

Paul Silas Peterson

A third time, Erich Przywara, the Jews and *Stimmen der Zeit*: With a response to Aaron Pidel and a brief look into Przywara's late letters to Carl Schmitt

DOI 10.1515/znth-2017-0010

Abstract: In diesem Aufsatz werden die Veröffentlichungen des Jesuiten Erich Przywara und der sehr einflussreichen jesuitischen Zeitschrift *Stimmen der Zeit* aus den frühen 1930ern Jahren und besonders aus dem Jahr 1933 analysiert. In diesem Zusammenhang antworte ich auch meinen Kritikern. Außerdem werden die Hintergründe und Quellen der spezifischen Form des Antisemitismus dargestellt, die in den *Stimmen der Zeit* vertreten wurde. Deutsche Jesuiten propagierten 1933 durchaus radikale Positionen in der Zeitschrift. In dem katholischen Blatt liest man u. a., dass die Juden dem deutschen Volk mehr Schaden als Nutzen brächten. Es wurde damals auch die nordische Rasse als für Herrschaft besonders geeignet bezeichnet. Im letzten Teil dieses Aufsatzes werden Przywaras spätere Briefe an Carl Schmitt, den gläubigen antisemitischen deutschen Katholiken, analysiert. Sie zeigen, dass Przywara von dessen antidemokratischer politischer Theorie der 1930er Jahre zutiefst beeindruckt war und die Ideen des Kronjuristen des Dritten Reiches sogar noch in der Zeit nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg verbreiten wollte.

Keywords: Anti-Semitism, fascism, Jesuits, *Stimmen der Zeit*, Erich Przywara, Carl Schmitt, National Socialism

The following article addresses some publications in the 1930s from Erich Przywara – the author of “the Catholic *Cogito, ergo sum!*”¹ – and the German Jesuits’ *Stimmen der Zeit*, one of the most important Catholic journals that engaged the

¹ “Das katholische Cogito, ergo sum!” was placed on the first page of the 1932 edition of the *Analogia Entis*.

ideological conflicts in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s from a Catholic perspective. Here I build on previous research and revisit earlier interpretations, thereby providing some responses to my critics. Special attention is given to the anti-Semitic nature of the Jesuit journal in the early period of the Third Reich, as well as to the question regarding its ideological orientation in the context of post-World War I European fascism. It appears that the journal tried to build bridges to the more moderate wing of National Socialism without losing its Roman Catholic orientation. In the final part of this article, Przywara's later letters to Carl Schmitt are analyzed.² Some of those matters that were treated only briefly in previous publications will also be expanded upon below. In the following article I will also respond to Aaron Pidel's (Notre Dame University) claim that I have advanced "wrongheaded conclusions" regarding Przywara's anti-Semitism and fascist ideas in the early 20th century.³

As has been demonstrated in previous publications, and as will be addressed below, in the 1920s and 1930s Przywara presented the essence of the Jews as "restless" and "revolutionary."⁴ After World World I, he saw Jews and Judaism

² I would like to thank Dr. Clemens Brodkorb, the head of the *Archiv der Deutschen Provinz der Jesuiten*, for making these available.

³ Aaron Pidel, S.J., "Erich Przywara, S.J., and 'Catholic Fascism:' A Response to Paul Silas Peterson." *JHMTh/ZNThG* 23/1 (2016), 27–55, here 29. Pidel claims that I established Przywara's nearness to anti-Semitism and fascism "by insinuation." *Ibid.*, 30. This is somewhat surprising because it has been established by direct citation. As Pidel remarks, John Betz (Notre Dame University) contributed to Pidel's response. *Ibid.*, 28. Pidel and Betz have offered apologetic interpretations of Przywara's post-World War I German Catholic anti-Semitic resentment and his nationalistic, fascist and racist ideological viewpoints. They overlook some of the historical issues regarding Przywara's work and his intellectual context. In my view, their *well-intentioned* historical work exemplifies the problematic that David Cymet named "History vs. Apologetics." That is, it is driven by the agenda to defend Przywara from criticism, and really from those very things that he published and propagated at a time when intense anti-Semitic and fascist ideology was on the rise. See David Cymet, *History vs. Apologetics: The Holocaust, The Third Reich, and the Catholic Church*. Lanham, Mar.: Lexington Books, 2010. Pidel recently wrote his dissertation on Przywara's ecclesiology under Betz's direction at the University of Notre Dame.

⁴ Paul Silas Peterson, "Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*, bolshevism, the Jews, *Volk*, *Reich* and the *analogia entis* in the 1920s and 1930s." *JHMTh/ZNThG* 19 (2012), 104–140; *idem*, "Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews: A response to John Betz with a brief look into the Nazi correspondences on Przywara and *Stimmen der Zeit*." *JHMTh/ZNThG* 21 (2014), 148–163. See also my monograph, *The Early Hans Urs von Balthasar: Historical Contexts and Intellectual Formation*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, for further background on the "General historical contexts" at this time (7–11) and "Germanophone Catholicism" in Europe (11–22). See also the section on "Nazi Germany and *Stimmen der Zeit*" (184–227), and "The anti-modern anti-Semitic complex" (250–287). Przywara's anti-Semitic ideas influenced Balthasar. Klaus Schatz has addressed the Jesuits and National Socialism. He has done an excellent job in showing the National Socialists'

as the deep and dark force behind capitalism and communism, which he condemned, along with Zionism.⁵ The Jews, as he suggested, only cared about “wealth and glamour”. He clearly propagated an anti-Semitic conspiracy theory. The background of this theory will be addressed below. He also advanced a fundamental rejection of Judaism. Przywara claimed that “Judaism, in its final secret instincts, feels itself to be as the constantly chaos-creating and out of the chaos new-creating Creator-God in the world.”⁶ In his view, the Jews wanted to take the place of Christ and become God. He employed the “wandering Jew”

persecution of the Jesuits. He provides an extensive and detailed presentation of those Jesuits who resisted, and a thorough analysis of those who were persecuted. As he correctly concludes, some Jesuits were building bridges to the ideology, while others were less willing to fit in to the new political order. See Klaus Schatz, *Geschichte der deutschen Jesuiten (1814–1983)*, vol. 3: 1917–1945. Münster: Aschendorff, 2013, 323–451, here 328 “Sicher gab es unter den Jesuiten keine Einheitlichkeit in der Frage der richtigen Taktik gegenüber dem Regime wie auch in den politischen Überzeugungen selbst.” For Schatz’s treatment of *Stimmen der Zeit* in the NS-period, see *ibid.*, 347–353. As late as the summer of 1940, in the middle of the war, the National Socialist authorities, and Hitler himself, were still not ready to ban the Jesuits as an organization, not even in the eastern areas of the Reich which did not fall under the concordat. *Ibid.*, 371. Clearly, as an organization, the Jesuits were not a major threat to National Socialism. If they were such a threat, the National Socialist government would have banned them. They did not do this, they simply forced those Jesuits to get into line who were not yet already in line. Of course, some radical National Socialists were deeply critical of the Jesuits. This is, however, only one side of the story. The other side of the story has to do with the many mediatory positions that emerged between the Jesuits and fascism and the complex web of interconnection and, in some case, commonality in aims, hopes and resentments.

5 See Przywara, “Judentum und Christentum. Zwischen Orient und Okzident.” *StZ* 110 (1926), 81–99, here 98: “Judentum kann allein überwunden werden vom Christentum [...]. Judentum ist innerlichst Religion und innerlichst Religion bis in seine verdorrtesten Zweige hinein. Gewalt des Kapitalismus und Gewalt des Kommunismus sind beide letztlich religiöse Gewalt. Nur daraus wird es verständlich, wie sehr ‘Jerusalem’ von bolschewistischen wie kapitalistischen Juden, Westjuden Amerikas wie Ostjuden Rußlands als die Erfüllung begrüßt wird.”

6 Przywara, “Judentum und Christentum”, 92: “Judentum, in seinen letzten geheimen Instinkten, fühlt sich als den beständig chaosschaffenden und aus dem Chaos neuschaffenden Schöpfer-Gott in der Welt.” Przywara was invited to discuss his views of Judaism with Jewish scholars, including Martin Buber. In his report from 1961, Przywara remarked that Buber was the most critical of his understanding of Judaism. Erich Przywara, “Begegnungen jüdischen und christlichen Geistes.” In *Juden, Christen, Deutsche*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Schultz. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1961, 239–248, here 241. As Hermann Greive suggests, Przywara’s later remarks on this meeting with Buber show that he was trying to justify himself. Hermann Greive, *Theologie und Ideologie. Katholizismus und Judentum in Deutschland und Österreich. 1918–1935*. Heidelberg: Schneider, 1967, 113 f. Buber writes in the same volume: “Der Mensch kann dem Göttlichen nicht nahekomen, indem er über das Menschliche hinauslangt; er kann ihm nahekomen, indem er der Mensch wird, der zu werden er, dieser einzelne Mensch da, erschaffen ist.” Martin Buber, “Der Chassidismus und die Krise des abendländischen Menschen.” In *Juden, Christen, Deutsche*, ed. Schultz, 83–94, here 94.

concept in his writings while rejecting “Jewish messianism” in his *Analogia Entis* (1932). He propagated an essentialist concept of Jews, or, as he sometimes called it, the “basic tension of the Jew”. For Przywara, “the Jew” stood for a “rising will of destruction.” In his theology and social and cultural analysis, “Christianity” becomes the “enemy” of Judaism. For this reason, he provided a way of dealing with this problem (as he saw it) of the existence of the Jews in a Christian country. He wanted to “overcome” Judaism with the right “weapons.” Przywara not only abhorred “Jewish capitalism”, he saw “the hatred towards the Jews in world history” as essentially justified because of the Jews’ failure to convert. While Siegfried Marck claimed in 1929 that Przywara was promoting authoritarian themes in his philosophy of religion, Przywara himself condemned Hermann Cohen’s internationalism and his understanding of universal humanity. He saw the idea of a universal humanitarianism as a threat to Christianity. In this sense, he rejected the idea that all human beings, Jews and non-Jews, were equal. Przywara thereby opened the door to the exclusion and marginalization of the Jews, even if he did not call for violent persecution. He argued that Judaism was an “insolent disturber” of the German *Volktum*. At the same time, he created an ontological system that reflected his ideas of a hierarchical social and political order in philosophical terms.⁷ He also used the *analogia entis* theory in arguments for *völkisch* categories,⁸ and encouraged *völkisch* understandings of Christian identity. Like many others, he promoted Juan Donoso Cortés’s political theory (one of the forerunner’s of National Socialist ideology), advanced an integral Catholicism in National Socialist Germany, and developed positive relationships to some forms of National Socialist religiosity (like Dietrich Eckart’s). Przywara himself mentions the fact that his *Analogia Entis* emerged in critical conversation with Johann Plenge, the self-proclaimed intellectual father of National Socialism. Przywara actually praised the idea of a dictator in 1936. He also advanced a Christian anthropology based on the foundational principle of command and obedience. While promoting an anti-communist political theory based upon religion, Przywara also developed a political theology which called for Catholics to die for the fatherland. In 1933, he was somewhat optimistic about the rise of the new political order in Germany. He tried to help the *Reich* learn some lessons from the Middle Ages and rediscover the true German religion of Catholicism. He liked to cite lines from Gertrud von Le Fort, like “Feindlos werd’ ich am

7 Many others were doing the same thing with social theory, religion and philosophy of religion at this time in the promotion of a “Stufenordnung des Seins” or the “Ständeordnung des Alls.” See for example Leopold von Andrian-Werburg, *Die Ständeordnung des Alls. Rationales Weltbild eines katholischen Dichters*. München: Kösel & Pustet, 1930.

8 See Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 133.

Sieg” (I will be without enemies at the victory) or “Du Volk des Sieges” (you *Volk* of victory), and he developed his own his ideas like “Sieg-Katholizismus” (victory-Catholicism). He legitimized the political transition to a dictatorship in theological terms and promoted Carl Schmitt’s ideas. Przywara even encouraged his followers to think about the atoning blood of war. In the Third Reich, Przywara seems to have thought that there was “the positive sense” of the German “movements.” Some of these issues will be addressed below. Some of the racist theories and anti-Semitic ideas in the major Jesuit journal in Germany, *Stimmen der Zeit*, will also be addressed. These issues, along with the others that have been addressed in my previous publications, show how this important journal, and thus the German Jesuits themselves, made room for Catholic fascism at the outset of the Third Reich. Of course, it was not a leading organ of National Socialism. Nevertheless, it established a mediatory position between traditional Catholicism and fascist ideology after World War I.

1 Przywara, the Jesuits, Anti-Semitism and National Socialism

As I have argued: “Przywara promoted a position that was in many ways compatible and supportive of National Socialism. It was not identical, however, with the stereotypical form of this thinking, as promoted, for example, by Alfred Rosenberg. There were a variety of positions within the new ideological swing in the 1920 and 1930s. Like many other Catholic intellectuals at this time, and like many authors at *Stimmen der Zeit*, Przywara represented a position that had hoped for a Catholic friendly Nazism.”⁹ Many fascists were cultivated intellectuals, or refined fascists, who did not offer “unqualified affirmation or unqualified negation”, such as Przywara (Hans Urs von Balthasar’s “großen Pater”).¹⁰ Although he rejected the idea of a universal humanity, Przywara did not want to eradicate the Jews violently. He thought that the Jews should convert to Catholicism. He argued that they should convert to Catholicism for different reasons. One of these reasons was clearly religious. In another regard, however, Przywara also thought that the Jews were a problem for the social and political order in the German *Reich*, and especially a problem for the German *Volk*. While some have claimed that Przywara was a danger to the National Socialist order, it has been shown that some National Socialists did not see him this way at all.

⁹ Peterson, “Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews”, 158.

¹⁰ Pidel holds Przywara to be a careful and differentiated intellectual who rarely advanced “unqualified affirmation or unqualified negation”. Pidel, “Erich Przywara”, 55.

Przywara was clearly working in his ideological context and seeking to form a new kind of Catholicism at his time. He broke away from the older schools of ultramontanist Catholicism and old-school Neo-Thomism and charted new territory.¹¹ This is why he was creatively engaging Juan Donoso Cortés, Carl Schmitt and the National Socialist intellectual Dietrich Eckart. He tried to weave them into the Catholic discourse and, at the same time, show National Socialists that Catholicism's potential was far greater than they thought. Przywara was deeply embedded in a specific form of the ideology of his time. He was trying to make it work for the church, and make the church work for it. Przywara's fascism, like Hans Urs von Balthasar's, was a refined Catholic fascism.

A key aspect of this fascism was anti-Semitism. There is a complex debate about the terminology and categories used to describe this phenomenon.¹² As John F. Pollard holds, some "have tried to make a distinction between the *racial* antisemitism of National Socialism and other fascist movements as opposed to what they regard as the 'anti-Judaism' of Catholicism. Comparing Christian antisemitism to the mutual suspicions and hostility between Catholics and Protestants, they argue that it was an essentially *religious* phenomenon. This does not make sense in the context of interwar Europe."¹³

Przywara was a very skillful writer. He drew upon remarks in Jewish writings to condemn the Jews using their own words, and to reinforce prejudices and resentment towards the Jews. This was a common method of assault at this time, and before. Przywara's anti-Semitism did not follow the style of a political speech against the Jews, nor was it obsessed with racial and biological issues. It was a unique form of intellectuality that sought to promote an anti-Semitic agenda at a much higher level of cultural discourse. This was done in a unique historical context. It was a context in which the status of Jews in civil society and their rights – rights that had been slowly established with historical advances in liberal political orders – were being criticized, challenged and overturned. Przywara did not defend them. He added criticism to them by making the claim

11 On the background and development of neo-Thomism and the significance of the *Kulturkampf*, see my "Der autoritäre Thomas." *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* 11/2 (2017), 45–52.

12 See Peterson, "Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews", 156.

13 John F. Pollard, "'Clerical fascism': Context, overview and conclusion." In *Clerical Fascism in Interwar Europe*, ed. Matthew Feldman, Marius Turda, with Tudor Georgescu. London: Routledge, 2008, 221–234, here 225. Pidel essentially follows this tradition. In fact, Pidel suggests that many of Przywara's arguments against the Jews were essentially ambivalent: "In many cases the appearance of these terms in Przywara's writings has the quality of reported speech, an attempt to portray this intra-Jewish controversy on its own terms." Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 48. Pidel fails to recognize that Przywara was picking up themes from this intellectual discourse and using them to condemn the Jews as a whole.

that the whole problem with the Jews, as he thought, was not only a racial, economic, political or social issue, but also a religious one.

At this time in Germany, after World War I, there was a new wave of anti-Jew sentiment. Przywara's remarks about a Zionist world conspiracy and Jewish capitalism and communism is deeply connected in this new wave. Przywara saw the Jews and their faith as exemplifying a rising will of destruction and he claimed that they were a danger. The antisemitism of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s was a complex phenomenon. There were very extreme forms and less extreme forms of anti-Semitism at this time. When Przywara wrote about the Jews in essentialist terminology, he was clearly embracing racist language. Of course, he also saw this as a religious matter. Yet, he did not distinguish between these two aspects in a clear sense. He saw the religious and natural aspects of human life as connected. He also argued explicitly that the racial and intellectual dimensions were interrelated. Furthermore, his arguments suggest that the existence of the Jews in Germany was a problem, one to be overcome with the "right weapons."¹⁴ Przywara was supporting a view of the Jews that was not the most extreme anti-Semitic position at this time. Most intellectuals rejected the most extreme forms of anti-Semitism, which called for the violent suppression of the Jews. However, his work was obviously not quelling anti-Semitism. On the contrary, he was contributing to the marginalization of the Jews. He was also contributing to the idea that they were, at a very deep level, foreign to the Germans and the budding Christian Reich. Indeed, he explicitly defended racist thinking. One can read "Przywara against Przywara",¹⁵ but the historical realities of anti-Semitism

¹⁴ Pidel is right to point out that I assert "Przywara's complicity in the destructive ideologies of his day". Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 28. Pidel claims that this is, however, "more false than true". Ibid., 29. Pidel concedes that "Przywara does sometimes employ anti-Judaic tropes." Ibid., 29. Nevertheless, he asserts that these tropes worked "to quell rather than enflame antisemitic passion." Ibid., 29. To be clear, Pidel claims that the "anti-Judaic tropes" were actually, if understood correctly (with the correct hermeneutical key), quelling anti-Semitism. This is a contradiction, and, as such, nonsense.

¹⁵ See Joachim Negel, "'Nichts ist wirklicher als Gott' – Erich Przywaras Versuch, angesichts menschlicher Unheilsgeschichte den Gott biblischer Heilsgeschichte neu zu denken." In *Urkatastrophe. Die Erfahrung des Krieges 1914–1918 im Spiegel zeitgenössischer Theologie*, ed. Joachim Negel and Karl Pinggéra. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2016, 176–226. Negel claims that often-times one must read "Przywara against Przywara" (ibid., 222: "Deshalb muss man nicht selten Przywara gegen Przywara lesen"). Ibid., 223: "Peterson verweigert in seiner Studie genau einen solchen diachronen Lektüreeansatz [...]." There is, however, a problem with so-called "diachronic" methodology in historical-critical research. One of the questions that should be raised here in response to Negel is the following: Are historical findings to be rejected because they do not follow a diachronic methodology? Diachronic methodologies often seek to transcend the parameters of time and context and read the source "through time" not "with time" (synchronic), and assert the

should not be interpreted in such a way that they essentially make them mean something that they did not mean in the original historical context. The fact that Przywara rejected a common humanity of Jews and non-Jews shows how far he was willing to go in his arguments against liberalism. It also shows how he was opening the door to those who were excluding and marginalizing the Jews.

1.1 German Catholics and Hilaire Belloc's *The Jews* (1922)

According to Hermann Greive's study, *Theologie und Ideologie: Katholizismus und Judentum in Deutschland und Österreich, 1918–1935*, Theodor Haecker and Erich Przywara were the most prominent Catholic representatives of a theological analysis of the "Judenfrage."¹⁶ Greive speaks of Przywara's "unbelievably simplifying and leveling presentation of Jewish religiosity."¹⁷ Greive emphasizes an influential anti-Semitic book from the 1920s in his description of the ideological background. This book is Hilaire Belloc's *The Jews* (1922).¹⁸ Haecker actually translated this book into German. His translation was published in 1927 (*Die Juden*). He also wrote an essay in *Hochland* that promoted the book. He thought it was a truly Catholic book. As Ismar Elbogen writes: "[Hilaire Belloc's] Book, *The Jews* (1922), is crafty and deceptive. There is one truth in this untruthful

idea of an author (from one time) against his own ideas (from another time). This may be entirely acceptable in systematic theology. This methodology is, however, problematic when it comes to historical-critical analysis. If one seeks to understand an author and his work at a specific time and place, one must address the specific time and place, and understand the theology in its historical context. Indeed, a diachronic methodology would run the risk of skipping over the dark chapters, such as those in the Third Reich, in order to emphasize the positive issues.

16 Greive, *Theologie und Ideologie*, 106. Greive also refers to Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Begegnung mit dem Judentum. Das Erbe Israels und die Christenheit*. Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1963, 106 f. Kraus addresses Przywara, Hans Urs von Balthasar and Walter Zimmerli's engagement with Judaism and their views on Martin Buber's work. Przywara may have also been influenced by Kurt Ziesché, *Das Königtum Christi in Europa*. München, Regensburg: Manz, 1926. Ziesché's anti-Semitism and new Catholic nationalism was very influential in the 1920s in the rightwing Catholic groups, see Christoph Hübner, *Die Rechtskatholiken, die Zentrumsparterie und die katholische Kirche in Deutschland bis zum Reichskonkordat von 1933. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Scheiterns der Weimarer Republik*. Münster: LIT, 2014, 585 ff.

17 Greive, *Theologie und Ideologie*, 111: "[...] unglaublich simplifizierenden und nivellierenden Darstellung jüdischer Religiosität [...]."

18 Hilaire Belloc, *The Jews*. London: Constable, 1922; see Bryan Cheyette, *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society Racial Representations 1875–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 150 ff.

book, the observation that the age of liberalism, of tolerance, and of the recognition of the rights of man was past.”¹⁹ Although Haecker praised the book,²⁰ he was critical of the fact that it did not also address the deeper religious issues of Judaism. This is essentially Przywara’s contribution to the new post-World War I anti-Semitism. He agrees with the general approach of Belloc, but adds the deeper religious dimension to the mix. The roots of Belloc’s anti-Semitism go back to French anti-Semitism around Charles Maurras.²¹ Belloc presented the Jews as a foreign race that could not integrate and he argued that the Jews were controlling world finances. He called for the Jews to be viewed as a separate nationality within the national context.²² Those that followed Belloc’s thinking wanted to fight Jewish influence in society.²³ As Bernhard Dietz explains: “Like so many intellectual anti-Semites, Belloc distanced himself adamantly from the usual propagandistic anti-Semitism, as that this was counter-productive in its dangerous emotionality.”²⁴ According to this thinking, the Jews actually profited from the radical anti-Semitism. Belloc claimed that it was a strategy that the Jews used.²⁵ Belloc’s basic view of the Jews seems to be adopted by Przywara, including the idea that the Jews were involved in communist Bolshevism, capitalism and cosmopolitan international ideas. Belloc was very influential among anti-Semitic rightwing ideologues after World War I. He and G. K. Chesterton both attacked the Jews in the inter-war period. According to Colin Holmes, they excluded the Jews in racial categories and referred to them as “parasitic.”²⁶ Like Belloc, Przywara did not want to advance a violent anti-Semitism. They viewed this as counterproductive in the resistance to the Jews. Przywara wanted to get to the issues underlying the problem, just as Belloc did. Belloc argued that the Jews were radically foreign, a nationality within the nation. Przywara adds to this interpretation the idea that there was a deep religious dimension to the problem of the Jews that drives them to a rising will of destruction and control.

19 Ismar Elbogen, *A Century of Jewish Life*. Philadelphia, Penn.: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960, 514; as cited in Greive, *Theologie und Ideologie*, 106.

20 See his “Nachwort.” Greive, *Theologie und Ideologie*, 106 f.

21 Bernhard Dietz, *Neo-Tories. Britische Konservative im Aufstand gegen Demokratie und politische Moderne (1929–1939)*. München: Oldenbourg, 2012, 188–191, here 189.

22 Dietz, *Neo-Tories*, 189.

23 Dietz, *Neo-Tories*, 190 ff.

24 Dietz, *Neo-Tories*, 189.

25 Dietz, *Neo-Tories*, 189.

26 Colin Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society 1876–1939*. London: Arnold, 1979, 212.

1.2 Przywara's call for "Sieg-Katholizismus"

In Przywara's "Integraler Katholizismus?" from 1927 he calls for true integralism. He thought that the times were calling for this after "the collapse of the modern spirit."²⁷ There is a "but" in his argument.²⁸ Przywara claims that Catholics should neither absolutize the past nor the present. He also suggests that the right integralism does not stand in contradiction to the church. Although there is a little "but" in his argument, the fundamental point is left standing: The time had come to promote a new and aggressive Catholicism, not a "Catholicism of compromises" (as he emphasizes) but a "victory-Catholicism" ("Sieg-Katholizismus"). Only this approach could take the field after "the collapse of the modern spirit." The new point of orientation in this thinking in the 1920s was the Middle Ages. It had to do with a renewal of the idea of the Middle Ages. This was clearly a challenge to the legitimacy of the new cultural, social and political order after World War I in Germany. Przywara's desire to revive the Middle Ages entailed a socio-political dimension. In the later 1920s he was calling his readers to return to the time when Catholicism was "all-forming." This basic collaborative approach – one that rejected the oppositional stance of traditional Catholicism of the later 19th century (as exemplified especially in the *Kulturkampf*) – set the stage for his posture of collaborative embrace in the coming years.

1.3 Przywara's constructive engagement with the "Deutscher Aufbruch" (November 1932)

In November of 1932, before Hitler's rise to power, Przywara published an extensive presentation of the intellectual work of various rightwing ideologues ("Deutscher Aufbruch", "German awakening/ departure/ start"), focusing especially on Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn, Arthur Moeller van den Bruck and

²⁷ Erich Przywara, "Integraler Katholizismus?." *StZ* 113 (1927), 115–121, here 119: "Wenn also heute so etwas eingetreten ist wie ein Zusammenbruch des neuzeitlichen Geistes, so ist es klar, daß nicht ein zaghafter, klug vernünftelnder Katholizismus der Kompromisse und eines gewissen Minimierens, sondern allein ein energisch seine Alleingeltung betonender Sieg-Katholizismus auf das Trümmerfeld treten kann. Damit aber ist, wie es scheint, gleichzeitig gesagt, daß ein solcher Katholizismus sich seine Kraft und Orientierung von den Zeiten her holen müsse, die tatsächlich Zeiten eines allformenden Katholizismus waren, also christliche Antike und Frühmittelalter. Insofern würde man also dem Programm Balls zustimmen müssen. Nicht ein Katholizismus der Kompromisse, sondern der Katholizismus des ungeminderten 'Außer der Kirche kein Heil' ist der Katholizismus, den die heutige Lage fordert." Przywara refers to Hugo Ball, *Die Flucht aus der Zeit*. München: Duncker & Humblot, 1927.

²⁸ Pidel emphasizes that there is a "but" in Przywara's argument. Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 41.

Carl Schmitt (at the end of the essay).²⁹ Przywara was clearly fascinated by these authors and their agenda. He offers his readers a thorough analysis of the new intellectual movement that was rising to overturn democracy and liberalism. He highlights many passages from their work which show a radical rejection of democracy and liberalism, as well as a radical rejection of the general developments of the modern political order. His article introduces his Catholic readers, who were certainly familiar with the anti-liberalism and anti-modernism of the past generations, to this new form of radical resistance that was emerging. At the end of the long introduction to the new “German awakening”, he essentially affirms – in 1932, in the Weimar democracy – its general push to the idea of a *Reich*. He was, however, critical of the remaining romantic dimensions.³⁰ While the shift to authoritarianism seems to be good for the most part, it is still somewhat infected with some forms of this older modernism that it is seeking to overcome, namely romanticism. Thus, Przywara calls it to embrace Catholicism more fervently. He articulates this with the corporative imagery of a body, the Catholic Church, with many members – a body that holds the contradictions together. In this regard, Przywara was essentially offering suggestions for improvement of the German fascist movement: become more Catholic. He was not, of course, critical of their anti-liberalism, rejection of democracy or racist and corporative ideology. He wanted the “awakening” to embrace Catholicism more fervently.³¹ At the end of the Weimar democracy, Przywara was introducing his Catholic readers to a new anti-liberal ideology. He was building a bridge between this fascism and his traditional Catholic readership.

1.4 Przywara’s constructive engagement with the “German Front” as a “Catholic” movement (December 1932)

In Przywara’s constructive engagement with fascist intellectuals in his “Deutsche Front”, he introduces his Catholic readership to various German fascist intellectuals, the radical rightwing, conservative revolutionaries and National Socialist theorists.³² He carefully presents much of their agenda as a true representation

²⁹ Erich Przywara, “Deutscher Aufbruch.” *StZ* 124 (Nov. 1932), 82–93.

³⁰ Przywara, “Deutscher Aufbruch”, 93.

³¹ Przywara, “Deutscher Aufbruch”, 93: “In diesem Sinn dürfte das Wort Moeller van den Brucks wahr sein: ‘der deutsche Nationalismus ist Streiter für das Endreich’ (Das Dritte Reich 320). Denn je deutlicher das obige Entweder-Oder wird, um so näher sind wir dem Endreich.” The “Entweder-Oder” is between Catholicism and “zigeunernden Ästhetentum”.

³² Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 135 f.

of Catholicism.³³ This essay was published in December of 1932, before Hitler became chancellor. Przywara's interpretation of the new nationalism is critical, constructive and affirmative. He affirms the new nationalism in that it is "internally directed towards that which is Catholic [Katholischen]". He is critical, however, because it still stood "in wild defiance of everything Christian that has been handed down".³⁴ While he was somewhat critical, Przywara saw the new nationalism as representative of true Catholic thought in many regards. For example, he presents Carl Schmitt and Othmar Spann as the two main "katholische Denker" ("Catholic intellectuals") among the new German Front authors. He does not attempt to discredit them as false representatives of Catholicism. He offers them suggestions for improvement. In his reading, Schmitt and Spann are the key figures and the best, most mature, representatives of the "German Front." He is somewhat critical of them, but not in a fundamental sense. Przywara was very familiar with their work; as his essay shows, he read all the major works from Schmitt and Spann. After an extensive summary of their thought, he writes: "Schmitt and Spann not only represent the mature literature of the 'German Front,' but everything else [from the 'German front', PSP] lies in the span of their ideas."³⁵ As he argues, the Catholic intellectuals were at the forefront of the movement and embodied the movement itself. Clearly, the readers of *Stimmen der Zeit* would have understood the message here: this is, for the most part, a positive movement. It may need some improvement but generally it is on the right track. In his summary of Schmitt, Przywara emphasizes the importance of Juan Donoso Cortés for Schmitt's thought. Schmitt seems to have influenced Przywara in this regard. Przywara praised Donoso Cortés later in 1936, in the context of the German dictatorship. Indeed, Schmitt was the "mature" Catholic intellectual in the fascist movement. As his later letters to Schmitt also show, he held his work in high regard. Przywara was well aware of the historical emergence of the new ideology after World War I. He remarks on this and explains

33 Pidel has claimed that Przywara shows "ambivalence" towards Schmitt in this essay. Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 34.

34 Erich Przywara, "Deutsche Front." *StZ* 124 (Dec. 1932), 153–167, here 153: "Die Sichtung der drei Klassiker des neuen 'Deutschen Aufbruchs' zeigte uns, wie alle Grundanschauungen des neuen deutschen Nationalismus bei ihnen in der Tat vorliegen. Die eigentümliche Religiosität dieses Nationalismus (in Lagarde): einerseits innerlich hingezogen zum Katholischen, andererseits in wildem Trotz gegen alles überliefert Christliche. Ebenso seine politische Geistigkeit: der Mythos des 'Reiches', aber in Deutschland als 'einer proletarischen Nation' (Moeller-Bruck, *Das Dritte Reich* 71), darum als 'Sozialaristokratie' des 'organischen Staates' (Langbehn) unter dem 'Führer'."

35 Erich Przywara, "Deutsche Front", 158: "Schmitt und Spann bezeichnen nicht nur das gereifte Schrifttum der 'Deutschen Front', sondern in der Spannweite ihrer Ideen liegt eigentlich alles übrige."

that it is a shift from “subjectivism to objectivism in the idea of representation and authority” (here he is referring especially to Schmitt). He claimed that the new movement was a shift from “individualism to the corporate in the idea of the estate/ corporative state [ständischen Staates]” (here he is referring especially to Spann). Przywara also thought it was a shift from “intellectualism to nature in the idea of the folkdom [Volkstums]” (here he is referring especially to Wilhelm Stapel). After his long presentation, he writes: “To the extent that these shifts could thus appear as a shift towards that which is Catholic [zum Katholischen], to that extent one cannot ignore also that which is Catholic [das Katholische] in their political effect.”³⁶ Przywara seems to suggest here that the post-World War I transitions were in many regards a rediscovery of and a consequence of that which is Catholic, or Catholicism.³⁷ He saw it all as displaying an inner pull to that which is Catholic. He suggests that the Catholic Church should recognize itself in this new fascism. After the long struggle of the Catholic Church against modernism, liberalism and democracy in the 19th century, and after the Catholic dominated Center Party adopted the democratic system in the Weimar Republic, younger intellectuals were now beginning to see the truth of Catholicism and the errors of liberalism. In December of 1932, Przywara is calling Catholics to move towards a posture of careful embrace, to recognize the deeper Catholic impulses in the new political effects of this fascist ideology.

In the middle of his essay, after he introduced Schmitt and Spann, Przywara nevertheless challenges their acceptance of a “Pluriversum.”³⁸ At the end of the essay he also offers a gentle criticism in the sense of a suggestion for improvement. He addresses “the secret tragedy of the ‘German Front’” (“die geheime Tragik der ‘Deutschen Front’”).³⁹ These are not the words of fundamental criti-

36 Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 166 f.: “Wenn wir so den geistigen Gehalt des neuen deutschen Nationalismus überschauen, werden wir uns nicht dem Eindruck verschließen können, daß in ihn so gut wie alle Ideen der sogenannten ‘Erneuerungsbewegungen’ der Jahre nach dem Krieg eingegangen sind: Wende vom Subjektivismus zum Objektivismus, Wende vom Individualismus zum Korporativen, Wende vom Intellektualismus zur Natur. Damit aber haben diese Ideen hier ihre politische Auswirkung erhalten: die Wende vom Subjektivismus zum Objektivismus im Gedanken der Repräsentation und der Autorität, die Wende vom Individualismus zum Korporativen im Gedanken des ständischen Staates, die Wende vom Intellektualismus zur Natur im Gedanken des Volkstums. In dem Maße, als diese Wendungen also als Wende zum Katholischen erscheinen konnten, in dem Maße wird man also auch das Katholische in ihrer politischen Auswirkung nicht verkennen dürfen.” He writes about Barth’s influence on Stapel: “Es ist mit Händen zu greifen, wie auf diese niedersächsischen Protestanten die Botschaft Karl Barths eingewirkt hat.” Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 159.

37 On this theme, see Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 106–111.

38 Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 158.

39 Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 167.

cism. As he suggests, the German front seems to be trying to reach something (good), but there is a sad twist in the story. This sad twist in the story of the rise of fascism in the 1920s and early 1930s is the fact that it has not yet fully adopted Catholicism. It is still too critical of traditional Catholicism. This is tragic because they are actually in deep agreement. This is the tragedy of the new fascism of the radical rightwing. Even though it is “internally directed towards the *Katholische*”, it is still not Catholic enough. It has not yet embraced Catholicism to the necessary degree. In this sense, he is especially critical of Schmitt and Spann’s acceptance of a “*Pluriversum*.” He writes at the end of his article: “A ‘turn to the object’ is not then consequent/ logical/ consistent/ coherent [folgerichtig] if one remains in the property of the subject.”⁴⁰ True objectivism entails a rejection of the *pluriversum* and an affirmation of the universal truth of the one religion, Roman Catholicism. He returns to this theme again in the final remarks as he addresses “the secret tragedy.” In this, he sees “their recoiling back from the will to the objective into a subjectivism of ‘attitudes’ [...]”⁴¹ This is Przywara’s criticism of Schmitt and Spann. They are not Catholic enough because they seem to leave room for some kind of pluralism. Regarding other fascist authors that he addresses, he does not criticize their focus on the nation. He specifically criticizes the fact that they do not include a transcendent dimension. This again was essentially a call for the fascist movement to move closer to Catholicism. He does not criticize their focus on community. He challenges the *Tat-Kreis* for their criticism of the owners in society at large (the “*Besitzenden*”).⁴² Przywara argues that the owners are also a part of the “nation.”⁴³ He does not criticize the focus on nature, myth and religion of blood, *Rasse-Erziehung*, etc. (here he is thinking especially about Alfred Rosenberg and Ernst Krieck).⁴⁴ He criticizes the lack of transcendence in this. On virtually all points, Przywara’s article reflects the hopes for a Catholic friendly fascism. This seems to be Przywara’s orientation. In his article, there is no criticism of the *Reich*-themes. At the end of the Weimar Republic, Przywara saw what was coming and he wanted to help it become more Catholic. Indeed, he must have agreed with Stapel’s vision of the emerging “anti-secular front”, as he documented this. Stapel himself, as he thought, was just building on Karl Barth’s theology.

40 Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 167: “Eine ‘Wende zum Objekt’ ist nicht dann folgerichtig, wenn man in der Eigenschaftlichkeit des Subjektes stecken bleibt.”

41 Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 167: “ihr Zurückschnellen aus dem Willen zum Objektiven in einen Subjektivismus der ‘Haltungen’ [...]”

42 Cf. Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 166.

43 Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 167.

44 Cf. Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 162 ff.

As has been shown, Przywara's "Reich und Kreuz" piece was another "constructive call for a Christian *Reich*" before Hitler took power.⁴⁵ A natural reading of this text shows that Przywara was trying to situate the Catholic Church as the all-encompassing force to unify the "Roman" (fascist Italy) and the "German" (*Reich*). This is a classic example of the *Reich* mythology and a specific expression of Catholic fascism at this time.⁴⁶ The basic idea here has to do with a new version of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. This political body included the territories of Italy and Germany. The hope was for a new form of political alliance in which the Catholic Church provided the instance of universal mediation. As fascism was spreading in Europe, Przywara thought that the time had come for the Catholic Church to collaboratively embrace the great awakening.

1.5 Przywara's call to develop a religious Reich-ideal (April 1933)

In February of 1933, Przywara argued that the Prophets of the Old Testament were the "sharpest anti-Semites" ("schärfsten Antisemiten") in that they attacked the "back-slide into the paganism of the Semites, which saw the divine in the ground and in blood."⁴⁷ He thus rejected both the Semites and those who were trying to find the divine in the ground and in blood. In this sense, he rejected a specific ideological position within the most radical form of National Socialist ideology. This radical form of the ideology rejected Christianity. Przywara challenges this while, at the same time, affirming the anti-Semitic attitude.

Przywara was encouraging Catholics to develop the Reich theme in 1933. As he remarked in April 1933, Moeller's *Das Dritte Reich* (1931) as well as Friedrich Hielscher's *Reich* (1931) and Ernst Jünger's *Arbeiter* (1932) are "without a doubt the books of the 'movement' and there is not much sense in brushing them aside with the gesture of a 'Realpolitiker' [...]. German Catholicism must see to it that it responds to this pagan 'Reich' with a religious Reich-ideal."⁴⁸ Przywara

⁴⁵ Peterson, "Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews", 150–152, here 151.

⁴⁶ Pidel tries to reinterpret this. See Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 42–44. He claims that Przywara's work on the *Reich* shows that he was trying to argue for "non-expansionist internationalism." *Ibid.*, 43.

⁴⁷ Erich Przywara, "Theologie des Judentums." *StZ* 124 (Feb. 1933), 341–342, here 342: "Rückfall in das Heidentum des Semiten, der das Göttliche in Boden und Blut sieht."

⁴⁸ Erich Przywara, "[Rev.] Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, *Das ewige Reich, Band 1, Die politischen Kräfte*, ed. Hans Schwarz. Breslau: Korn, 1933." *StZ* 124 (April 1933), 70: "[...] ohne Frage die Bücher der 'Bewegung', und es hat nicht viel Sinn, sie nur mit der Geste des sog. 'Realpolitikers'

wanted the church to turn towards a posture of embrace and collaboration in 1933. In the same April issue, another Jesuit followed in this sense and rejected criticisms of anti-Semitism.

In April of 1933, the Jesuit Anton Koch wrote a critical review of a book that was critical of anti-Semitism. Koch rejected liberal tolerance in this review. Rather than liberal tolerance, Koch called for a clarification of Jewish influence in German society.⁴⁹ If the German Catholics wanted to know what the intellectual Jesuits thought of the situation in 1933, they need look no further than *Stimmen der Zeit*. Koch was not a marginal figure with outlandish ideas compared to the rest of the Munich-constellation. His views fit squarely into the ideological mix that was emanating from *Stimmen der Zeit*. He and Przywara made similar arguments. The new anti-Semitism was not a problem in its essence for these Jesuits. It was problematic in the extreme forms, which they rejected. They wanted a “balanced” anti-Semitism that exposed Jewish influence in German society, limited the Jews and encouraged them to convert to Catholicism. Przywara added the fundamental religious criticism to this mix which suggested that the Jews themselves were essentially, in their Judaism as well, a threat. He thought that the Jews wanted to become God and control everything. This is why they should convert to Catholicism. Then they would know that they are not God. There are moments in Przywara’s work where the anti-Judaism and anti-Protestantism come together. As Przywara explains in April of 1933, he saw the inner essence of Protestantism to be “Old Testament.”⁵⁰

1.6 Przywara and the shift to corporatism against humanitarianism (June 1933)

Przywara published “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie” (1933) in the collection *Volk im Glauben. Ein Buch vom katholis-*

abzutun. Es ist nun einmal nicht eine sog. ‘sachliche Nüchternheit’, die die Herzen gewinnt, sondern immer nur eine ‘große Liebe’. Darum wird der deutsche Katholizismus zusehen müssen, daß er diesem heidnischen ‘Reich’ gegenüber ein religiöses Reichsideal antworten lasse.” On Przywara’s praise of Le Fort and the romantic religious Reich ideology in literary form in 1934, see Erich Przywara, “Die Heilige unserer Zeit.” *StZ* 127 (Aug 1934), 352–355.

49 See Anton Koch, “Streit um Israel.” *StZ* 125 (April 1933), 64–66. He criticizes this book: Heinrich Graf Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Das Wesen des Antisemitismus*, ed. Richard Nicolaus von Coudenhove-Kalergi. Wien: Paneuropa Verlag, 1932.

50 Erich Przywara, “[Rev.] Hans Michael Müller, *Macht und Glaube*. München: Kaiser, 1933.” *StZ* 125 (April 1933), 66–67, here 67: “Damit ist wieder einmal deutlich, wie sehr der Protestantismus in seinem innersten Wesen Altes Testament ist.”

chen Deutschen (imprimatur: 20 June, 1933).⁵¹ This essay is a good example of Przywara's thinking in 1933. Here he addresses various streams of thought in German Catholicism. He sees a foundational shift from the end of World War I to around 1925 or 1926, a turn from "subjectivism to objectivism" ("vom Subjektivismus zum Objektivismus").⁵² As he claims, "the real place of religious objectivism is the liturgical movement" ("der eigentliche Ort des religiösen Objektivismus ist die liturgische Bewegung").⁵³ He then writes: "The internally logical addition to this fundamental turn is therefore: from individualism to corporatism."⁵⁴ This is the social and political dimension to the transition that Przywara sees in Catholic thought. He then points to Max Scheler, Othmar Spann and Johann Plenge.⁵⁵ He also understands this as a turn to community and nature.⁵⁶ In his view, the new Dialectical Theology is also on this track: "It has to do with a Christianity of the glory of God, a Christianity of the emphasized super-natural, a Christianity of self-purposeful religious life, – in an emphasized front against humanitarianism [gegen Humanitarismus], morality and activism."⁵⁷ Indeed, Przywara sees the times shifting "against humanitarianism", and he embraces this. What comes is a new objective authoritarianism. This broad shift away from subjectivism and to objective authoritarianism is essentially, in Przywara's mind, a shift to Catholicism. Drawing upon a fresh convert from Protestantism to Catholicism, Oskar Bauhofer,⁵⁸ Przywara describes the shift as a shift away

51 Erich Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie." In *Volk im Glauben. Ein Buch vom katholischen Deutschen*, ed. Max Horst and Richard Hebing. Berlin: Schmid, 1933, 181–192. This was reprinted later as "Die Fünf Wenden. Eine Grundlegung." In his apologetic defense of Przywara, Pidel refers to a later edition of this essay. See Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 34. Yet Pidel does not understand the historical context, the essay or Przywara's sources.

52 Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie", 184.

53 Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie", 185.

54 Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie", 185: "Die innerlich folgerichtige Ergänzung zu dieser grundlegenden Wende heißt darum: vom Individualismus zum Korporativen."

55 Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie", 185 f.

56 Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie", 186 f.

57 Przywara, "Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie", 188: "Es geht um ein Christentum der Ehre Gottes, um ein Christentum der betonten Übernatur, um ein Christentum selbstzwecklichen religiösen Lebens, – in einer betonten Frontstellung gegen Humanitarismus, Moralismus, Aktivismus."

58 Oskar Bauhofer (1897–1976) was a Swiss Protestant pastor who converted to Catholicism in 1932. On the controversy between Georg Wobbermin and Karl Barth following Peterson and Bauhofer's conversion, see Matthias Wolfes, *Protestantische Theologie und moderne Welt. Studien zur Geschichte der liberalen Theologie nach 1918*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999, 322 f. Wobbermin saw the influence of the new deeply anti-liberal Protestant theology of Karl Barth as contributing to the conversion of these figures to Catholicism.

from the “‘inferiority’-pains” (“‘Inferioritäts’-Schmerzen”) “to a new ‘Catholic estate/corporative-consciousness’” (“‘katholischen Standesbewußtsein’”).⁵⁹ As he argues: “It is fundamentally a turning ‘to’ Catholicism, and only secondarily a turning ‘in’ Catholicism.”⁶⁰ As he suggests, Catholics should be proud of this. Referring to earlier attempts of Catholic intellectuals to fit into the Enlightenment trends, he argues: “The earlier ‘nibbling on the foreign’ turns to a desire of re-discovering of the truly Catholic.”⁶¹ Although he fundamentally supports this general shift to authoritarian Catholicism and anti-individualist and anti-liberal fascist corporatism, he nevertheless warns of two dangers. One danger would be that the turn to *Gemeinschaft* might turn into an “exclusive community of an elite” (“exklusive Gemeinschaft einer Elite”).⁶² Indeed, like Spann, Przywara thought that the ideal fascist ideology must include the whole. The other concern he has is with it turning to a “form of the ‘collective’ of the ‘masses’” (“Form des ‘Kollektiven’ der ‘Masse’”).⁶³ Przywara’s criticism here reflects a specific form of fascist thought. Who were these people that Przywara wanted to praise as embodying the true turning of the times away from liberalism? Plenge claimed to be the intellectual father of National Socialism.⁶⁴ Othmar Spann, a member of the NSDAP,⁶⁵ was one of the many enemies of the new democracy in Austria after World War I. His *Der wahre Staat* (1921)⁶⁶ provided the framework for a corporative/ estate political and economic system to establish a fascist order of authoritarianism. This was based upon theories that rejected human equality. The anti-democratic thought emphasized the organic unity of society.⁶⁷ Przywara

59 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie”, 189.

60 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie” 189: “Es ist grundlegend eine Wende ‘zum’ Katholizismus, und erst sekundär eine Wende ‘im’ Katholizismus.”

61 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie”, 189: “Das frühere ‘Naschen am Fremden’ kehrt sich um zu einer Lust am Wieder-Entdecken des eigentlich Katholischen.”

62 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie”, 190.

63 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie”, 190.

64 Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 123.

65 On Spann’s membership in the NSDAP, see Gerhard Botz, “Die österreichische NSDAP als asymmetrische Volkspartei. Soziale Dynamiken oder bürokratische Selbstkonstruktion?.” In *Junge Kämpfer, alte Opportunisten. Die Mitglieder der NSDAP 1919–1945*, ed. Jürgen W. Falter. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2016, 417–462, here 444.

66 Othmar Spann, *Der wahre Staat. Vorlesungen über Abbruch und Neubau der Gesellschaft gehalten im Sommersemester 1920 an der Universität Wien*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921. See also his “Die Bedeutung des ständischen Gedankens für die Gegenwart.” *Ständisches Leben* 3 (1933), 353–361.

67 On Spann and the ideological world of corporatism, with comparisons and contrasts to National Socialism, see also Klaus Neumann, “Inter-war Germany and the corporatist wave 1918–

provided the religious-philosophical basis for this view of the organic-whole in his *Analogy of Being (Analogia Entis)*. Przywara was very familiar with fascist thought in the early 1930s, and he supported it in his own unique way. He did not want a fascism of the masses, he wanted an orderly, structured fascism, with an authoritarian political system in which the church played a key role. This is not a system for an elite group, but for the whole.

Przywara argued that “the liquidation of that rationalist optimism of progress, which has dominated Europe for three centuries, is unstoppable.”⁶⁸ He narrated the shifting “against humanitarianism” to the new authoritarianism in language of death and resurrection, drawing upon the idea of Jesus’s resurrection. Indeed, in 1933, after the rise of Hitler, Przywara was seeing the hopeful transition in full swing. He was somewhat critical of the collectivist masses and an understanding of the ideal fascism in elitist terms, but nevertheless, on the whole, this awakening was a fundamental turn to Catholicism. What was needed in 1933 was a closer examination of that Catholic tradition. People like Spann and Przywara could show the way. They could harness the Catholics for the cause, as long as those in power were willing to recognize the importance of Catholicism. This is where Przywara is in 1933. He is essentially in a posture of optimistic negotiation with National Socialism. In National Socialist Germany, Przywara is advancing what would become Austro-fascism. It was clearly not a posture of resistance or opposition. As he saw it, the shift towards fascism in Europe was not something that could be stopped. It was a world-historical development. The humanist Enlightenment was finally being exposed for what it was: error – an error that was undergoing liquidation in 1933. Of course, the Catholic Church had been making this claim about the fundamental error of the Enlightenment for a century at this point. Although the Catholic Center Party had embraced the democratic system, the times had now changed in 1933.

1.7 Przywara’s anti-Semitic call for integralism in National Socialist Germany (September 1933)

Przywara’s “Nation, Staat, Kirche” (September, 1933) defended a specific interpretation of nationalistic and *völkisch* ideas with Christian language and the

39.” In *Corporatism and Fascism: The Corporatist Wave in Europe*, ed. Antonio Costa Pinto. London: Routledge, 2017, 124–143.

68 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie”, 192: “Die Liquidierung jenes rationalistischen Fortschritt-Optimismus, der das Europa dreier Jahrhunderte beherrscht hat, ist unaufhaltbar.”

analogia entis concept.⁶⁹ As I have argued, it is “an example of his support of Catholic integralism in Nazi Germany.”⁷⁰ Both John Betz and Pidel have tried to offer an apologetic interpretation of this text. In Pidel’s reading, “As Przywara sees it, the Church is the best hope for discouraging idolatrous nationalism while preserving the value of ethnic and national diversity.”⁷¹ There is some truth to Pidel’s argument. Przywara does challenge the divinization of the nation. He also calls for cooperation between nations. Yet there are other major aspects of his essay that should not be overlooked. In it, Przywara explicitly affirms biological and intellectual racism. He also affirms nationalism within the church in a mystical theology of the nation. He rejects the Jews, concepts of universal humanity, the Enlightenment and cosmopolitanism, or “cosmopolitan distance” (“weltbürgerlich[e] Distanz”⁷²). He is also critical of democracy in 1933 after the rise of Hitler. In the text, Przywara writes: “Nature comes from ‘nasci,’ ‘to be born.’ Being born refers not only to procreation and conception, but precisely being born into the ‘stock/ tribe/ clan/ lineage/ line/ race’ [‘Stamm’]. Procreation and conception stand ultimately in service of this ‘stock,’ in order for it [the ‘stock’] to become always young again and maintain itself.”⁷³ The “hymns of the Enlightenment about the ‘pure humanity’” are thus “thin” and “bloodless.”⁷⁴ Here Przywara again rejects humanitarianism and the Enlightenment ideas of human equality. Clearly, he wanted to have the “blood” of ethnic identity in his anthropology, and he wanted to propagate, as he continues, the “qualitative differences between man and woman, between nation and nation.”⁷⁵ This was all very typical of 1933 Germany. Especially the talk about subservience to the nation. The common term used in National Socialist rhetoric for this concept was *Volksgemeinschaft*. Przywara does not use this charged term from the political discourse. With his essay he was, however, affirming the same pathos in a unique intellectual way. He goes on to argue that “the German is through

69 Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 133, 137; Peterson, “Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews”, 157 f.

70 Peterson, “Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews”, 157.

71 Pidel, “Erich Przywara”, 46.

72 Erich Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche.” *StZ* 125 (Sept. 1933), 370–379, here 378.

73 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 370: “Natur kommt von ‘nasci’, ‘geboren werden’. Geborenwerden weist nicht nur zurück auf Zeugung und Empfängnis, sondern eben hierin auf den ‘Stamm’. Zeugen wie Empfangen wie Geborenwerden stehen zuletzt im Dienst dieses ‘Stammes’: daß er immer neu jung werde und so sich erhalte.”

74 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 371: “Wie dünn und blutlos erscheinen uns heute die Hymnen der Aufklärung auf die ‘reine Menschheit’ [..].”

75 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 372: “[..] die qualitativen Unterschiede zwischen Mann und Frau, Nation und Nation [..].”

and through a German [...].”⁷⁶ In his account, this racist idea includes every dimension of human life: “Not simply the natural, but also the spiritual/ intellectual life itself is male, female, English, German, Frisian, Bavarian.”⁷⁷ His ideal state in 1933 seems to have been the fascist *Ständestaat* idea, one of the core ideas in Austrian fascism and in many streams of National Socialism. Many National Socialists presented themselves as embodying the corporative vision of social harmony. Yet National Socialism was usually more focused on the idea of a dictator. In the same essay, Przywara analyzes Plato and Aristotle and claims: “the classical philosophy of Europe thus appears to see this hovering tension between one-rule and democracy as ‘human state form’ [...].”⁷⁸ Indeed, this seems to be his own ideal vision. Later in 1936 he even praises the idea of an apex of the state against republicanism. Yet Przywara was wise to guard against the divinization of the nation in this essay, and he was critical of the “Boden und Blut” theme in his theological prose.⁷⁹ These specific points in the radical rightwing ideology were a threat to Catholicism. He weaves in and out of these themes in his essay, not forgetting to mention “the ‘fleshly messianism’ of the unbelieving Jews who only tolerated a messiah of wealth and glamour of their own nation [...].”⁸⁰ This is another example of his anti-Semitism at this time. As was typical of 1933 Germany, here too the Jews are presented as self-seeking capitalists and decadent liberals. The anti-Jew attitude was deep in his thought in late 1933. Przywara also addresses Christ’s “victory over unbelieving Judaism [...].”⁸¹ Traditional Christian concepts describe the “fulfilment” of the promises of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ. With Przywara, this is transformed into the martial language of “victory” and “defeat.”

The nationalist pathos was also firmly embedded in his thinking at this time. In a surprising reversal of the older posture of the *Kulturkampf*, Przywara now calls the baptized to give their life to the nation and the state. These themes are all a part of Przywara’s idea of the *Reich* in 1933. In a nutshell, it was anti-Semitic, nationalistic, authoritarian, anti-democratic, anti-liberal, anti-individualistic,

76 Przywara, “Die Hauptrichtungen der katholischen Theologie und Philosophie”, 372: “[...] durch und durch ist der Deutsche Deutscher, [...].”

77 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 372: “Nicht einfach das Naturhafte, sondern das Geistesleben selber ist also männlich, weiblich, englisch, deutsch, friesisch, bayrisch.”

78 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 375: “Als ‘menschliche Staatsform’ scheint also die klassische Philosophie Europas diese Schweben-Spannung zwischen Ein-Herrschaft und Demokratie zu sehen, [...].”

79 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 376.

80 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 376 f.: “den ‘fleischlichen Messianismus’ der ungläubigen Juden, die nur einen Messias des Wohlstandes und des Glanzes der eigenen Nation ertrugen [...].”

81 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 377.: “[...] Sieg über das ungläubige Judentum [...].”

anti-cosmopolitan, racist and, in a strange new way, Catholic. In this thinking, which is typical of early 20th century fascism, the individual was ultimately subsumed under the nation and state. Przywara made an argument for this fascist idea with special religious language:

“Catholic politics as ‘Catholic’ thus has a double-face. No baptized person can ever undo the fact that he died in baptism with Christ to this world, to rise with Christ into this world. From here he bears indelibly in his depth the distance of the one who died and rose again [sc. Christ] to this world. In this he participates in the freedom of God towards the diversity and the transformation of that which is earthly. For this reason, Catholic politics does not identify itself with any political form, but stands in freedom toward every form [...]. And thus an apparent ‘swing-policy of Catholic adaptation’ bears (and perhaps this precisely in the humiliation of such contempt) that glimmer of divine freedom. On the other hand, the baptized has died and rose again to be, entirely, as Christ and with Christ, sent into this world, as the one sent is used without consideration [rücksichtslos], indeed, as the grain of wheat is sunk into the earth. The freedom of his distance would be the most evil presumption of the majesty of God, if it were to mislead him to escape being-sent, being-used and being-sunk. And so it is the nation and the state to which the baptized has to give his life and work, not in a distinguished ‘cosmopolitan distance,’ but in a true, partisan drive/ push [Drang] to the growing greatness of his nation and state [...].”⁸²

The grain of wheat must fall into the nation and state, as he argued: “Within this being-sent and being-sunk of the individual into his nation and state, a particular range will open up. On the one hand, the distance of one who died and rose again will make the Catholic politician particularly capable of serving the relations between nations and states and to see that which mutually spans them [sc. Christianity, the Catholic Church]. On the other hand, the totality of

82 Przywara, “Nation, Staat, Kirche”, 378: “Katholische Politik als ‘katholische’ hat damit ein doppeltes Gesicht. Kein Getaufte kann jemals ungeschehen machen, daß er in der Taufe mit Christo dieser Welt gestorben ist, um mit Christus in jene Welt aufzuerstehen. Von hier aus trägt er unauslöschlich in seiner Tiefe die Distanz des Gestorbenen und Auferstandenen zu dieser Welt. Hierin nimmt er Teil an der Freiheit Gottes gegenüber der Vielfalt und dem Wandel des Irdischen. Darum identifiziert sich katholische Politik mit keiner politischen Form, sondern steht allen in Freiheit gegenüber [...]. Und darum trägt auch noch eine scheinbare ‘Schaukelpolitik katholischer Anpassung’ (und vielleicht gerade sie, in der Verdemütigung solcher Verächtlichkeit) diesen Schimmer göttlicher Freiheit. Andererseits aber ist der Getaufte gestorben und auferstanden, um restlos, wie Christus und mit Christus, in diese Welt gesendet zu werden, wie der Sendling rücksichtslos ins Werk verbraucht wird, ja wie das Weizenkorn in die Erde versenkt wird. Die Freiheit seiner Distanz wäre übelste Anmassung der Majestät Gottes, wenn sie ihn dazu verleiten wollte, diesem Gesendetwerden und Verbrauchtwerden und Versenktwerden zu entgehen. Und so sind es gerade Nation und Staat, denen der Getaufte sein Leben und Wirken zu schenken hat, nicht in einer vornehmen ‘weltbürgerlichen Distanz’, sondern in wahren, partei-nehmendem Drang zur wachsenden Größe seiner Nation und seines Staates [...].”

the surrender of the sent-one and of the grain of wheat will be able to produce a Catholic politics that serves to the end/ unto death [bis zum Letzten] the greatness of one's own nation and state."⁸³ This emphasis on the individual being subsumed under the nation and state was typical of the ideological climate in 1933 Germany. In Przywara's case, there was also a specific Catholic Christian articulation of the theme. He drew upon specific religious language ("grain of wheat", death and resurrection, etc.) and, in many other places (such as "Deutsches Schicksal"), especially on the romantic idea of the medieval church, the representative instance which "spans" the nations. In this sense, Przywara was joining different themes to create a specific form of fascism, Catholic fascism.

These passages above are examples of Przywara providing an outlook on the situation in the Third Reich after the Enabling Act, which came into force on the 24th of March, 1933. The German Catholic Center Party supported this act that gave Hitler extensive powers. Przywara's article shows the thinking that he was propagating in 1933. Now that the political situation had changed, the Center Party is no longer the focal point. Indeed, democracy itself is no ideal to strive for, as the "classical philosophy of Europe" shows. A new era has emerged and the Catholic Church should feel free to embrace this new era in courage. After all, there is a "swing-policy of Catholic adaptation" ("Schaukelpolitik katholischer Anpassung"). A new time has come and Christians should "swing" with the times and "adjust." The baptized should embrace this "freedom." In the end, it is time to take sides, to be partisan for the greatness of the "nation" and the "state." Germans are, after all, born for the "stock", it is in their "blood." This national identity not only has to do with "natural" issues, "but also the spiritual/ intellectual life." "Cosmopolitan distance" is to be rejected. The "stock" must become "young again and maintain itself." The focus is now the nation, the greatness of the nation and the state, the time has come for service, even unto death if necessary. Clearly, the "self-seeking" Jews will have no part in the growing "greatness" of the nation and state in National Socialist Germany.

The assault on the Jews was underway everywhere in Germany in 1933, and also in the pages of *Stimmen der Zeit*. In October of 1933, Przywara addressed Leo Baeck. He holds that his work shows that Judaism, or the Jews as Israel, want to

83 Przywara, "Nation, Staat, Kirche", 378 f.: "Innerhalb dieses Gesendet- und Versenktseins des Einzelnen in seine Nation und seinen Staat wird dann wiederum eine besondere Spannweite sich auftun. Auf der einen Seite wird die Distanz des Gestorbenen und Auferstandenen den katholischen Politiker besonders fähig machen, den Beziehungen zwischen den Nationen und Staaten zu dienen und das gemeinsam Überbrückende zu sehen. Auf der andern Seite aber auch wird die Restlosigkeit der Hingabe des Sendlings und Weizenkorns eine katholische Politik zeitigen können, die bis zum Letzten der Größe der eigenen Nation und des eigenen Staates dient."

“be Christ”, and that is why they reject Christ.⁸⁴ Baeck’s work shows that there is a “terrible/ dreadful/ horrible battle between the Jew and the Christian”.⁸⁵ Clearly, the journal was not an organ of humanitarianism. Przywara held that this was being liquidated. Some Jesuits also promoted the idea that the Jews were more harm than good in 1933 in *Stimmen der Zeit*.

1.8 Gutav Lehmacher on the Jews and the Nordic race (November 1933)

If German Catholics were wondering what to think about the whole discussion of racial issues in National Socialist Germany, they need look no further than *Stimmen der Zeit*. There the Jesuit Gutav Lehmacher argued in November of 1933 in all clarity that “intellectual characteristics” (“geistige Eigenschaften”) were conditioned by race.⁸⁶ The Jesuit was clearly convinced that the Nordic race was special, as that it was “well suited for conquest and rule”.⁸⁷ He tried to keep things in balance in his extensive review of the new racist literature, but this was the position that was put out to the readers. He argued that the Jews are a different race. Drawing upon and affirming anti-Semitic literature of his time, he believed that the Jews “bring more harm than good to our Volk” (“unserem Volk mehr Schaden als Nutzen bringen”).⁸⁸ His criticism of the Jews was probably influenced by his belief that they were overrepresented in occupations, as he suggests. In the middle of Hitler-Germany, Lehmacher holds that the “immigration of the Eastern Jews could not improve the racial composition.”⁸⁹ He also claimed that the Jews had a special ability to “place themselves into the souls of other people and control them according to their will.”⁹⁰ Of course, he

84 Erich Przywara, “Jude und Christ.” *StZ* 126 (Oct. 1933), 51–54, here 53: “Im grimmigen Rhythmus dieser Zeichnungen ward aber bereits offenbar, wie unter dieser scheinbaren Objektivität doch nichts anders lebt als das, was am Karfreitag durch Jerusalem tobte: das Nein Israels gegen Christus, weil es selbst Christus sein will.” He addresses Leo Baeck, *Wege im Judentum: Aufsätze und Reden* (Berlin: Schocken, 1933).

85 Przywara, “Jude und Christ”, 54: “So wird das Buch zum lebendigen Zeugnis des furchtbaren Kampfes zwischen Jude und Christ [...]”

86 Gutav Lehmacher, “Rassenwerte.” *StZ* 126 (Nov. 1933), 73–82, here 74.

87 Lehmacher, “Rassenwerte”, 78: “Nun scheint sich allerdings die Nordrasse durch Kraft und Stetigkeit des Willens, durch Selbstvertrauen und Ehrliche zum Erobern und Herrschen wohl zu eignen.”

88 Lehmacher, “Rassenwerte”, 81.

89 Lehmacher, “Rassenwerte”, 81: “Und die starke Einwanderung der Ostjuden konnte unsere rassische Zusammensetzung nicht aufbessern.”

90 Lehmacher, “Rassenwerte”, 81: “[...] sich in die Seele anderer Menschen zu versetzen und sie nach ihrem Willen zu lenken.”

slightly distances himself from the most radical pagan racists. He thus claims in a very unusual negation of a negation that it cannot be proven that a Jew cannot be made a “useful member of the German *Volk*” (“brauchbaren Gliede des deutschen Volkes”).⁹¹ Furthermore, he emphasizes justice as the foundation of society, and holds that freedom of the will, education and divine grace should be added to the mix of the equation. Yet even here he argues that Christianity helps racial improvement. On the whole, the Jesuit argued that the Nordic race was suited to rule and Jews neither belong to the German race nor were they good for it. While he was not calling for the violent persecution of the Jews, his arguments clearly suggest the need to expose, monitor and control the Jews as that they were fundamentally different and potentially harmful for the German *Volk*. Indeed, this was already happening in 1933, all under the guise of “justice” and “legality”, of course. His article essentially affirms the status quo. It is also a good example of the thinking in the journal at this time. It fits into the broader impulses that Przywara and others were promoting.

1.9 Anton Koch on sterilization politics (November 1933)

The sterilization politics of the National Socialist government was addressed already in 1933 by *Stimmen der Zeit*. In November of 1933, for example, the Jesuit Anton Koch provides a relatively positive reception of the developments in Germany.⁹² Indeed, he is not really critical of sterilization. He essentially argues that the new sterilization law does not get at the real issue that should be addressed. According to Koch, this issue was German birth rates. He wanted to see these raised. He was clearly hoping to join forces with the state in the ideological turn. He called the state and the church the highest powers and he wanted to see them join forces to discipline the people with a concerted and “iron no” against those things that would slow birth rates, and a concerted “yes” to advance the life of the *Volk*.⁹³ While the experiment of Soviet Russia would lead to destruction

⁹¹ Lehmacher, “Rassenwerte”, 82.

⁹² Anton Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens.” *StZ* 126 (Nov. 1933), 82–87, here 85: “Der Justizminister des Reiches kündigt eine Neuordnung der Rechtsgrundsätze an, die vor allem dem Schutz des Lebens kommender Geschlechter und der Erschwerung der Ehescheidung dienen soll. Es ist ganz zweifellos, daß eine Bewegung auf diesem Gebiete hin zu den Grundauffassungen der katholischen Kirche ebenso notwendig ist, wie sie lebensfördernd wirken muß.” On his view of the new law, see *ibid.*, 85 f.

⁹³ Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 86: “Erst wenn sich dieser letzte und tiefste Glaube an das Leben verbindet mit dem Glauben an die irdische Zukunft und Größe des

of the “Volkstum”, Koch sees “Deutschland” going a different direction in 1933. Germany is going back to the “natural foundations” (“naturhaften Grundlagen”) in order to rebuild the “Volksleben”.⁹⁴ In principle, he was not critical of this interest in the “natural foundations.” As he remarks, he is waiting to see if the population rises after 1933. While he is not sure if it will rise or not, he is sure that the final result of the development will be good “if the no and yes of the church connects with the no and yes of the state – for the good of the *Volk*.”⁹⁵ It seems that Koch and his colleagues at *Stimmen der Zeit*, like Przywara, were hopeful of the development that came in 1933. They wanted to see the church recognized for what it was, a cooperative partner in the “iron” resistance to the modern developments. It was time to seize the hour with force, “zum Wohle des Volkes.” If the *Volk* saw that the church and the state were “entirely unified” (“völlig einig”)⁹⁶ in this program they would be able to convince those who were not yet committed. This is one of many examples of Catholic fascism and Catholic integralism in National Socialist Germany. It is an expression of an essentially positive hope for the Catholic Church’s participation in National Socialist Germany as one of the two “highest powers” (“die beiden höchsten Gewalten”), alongside the National Socialist state.⁹⁷ This is the general impulse in the journal after the rise of Hitler and the destruction of the first modern German democracy. Indeed, Koch affirmatively drew upon one of the leading political figures in National Socialist Germany, Walter Groß (1904–1945), and his work in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, offering the Catholic Church as a servant in the agenda for the *Volk*.⁹⁸ Groß was on the cutting edge of the National Socialist racist political agenda. He was one of the key figures behind the Nuremberg

eigenen Volkes, keimt jener schöpferische Wille in den Volksgenossen auf, der die Lebensquellen neu und reich aufsprudeln läßt. Erst wenn das ganze Volk sieht, daß die beiden höchsten Gewalten, die Kirche und der Staat, völlig einig gehen in dem ehernen Nein gegen alles, was die Quellen des Lebens zum Versiegen bringt, erst dann werden auch die heute noch Halben, Unentschlossenen wieder lernen, ihr Ja zum Leben der Nachkommenschaft zu sprechen und die Opfer auf sich zu nehmen, die dieses Ja notwendig auferlegt.”

94 Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 87.

95 Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 87: “[...] wenn das Nein und Ja der Kirche sich verbindet mit dem Nein und Ja des Staates – zum Wohle des Volkes.”

96 Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 86, see citation above.

97 Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 86, see citation above.

98 Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 86. On Groß, see Roger Uhle, *Neues Volk und reine Rasse. Walter Gross und das Rassenpolitische Amt der NSDAP (RPA) 1934–1945*, Diss. Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen, 1999; Sonja Schnitzler, *Soziologie im Nationalsozialismus zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik. Elisabeth Pfeil und das “Archiv für Bevölkerungswissenschaft und Bevölkerungspolitik”*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2012), 186–193.

Race Laws and the “Aktion T-4.” At the time that Koch was constructively engaging his work, Groß was the Head of the Enlightenment-Office for Population Policy and Racial Care (*Leiter des Aufklärungsamtes für Bevölkerungspolitik und Rassenpflege*). Why would the Jesuit Koch be constructively engaging the work of someone like Groß at the end of 1933? Furthermore, why did he present the church as a cooperative partner in this context?⁹⁹ For the same reason Przywara was engaging all the intellectuals of fascism. It seems that Koch and Przywara were trying to express hopes for an integralist solution to the challenges of the time. There was room for discussion and compromise with Groß and his ideology if the National Socialists were willing to see that the church was indeed this second of the two “highest powers.” This was the thought-world of *Stimmen der Zeit* in 1933. Opposition was not the agenda. Finding common ground was the agenda, as well as optimistic negotiation and strategic compromise. This posture of negotiation and compromise did not emerge suddenly in 1933. Its roots are found in the earlier turn away from the older generation of ultramontanism. The time had come to move away from the old program of inward-looking resistance. The time had come to engage the German field with a “victory-Catholicism.” In large part, this turn had to do with the rise of German anti-liberalism after World War I. As the conditions changed, old Catholic anti-liberalism could now join forces with new German anti-liberalism.

Przywara’s engagement with Spengler in his “Dynamismus” has already been addressed briefly.¹⁰⁰ In December of 1933, Przywara essentially sees Spengler and Augustine in agreement with one another. He essentially praises Spengler’s radical nationalistic ideas against Marxism. He narrates this in a general theory of blood and battle in submissive obedience. At the end of 1933, Przywara was finding ways of joining Ignatius with Spengler and Augustine, with Carl Schmitt, Nietzsche and Donoso Cortés in the background.¹⁰¹ In his argument, the whole Society of Jesus seemed to be taken into the ideological swing of the times. He thought that the power of dynamism of his time was living in the Jesuits. Spengler’s version of national socialist ideology, along with its anti-Marxist resentments, seems to have found a safe home in the Munich journal. This article is another example of the creative and fusional energy that was emanating from *Stimmen der Zeit* in 1933.

99 See esp. Koch, “Die Kirche und die Quellen des völkischen Lebens”, 86, after citing Groß in the *Völkischer Beobachter* (Nr. 233, 21 Aug., 1933) on the *Volk* learning once again to follow the “healthy instinct of life [gesunden Instinkt des Lebens]”, Koch writes: “Hier ist denn auch der Punkt, wo sich die Ziele des Staates mit denen der Kirche am allernächsten berühren, und wo die Kirche ihre volkserzieherische Macht am unmittelbarsten einsetzen kann.”

100 Peterson, “Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*”, 137 f.

101 Przywara, “Dynamismus.” *StZ* 126 (Dec. 1933), 155–168, see esp. 166 f.

1.10 Przywara, Erik Peterson, Erich Voegelin and Dietrich Eckart (1934)

In a book review in March of 1934, Przywara cites Erik Peterson, a fresh convert to Catholicism from Protestantism, who writes: “Also within the church, the differentiation between Jews and gentiles, between *Jewish-Christians* and *gentile-Christians*, is entirely possible in the *natural* sphere.”¹⁰² Presumably, this too was Przywara’s own view. As he states in his review and summary of Peterson, which he seems to affirm here, “The unity of the One Church cannot be secularized, as the Enlightenment wanted, to a unity of the One Humanity.”¹⁰³ Przywara confirms this position in various publications at this time. In this thinking, the Jews remain Jews in the natural realm even after their conversion. He also fundamentally rejected the idea of a “unity of the One Humanity.” The theoretical question in the background here is whether converted Jews should be viewed as equals? Does the conversion to Christianity entail a fundamental status of equality? As the theological argument here suggests, even after conversion the Jews remain Jews in the natural sense. This would mean that the Jews would not necessarily have to acquire the status of equality in the legal and political sense, even if they had it in the spiritual sense.

Przywara may have been influenced by the thought of Erich Voegelin. Przywara references Voegelin’s race-theoretical work in April of 1934.¹⁰⁴ In August of 1934, Przywara uses the Bible and a citation from the rabbi and dramatist Emil Bernhard Cohn about the persecution of the Jews to remind the readers of *Stimmen der Zeit* about the “curse of unbelieving Judaism” (“Fluch des ungläubigen Judentums”).¹⁰⁵ In September of 1934, Przywara offers a positive presentation of various works from Dietrich Eckart, a key figure in National Socialism. He refers to Alfred Rosenberg’s edition of his work.¹⁰⁶ Przywara thought that Catholicism

102 Erik Peterson, *Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden. Drei Vorlesungen*. Salzburg: Pustet, 1933, 53: “Auch innerhalb der Kirche ist in der *natürlichen* Sphäre die Unterscheidung von Juden und Heiden, von *Judenchristen* und *Heidenchristen* durchaus möglich.” As cited in Erich Przywara, “Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden.” in *StZ* 126 (March 1934), 414–415, here 414:

103 Przywara, “Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden”, 414: “Die Einheit der Einen Kirche kann nicht, wie die Aufklärung es wollte, zur Einheit Einer Menschheit verweltlicht werden”.

104 See Erich Przywara, “Ende oder Anfang der Philosophie?.” *StZ* 127 (April 1934), 46–49, here 48; Przywara refers to Erich Voegelin, *Die Rassenidee in der Geistesgeschichte*. Berlin: Junker and Dünnhaupt, 1933; see also Voegelin’s *Rasse und Staat*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.

105 Erich Przywara, “[Rev.] Emil Bernhard Cohn, *Aufruf zum Judentum*. Berlin: Siegfried Scholem, 1934.” *StZ* 127 (Aug. 1934), 357–358, here 358. See Deborah Horner, *Emil Bernhard Cohn. Rabbiner und Bühnenautor*. Berlin: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2009.

106 Erich Przywara, “Gläubigkeit.” *StZ* 127 (Sept. 1934), 370–383, here 378 ff. He later writes in reference to Dietrich Eckart’s work, among others: “*Katholische Gläubigkeit* ist in Wahrheit die Antwort auf die wilden Fragen, die in all diesen Gläubigkeiten brennen.” *Ibid.*, 380.

was the answer to the religious questions in Eckart's work. As this shows, he saw these intellectual and spiritual worlds in dynamic tension and collaborative unity.

2 *Stimmen der Zeit* in the context of German fascism

Przywara was not a National Socialist.¹⁰⁷ He was, however, promoting a specific form of fascist ideology after World War I. This form of fascism was not imbued with secularist ideology or neo-paganism but with Catholicism. This was not traditional 19th century anti-liberal, anti-modernist, ultramontane Catholicism. It sought to re-identify with German culture and tradition against the older traditions of ultramontane Catholicism. In this sense, it also had a progressive edge because it was positively engaging new philosophies (such as Heidegger's),¹⁰⁸

107 Pidel claims that I tried to establish "indices of concrete NS loyalty". Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 35.

108 The National Socialist philosopher Martin Heidegger influenced many Catholic intellectuals in the 1930s, such as Hans Urs von Balthasar. Balthasar's thinking emerged in and was in dialog with the context of early 20th century European fascism. Balthasar was drawing upon streams of this ideology and developing a unique form of it with other sources of theology, philosophy and literature. Yet "Balthasar was not [...] a vulgar fascist in the stereotypical sense of Rosenberg [...]. Balthasar's expression of the zeitgeist is a softer form from the periphery of the later generations of the *George-Kreis* in the specific milieu of new-conservative, post-World War I Germanophone reform Catholicism and of the Swiss German variation of *Kulturkatholizismus*. Balthasar's form of the ideology was more taken with an authoritarian *Ständestaat* than a dictatorial absolutism. It was too timid for vulgar Germanic blood language but preferred the nature rooted essence of the *Gemeinschaft*. It was not interested in a new pagan religion to replace Christianity, but rather a renewed Catholicism that was harmonious with a version of the Germanic *Volk* ideology. It did not want the individual subsumed under a secular statist ideology, but rather a nationally oriented, religious *Gemeinschaft* order. It did not call for the violent uprooting of the Jews, even if it did want to see them restricted in social life, and viewed them as a general problem. Balthasar's fascism, like Przywara's, was a refined Catholic fascism." Peterson, *The Early Hans Urs von Balthasar*, 182 f. Some contemporary systematic theologians defend Heidegger's philosophy of death from a Christian perspective. Yet this often leads to the apologetic relativization of the connection between Heidegger's philosophy and his ideology. George Pattison, for example, writes that this whole issue is "compounded by Heidegger's own inability to give any clear post-war accounting of the responsibility he felt for the crimes committed by the Reich and, in several enigmatic statements, seems to suggest (a) that the death camps were morally (or, at any rate, ontologically) on the same level as industrialized agriculture and (b) that the Jews and other who died in the camps did not 'die' in the radical authentic sense of the term but merely 'perished'. However, these comments are, as I have said, enigmatic and could be read in a way that, far from trivializing the crimes of the Holocaust, sees them in the horizon of the broader modern phenomenon of a military-industrial complex that continues to threaten the diminishment of human life. In these terms,

modern literature (such as the *George-Kreis*), social theory (like Spann's), legal theory (like Schmitt's) and political theory (like Spengler's). Przywara was a creative intellectual who was struggling with the intellectual tensions of his context and seeking to build bridges and defend positions. Przywara and many of his colleagues tried to convince their counterparts of the virility of the Catholic Church. They believed that liberalism was being "liquidated", and that the time had come for Catholicism to be rediscovered.¹⁰⁹ In fact, many of them seemed to think that the rise of fascism in Europe was essentially a positive opportunity for the Catholic Church, as that it was, in many regards, a turn to Catholicism, albeit one that was still incomplete and imperfect.

On the whole, and as the 1930s progressed, the Munich Jesuits were more sympathetic to Italian and Austrian fascism than German National Socialist fascism. The former forms were more sympathetic to the Catholic Church. As the 1930s progressed, the latter became more hostile to the church.¹¹⁰ Some versions

Heidegger's comments could be seen as analogous to those of a left-wing commentator such as Adorno." George Pattison, *Heidegger on Death: A Critical Theological Essay*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2013, 11. In Pattison's unusual presentation of Heidegger as an intellectual on the progressive left, he overlooks the fact that Heidegger's theories of self-sacrificial death, along with his racism and anti-Semitism all have a natural home in National Socialism. See Emmanuel Faye, *Heidegger, the Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy in Light of the Unpublished Seminars of 1933–1935*, transl. Michael B. Smith. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009.

109 They agreed with Romano Guardini and his claim that they were living at the "end of the modern age." Guardini developed this basic idea very early and it is found in many of his writings in the 1920s.

110 The fact that National Socialist ideologues did not see Przywara as an imminent threat is obvious from their explicit reference to him, such as Otto Dietrich's. Pidel asserts that "One element of Peterson's case for Przywara's receptivity to NS is the praise Przywara received from [sic] NS circles." Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 30. I drew upon this association to establish the point that Przywara was not viewed as an enemy of National Socialism. Of course, he had a somewhat different vision of the *Reich* when compared to Alfred Rosenberg. Yet Betz claimed that "Nazi records" indicated that Przywara was a dangerous representative of anti-National Socialist Catholicism. John Betz, "Translator's Introduction." in Erich Przywara, *Analogia Entis: Metaphysics: Original Structure and Universal Rhythm*, transl. John Betz and David Bentley Hart. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2014, 1–116, here 25. Granted, Betz was drawing upon literature that was simply misrepresenting the history with an apologetic approach. See my "Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews", 149. There were many conflicting ideological viewpoints in National Socialist literature and political commentary in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. Pidel points out the fact that Rosenberg was critical of Przywara's philosophy of religion. Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 31. I entirely agree with this observation. Rosenberg represented the radical rightwing of the National Socialist ideology. It was critical of traditional religion. The Jesuits were trying to establish bridges to the more moderate forms of fascism in Germany and across Europe. On Rosenberg's anti-Jesuit agenda, see my "Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews", 154; "Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*", 119; and *The Early Hans Urs von Balthasar*, 103 f.; 151–162; 185–189.

of fascism came into conflict with one another as they competed for power. For example, some forms of Catholic fascism were rejected and challenged by radical forms of National Socialism.¹¹¹ Some Catholic fascists sensed this tension and conflict and thus tried to make their version of the program more appealing to the critics. Przywara is a good example of one of these creative mediators, especially as he developed the idea of heroism from a Christian perspective.

¹¹¹ According to a report from Max Elsner from 1935 (as published in *Germania* in 1935), one of Przywara's lectures on "the Christian-heroic" ("Christlich-Heroische") was disrupted by students (probably National Socialists) at the University of Munich. See Max Elsner, "Ein bedauerlicher Vorfall an der Münchener Universität." *Germania. Zeitung für das deutsche Volk*, 3 Feb. 1935; as cited in Johann Neuhäusler, *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz. Der Kampf des Nationalsozialismus gegen die Katholische Kirche und der kirchliche Widerstand*, vol. 2, 2nd ed. München: Katholische Kirche Bayerns, 1946, 180; Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 33. According to Elsner, these students were mostly members of the *Kameradschaftshaus*, and thus presumably radical rightwing National Socialists. In Elsner's report of the event, he suggests that this radical group was actually damaging the cause of National Socialism. Furthermore, this seemed to him to be entirely contradictory as that the Catholics had an "exemplary national stance in the Saar-question which first enabled this glowing victory of the German matter." Elsner, "Ein bedauerlicher Vorfall an der Münchener Universität", as cited in Neuhäusler, *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz*, 180: "vorbildliche nationale Haltung der Katholiken in der Saarfrage [...], die erst diesen glänzenden Sieg der deutschen Sache ermöglicht hat." He warns that the behavior of these radicals could actually push Catholics into the ghetto. As his remarks suggest, Elsner wanted Catholics to be engaged in the national renewal. Furthermore, the inhibiting of the freedom of expression of worldview principles of one part of the *Volksgemeinschaft* contradicted, according to Elsner, the "clear will of the Leader" ("dem klaren Willen des Führers"). On the whole, as he explains, it was actually National Socialism that incurred "damages" from this. Referring to a published article, he calls for "trust for trust!" ("Vertrauen um Vertrauen!"). Elsner, perhaps like Przywara himself, probably wanted the radical National Socialists to trust them – trust that they too were concerned with the wellbeing of the *Volksgemeinschaft* and that they too had the correct "national stance" that led to a "victory of the German matter." Obviously, Elsner did not want to suggest that Przywara was in opposition to National Socialism. On the contrary, he too was trying to advance the nationalist cause in his own unique Catholic way. Drawing upon Otto Dietrich's analysis, Pidel writes: "How can Przywara be both a 'verticalist' denying religion any bearing on the world and a Catholic 'integralist' trying to position the Church to manipulate the emergent NS state?" Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 30. Pidel claims that my view, according to which Przywara was a Catholic fascist hoping for an integralist Catholicism in the Third Reich, contradicts Otto Dietrich's view of Przywara. Otto Dietrich praised Przywara for the separation of philosophy and religion. However, Rosenberg criticizes him for his emphasis on divine transcendence. This is an example of the internal dispute within National Socialism about religion. There was a discussion taking place about the status of religion and especially regarding traditional religious ideas. One of the questions at this time was: How much of the old traditional religion could be redeemed and maintained in National Socialism? How much of it could be preserved or reinterpreted without doing damage to the supposedly true Germanic religion or worldview? Przywara's praise of Dietrich Eckart, and many other rightwing and fascist intellectuals at this time, is an example of his participation in this discourse.

Nevertheless, his views would have seemed unorthodox to the most radical National Socialists who followed Rosenberg and an anti-Jesuit agenda.

The inner-Catholic discussion about various forms of fascism was very complicated. Even National Socialism was in some degree of internal conflict. National Socialist cultural theory, philosophy and literature (religious or otherwise), and National Socialist ideology, social theory and politics were interrelated phenomena with different interests and visions of the future. There was, however, a handful of common themes.¹¹² These themes also emerge with Przywara and many other Catholic and Protestant intellectuals at this time who were encouraging collaborative and dialogical approaches. Many were participating in this hermeneutical debate in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. This debate had to do with the themes of the ideological swing, but also with the role of traditional religion in the broader discourse. Przywara and many other Catholic intellectuals wanted to ensure that the traditional religion would have a place in the new *Reich*. They wanted it to be recognized as an able and willing player, one of the two highest powers (with the state).

Virtually everyone in this discourse was working with some kind of *Führer*-concept and *Reich*-concept. Przywara was also drawing on this theme, especially when addressing the apex of the state in his criticism of republicanism. He was also providing a unique interpretation of the new idea of the *Reich*. His view of the *Reich* had to do with a modernized idea of the Middle Ages. The Middle Age period was important because it was a time when the church was integral in the social order. Many Catholic intellectuals, like Przywara, were turning to this idea as an alternative to the Western republican, democratic and humanitarian conceptions of political order. This political idea sometimes went together with the idea that the German tradition was called to be a unique political force in the world. It was deeply related to neo-romantic political and religious ideology and it became all the more plausible as the Weimar democracy came under assault.

Another shared theme in the 1920s and early 1930s was a criticism of Enlightenment rationality and autonomy. There were various forms of this intellectual trend. Some were highly creative intellectualized literary concepts of activism (with a deep interest in the phenomenon of the *Tat*), while others were brutish theories of authoritarian decisionism. Rationalism was usually viewed as non-heroic, republican and democratic, and thus anti-German in the 1920s. This was

112 Cf. Klaus Vondung, "Der literarische Nationalismus. Ideologische, politische und sozial-historische Wirkungszusammenhänge." In *Die deutsche Literatur im Dritten Reich*, ed. Horst Denkler and Karl Prümm. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1976, 44–65; Klaus Vondung, *Völkisch-nationale und nationalsozialistische Literaturtheorie*. München: List, 1973; Karl-Heinz Joachim Schoeps, *Literatur im Dritten Reich (1933–1945)*. Berlin: Weidler, 2000.

closely related to the reception of Nietzsche's life-philosophy. Many were also encouraging a general belief in fate, collective destiny and anti-liberalism. A large portion of the influential authors at this time in National Socialist Germany also promoted different versions of *völkisch* thought and anti-Semitism. Almost all of these intellectuals were nationalistic and neo-conservative (rather than traditionalist). A whole range of *Volk*-community and non-Marxist (and non-bolshevist) socialistic themes were articulated that offered a strong alternative to capitalism, liberalism and democracy. Visionary conceptions of an idealized neo-corporative/estate society played a major role in this debate. Many Catholic and Protestant intellectuals from this period were carefully embracing these streams of thought with theologically articulated interpretations and elegantly construed suggestions for improvement. Some National Socialists were more open to these mediating approaches from the theologians, while others were more radical in their opposition to organized religion and traditional belief. Przywara and many of his colleagues at *Stimmen der Zeit* and students were engaged in these debates. Their basic program was one of mediation. They sought to make the intellectual, social and political climate more amiable to Catholicism and, at the same time, show how Catholicism embraced these same themes with specific interpretations. One of the basic ideas common to most of this ideology was the negation of modern liberal individualism. In October of 1935, for example, Przywara was calling for a radical concept of self-negation in service and a self-negation of personality in the sacrifice of personality. He thought that this would "liquidate the modern age".¹¹³ The Spanish Civil War and the fear of bolshevism were also major issues on the horizon of Catholic fascism in the mid-1930s. The military conflict drove many Catholic intellectuals to support various forms of fascism. The war made the issue all the more dramatic. It seemed that a decision was now required: Is one for fascism – or against it?

Yet already by the summer of 1933 the injustices (not only rhetoric) of Hitler's Germany were known to the world. Many of these are listed in Hamilton Fish Armstrong's "Hitler's Reich – The First Phase", published in July of 1933 in the popular political journal *Foreign Affairs*.¹¹⁴ The democratic republic was gone, concentration camps were being established, the program of *Gleichschaltung* was being implemented, storm troops were killing opponents, universities were being

¹¹³ Erich Przywara, "Pascal und Dostojewski." *StZ* 130 (Oct. 1935), 56–60, here 60: "So allein wird die Neuzeit liquidiert: ihr Aufstand der Persönlichkeit in das Opfer der Persönlichkeit, ihr Aufstand gegen den Dienst in den Untergang in den Dienst. Dieses Grab allein wird das 'glorreiche Grab' der Auferstehung."

¹¹⁴ Hamilton Fish Armstrong, "Hitler's Reich – The First Phase." *Foreign Affairs* 11 (1933), 589–608, here 589.

“cleansed”, the press was being “assimilated”, radical propaganda and radical anti-Semitism was omnipresent, rumors of the expansionist politics were already known, the pathos of the greatness of the nation was growing steadily. This was the world that Przywara was writing to in 1933 as he called his readers to die for the greatness of the nation. He is one of many clerical figures of his era who reflected a specific religious-ideological sentiment that has been called “clerical fascism” in interwar Europe.¹¹⁵ There were many expressions of this general sentiment in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. Some versions were Catholic while others were Protestant. Some were simply using Catholicism for their political agenda, while others were developing highly intellectualized and theologically-articulated support for fascism that sprang from the intellectual framework

115 See Matthew Feldman, Marius Turda, with Tudor Georgescu, ed., *Clerical Fascism in Interwar Europe*. London: Routledge, 2008; Hübner, *Die Rechtskatholiken*, 596 ff.; John Pollard, “Fascism and Catholicism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Fascism*, ed. R. J. B. Bosworth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 166–184; Jorge Dagnino, *Faith and fascism: Catholic intellectuals in Italy 1925–1943*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017; Olaf Blaschke, *Die Kirchen und der Nationalsozialismus*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2014; John Pollard, *The Papacy in the Age of Totalitarianism 1914–1958*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014; Jan Nelis, Anne Morelli, and Danny Praet, “The Study of the Relationship between Catholicism and Fascism, beyond a Manichean Approach?.” In *Catholicism and Fascism in Europe 1918–1945*, ed. idem. Hildesheim: Olms, 2015, 9–14; Beth A. Griech-Polelle, “The impact of the Spanish Civil War upon Roman Catholic clergy in Nazi Germany.” In *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust*, ed. Kevin P. Spicer. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2007, 121–135; Gerhard Besier, “Anti-Bolshevism and Antisemitism: The Catholic Church in Germany and National Socialist Ideology 1936–37.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 43 (1992), 447–456; Guenter Lewy, *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany*. New York, N.Y.: MacGraw-Hill, 1964; Richard Grunberger, *The twelve-year Reich: A social history of Nazi Germany 1933–1945*. New York, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart Winston, 1971; John Pollard, “Fascism and Religion.” In *Rethinking the Nature of Fascism: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. António Costa Pinto. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 141–164; Robert Michael, *A History of Catholic Antisemitism: The Dark Side of the Church*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011; Tom Villis, *British Catholics and Fascism: Religious Identity and Political Extremism between the Wars*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013; Kevin P. Spicer, *Hitler’s priests: Catholic clergy and National Socialism*. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008; Cymet, *History vs. Apologetics*; Susan Zuccotti, *Under His Very Windows: The Vatican and the Holocaust in Italy*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002; John F. Pollard, *The Vatican and Italian Fascism 1929–1932: A Study in Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985; Ernst Hanisch, “Der Politische Katholizismus als ideologischer Träger des ‘Austrofaschismus’.” In *Austrofaschismus. Politik – Ökonomie – Kultur 1933–1938*, ed. Emmerich Tálos and Wolfgang Neugebauer. Wien: LIT, 2005; Klaus-Jörg Siegfried, *Klerikalfaschismus. Zur Entstehung und sozialen Funktion des Dollfussregimes in Österreich. Ein Beitrag zur Faschismuskussion*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1979; Robert Kriechbaumer, ed., *Österreich! und Front Heil! Aus den Akten des Generalsekretariats der Vaterländischen Front. Innenansichten eines Regimes*. Wien: Böhlau, 2005; Richard Griffiths, *An Intelligent Person’s Guide to Fascism*. London: Duckworth, 2000; Bernhard Dietz, *Neo-Tories*.

of Catholicism. Przywara is an example of a refined intellectual expression of this ideological mix with a corporative theory and a metaphysics of the whole. He was not in any significant opposition to fascism. Przywara did not offer a defense of the Jews or seek to help them in any significant way. On the contrary, Przywara's writings from this period exemplify a specific form of post-World War I anti-humanitarian, anti-democratic and anti-liberal Catholic fascism.¹¹⁶ He promoted a unique form of ideology in his context in the 1920s and 1930s. This version was not identical to the radical forms of National Socialism.¹¹⁷ Clearly, Przywara was not a vulgar fascist like Rosenberg. He was something else. He was more cultured and careful. He promoted a refined Catholic fascism, not a neo-pagan blood-and-soil fascism. The former must be distinguished from the latter. The Catholic version was bound to papal teachings in one way or another. The Jesuit Max Pribilla, for example, praised Benito Mussolini in 1935, and, while drawing upon Leo XIII's *Diuturnum Illud* (1881), called for a *res mixtae*.¹¹⁸ This was the agenda of the progressive Jesuits as they established a path of mediation in the 1930s in the wake of the old *Kulturkampf*.

Like many others at *Stimmen der Zeit* in Munich, Przywara wanted to see the Catholic Church respected in National Socialist Germany. His writings tried to convince fascist intellectuals and German leaders of the importance of the Catholic Church and the Catholic intellectual tradition. Balthasar and Przywara and many of the others in Munich seem to have supported the Austrian version of fascism. Of course, if one can successfully establish the claim that this specific form of cultural, socio-political and religious ideology in Austria from 1933 to 1938 was not "fascist", then Przywara and many others were also not "fascists." Yet this agenda would be more motivated by apologetics than history. This is because Austro-fascism had too many similarities to the other forms of fascism that emerged in Italy, Germany, Spain and elsewhere in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s. In general, the religiously infused ideology in the case of Przywara and many other Jesuits in *Stimmen der Zeit* was anti-Semitic, anti-liberal, anti-democratic and authoritarian.

116 For my definition of Catholic fascism see Peterson, "Once again, Erich Przywara and the Jews", 162.

117 Peterson, "Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*", 139: "[...] it is to be distinguished from the internally contradictory and diverse NS ideology [...]."

118 See Peterson, *The Early Hans Urs von Balthasar*, 201.

3 Przywara's letters to Carl Schmitt, 1953–1961

Przywara's letters to Carl Schmitt from the 1950s and 1960s show how much Przywara admired Schmitt and agreed with him.¹¹⁹ Even after the destruction of World War II, Przywara was filled with praise for the Crown-Jurist of the Third Reich, his ideology and anti-liberal pathos. In a letter to Schmitt from the 2nd of July, 1953, Przywara expresses the fact that what he wrote before 1947 was either burned, not available or could not be republished because publishers were not interested in it. In a sympathetic moment, he asks Schmitt if he had the same experience. Przywara also asked Schmitt to send some of his works from the 1930s. In another letter from Przywara to Schmitt on the 23rd of July, 1953, he asks for more of his works, such as his works on Juan Donoso Cortés and his *Leviathan*. Przywara explains that he is writing an extensive review which will appear anonymously in *Die Besinnung: Kritische Zeitschrift für Kultur- und Geistesleben*, which was edited by Karl Borromäus Glock.¹²⁰ He mentioned to Schmitt that he was going to address Schmitt's *Der Nomos der Erde* in this publication. In another letter from the 17th of August, 1953, Przywara asks Schmitt for more of his publications. He also states that he, Przywara, found Schmitt's *Staat, Bewegung, Volk* (1933)¹²¹ in his evacuated books. In this work, Schmitt offered a legal justification of the National Socialist revolution of 1933 because of the "German sense for order."¹²² Schmitt also initiated an anti-Semitic conference in 1936 ("Das Judentum in der Rechtswissenschaft") in which the Catholic jurist Schmitt remarked, in the final sentence of the closing address of the conference: "In that I defend myself from the Jew,' our Leader Adolf Hitler says, 'I fight for the work of the Lord.'"¹²³ In the same letter, Przywara remarks

119 Drawn from Archiv der Deutschen Provinz der Jesuiten, Nachlass Przywara, Abt. 47 – 182, Nr. 1261. Further research is needed in the analysis of Schmitt's responses to Przywara. His literary estate is kept in the Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen. Schmitt's letters were not consulted for this research. Pidel has also analyzed Przywara's letters. Pidel, "Erich Przywara", 34 f. Yet he seems to misunderstand Przywara's admiration of Schmitt.

120 Cf. Doris von der Brélie-Lewien, *Katholische Zeitschriften in den Westzonen 1945–1949. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Kultur der Nachkriegszeit*. Göttingen: Muster-Schmidt, 1986, 68 ff.

121 Carl Schmitt, *Staat, Bewegung, Volk. Die Dreigliederung der politischen Einheit*. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1933; this was vol. 1 of the new series: *Der deutsche Staat der Gegenwart*.

122 Horst Dreier, "Die deutsche Staatsrechtslehre in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus." *Veröffentlichungen der Vereinigung der Deutschen Staatsrechtslehrer* 60 (2001), 9–72, esp. 20–24, here 22.

123 Schmitt: "Indem ich mich des Juden erwehre' sagt unser Führer Adolf Hitler, 'kämpfe ich für das Werk des Herrn.'" Carl Schmitt, "Schlusswort des Reichsgruppenwalters Staatsrat Prof. Dr.

on Schmitt's *Staat, Bewegung, Volk*. He sympathetically remarks on the fact that Schmitt had to navigate through the whole wire entanglement. This is clearly a remark of sympathetic recognition and understanding. He suggests that Schmitt was a clear-headed intellectual who was careful and balanced, judicious and thoughtful given the circumstances. He then goes on to remark that National Socialism adopted and perverted Schmitt's own ideas. In this context, again expressing his sympathy and understanding for Schmitt's ideological work from the 1930s, Przywara claims that the American democratic political tradition is essentially modeled on the same ideas of an authoritarian democracy that Schmitt himself described.

Przywara seems to be an example of a German intellectual in the 1950s who was still holding on to the idea of some positive continuity from the intellectual traditions of the Third Reich. This was a completely normal response to the situation in the 1950s for those, like Przywara and many of his Catholic colleagues, like Schmitt, who were deeply invested in the intellectual trends that took shape at that time in the new authoritarian order. In his letters, Przywara often remarks negatively on the fact that Schmitt and his friends were not being treated well in the post-World War II press. The sense is clear: Both he and Schmitt were suffering from the same brutal injustice of history. The world outside, the world of the victors, the new press and the contemporary academic culture emerging in post-1945 Germany, all of this did not understand them (this is also reflected in the letter to Schmitt from the 2nd of December, 1953).¹²⁴ As Przywara remarks in a letter to Schmitt (18 October, 1954), he was thankful for Glock's journal, the *Besinnung*, as that it was the only courageous journal. Why was it the only courageous journal? Probably because it was still publishing literature that was drawing upon the old intellectual themes of the 1930s and 1940s. In the same letter, he praises Schmitt's *Leviathan* with the highest praise for showing the absurdity of democracy and dictatorship.¹²⁵

Carl Schmitt." *Die deutsche Rechtswissenschaft im Kampf gegen den jüdischen Geist*, Heft 1 (1936), 28–34; as cited in Dreier, "Die deutsche Staatsrechtslehre in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus", 31.

124 This is, of course, essentially the same thing that Pidel and Betz are claiming today.

125 Cf. Carl Schmitt, *Der Leviathan in der Staatslehre des Thomas Hobbes. Sinn und Fehlschlag eines politischen Symbols*. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1938. Arthur Versluis offers this commentary on Schmitt's *Leviathan*: "Nazism represented for him, at least potentially, the reunification of inner and outer life, a kind of modern reunification of the mythic and spiritual with the outer public life. It at first seemed to conform to the Hobbesian notion that in exchange for obedience, one receives protection from the state; it represented a new form of corporatism as an alternative to the sociopolitical disintegration represented by parliamentary democracy in the Weimar era [...]." Arthur Versluis, *The New Inquisitions: Heretic-Hunting and the Intellectual Origins of Totalitarianism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, 52. On the meaning of this text

Even after World War II, Przywara was still promoting some of the old ideas. This time, however, he did this without the explicit attacks on the Jews, liberalism or democracy. In the 1950s he offered the public a new version of the corporative-theory, drawing upon romantic nationalistic religious ideas of a mythical Prussian Christian order, a holy *Reich*, with a concept of official hierarchies of offices.¹²⁶ The adjustment to the new liberal order of the Bonn Republic was long and complicated for people like Schmitt and Przywara. Now they were having difficulty republishing their old work from the 1930s, and it seemed that the press and the public were slowly turning against them. In the 1950s, some journals were still entertaining their ideas. For the most part, however, Sieg-Catholicism was becoming *passé*.¹²⁷

in Schmitt's own development see Reinhard Mehring, *Carl Schmitt. Aufstieg und Fall*. München: C. H. Beck, 2009, 380–388.

126 See Richard Faber, *„Wir sind Eines“. Über politisch-religiöse Ganzheitsvorstellungen europäischer Faschismen*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005, 29 f.: „Przywara glaubt noch 1955, daß der christliche Konservatismus des ‘andern Preußen’ Friedrich Wilhelms IV. und seines Kreises [...] ‘auf eine Wieder-Erweckung des alten ‘Ordensstaat Preußen’” ausging: ‘unter einer “Weltherrschaft Gottes” im “Reich Gottes” “Dienst” zu tun, – eben darum aber in dem Gesetz der heiligen Ämter-Stufung, wie es das Gesetz des “Heiligen Reich” war und darum überkommen war von dem Staat des Ritterordens, der dieses “Heilige Reich” in die Weiten des Ostens hinein “repräsentierte”’. Here Faber cites Przywara, “Um Preußen.” *Besinnung* 10 (1955), 87. He also addresses Przywara's call for a “zweiten ‘berufsständischen’ Kammer, unter ausdrücklicher Berufung auf die aus dem JUNI-KLUB hervorgegangenen ‘Ringbewegung’ [...]” Faber, *„Wir sind Eines“*, 39; see Erich Przywara, “Demokratie.” *Besinnung* 10 (1955), 15 f.

127 This is not to suggest that the theological ideas of analogy in themselves and metaphysics are all misguided. There is, of course, still a need to untangle these theological and religious-philosophical ideas from the ideology. In fact, it may be best for theologians, for those who care to develop metaphysics (which is a praiseworthy task that I support wholeheartedly!), to start anew, to write new metaphysics that are not entangled with these fascist ideologies. Perhaps something can be redeemed from the older works of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. On the whole, however, much of this philosophy of religion (and legal theory) is simply an expression of the intellectual world of fascism.