"Mit brennender Sorge made it indisputably clear the racial ideology expressed by the Nazi party was not supported by the Catholic Church."

MIT BRENNENDER SORGE

An Exegesis on the Encyclical to the Third Reich

ALEXANDRA VALDEZ

THROUGHOUT THE 1930S, THE ASCENDANCE OF THE NAZI REGIME NOT ONLY DIMINISHED THE AUTHORITY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GERMANY, BUT ALSO DIRECTLY COUNTERED FUNDAMENTAL CATHOLC DOCTRINES. IN FACE OF THE MOUNTING ATROCITIES OF THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT, POPE PIUS XI, WITH THE HELP OF EUGENIO PACELLI, NUNCIO TO GERMANY, AND GERMAN BISHOP MICHAEL FAULHABER, IN AN UNPRECEDENTED OUTREACH TO THE ENTIRE GERMAN FAITHFUL, ISSUED THE ENCYCLICAL *MIT BRENNENDER SORGE*. APPEALING PARTICULARLY TO THE YOUTH AND THE LAITY, THE ENCYCLICAL CHALLENGED GERMANS TO USE CONSCIENCE AS A FINAL RESORT IN ASSESSING THE VALIDITY OF A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION OR POLITICAL MOVEMENT. IN ITS ADDRESS TO THE GERMAN PEOPLE, *MIT BRENNENDER SORGE* REFLECTED THE DELICACY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HOLY SEE AND THE NAZI REGIME BY NOT REFERENCING ANY PERSON, PARTY, OR ORGANIZATION SPECIFICALLY. NEVERTHELESS, THE PURPOSE AND THE TIMELINESS OF THE ENCYCLICAL WAS LOST ON FEW, PARTIALLY DISPELLING THE WIDESPREAD BELIEF THAT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TURNED A BLIND EYE TO THE THIRD REICH.

INTRODUCTION

Passion Sunday, 1937: the encyclical to the German Church—*mit brennender Sorge* ("with burning concern")—was read at the pulpits of Catholics churches throughout the German Reich. This document is the sole official public declaration from the Head of Rome against the Nazi regime. In the years after the war, the response of the Catholic Church, particularly on the hierarchical level, to the atrocities that took place under the command of Adolf Hitler has been considered grossly insufficient. It is the responsibility of an institution such as the Roman Catholic Church to take a stand against any miscarriage of justice. Thus, to remain a bystander in the face of a leviathan such as the Holocaust is beyond inexcusable.

WITH THE SIGNING OF THE REICHSKONKORDAT, THERE WAS THE APPEARANCE OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE NAZI REGIME.

Any judgment of the Catholic Church's actions is far from being settled. *Mit brennender Sorge* is at the center of this heated debate. The most vehement critics emphasize how the document failed to defend the Jews in Germany. The anti-Semitic views of the National Socialist Party were explicit from its inception, and by 1937, the harshly discriminatory Nuremberg Laws had been in effect for almost two years. In other words, it was distressingly clear that the rights of thousands of individuals, particularly the Jews, were being disregarded by the German government. By remaining mute on the subject, the Church—with her own hand in anti-Judaist sentiment—can be construed even as desirous of such an atrocity. But for every individual that holds the Church in contempt for her virtual silence, there is another that cites *mit brennender Sorge* as proof that the Church, as an institution, defied the Nazi regime. Determining the culpability of the Church in these matters does not fall under the scope of historical study. Thus, it is not my intention to either condemn or exonerate her. Rather, this will be an analysis of the encyclical—in its content and language—attempting to determine what the Church was communicating to the German-Catholic population.

THE *REICHSKONKORDAT*

Before beginning a discussion of the encyclical, it is important to address another document that is invaluable when considering relations between the Catholic Church and the Third Reich during the period preceding the outbreak of World War II: the Concordat between the Holy See and the German Reich. On July 20, 1933, less than six months after Adolf Hitler was sworn in as Chancellor, Cardinal Secretary of State Eugenio Pacelli and Vice-Chancellor Franz von Papen signed the *Reichskonkordat*, which was meant to define the state's relationship with the Roman Catholic Church. The majority of the articles outline a series of freedoms that were to be assured to the Church under the German government.

The Concordat guaranteed the profession and public practice of the Catholic religion (Article 1), unhindered commu-

"It is the responsibilty of an institution such as the Roman Catholic Church to take a stand against any miscarriage of justice."

nication between the Holy See and German Catholics (Article 4), the maintained existence of Theological Faculties in State Universities (Article 19), Catholic education in schools (Article 21), the right of the bishops to approve all Catholic religion teachers (Article 22), the retention of Catholic denominational schools as well as the establishment of new ones (Article 23), and the protection of Catholic organizations and societies in addition to the institutions and activities thereof (Article 31).[i] The German government gains little from this agreement in comparison to the protections promised to the Church. The most notable article that would be considered advantageous to the state required the Catholic bishops to take an oath of loyalty to the German Reich (Article 16).[ii] Another advantage—and possibly the sought advantage—of the German government was that the agreement with the Church would discourage the Church from openly criticizing the Nazi Regime, in order to preserve the protections guaranteed by the Concordat.

It is clear from this Concordat that the Catholic Church held the protection of herself as an institution and the rights of its members to practice freely of the utmost importance. Unfortunately, as time would tell, the Third Reich was not particularly diligent in upholding the agreements made in the *Reichskonkordat*. The most alarming and incessant breaches of the agreement were encroachments upon Catholic education and youth organizations. A policy was established forbidding double-membership in the Hitler Youth and other youth organizations.[iii] In 1936, the *Gesetz über die Hitler Jugend* (Law on the Hitler Youth) was passed. Although it was not put into strict effect until 1939, it would require "the entire German youth inside of the region of the Reich" to become members of the Hitler Youth.[iv] The government sought to secularize schools by decreasing school prayers and religious services, curtailing the number of religious instructors, and even attempting to remove crucifixes from classrooms. A campaign to convert confessional schools into interdenominational schools caused great alarm among the German bishops for these institutions were specifically protected under the *Reichskonkordat*.[v] The near abolition of private schools and a ban on members of religious orders from teaching came as a further blow to the Catholic educational system.[vi]

On August 20, 1935, the bishops of Germany gathered in Fulda to draw up a memorandum sent directly to Adolf Hitler. In addition to expressing concern over the violations of the Concordat, the bishops were distressed over the "neopagan attacks against Christianity and the church" and "the general secularization of all aspects of public life."[vii] They received no response. As a result, in January of 1937, the bishops reassembled in Fulda once more to draft another memorandum, but expecting the same result as the first, they appealed to higher power. Shortly following the conference, the three cardinals of Germany, Bertram, Faulhaber, and Schulte and two bishops, Galen and Preysing arrived in Rome at the request of Pope Pius XI. Here, they appealed for the pope to make a public declaration on the condition of the Catholic Church in Germany. At the request of Eugenio Pacelli, Michael Faulhaber prepared the encyclical, which was then revised by Pacelli and the Holy Father himself.[viii]

The encyclical fiercely bemoaned the grievances committed by the Third Reich against the Concordat and the Church. However, although the violations of the *Reichskonkordat* were the leading catalyst to the drafting of the encyclical, the main focus was not on the German government. Instead, Rome addressed the German faithful. The Third Reich's disregard for diplomatic agreement

communicated two things to the German Church. First, the temporal power that the Church and the Papacy once exerted had become extremely limited. Second, the protection that the Church had sought to attain for the faithful through diplomacy was by no means assured. In light of these two facts, the Church realized that appeals to the Third Reich were useless. Thus, they released an encyclical that was entirely unprecedented in the long history of the Church in Rome.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ENCYCLICAL

Mit brennender Sorge—translated in the official English version as "with deep anxiety"—literally means, "with burning concern." These words evoked a sense of urgency. The body of the encyclical was divided into three main sections, excluding the introduction and the conclusion.[ix] The first section outlined and reiterated the principles of the Catholic faith and criticized the Nazis use of language to create a religion out of their fascist ideology. The second section (not discussed in this work) identified the authority of morality and natural law as superior to temporal decrees and it served as a reinforcement of the first section by disparaging the fabricated moral standards of the Nazi ideology which removes God as the being that shapes morality and natural law. The final and most unique section was a direct address to the German faithful in three sections: one to youth, one to the priests and the ordained, and one to the laity.

REINER GLAUBE: UNADULTERATED FAITH

The first section was comprised of five smaller sections. Only the first three will be discussed as the major points are largely encompassed within them. The first four broke down the pure components of what Catholics believe starting with God (*Reiner Gottesglaube*), then discussing Christ (*Reiner Christusglaube*), then the Church (*Reiner Kirchenglaube*), and finally the headship of Pope (*Reiner Glaube an den Primat*). The fifth subsection is titled, *Keine Umdeutung heiliger Worte und Begriffe*, which criticized the adoption of Christian vocabulary in Nazi speech. These first sections were addressed to the faithful and act as a conscientious reminder of foundational beliefs of Catholicism. It was also a poignant reprimand of the current German Reich. As a highly diplomatic document, there was no naming of perpetrators nor is there specific mention of Nazism; however, the people and the problems being addressed were clear to all who heard it in 1937.

GERMAN CATHOLICS PLEDGE LOYALTY TO THE STATE DURING MASS.

REINER GOTTESGLAUBE: UNADULTERATED FAITH IN GOD

Reiner Gottesglaube emphasized that faith in God, according to the Catholic creed, is very specific and defined. It served as a sharp critique of the neopaganism and pantheism perpetuated in Nazi speech and ceremony and asserted that there can be no substitution for the being called God:

Our God is the Personal God, supernatural, omnipotent,

infinitely perfect, one in the Trinity of Persons, tri-personal in the unity of divine essence, the Creator of all existence. Lord, King and ultimate Consummator of the history of the world, who will not, and cannot, tolerate a rival God by his side.[x]

The Nazi ideology made this rival God by divinizing the State and the so-called Aryan race. The Nazis created a state in which it was no longer possible to serve God properly simultaneously with the German nation, for "no one can serve two masters."[xi] Not only did the Church reject the elevation of race and the state on the ground of idolatry, but also the Church expressed recognition of a universal equality owed to all men before the eyes of God: "As God's sun shines on every human face so His law knows neither privilege nor exception."[xii] It is also of note that the rejection of a higher race (*Rasse*) is mentioned three times in this section alone.[xiii] The repetition of this word and the repeated denial of its significance before God, though not an articulate defense of the Jews, clearly stated that these racist attitudes were wholly incompatible and unsupported by Christianity. Yet, there were a countless number of Catholics during this time period who conflated these ideologies without reservation.

REINER CHRISTUSGLAUBE: UNADULTERATED FAITH IN CHRIST

There are two important points brought forth in the next section: *Reiner Christusglaube* (unadulterated faith in Christ). One of these points was a defense of the Old Testament as an essential part of the Christian faith. "The sacred books of the Old Testament are exclusively the word of God, and constitute a substantial part of his revelation."[xiv] The recognition of this issue was the closest that this encyclical comes to mentioning the Jews. While it certainly was not a defense of Judaism nor a condemnation of the Nazi policies against the Jews, it is significant that it denied the blasphemy that Christianity was independent of Judaism, especially in a society in which the denial of Jesus' Jewish ancestry was being professed.[xv]

The next important point was the denunciation of Alfred Rosenberg's "The Myth of the 20th Century," a poisonous composition which contained seething anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic ideas. This work was particularly dangerous because it ordained the Aryan race as superior, not so much on biological grounds (i.e. Darwinism), but rather on spiritual grounds: "The soul signifies race as seen from inside. And, vice versa, race is the exterior of the soul."[xvi] This declaration alone makes the superiority of a race not designed by nature, but intertwined into the very plan of God, the Creator. This work of Nazi propaganda never became part of official Nazi teaching as Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, but because of its message, namely that it was not Jesus Christ that saved, but rather race and blood, the Church responded with great ferocity. Neither Rosenberg nor his book was explicitly named, but there was absolutely no mistake that when the encyclical decried the "so-called myth of blood and race," it was a direct and unambiguous address to this paradigm of Nazi propaganda.[xvii]

REINER KIRCHENGLAUBE: UNADULTERATED FAITH IN THE CHURCH

The Church founded by the Redeemer is one, the same for all races and all nations. Beneath her dome, as beneath the vault of heaven, there is but one country for all nation and tongues; there is room for the development of every quality, advantage, task and vocation which God the Creator and

"Asking someone to choose between his nationality and his faith was essentially asking him to reject a part of himself."

Savior has allotted to individuals as well as ethnical communities.[xviii]

These lines from *mit brennender Sorge* encompass the pure meaning of what it means to be Catholic, that is, universal. Already within the first twenty paragraphs of the encyclical, it was iterated time and again that blood and race and nation mean nothing before God, and thus it is fallacious to raise the former above the latter. In the same paragraph, the encyclical identified one more of the four marks of the Church: unity. This oneness is such of an indivisible nature that those who try to disrupt it are guilty of attempting to dismantle what God has designed.

Under these two principle marks, the encyclical launched into what is possibly its most pertinent message. It underlines that there will be no excuse for those who cause division in the Church. Ever the diplomatically worded document, the encyclical does not excuse the Church from scrutiny and self-recrimination. This is used as a device to stress that such scrutiny must also be applied to "other organizations."[xix] Furthermore, there is an appeal to the conscience, and the duty that all men have to examine and heed it, stating, "It yet remains true that at no moment of history, no individual, in no organization can dispense himself from the duty of loyally examining his conscience, of mercilessly purifying himself, and energetically renewing himself in spirit and in action."[xx] Perhaps such words were not strong enough to convert those who had already abandoned the Church, but to those with misgivings, these words would remind them that there would be no pardon for ignorance or adhering to an ideology.

The Church recognized that taking a stand for one's faith can be difficult, even more so when it put a person in contention with his country. And yet, this did not stop her from asking the very highest price from her members: "Our wholehearted paternal sympathy goes out to those who must pay so dearly for their loyalty to Christ and the Church, but directly the highest interests are at stake, with the alternative of spiritual loss, there is but one alternative left, that of heroism."[xxi] By 1937, it had already become evident that any defiance to the reigning party would possibly result in great suffering and persecution. Asking someone to choose between his nationality and his faith was essentially asking him to reject a part of himself. Unfortunately, such was the conundrum with which millions of Germans struggled prior to and during WWII.

AN DIE GLÄUBIGEN: TO THE FAITHFUL

Previously, encyclicals were largely reserved for the clergy and the educational elite. Though the issues discussed may have been of some concern to the laity, these papal letters were not written for the majority of the population. Even today, the majority of the Catholic faithful do not read the papal encyclicals, although they are easily obtainable. This direct address to the faithful was entirely unprecedented in 1937. Indeed, the Church had never before faced a crisis such as that occurring in Germany. Additionally, the role of the Roman Catholic Church had changed a great deal in the past centuries. Gone were the days when the Pope could exercise great power over world leaders with the threat of excommunication. The Holy See's voice on the political front had waned, and its demands and request fell on deaf, or perhaps simply indifferent, ears. Thus, he turned to the Body of Christ, to the faithful, who were waiting to hear him address their crisis. To the youth, Pius XI challenged them to be unyielding to "a gospel that has not been revealed by the Father of Heaven."[xxii] He encouraged them to participate in the youth organizations created by the state but to combat any hostility against the Holy Mother Church and Christianity, fostering love and loyalty to their earthly country so long as it shall not result in unfaithfulness to the heavenly home. This section illustrates that the Church had a similar awareness as the National Socialists: the youth were the future. To the priests, Pius XI sent words of congratulations and support for their faithfulness in times of trial. He asked them always to be faithful to the truth. Here, Pius XI made the assertion that failure to correct error and deviating from the truth was not only a disloyalty to God "but also an offense against the real welfare of your people and country."[xxiii] Lastly, he expressed his deep gratitude and empathy to those who had already made great

sacrifices and suffered imprisonment in jail or concentration camps. In the final subsection, "to the followers from the Laiety," the Holy Father addressed the parents in particular and emphasized the importance of their obligation and right to educate their children according to the faith. Although there were great campaigns against confessional schools and religious education in interdenominational schools, he ordered parents to ensure that their children's Christian education was not tainted by the ideas of a false gospel, cautioning, "Yet do not forget this: none can free you from the responsibility God has placed on you over your children."[xxiv]

REACTIONS

The German government's reaction to the encyclical was immediate. Dated March 14, 1937, the encyclical was actually set to be read from the pulpit a week later on March 21st—Palm Sunday. The actual reading was divided into two parts, the first half being read in the morning and the last half in the evening. As soon as seven o'clock the evening of March 20th, the government had issued an order for the seizure of the encyclical.[xxv] Fortunately, the actual reading of the letter was left undisturbed. Theoretically, the Pope's ability to correspond with the members of the Catholic Church was protected under Article 4 of the *Reichskonkordat*. It declared that, "Instructions, ordinances, Pastoral Letters, official diocesan gazettes, and other enactments regarding the spiritual direction of the faithful issued by the ecclesiastical authorities within the framework of their competence (Art. 1, Sect. 2) may be published without hindrance and brought to the notice of the faithful in the form hitherto usual."[xxvi] This term "usual forms"[xxvii] came to be defined by the government as *Amtsblätter* or as a sermon from the pulpit.[xxviii] Therefore, any extra publications or flyers were not protected under the Concordat and were immediately confiscated upon distribution. Two days after the release of *Mit brennender Sorge*, minister for church affairs Hanns Kerrl charged all the German bishops with violating their oaths of loyalty in a letter. Subsequently, he prohibited the printing, reproduction, and further distribution of the encyclical and the two publishing houses that had printed the document were closed.[xxix]

In a letter addressed March 30, 1937, to Secretary of State Eugenio Pacelli, Cardinal Faulhaber describes what he has heard of the reception of the faithful to the encyclical:

> *The letter was listened to by the people with tense concentration and visible emotion. In spite of bad weather, the parishioners came to the parish church from the mountains and the remote farms. In some parishes, the pastor read the whole letter on Palm Sunday morning and even in this case, the faithful stayed in the church—without exception—until the end.*[xxx]

It seems that it was important to the faithful to hear what their Holy Father had to say about their current situation.

HITLER JUGEND SUPPLANTED ALL CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS BY NAZI DECREE.

Faulhaber indicated that the last section of the encyclical, which directly addressed various groups within the Church, made a particularly strong impression. Though the Churchgoers were certainly influenced by these words, two pastors indicated that it was necessary to provide future analysis for all the contents of the letter to be clear. One priest expressed the difficulties that have arisen because of the seizure decree which does not allow the people to have and read the encyclical on their own, an issue protested by both Cardinal Bertram and Nuncio Orsenigo.

In the wake of the encyclical's release, the Ministry for Church affairs considered taking action that would have radically changed the relationship between the German State and the Church. Kerrl proposed sending a note to the Vatican to declare the Concordat invalid—a rather ironic proposal considering the repeated violations made by the German State against the Church. The Church would not request such a termination because it served as diplomatic proof that the Nazi government that promised to respect the religious freedom of the Roman Church in Germany. The Third Reich, with its continued violations against the agreement, had little to lose in ending this relationship. Ultimately, this note was never sent and diplomatic interactions remained.[xxxi] Thus, despite the initial waves caused by the release of the encyclical, the interactions of the Church in Germany with the German government were mostly unchanged. The ebb and flow of antagonism of the Nazis against the Church remained after *mit brennender Sorge*, but no attempts at completely disabling the Church were made. Parishes remained open and the sacraments were always available.[xxxii] On the Catholic side, services were well attended, as were pilgrimages.[xxxiii]

Meanwhile, the fight for the youth raged on as a steady one-by-one dissolution of Catholic youth organizations in dioceses throughout the country were enacted. By the early months of 1938 the eradication of all youth organizations excepting the Hitler Jugend was in effect in Paderborn, Münster, Trier, Breslau, Bavaria, Cologne, and Aachen. Finally, a policy was passed in February 1939 which declared a Reich-wide abolition of such organizations.[xxxiv] Morality trials which had been essentially abandoned since the summer of 1936 were revisited. These trials, which began in 1935, were a campaign to prosecute members of religious orders that had been accused of sexual offenses. The trials were used as a particularly malicious means of propaganda, which is evidenced by the sporadic nature in which the trials proceeded. Clearly meant to cause great distrust among the Catholic believers in the clergy, it is questionable whether the trials had their intended effect. The means by which the police attempted to prove the crimes of the clergy members made it all the more obvious that much of the information was fabricated, which most often resulted in generated sympathy for the Church and those indicted.[xxxv]

Though the persecution of the Church did rouse up sympathy and support, the Church was still suffering on the inside. The same year that *mit brennender Sorge* was read witnessed approximately 108,000 members leave the Church, over double the number that that had withdrawn the previous year. The year 1938 would see 88,700 members abandon the Church.[xxxvi] There are too many variables and a substantial lack of documentation to be able to definitively say whether those who left were influenced to do so by the papal letter; however, dismissing it as coincidence would be

"By issuing a papal document, the Church brought the situation of the Church in Germany to the attention of the world."

unwise. It is never the intention of the Holy Father, in anytime period or situation, to alienate any members of his flock. On the other hand, there are those who find themselves no longer in communion with the Holy Mother Church when such strong decrees, as those made in *mit brennender Sorge*, are declared. Whatever thin guise of cooperation that had been constructed by the Concordat had been torn away. The Church, as an institution, was put in contention with the National Socialist Party, the government of the German nation. The Catholics who defied the State could no longer be dismissed simply as radical outliers. The entire Catholic body had been charged by the Pope to stand true to the faith, even in the face of persecution. It was clear that the Nazi ideology, particularly the myth of blood and race—the defining doctrine of National Socialism—could not be compatible with Catholic doctrine. If the encyclical was taken to heart, it is clear why there would be those who would be compelled to leave the Church as a result.

PURPOSE AND LANGUAGE OF THE ENCYCLICAL

Mit brennender Sorge was composed for two ends. First, it was drafted to express the grievances of the Church in Germany with the German government's violations of the *Reichskonkordat*, as well as to decry the National Socialist ideology that undermines Catholic doctrine. Second, the Holy Father wished to directly address the Church in Germany in order to give them encouragement in their suffering and to remind them of their personal responsibility before the Church and before God. It was of the utmost importance to communicate these messages without pitting the Church against the German nation. Some of these delicacies of language have already been referenced. The entire document was built on subtlety, but subtlety without the loss of clarity. The reader will notice that there was no mention of specific names; Hitler, Rosenberg, even the name of the party itself were absent from the pages of the letter. In doing so, the Church was making universal statements that can be applied throughout all ages and to any "organization" that may violate these universal principles. Yet, all who heard the encyclical knew exactly to whom and of what the encyclical spoke. For all practical purposes, the outcome was the same. But in not naming individuals and organizations explicitly, the encyclical avoided making an outright accusation. The encyclical called the perpetrators "whoever" (*wer*).[xxxvii] It was the listeners who identify the "who," and thus make the accusation complete.

In terms of what it hoped to achieve, Cardinal Michael Faulhaber, Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, and Pope Pius XI did not expect *mit brennender Sorge* to fix the problems of the Catholic Church in Germany. Indeed, they knew that it would not. The Third Reich's treatment of the *Reichskonkordat* and the Fulda conferences had already proved that those running the German government would pay no heed grievances of the Holy See. The toil of the Church, however, did not fail utterly to bear fruit. Though the political influence of the Roman Catholic Church had diminished, its far-reaching influence had not. By issuing a papal document, the Church brought the situation of the Church in Germany to the attention of the world. Though it certainly did not cause an uprising against Germany, it cannot be diplomatically favorable for a country's government to be criticized by the Holy See. More importantly, Pope Pius XI was fulfilling his all important role as Shepherd, which in part means caring for the most vulnerable members of the flock. Though he may have remained silent on the specific issue of anti-Semitism, he did not leave the Roman Catholic Church in Germany to suffer alone and in silence. The Holy Father weighed his word carefully. Not wanting to alienate members of the body of Christ, he did his best to express that sacrifice would be necessary, but avoided insinuating that it required a rejection of one's German nationality. He called for a rejection of unfaithfulness, of apostasy, of an "organization." The call was not to open rebellion, but rather conscientious objection.

CONCLUSION

The Pope considered his greatest responsibility as the head of the Catholic Church to be the protection of the Church, to ensure that she can thrive in spirit and in truth. *Mit bren-*

nender Sorge made it indisputably clear the racial ideology expressed by the Nazi party was not supported by the Catholic Church. Unfortunately, no further action was taken to oppose the anti-Jewish measures. This is most likely because the Church feared that any drastic action would only serve to compound the problems of the German Catholics. In hindsight, this failure is regrettable. However, I would argue that the encyclical *mit brennender Sorge* cannot be included in the criticism of the Church's silence. It did not express the Church's sympathy for the Jews because that was not its purpose. Based on its purpose, this encyclical was a strong and unequivocal document that was addressed to and for the members of the German Catholic Church. Its main focus was the people of Germany, not the National Socialist government. Furthermore, the reactions of the German government, though not drastic, clearly communicated that widespread fear of further persecution was not unfounded. The right to practice the Catholic faith was never fully taken away, but the government did its utmost to continue to alienate the population from the Church. The Church was engaged in a battle for the ears and the hearts of her faithful, and it would be the loss of souls as well as the loss of lives that would preoccupy her through the rest of the reign of the Nazi regime—and long after the swastika ceased to fly.

ENDNOTES

i. "Concordat between the Holy See and the German Reich"
ii. "Concordat between the Holy See and the German Reich": "Before God and on the Holy Gospels I swear and promise as becomes a bishop, loyalty to the German Reich and to the State of . . . I swear and promise to honor the legally constituted Government and to cause the clergy of my diocese to honor it. In the performance of my spiritual office and in my solicitude for the welfare and the interests of the German Reich, I will endeavor to avoid all detrimental acts which might endanger it."
iii. Helmreich (290)
iv. "Gesetz über die Hitler Jugend.": "Die gesamte deutsche Jugend innerhalb des Reichsgebietes ist in der Hitlerjugend zusammengefaßt."
v. Helmreich (275)
vi. Helmreich (289)
vii. Helmreich (275)
viii. Helmreich (280)
ix. The organization and structure of the English version is considerably different from that of the German. The English version, for example, does not contain section titles, and the paragraphs are divided differently. I have used the official English translation from the Vatican website for my citations. However, when I refer to the structure, it will be in reference to the original German structure. There has been some controversy over the whether or not the current English translation is the most accurate because it was from the Latin translation, rather than from the original German. Therefore, I have provided citied passages that are significantly different in the footnotes in its original German, in order to highlight aspects of the German language that do not come through in the English translation.
x. Pope Pius XI, Pacelli, and Faulhaber, "*Mit brennender Sorge*," para. 9.
xi. Mt 6:24.
xii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 10.
xiii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 8, 10, 11.
xiv. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 15.
xv. „Die Wahrscheinlichkeit, dass Christus kein Jude war, dass we keinen Tropfen echt jüdischen Blutes in den Adern hatte, ist so groß, dass sie einer Gewissheit fast gleich kommt." von „Grundlagen des 19. Jahrhunderts" von H. St. Chamberlain in Adam, "Jesus der Christus und wir Deutsche."
xvi. Rosenberg, *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts*, 2 "Seele aber bedeutet Rasse von innen gesehen. Und umgekehrt ist Rasse die Außenseite einer Seele. " Translation by author.
xvii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 17.
xviii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 18.
xix. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 19.
xx. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 19.
xxi. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 21.: "Aber—heir ist der Punkt erreicht, wo es um Letztes und Höchstes, um Rettung oder Untergang geht, und wo infolgedessen dem Gläubigen der Weg heldenmütigen Starkmutes der einzige Weg des Heiles ist."
xxii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 33.
xxiii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 36.
xxiv. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 48.
xxv. Faulhaber (315)
xxvi. "Konkordat zwischen dem heiligen Stuhl und dem deutschen Reich."
xxvii. "üblichen Formen"
xxviii. Helmreich (280)
xxix. Helmreich (282-3)
xxx. Faulhaber (315): "Das Rundschreiben wurde vom Volk mit gespannter Aufmerksamkeit und sichtlicher Ergriffenheit angehört. Trotz schlechten Wetters waren die Pfarrkinder...von den Bergen und entfernten Bauernhöfen zur Pfarrkirche gekommen. In einigen Pfarreien haben die Pfarrer das ganze Rundschreibens am Palmsonntag vormittag verlesen...und auch in diesem Fall . . . sind die Glaubigen ohne Ausnahme bis zum Schluss . . . in der Kirche geblieben." Translation by author.
xxxi. Helmreich (285)
xxxii. Helmreich (296)

xxxiii. Helmreich (294)
xxxiv. Helmreich (290-1)
xxxv. Helmreich (288)
xxxvi. Hehl (105)
xxxvii. "Mit brennender Sorge," para. 10-12.

REFERENCES

Adam, Karl. "Jesus der Christus und wir Deutsche." Wissenschaft und Weisheit 10 (1943).

Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift. Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelanstalt, 1980. <http://alt.bibelwerk.de/bibel/?kbw_ID=30359731&.>

Faulhaber, Michael. Akten Kardinal Michael von Faulhabers 1917-1945. Vol. 1935. 2 vols. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag.

"Gesetz über die Hitlerjugend," Dezember 1, 1936. <http://www.documentarchiv.de/ns/1936/hj_ges.html.>

Hehl, Ulrich von. "Das Kirchenvolk im Dritten Reich." In Die Katholiken und das Dritte Reich, edited by Klaus Gotto and Konrad Repgen, 93-118. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1990.

Helmreich, Ernst Christian. The German Churches under Hitler: Background, Struggle, and Epilogue. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979.

"Concordat between the Holy See and the German Reich," July 20, 1933. <http://www.newadvent.org/library/docs_ss33co.htm.>

Pope Pius XI, Eugenio Pacelli, and Michael Faulhaber. "Mit brennender Sorge," March 14, 1937. < http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_14031937_mit-brennender-sorge_ge.html.> German <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_14031937_mit-brennender-sorge_en.html> English

Rosenberg, Alfred. Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts. München: Hoheneichen Verlag, 1930. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/2628285/Der-Mythus-des-20-Jahrhunderts-Alfred-Rosenberg.>