf* on the part of Germany. For Goyau knows that not every German state participated in the *Kulturkampf*; therefore, if the states of Württemberg and Bavaria did

⁶⁵ Heinrich Schrörs, “Is the War a War of Religion,” *German Culture Catholicism and the World War*, ed. George Pfeilschifter (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1916) 53-62.

⁶⁶ Francis Xavier, “Catholicism and Protestantism in Modern Germany,” *German Culture Catholicism and the World War*, ed. George Pfeilschifter (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1916) 286-9).

⁶⁷ Ibid., 291.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 297.

not enforce the policies of the *Kulturkampf*, why would their men fight in a war that was just a continuation of it?⁶⁹

Schrörs also downplays events such as the Baron Bunsen opening an Evangelical chapel in Rome in 1819, saying that since then several other nationalities have built Evangelical chapels in Rome.⁷⁰ Germany is hardly the sole supporter of the Protestant faith. Schrörs also refutes Goyau's claims that Emperor William made comments which were insulting to Catholics at the inauguration of a Lutheran church in Jerusalem. Goyau claims that his comments were meant to convey a sense of disappointment at how Catholics had represented Christianity in the Muslim world. Schrörs disagrees, saying that the Emperor made remarks that were praiseworthy of all Christians regardless of their denomination. The Emperor did speak on how the German Empire should exercise its growing influence in the Middle East to the benefit of Christianity, but he made the speech in Bethlehem, not Jerusalem. It ran thus:

Now, it is our turn. The *German Empire* and the German name have now *acquired an esteem in the Osman Empire* as never before. It is now our duty to show, what the Christian religion really is, how the practice of *Christian charity* even towards the Mohammedans is simply our duty, and we should exhibit it not so much *by dogmas and attempts at conversion as rather by example.*⁷¹

⁶⁹ Schrörs, 53-62.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 62.

⁷¹ Ibid., 63.

Schrörs argues that William was only addressing the “political influence of the German Empire” and its opportunity to express “universal Christian charity.” His remarks were not meant as a polemic against Catholicism as Goyau had claimed⁷².

Schrörs dismisses offhandedly Goyau’s claims that the Austrian “Away-from Rome” movement was inspired by Germany. He says that it was started in Germany “by two Viennese students and a political charlatan.”⁷³ However, Goyau gives no evidence that the movement was actually conceived or supported by the official German government.

Schrörs admits that there is a tradition of pantheism in German philosophy and that there are even those in Germany that actively promulgate its doctrines. However, the claim that pantheism dominates German culture is ludicrous, he says. German schools and social legislation are still based on Christian principles and the majority of the people, including the leaders, still consider themselves to be Christians. In the same manner that pantheism has its adherents in Germany, so to does logical positivism in France, where it even has some considerable degree of influence. He says that it is the “creed” of the freemasons, who are in turn a prominent force in politics. It is also a major influence on the educational system. Positivism is atheistic, he says, and it infects all of French culture: it is not just a marginalized viewpoint as Schrörs claims is the case with pantheism in Germany. “And if the war on the part of France is produced by its culture, then it is a war of atheistic naturalism. Let it be understood, we do not make this assertion; for we regard the war as a struggle for political and economic supremacy.”⁷⁴.

⁷² Ibid., 63.

⁷³ Ibid., 64.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 65-6.

Professor Franz Sawicki takes up the argument concerning German philosophy in his article “German Philosophy and the World War.” He acknowledges that the French accusation centers on the thinkers Kant, Hegel, and Nietzsche. Kant is blamed for separating right and morality and for stating “that the essence of right consists in its capacity to be enforced.”⁷⁵ Hegel is blamed for announcing “the inherent justice of accomplished facts.”⁷⁶ The French also bemoan German monism, but these three thinkers receive are singled out as the cause of Germany’s immorality.

Sawacki admits that these views do have adherents in Germany; however, this does not make Germany unique. For example, he cites the Italian Renaissance as a revolt against Christian morality that occurred well before Nietzsche. Whether the Italian Renaissance can be compared with Nietzsche in this regard or not, Sawacki’s point—that a rejection of Christian morality is not a novel, German idea—is valid. A turning away from Christian morals is bound up with modernism, and is something which all Western European states were experiencing⁷⁷.

Sawacki’s main argument, however, is that the French intellectuals writing for Baudrillard have basically misinterpreted German thinkers, particularly Kant. German philosophy does place much emphasis on the individual. For Kant, human dignity resides in the fact that each individual person is to be considered an end to himself, not as a means. However, Sawacki maintains that, if an individual is considered as such, this does not necessarily imply that an individual can invent his own morality to further his own desires, nor does it mean that an individual is not subject to some higher purpose.

⁷⁵ Franz Sawacki, “German Philosophy and the World War,” *German Culture Catholicism and the World War*, ed. George Pfeilschifter (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1916) 112.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 112.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 112.

Not only are higher purposes not denied, but the existence of a world of loftier aims and values, to which man's life ought to be devoted and consecrated, is explicitly maintained. The dignity of the human person is derived from the fact that it towers above the phenomena of sense and that it belongs to a spiritual world of ethical ideals. Not the ego in itself deserves to be exalted, but only in as much, as it sets before us the dignity of our nature, and is the bearer of sublime destinies and the organ of the ideas of the true, the good and the beautiful.⁷⁸

Autonomy in German philosophy does not refer to unrestricted action in the moral realm. Humanity is still subject to moral law, but finds freedom in a willing submission to it. Speaking about the autonomous, moral individual: "only an external law, arbitrarily imposed, is repudiated, not the law within his own breast."⁷⁹ This reminds one of St. Augustine's distinction between Jews and Christians in *On Christian Teaching*. According to Augustine, the Jewish people were only able to obey the literal law of God and so mistook the letter of the law for God's will. Thus they were unable to see Jesus as the Christ who represented the fulfillment of that law.⁸⁰ Or perhaps a better example of this can be found in the Scriptures themselves. In Matthew 5: 21-2, after giving the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus tells his disciples that formerly the law forbid them to kill "and whoever kills will be liable to judgment. But I say to you, whoever is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment."⁸¹ Far from just being subject to a moral law,

⁷⁸ Ibid., 114.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 115.

⁸⁰ St. Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, trans. R. P.H. Green (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

⁸¹ Donald Senior, Mary Ann Getty, Carrol Stuhlmueller, and John J. Collins, eds., *New American Bible*

according to these words, a Christian should be transformed interiorly, so that he becomes the type of person who not only does not sin, but he does not even want to sin. And according to Sawacki, this was precisely what German philosophy was concerned with—the “*harmonious fusion of liberty and law*.”⁸²

The Center Party in Germany is a good example of this type of Christian transformation—a “harmonious fusion of liberty and law.” At first the German Center party supported expansionist policies as much as any other group did in Germany.⁸³ However, war aims were not officially discussed at all. The government took this attitude mainly to support the *Burgfrieden* that had been in place at the beginning of the war, and on 28 August, 1914, the Secretary of State proscribed the nation’s newspapers from discussing war aims.⁸⁴ Catholics and the Center party were in a difficult position concerning the obscurity of war aims and their decision on how to support the government during the war. On the one hand, a negotiated peace was the best chance for political change in Germany, because conservatives viewed a gain in territory as a way of postponing any political or social changes.⁸⁵ For this reason it would have been to the advantage of the Catholics to support the idea of a defensive war as opposed to annexation. However, the Center Party also favored annexation, because this would bring more Catholics in to Germany, namely from Belgium and Luxemburg, but also from areas under Russian and Polish domination in the East. And it also cannot be

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

⁸² Sawacki, 116.

⁸³ Ellen Lovell Evans, *The German Center Party: 1870-1933—A Study in Political Catholicism* (US: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981) 204.

⁸⁴ David Welch, *Germany, Propaganda and Total War, 1914-1918* (London: The Athlone Press, 2000) 65-6.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

forgotten that Catholics needed to show their loyalty to the State and that this was more important for their own well being than it was for most other groups in Germany.

David Welch argues that “‘the spirit of 1914’ was a ‘platform’ upon which to build trust and cooperation. [The government] took it for granted, ignored genuine political and economic grievances and continued to exclude the Reichstag from decision making.”⁸⁶ Instead of utilizing the strength of the *Burgfrieden*, the government took advantage of it to such a degree that would cause many to lose faith in the German government. Most Catholics at the beginning of the war agreed wholeheartedly with why the government said it was going to war.⁸⁷ Many even supported the type of limited democracy in Germany at the time. For example, Dr. Goetz Briefs spelled out the reasons for why the German form of government is better and more Christian than the parliamentary style that nations like France and England were adopting in his article “State, Political Liberty and Militarism in Germany.”⁸⁸ Overall, German Catholics wanted to be loyal Germans and obey the State, but the fact that their government kept them at such arm’s length helped change that during the war.

One of the reasons why this changed is that the government’s war aims were constantly vague, and no one could say with any accuracy why Germany was fighting the war.⁸⁹ Germany’s actions, most notably the invasion of Belgium, were predicated on the notion of a short, defensive war⁹⁰, but as the war continued to drag onwards and the defensive nature of the war came into doubt, German Catholics came increasingly to

⁸⁶ Ibid., 256.

⁸⁷ Evans, 203.

⁸⁸ Goetz Briefs, “State, Political, Liberty and Militarism in Germany,” *German Culture Catholicism and the World War*, ed. George Pfeilschifter (St. Paul: Wanderer Printing Co., 1916) 339-62.

⁸⁹ Welch, 67

⁹⁰ Ibid., 255

support a peaceful resolution and a defensive posture over one advocating annexation⁹¹. Although parliamentary power was restricted during the war, this ensured the possibility of one man, Matthias Erzberger, gaining all the more influence because he had to seek out other avenues with which to influence the German war effort. It was he who operated a propaganda bureau and visited neutral countries. He became a confidant of the Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, established contacts with Catholics in neutral countries around the world, and acted as German ambassador to the papal nuncio. It was these contacts in Rome that led him to accept the pope's decision to support a negotiated peace.⁹²

This decision to support a negotiated peace reached a head on 6 July, 1916, when Erzberger made a speech in the Reichstag for the end of submarine warfare and the start of immediate peace talks. The speech was so powerful that it served as a "catalyst" the next day for an inter-party agreement to demand the "parliamentarization of Germany".⁹³ Thus, Catholic political participation in the *Burgfrieden* was fading.

My argument is that this is far different than the French rhetoric of the war portrays Catholic interests in France. *The German War and Catholicism* begins: "the Holy Spirit has said Curam habe de bono nomine, 'Take care of your good name'."⁹⁴ This sentence sums up much of the attitude of Baudrillart's book. Cardinal Amette also refers to France as the "eldest Daughter of the Church"⁹⁵ and much attention is paid throughout to this claim and others like it. Of these, the most notable is the article, "The

⁹¹ Ibid., 181.

⁹² Evans, 205-6.

⁹³ Welch, 191.

⁹⁴ His Eminence Cardinal Amette, Archbishop of Paris, "Letter," *The German War and Catholicism*, ed. Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1915) 5.

⁹⁵ Amette, 7.

Catholic Role of France in the World”, by “a Missionary” which details French missionary work as well as the immense number of saints that France has produced. A similar attitude is present in the German book. However, even though the German authors do display much arrogance at being German—there are several casual references to the German mind being more suitable than most to objective reasoning—there is little arrogance concerning Catholic identity. In other words the Germans do not make the same grandiose claims about Germany’s relation to the Church.

Most likely this was partially due to the fact that the Catholic position in France was much worse than that in Germany. The persecution of the Church by the State ever since the Revolution had consistently been more stringent than that experienced in Germany. Therefore, it seems likely that the Church in France viewed the war as an opportunity to reassert itself. However, this too was different than the situation in Germany. The French seemed to aspire to reclaiming France for Catholicism, while the Germans had no such goals for Germany.

National Catholicism gained much steam in France during the war, which was basically a belief that Catholicism was essential to the health of France.⁹⁶ It is also interesting to note that French Catholics were furious over Pope Benedict’s encyclical of November, 1914, because in it he declared neutrality and called for a peaceful settlement of the war. However, the Catholics in France wanted France to receive official recognition as the most important Catholic power involved.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ James F. McMillan, “French Catholics: Rumeurs Infâmes and the Union Sacrée, 1914-1918,” *Authority, Identity and the Social History of the Great War*, eds. Frans Coetzee and Marilyn Shevin-Coetzee (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1995) 116.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 118-20.

Annette Becker's book, *War and Faith: The Religious Imagination in France, 1914-1930*, discusses the religious revival in France and how it was related to the Catholic perception of the separation of Church and state. One interesting story that Becker details concerns the failed efforts of a young girl, Claire Ferchaud, to persuade President Poincaré to install the image of the Sacred Heart of Jesus on the national flag.⁹⁸

Without going into much detail about the French Catholic experience, as it is not of overall importance here, it is worth remarking that French Catholics at the time had a vested interest in restoring to the Church in France some of its former glory. I would suggest that such thinking, after a time, would tend to regard the Church as a cultural rather than a spiritual institution. An example of this worth mentioning is the fundamentalist Christian movement in North America. For fundamentalist Christians, US domestic policy is relentlessly scrutinized and demonized, while foreign policy, regardless of how flagrantly "anti-Christian" it may be, is almost always regarded as sacrosanct. This suggests that the fundamentalist desire for revival, to "put God back in America", is guided more by some cultural norm rather than any spiritual idea of the truth.

I do not think that this in any way describes the German Catholic experience, which had no aspirations for a Catholic Germany. Catholics simply wanted to be respected as practicing Catholics within the German Empire. However, when confronted with the charges laid down in Baudrillart's book, I would think that the principle challenge would be to reconcile one's German heritage with one's Catholic faith. Thus, the German response to accusations of war atrocities was sufficient to show that,

⁹⁸ Annette Becker, *War and Faith: The Religious Imagination in France, 1914-1930* (New York: Berg, 1998) 85-96.

regardless of the truth of the claims, any alleged atrocities could not be said to arise from an inherent flaw in German culture or thinking. Any atrocities resulted from military necessity, mass fervor or individuals, but not *Kultur*.

I think one of the more interesting ideas is Sawacki's defense of German individualism and idealism. That German thought exalts the Will and the Ego and makes the individual an end to herself is not necessarily anti-Catholic. However many doubts it raises, the union of liberty and law is a desire to see the realization of the Christian law and spirit and not just its imposition.

Christianity had for centuries in Europe taken the form of a political institution in which the monarchical ruler also had the approval of the Church. With the rise of modernism and secular nationalism, the role of the Church was challenged so that it had to assume a new form. The Church was forced to become international in order to contend with the nation-state for the allegiance of souls. At the same time, the transition from a divine, feudal monarchy to a secular, constitutional monarchy required a change in the believer as well. The individual could no longer rely on his role in society being a fulfillment of Christian law, and allegiance to a concrete, visible source of ecclesiastical authority was no longer as available. To the degree that the secular state was no longer Christian, the believer had to internalize Christian morals and assume some responsibility for them—since the government did not work to affect God's kingdom on earth, the individual had to do so.

The French Catholics, by pouring their energy into restoring the role of the French Catholic Church, were wasting their time, because the Church had evolved into a different form. With modernism, nationalism, and capitalism becoming more prevalent,

the Church demanded that individuals become capable of actualizing Christian morality in their own lives. I think that, to some degree, the Catholic Center party experienced this. At the start of and during the first half of the war, Catholics supported annexation even though this jeopardized chances for political change after the war. The Center party followed the government line, even supporting the hazy conception of the war being defensive in nature. However, as the government grew less and less willing to define war aims and limited the party's ability to participate, one man fell under the influence of the Pope and encouraged the rest of the Center party to sue for peace and work for a more powerful parliament in the government.