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Hitler himself supposedly coined the definition of ‘Volksdeutsche’ that appeared in a 1938 memorandum of the German Reich Chancellery. The Volksdeutsche, that document rather blandly explained, were people whose ‘language and culture had German origins’ but who did not hold German citizenship. But for Hitler and other Germans of the 1930s and 1940s, the term ‘Volksdeutsche’ also carried overtones of blood and race not captured in the English translation ‘ethnic Germans’. According to German experts in the 1930s, about thirty million Volksdeutsche were living outside the Reich, a significant proportion of them in eastern Europe — Poland, Ukraine, the Baltic states, Romania. The nazi goal of expansion to the east ensured that Volksdeutsche in those areas occupied a special place in German plans.

Memoir literature attests to the fact that some of the Volksdeutsche in eastern Europe contributed far more than silent acquiescence to the betrayal and murder of their Jewish neighbours during the Holocaust. Individual ethnic Germans stole Jewish property, participated in nazi-sponsored pogroms, and turned in Jews who tried to pass as Aryans. In more subtle ways too, the Volksdeutsche contributed to the explosion of genocidal anti-semitism in eastern Europe under nazi tutelage.

It might seem unproductive to examine connections between anti-semitism and the Volksdeutsche of eastern Europe in the nazi era. After all, what remains to be learned? Anti-semitism predated naziism in the region by hundreds of years, and those inhabitants of eastern Europe whose ancestry could somehow be deemed German were by no means alone in their hostility toward Jews and Judaism. Nor did they distinguish themselves from the Poles,
Ukrainians, Lithuanians or Romanians around them in their willingness to express that hatred in violent attacks on Jews.4

But we can learn something new if we shift the focus from the ethnic Germans themselves to the question of how the nazis conceived ‘ethnic Germanness’. This essay argues that the way National Socialist ideology defined ‘Volksdeutsche’, the policies nazi authorities based on that definition, and the essential tenuousness of the concept itself, contributed to the production of even more widespread and virulent forms of anti-semitism than the region had known. Earlier attacks on Jews in eastern Europe, rooted in Christian tradition, tended to combine brutality with attempts to convert or force assimilation. Nazism’s concern with ethnic ‘Germanness’ was one factor in the devolution of that Church-based anti-semitism into active support of genocide.

Nazi racial policy was two-pronged. It involved both the eradication of those people deemed impure — Jews above all, Gypsies, and certain mentally or physically handicapped people, the so-called ‘lives unworthy of living’ — as well as the promotion of those identified as valuable Aryans. In the east, the second half of this dual policy meant locating ethnic Germans and designating them as the beneficiaries of genocide. In October 1939, Hitler charged Heinrich Himmler, the man who would orchestrate implementation of the so-called Final Solution, with the task of administering the web of agencies, organizations and regulations set up to identify, re-educate and resettle the Volksdeutsche.5 In much the same way as nazi authorities made laws, regulations and institutions to define and deal with Jews, they constructed a complex bureaucracy to handle ethnic Germans.6

The concept of ‘Volksdeutsche’ played an important role in nazi racial policy. In the closed system of National Socialist thought, the mere existence of the Volksdeutsche provided some legitimation for the murder of millions. The idea that ethnic Germans would inherit the homes and possessions of people whom nazi ideology defined as unworthy Jewish lives made the so-called struggle for living space more concrete. At the same time, the notion that pure Germans had somehow been trapped outside the Reich and forced to suffer under alien rule provided Hitler’s forces with a pretext to overrun eastern Europe. If the Volksdeutsche had not existed, the nazis might have invented them.

Indeed, in some cases, the archival record suggests that Germans
practically did invent the Volksdeutsche. In August 1941, for example, the nazi murder squad ‘Einsatzgruppe B’ reported from Smolensk that it had located a number of ethnic Germans. According to the report, however, intermarriage had so alienated those people from their roots that their claim to ‘Germanness’ was now tentative at best. Despite that admission, the Einsatzgruppe considered it in Germany’s ‘ethnic-political interests’ to carve out a special status for those dubious Volksdeutsche in relation to the rest of the population. Accordingly, the Einsatzgruppe requested additional allocations of food and preferential treatment with regard to housing for the group.7 For the purposes of the Einsatzgruppe, the existence of people who could be labelled ‘Volksdeutsche’ was more important than the cultural or racial authenticity of such claims.

In a fundamental way, the dichotomy in Nazi racial policy between Jews and Volksdeutsche created incentives for open support of anti-semitic activity. Nazi regulations made ethnic Germans the prime beneficiaries of property stolen from Jews. When Germans and their helpers deported and murdered Jews, they often reassigned the homes left vacant to ethnic Germans who either came from the region in question or had been resettled there.8 The Einsatzgruppen who slaughtered Jews in the Soviet Union in 1942 also distributed ‘loot, cattle, and harvesting machines’ to the ethnic German population, ‘making available the houses and belongings of Jews and so on’.9 On Himmler’s order, various agencies distributed to the people identified as ethnic Germans under the nazis’ resettlement programme clothing and household effects seized from Jews who had been killed in death camps and elsewhere.10 Jewish belongings, from thermos bottles to baby carriages, mirrors and sunglasses, were collected for the Volksdeutsche. Instructions to relevant agencies stressed the importance of removing the Jewish star from all clothing.11

Jews who experienced expropriation witnessed how greed increased the ranks of their enemies. Many of the most eager predators, some Jewish observers noted, the newly minted ethnic Germans, were in fact their old Polish or Ukrainian neighbours. A Jewish survivor from Radomsko recalled a Polish chemist who ‘declared himself a Volksdeutsche’ in order to take over a family enterprise that manufactured paints and dyes.12 Another survivor from the same town suggested that a Ukrainian family simply ‘became Volksdeutsche’ in order to claim the flat of a Jewish man
who collected antiques.\textsuperscript{13} Meanwhile, an official report submitted to the Foreign Office in April 1944 confirmed that, in Hungary, the ‘sanitizing actions’ of invading German troops engaged in ‘the solution of the Jewish question’ had indeed had very favourable effects for ethnic Germans there.\textsuperscript{14} And once in possession of Jewish belongings, the ethnic Germans retained a vested interest in promoting the nazi cause. Nazi racial policy had given them what they had and their continued claim to those possessions rested on the racialist assumptions inherent in the National Socialist world view.

There were negative incentives as well to induce potential ethnic Germans to comply with nazi racial policy. The relevant regulations factored political reliability into determinations of ethnicity. The ‘Deutsche Volksliste’ was set up in 1941 to gather information on ethnic Germans and divide them into four categories, ranging from the ‘pure and politically clean’ specimens of category one to the ‘renegades’ of category four who had to be won back to ‘Germanness’. Members of all four groups qualified for resettlement. Politically undesirable men and women, however, were to be sent to concentration camps. Moreover, SS and police officers were to supervise the Germanization process; in cases where parents neglected the Germanic training of their offspring, the children were to be taken away and given to other homes.\textsuperscript{15} In February 1942, Himmler himself ordered that people of German ancestry who failed to put themselves on the list could be sent to concentration camps.

Nazi policies regarding the Volksdeutsche exacerbated anti-Semitism by stirring up greed for possessions seized from Jewish victims. But there was another, less obvious, way that the concept of ‘ethnic Germanness’ fostered hatred. The very tenuousness of the notion, which we might expect to have mitigated its destructive effects, in fact served to worsen the plight of Jews in eastern Europe.

Nazi ideology assumed clear-cut categories. It expected ethnic Germans to be easily identifiable — from their appearance, language, habits of living and qualities such as cleanliness, willingness to work hard and devotion to National Socialism.\textsuperscript{16} But when nazi authorities tried to implement policies regarding the Volksdeutsche, they found that concept to be full of contradictions, unclarities and absurdities. Over decades and centuries, settlers from German-speaking Europe had intermarried with their neigh-
bour. Many had changed their religious allegiances, adopted or adapted cultural practices, abandoned the German language or transformed it in ways alien to the German ear. Nazi authorities used a combination of cumbersome bureaucracy and simple arbitrariness in their attempts to sort out this ethnic mix. The results, however, often disappointed believers in racial purity.

In 1944, for example, SS reports from across occupied eastern Europe complained bitterly about the absence of qualities associated with Germanness among the supposed ethnic Germans. SS officials in the Wartheland grumbled that the Volksdeutsche sent from Russia spoke only Polish, Russian or Ukrainian and had forgotten how to work. Other Gau authorities protested that the ethnic Germans they were expected to resettle lacked proper German family values. As soon as their husbands were out of the picture, one reporter carped, the women took up with Ukrainians and Poles. The men, the account continued, were no better; they slept with Polish women and assumed the cultural habits of Poles, while the youths were lazy and promiscuous.

So instead of finding pockets of pure Germanness preserved in the east, observers from Germany discovered ethnic Germans who had been influenced by the culture of their neighbours, even in some cases their Jewish neighbours. A German Protestant visitor to colonies of Volksdeutsche in Poland remarked that their language reflected a 'Jewish jargon'. Some ethnic Germans had even married Jews. In 1944, the resettlement programme for Volksdeutsche in Galicia encountered such a case. An ethnic German woman who had divorced her Jewish husband applied for resettlement. The SS questioned whether she or her children qualified for inclusion in the programme. It was Himmler who ultimately decided that the mother could be accepted for resettlement without the two children. They could only enter Germany as charges of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt, and only if they were sterilized.

Contemporaries did not fail to notice the many difficulties associated with defining Volksdeutsche. When the Ministry of Justice proposed a new marriage law, it planned to prohibit German citizens from marrying foreigners. Drafters of the law wanted to make an exception for ethnic Germans, but 'the difficulty of delineating ethnic Germans in a clear and unambiguous way' persuaded them not to do so. Jewish observers, too, noted the hollowness of the notion of Volksdeutsche. A Polish survivor describes members of a putatively ethnic German organization,
the *Selbstschutz*, as ‘people from our town, Poles’. With the nazi presence, she pointed out, they ‘suddenly heard the call of their German blood! Mostly they were scum: ex-jailbirds, card-sharps, thieves, petty (and not so petty!) crooks’.22

Given the difficulties of defining Volksdeutsche, aspiring ethnic Germans in the east found the easiest way to prove themselves good Germans to be prove themselves good nazis. And the easiest way to establish nazi credentials was by endorsing and actively implementing attacks on Jews. Nazi authorities further encouraged that tendency by fostering an atmosphere of uncertainty around the identification of Volksdeutsche. They constantly altered rules and regulations, making it possible for ethnic Germans to be reclassified or even declassified. In May 1941, SS authorities announced that ethnic Germans in the Baltic states who had not registered for the first resettlement programme in 1940 could no longer be considered for government service. By passing up the earlier opportunity to co-operate, SS officials reasoned, those people had demonstrated their deficient commitment to Germanness.23 In August 1941, Einsatzgruppe B in Smolensk asked the military not to issue permanent identification papers for ethnic Germans, so that the option of reassessing an individual’s status would remain open.24

But even while they quibbled over the details of what constituted an ethnic German, nazi authorities showed themselves more concerned with destroying Jews and expanding German power in the east than with maintaining the purity of their own ideological principles of Germanness. In early 1940, the Minister of the Interior announced that, in the interests of the fatherland, Volksdeutsche should be defined as generously as possible. Political reliability was not to play a role in that consideration.25 Himmler took expansion of the category further. Sometime in 1940/41, he ordered the Germanization of ‘racially valuable Poles’. If sufficient numbers of ethnic Germans were not on hand, that programme implied, Hitler’s underlings could simply create more. Himmler tried to lure Poles into the scheme with promises of property and economic advancement, presumably at Jewish expense.26

As the war dragged on, nazi authorities openly distorted the definition of Volksdeutsche in order to expand the ranks of the Waffen-SS. In April 1944, German officials in Hungary announced that ethnic Germans there would perform their mili-
tary service in the Waffen-SS. The Germans accompanied that decision with a new, more generous definition of Volksdeutsche. The Hungarian government had based its count of 720,000 on the assumption that ethnic Germans were those who identified themselves as such and were recognized by the ethnic German leadership. In 1944, nazi authorities opted to dispense with any formal definition, basing the decision instead on an interview with the individual in question. In this way, the Germans reported, they could add several hundred thousand people to the original count of Volksdeutsche in Hungary.27

In the west, too, nazis showed that they were willing to relax the definition of Volksdeutsche in order to recruit more men to the Waffen-SS. In 1942, the Ministry of the Interior announced unrestricted rights of German citizenship to anyone of German ancestry in Alsace, Lorraine or Luxembourg who joined or was conscripted into the Waffen-SS. Two German grandparents sufficed to establish German ancestry.28

Turning to the Christian churches of eastern Europe, we again see how the notion of Volksdeutsche served to exacerbate anti-semitism. In two important ways, developments related to ethnic Germans as members of Christian communities paralleled issues discussed above. On the one hand, the tenuousness of the concept of Volksdeutsche encouraged anti-semitism as a way of establishing German credentials. On the other hand, nazi authorities, in an attempt to placate the churches in the east, further distorted their own principles of ethnic Germanness but in ways that only worsened the situation of the Jews.

Many ethnic Germans understood piety as intrinsic to their German identity, whether they were Lutherans surrounded by Catholic Poles, Roman Catholics living among Orthodox Romanians, Baptists or Mennonites in Ukraine. For those self-conscious religious minorities, religion and ethnicity were mutually reinforcing. In June 1938, a Sudeten German pastor called the Protestant Church 'the last bulwark of the völkisch idea in Sudeten Germany';29 for an ethnic German pastor in Romania, Germanness and the Lutheran faith formed two sides of the same coin.30

Christian piety may have been crucial to the self-identity of many ethnic Germans in eastern Europe, but given nazism’s antagonism toward Christianity, it was unacceptable as the central component in a definition of Volksdeutsche. Nazi authorities
repeatedly criticized ethnic Germans for their devotion to their churches. In 1943, SS authorities, with the backing of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt, resisted demands to allow additional clergy to minister to ethnic Germans in the Generalgouvernement. Ethnic Germans, nazi officials worried, would simply exploit any such appointments for the propaganda purposes of their own religious agenda. Under no circumstances, stressed SS correspondence in 1944, were the confessional ambitions of ethnic Germans to be encouraged. Any strengthening of the church, senior SS men predicted, would come back to haunt the regime.

Instead of rejecting the nazi definition of Volksdeutsche as irreconcilable with their Christian identity, spokesmen of some ethnic German religious groups became more aggressively anti-semitic as an alternate way of establishing Germanness. Some church publications of the ethnic German Lutheran community in Poland, for example, became increasingly vocal in their attacks on Jews after 1933, moving from an emphasis on traditional themes of Christian anti-Judaism to echo nazi racial and political anti-semitism. In 1935, an ethnic German church paper from Posen reported on the 30,000 Jews who had emigrated to Palestine in the previous year, but used discussion of topics that had nothing to do with church matters simply to promote hatred toward Jews. The article depicted the Jews in Palestine not as a religious community, but as communist Zionists who cared nothing for the God of the Old Testament, felt loyalty only to Jewish blood and even ate pork.

In 1936, Glaube und Heimat, a publication of ethnic German Lutherans in Poland, bemoaned the fact that the size of Poland’s Jewish population would make it difficult to imitate Germany’s ‘solution of the Jewish question’. The church paper quoted a Polish senator who had remarked that there were one million Jews too many in Poland and added its own parenthetical commentary: ‘(Only one million? In Poland there are a total of about four million Jews!)’ In May 1940, an ethnic German pastor in Bohemia who wanted to ingratiate himself with the German authorities made sure to point out that his church ‘stood on the ground of a Jew- and dogma-free Christianity’.

In March 1942, nine months after Romania entered the war, the German Protestant Church there founded its own group affiliated with the Institute for Research into and Elimination of Jewish Influence in German Church Life, a loudly anti-Jewish organiz-
ation founded by members of the pro-nazi ‘German Christian Movement’. In an age of racial awakening, the German bishop in Romania argued, the Old Testament was not only dispensable but untenable because it simply made it harder for German people to come to Jesus. The church, another ethnic German pastor in Romania agreed, would grow accustomed to thinking in racial terms. The fact that ethnic Germans in eastern Europe partook in a Christian tradition of anti-Judaism provided a base on which nazi anti-semitism could develop. The concept of Volksdeutsche in turn helped transform that traditional Christian anti-Jewishness into nazi anti-semitism.

While the ethnic German churches took on traits of nazi anti-semitism, nazi authorities in eastern Europe also showed some willingness to accommodate the piety of the Volksdeutsche when it furthered their own ends. Such compromises reflected contradictions within nazism about the nature and place of Christianity. At the same time, these concessions made it easier for ethnic Germans to embrace genocidal anti-semitism while adhering to their religious traditions.

Nazi ideologues liked to claim that their ideas about race had nothing to do with religious considerations; in reality, however, even their putatively racial definition of Jewishness was based on religion — the faith of one’s grandparents was the determining factor. Conversely, when it came to defining Volksdeutsche, membership in a Christian church was not enough, since most of the ethnic Germans’ neighbours were Christian as well. At the same time, the variety of denominational affiliations among ethnic Germans made it impossible to employ more specific religious distinctions. Thus, while the nazis used religion to separate Jews from non-Jews, they needed other criteria to differentiate ethnic Germans from non-German Christians.

Despite the ideological and practical problems that Christianity posed with regard to the Volksdeutsche, under some conditions the nazis were prepared to use religion to win support from ethnic Germans for their racial goals. In early 1943, for example, SS officials suspended their resistance to pandering to ethnic German piety long enough to appoint some additional clergy for Volksdeutsche in the Generalgouvernement. Internal correspondence made it clear that the gesture was primarily symbolic, calculated as a way to enhance ethnic German loyalty. National Socialist officials selected the most politically reliable clergy they could find,
but in such small numbers that they would be virtually ineffective, except to convince the Volksdeutsche that the nazis were on their side.40 Eight pastors from Transylvania, home to a branch of the Institute for Research into and Elimination of Jewish Influence in German Church Life, were finally sent to minister to their ethnic German brethren in Poland.41 Through this concession, nazi authorities hoped to tighten the bond between the piety of the Volksdeutsche and the anti-Jewish cause.

By facilitating the fusion of Christian anti-Judaism and nazi anti-semitism, the concept of Volksdeutsche helped produce something both more virulent and destructive than the former and more effective than the latter alone. The revised anti-semitism that resulted from that alliance was more vitriolic than traditional Christian anti-Judaism because it abandoned the idea of potential conversion of Jews in favour of a policy of extermination. It was more effective than nazi ideas alone because the churches’ willingness to tolerate and even promote it generated a broader base of support.

Careful attention to the concept of ‘Volksdeutsche’ and to the history of its employment in nazi hands shows it could neither be articulated coherently nor substantiated empirically. Yet, instead of impeding the advancement of nazism’s genocidal plans, the very tenuousness of the notion of ‘Volksdeutsche’ actually contributed to the intensification of anti-semitism. In this way, the National Socialist understanding of ‘Volksdeutsche’ proved itself to be not only conceptually bankrupt, but morally disastrous as well.
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