

INTRODUCTION

Mark Edward Ruff and Thomas Großbölting

A widely heralded study appearing in 2017, just months before the 500th anniversary of Luther's posting the 95 Theses in Wittenberg, announced that the Catholic-Protestant divide both in Germany and Western Europe was mostly a relic of the past.¹ According to the study, not only were 98 percent of German Protestants and 97 percent of Catholics willing to accept each other as family members: many had found common ground over once irreconcilable points of dogma. Sixty-one percent of German Protestants and 58 percent of Catholics had come to believe that both good works and faith were necessary for salvation. These were percentages that would have been anathema to church leaders of the 1950s, to say nothing of the great Protestant and Catholic reformers of the sixteenth century. The sense of confessional distinctiveness had dwindled to such an extent—62 percent of Germans saw Catholics and Protestants as more similar than different—that scandals in one church no longer led to outpourings of triumphalism in the other: they adversely affected morale and membership in both.² When Franz-Peter Tebartz-van Elst, the Catholic Bishop of Limburg, gained notoriety for his first-class travel and lavish spending on luxuries such as a gold bathtub in his own opulently renovated quarters, it was not only infuriated Catholics who left their church. Protestants too dropped their membership in their churches, even though no Protestant leaders had been implicated in this series of scandals that culminated in Tebartz-van Elst's resignation as bishop of Limburg in 2014 and transfer to Rome, where he serves as a papal delegate for catechesis.

Such attitudes and behaviors would have been unthinkable in earlier eras and even as late as the 1960s.³ Though Catholics and Protestants had lived and worked next to each other in many regions, mutual suspicion tended to remain the rule. Parish administrators had long dutifully recorded the numbers of "mixed marriages," one of the biggest sources of confessional acrimony in the nineteenth century.⁴ That mistrust towards

intermarriage remained pervasive in the early Federal Republic and was the premise of a bestselling novel from 1963, Heinrich Böll's *Clown*. The main character, a young underemployed Protestant clown and convert to agnosticism, found himself abandoned by his Catholic girlfriend, Marie, with whom he had lived together out of wedlock for six years. His refusal to allow any future children to be baptized and raised Catholic prompted her to leave him for a progressive Catholic with powerful connections to the German Catholic establishment, including politicians in the Christian-Democratic Union (CDU). "Catholics make me nervous, because they are unfair," the major character opined in a reflection on both his miserably impoverished state and the seeming political and cultural dominance of Catholics in the early Federal Republic.⁵

But the confessional animosities of earlier generations amounted to far more than a wariness of mixed marriages. From the Weimar through the National Socialist era and even well into the first decades of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic, they were fueled by memories of the *Kulturkampf*. This notoriously violent struggle between 1871 and 1887 between a repressive Protestant-dominated state and the Catholic Church had led to the imprisonment of nearly nineteen thousand priests, police sweeps, and unprecedented fines levied against laity and clergy. But it was not only the mass disruption to the church's sacramental functions that Catholics remembered. They smarted under the anti-Catholic invective pouring out of the pens of politicians, churchmen, academics, journalists, and polemicists that raised menacing allegations of superstition, cultural backwardness, and even of treason for their having allegedly placed their loyalties to Rome and not to the German nation.⁶ Catholics drew an obvious lesson: Germany was a Protestant-dominated nation and Catholics were a minority subject to persecution seemingly on a whim.

Protestants, in contrast, justified their contempt towards the less educated minority through fears that Catholics might someday wield substantial political power and in turn despoil German culture and national identity. Trepidation about the loss of a privileged theological, political, and cultural status aggrieved many politically active Protestants, particularly those of a conservative and nationalist bent. Frequently caught in the middle through the Weimar era were Jews, who were often forced to triangulate between the culturally dominant confessional majority and a beleaguered minority that was also the target of disdain and prejudice.

These observations bring us to this volume's leading questions. First, why did confessional tensions inflamed in the nineteenth century persist so long into the twentieth century? As obvious as this question may seem, it resists easy answers. Complicating our understanding is the fact that confessional acrimony often seemed insignificant in comparison with the so-

cioeconomic and class-based ideological hatreds that brought Germany to the brink of civil war at various points in the first half of the twentieth century and proved to be crucial ingredients in the coming to power of both the Nazis and the Communists. Equally challenging is that confessional tensions tended to ebb and flow. They typically became most pronounced directly after tumultuous political transitions in 1870–71, 1918–19, and 1945–49 in which political power appeared to be up for grabs. And hence our second question: how, why, and under what circumstances did smoldering tensions reignite during subsequent eras of political turmoil and uncertainty?

That religious tensions would ease was anything but self-evident. Germany was the birthplace of confessional division, the home of Martin Luther and the first wave of Protestant reformers. The massive social, economic, and political transformations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries notwithstanding, the modern German confessional map remained the legacy of the Reformation era with its mantra, *cuius regio, eius religio*. Through the early 1960s, this landscape was dominated by Catholics and Protestants, free churches, small Jewish communities and a smattering of freethinkers notwithstanding. The confessional divide was a permanent and powerful driving force in German history and in its political culture.⁷ And yet confessional tensions did wane. This simple statement of fact leads us to our third *Leitfrage*: How did a divide long deemed unbridgeable ultimately close, so that by the 2010s most Germans outside of shrinking ecclesiastical circles were utterly ignorant of basic theological doctrines that had ushered in centuries of confessional strife? Did tensions subside because of initiatives to promote tolerance and ecumenism? Or did they ease because of the erosion of religious communities, dechristianization, and secularization, changes unfolding over decades that affected all faiths and confessions?

And finally: what were the consequences, short-term and long-term alike, of the confessional strife of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? The former are easy to identify: renewed prejudice, an integralist retreat behind confessional walls, and political acrimony. But for often conflicting personal and ideological reasons, many churchmen, theologians, and statesmen also became convinced that it was necessary for Germany to shed its confessional animosities. In the service of secularism, the higher good of the nation, ecumenism or simply maintaining what became known as the confessional peace, troubled confessional histories needed to be turned into relics, divisive theologies superseded, and new interdenominational political alliances forged. Was it indeed these conscious and deliberate attempts to brook the confessional divides in Germany that caused tensions to wane? And did these attempts to overcome confes-

sional division open the door to something worse, notably an embrace of extreme ideologies on the left and right, both of which promised to put an end to confessional strife by force if necessary?

These leading questions are all interrelated. They rest on the premise that the strife of the *Kulturkampf* era left behind a legacy in Germany more toxic than in other Western nations also beset by religious tensions and prejudice like Switzerland, the Netherlands, and the United States. The lone exception was the struggle over Ireland within the United Kingdom, but this conflict was anomalous since it not only brought together confessional, ethnic, linguistic, political, and historical tensions but was also rooted in what was tantamount to colonial conquest and exploitation. German unification, in contrast, had proceeded almost entirely on a voluntary basis, even if had been facilitated by military conquest and the annexation of Danish and French territory. Unification nonetheless led to political upheaval, as the creation of a new state altered the balance of power between Catholics and Protestants politically and culturally. As German liberals and conservatives ruthlessly and pitilessly waged their *Kulturkampf* against Catholics, they ensured that the confessional divide remained hardwired into the structure of political parties through the 1960s. Apprehensive of renewed victimization, practicing Catholics were far more likely to vote for parties that were officially Catholic, like the Center Party, and the CDU/CSU, which though interconfessional was perceived as a Catholic party. Protestants were understandably reluctant to cast their votes for parties that were de jure or de facto Catholic. They dispersed their votes instead across the political spectrum, from Communists and socialists on the one end to liberals, conservatives, and eventually National Socialists. The range of parties available for Jews was even smaller. They were usually prohibited from joining conservative or nationalist parties, and few were going to vote for avowedly Catholic parties.

Three Instances of Confessional Trauma

This volume accordingly puts at center stage the traumatic legacy of three episodes of upheaval from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in which each confession felt singled out. For Catholics, it was the *Kulturkampf* of the 1870s during which the bigotry, brutality, and disruptions to church ritual and life so scarred the laity and clergy that they were constantly on the look-out for fresh rounds of persecution and confessional prejudice. For Protestants, it was the collapse of the Hohenzollern monarchy, the creation of a secular republic in 1918, and the loss of their privileged status as an established state church that left behind wounds.

For decades, officials in the twenty-eight Protestant state churches—Lutheran, Reformed, and United alike—were left adrift, largely unable to come to terms with their changed status. Such fears informed their responses to Nazi attempts to launch a united *Reichskirche* in 1933 and 1934 and establish “Positive Christianity” as a religious foundation for the Reich. Protestants were unable to forge unity until after the war. But even in the new German Protestant church, the *Evangelische Kirche Deutschland* (EKD), resentments, internal rivalries, and fissures arising between 1933 and 1945, and a nostalgia for the pre-1918 past, left their mark, particularly during its tumultuous founding in 1945.⁸

For both Catholics and Protestants, it was the Nazi war against each of their churches, the so-called Catholic and Protestant *Kirchenkampf*, that prompted anguished soul-searching. As a third instance of ecclesiastical trauma, these “church struggles” entailed direct confrontation between the Nazi state and the churches over such flashpoints as the presence of crucifixes in schools, and the right to maintain youth organizations, religious festivals, and processions outside of church walls. But they were far more complicated than later narratives of ecclesiastical resistance to state oppression would have it. The majority of Christians in Germany, and indeed many churchmen themselves, came to support the Nazi dictatorship. The Protestant church struggle broke out over not just whether but how to implement the National Socialist ideology and agenda for national renewal within the church. Even within the more unified Catholic Church, internal tensions flared over whether and how to support the Nazi program for national renewal. In both churches, these struggles were accompanied by enormous hopes of a religious renaissance that might renew the German nation as a whole.

On the heels of exhausting internal struggles and demoralizing defeat after defeat in the struggle against the National Socialist state, a tiny but powerful elite of laity and clergy could look only outside their confessional home for support. It embraced interconfessional cooperation. It did so first in the resistance against Hitler, which brought together Catholics and Protestants. Its survivors opted to forgo the comforts and purity of a restored confessional Center Party in favor of interconfessionalism. But as Catholic laity secured the most important seats of power in the new CDU, Protestant leaders in the new party, to say nothing of those in the SPD and FDP, feared being overrun by what they perceived to be a Roman Catholic political steamroller. Well into the 1960s, confessional animosities again bedeviled those politicians and churchmen who had believed that these were a relic of the past.

In sum, many Catholics and Protestants at times of political uncertainty dwelled on what confessional rivals had done to them in the past and what

they might do to them again. Church leaders were haunted by the damage inflicted on their institutions during these eras of upheaval. Viewing the SED's campaign against the churches in the GDR, they feared its recurrence in the west. The past could not easily be filed away.

Confessional trauma played itself out on multiple fronts. On the national level, it shaped how Catholics, Protestants, and Jews responded to constitutions, political parties, political ideologies, and nationalist platforms.⁹ On the ecclesiological level, it informed how church leaders understood and interacted with those of different confessions and religions theologically.¹⁰ How Catholics and Protestants had interacted with Jews had a bearing on how they responded to Muslim immigration starting in the late 1950s. Within each religious body, finally, these traumas opened up divisions over how to respond to confessional "others," long erroneously but understandably perceived as monolithic. On one extreme stood confessional militants, usually religious integralists, seeking confrontation and/or a full retreat behind ghetto walls. Moderates urged cooperation with representatives from other denominations at the highest level of politics while keeping the rank and file isolated and protected. Some went a step further, adapting to the *Leitkultur* selectively, while striving to remain faithful to traditions, rituals, and beliefs. They could be both Catholics and Germans, even if their vision of the German nation fundamentally differed from that of Protestants.¹¹ On the other extreme were bridge-builders who adapted to the "other side." Accused by confessional integralists of selling out and overcompensating, they were willing to risk traditional identities and beliefs in a bid to refute prejudicial stereotypes. They, in turn, accused their intraconfessional integralist opponents of clinging to retrograde "ghetto" identities and siege mentalities.

On all of these levels, intraconfessional fissures opened up over whether it was legitimate to have multiple identities. Could one simultaneously have allegiance to a particular confession and to something else, be it a social class, a potentially rival political party, or the German nation? This question had no easy answer, and the messiness and incoherence of confessional responses to it serve as a central theme of this volume.

The Historiography of Confessional Identity

These questions about the complexity of confessional identity emerge out of a historiography taking root from the 1980s through the early 2000s that sought to place religion, piety, and above all religious and confessional conflict back at the center of nineteenth-century German social and political life. At the same time, the answers proposed in this volume are informed by

the critical rejoinders since the early 2000s to this “rediscovery” of religion and religious conflict.

How did this historiography of what might be called nineteenth-century confessionalization emerge? In Germany until at the least the mid-1980s, writing about religious history had long been the province of church historians, or *Kirchenhistoriker*, who belonged to theology and not history departments or *Fakultäten*. It was almost unheard of for a Catholic to research a Protestant topic or vice versa, let alone for a person with no faith commitments to write nonpolemical “objective” scholarship about religion. Because of centuries-old turf battles and the fact that *Kirchenhistoriker* in Germany to this day are required to be formal members of their churches, most German church historians had confessional commitments to uphold that were particularly pronounced during the ideological battles of the 1970s at German universities. In addition, these church historians tended to be specialists in political, diplomatic, and on occasion intellectual history. By the same token, it was rare for profane historians to venture into religious history.¹² Those who did so, like the Bonn historian Konrad Reppen, were historians of politics and diplomacy.¹³ The result, to put it polemically, was pictures of old men in musty church towers.

At the same time, for the pioneers of social history, such as Hans-Ulrich Wehler, who were gaining currency in both the United States and Germany from the 1960s through the 1980s, religion played little to no role.¹⁴ This meant that some of the earliest studies of how confessional differences shaped German political culture and religious institutions were carried out by sociologists like Gerhard Schmidtchen.¹⁵ Their findings naturally sought to shed light on the complicated politics of the 1970s and 1980s, but the confessional differences and prejudices described clearly had roots in the second half of the nineteenth century. For the focus of inquiry to shift to this foundational period, historians in both the United States and Germany had to make a break with how social history was being carried out. The social history of the era was heavily indebted to modernization theories, which placed secularization as one of the chief outcomes of modern society. Religion was destined to wane because of industrialization, urbanization, and the rise of modern society. Noting the unexpected vibrancy of American evangelicalism in the late 1970s and 1980s, historians like Jonathan Sperber and Thomas Nipperdey laid the contours for a social history of religion for the long nineteenth century by turning secularization theories on their head.¹⁶ They postulated a Catholic religious revival in the nineteenth century that they argued was the result of Catholics both resisting but more importantly adapting to modernity. For Sperber, this religious revival which predated the *Kulturkampf* provided a foundation for subsequent resistance against the Protestant-dominated state during

the struggle of the 1870s. This revival had been made possible by a period of chastening in which untampered and unruly Catholic popular piety had been gradually disciplined by ecclesiastical authorities. Organizations long led by laity came under clerical control; pilgrimages, processions, and *Vereine* were transformed with relatively little opposition.

These ideas found much fuller expression in the models of “social-moral milieu,” which by the 1990s emerged as the most viable alternative to traditional forms of confessional history.¹⁷ This concept was the brainchild of the sociologist M. Rainer Lepsius, who in turn had borrowed the term “Catholic milieu” from the left-wing Catholic and institutional church critic Carl Amery.¹⁸ Lepsius argued that German politics in the *Kaiserreich* and Weimar Republic had been shaped and destabilized by the rivalries between Catholic, socialist, and liberal worlds. Appealing to constituencies fearful that rivals would inflict harm, each milieu was characterized by a degree of cultural and social separation. The developers of milieu theory saw the formation of a milieu as a phenomenon of modern society and a negative self-definition as a hallmark of milieu identity.¹⁹ Socialists defined themselves in opposition to liberals while Catholics did in opposition to socialists, liberals, and conservatives, whose leadership and base was largely Protestant. Symbols and rituals thus assumed an undeniable potency. In putting special emphasis on Marian forms of piety, for instance, Catholics could easily anticipate angered reactions in Protestant circles.

The milieu paradigms were derived from the politics of the *Kaiserreich*. Indeed, there was universal consensus that the Catholic milieu experienced its highwater mark in the 1870s and 1880s, when anti-Catholic fervor was at its peak. But what about the eras thereafter? When and why did the milieus erode? Was it in 1933, during the Nazi era, during the wave of expulsions and resettlement from 1944 through 1949, or only in the 1960s? One solution to this problem was advanced by the German historian Olaf Blaschke, who labeled the entire era from 1815 through 1960 a “second confessional era,” fully cognizant that the notion of a nineteenth-century confessionalism might seem “exotic” to sober, secular-minded social historians steeped in Enlightenment ideals of rationality.²⁰ For Blaschke, religion had persisted—and its renewal in the nineteenth century brought with it a resumption of tribal identities. Like the “first confessional era,” of the notoriously violent sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the second saw a surge of polemics, divisive politics, and above all an extension of confessional identities to once unrelated areas of everyday life: confessional partisans overvalued and exaggerated confessional differences.

In light of the expansive claims of the milieu model and the paradigm of a second confessional era, it is hardly surprising that both were met with

criticism.²¹ The Catholic world, many pointed out, was as heterogenous as it was homogeneous: it was socially, economically, and culturally diverse. Critics noted that even the most violent excesses of the *Kulturkampf* era described by historians like David Blackbourn in his classic study, *Marpingen*, never came close to the devastating, religiously-rooted violence of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²² As traumatic as this era proved to be for Catholics, it lacked the equivalent to the wars of religion or the Thirty Years War to propel death tolls into the hundreds of thousands and even millions.

Nor were the confessional conflicts of the nineteenth and twentieth century life or death matters theologically. Confessional stereotyping only rarely drew from the theological categories and metaphors of the Reformation era. To be sure, some confessional warriors of the 1870s, 1920s, and 1950s saw themselves as carrying on the legacy of their forefathers from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They held on to dismissive stereotypes of the Catholic rank and file as prone to superstition and uncritical obedience to clerical leaders. But even here, the theological landscape of the nineteenth and twentieth century would have been largely unrecognizable to those from centuries earlier. In this earlier era, cultural and religious values focused on man's place in the universe and in a sinful world. These values accordingly gave greater urgency to structures of authority, the hierarchical nature of things, the necessity for salvation, church-state relations and martyrdom. By the nineteenth century, however, religion no longer occupied the same place in politics, the economy, and science. As governments and organizational forms became increasingly complex and specialized, religion became detached, both abruptly and gradually, from domains of life increasingly identified as secular. In the wake of the Enlightenment, educated German Protestants were using categories of reason now deemed "scientific" (*wissenschaftlich*) as a tool to assess faith claims. Such use of "reason" would have been anathema to reformers like Martin Luther and Huldrych Zwingli. In contrast to the early modern era, it was possible for Germans, particularly Protestants, to escape their religious confines altogether. Though small in number, these free-thinkers, atheists, agnostics, or secularists, what Todd Weir has called the fourth confession, exerted a disproportionate influence on politics and culture.²³ Those less willing to take such a fateful leap remained formal members of their church or synagogue but rarely practiced, ignoring the dictates, teachings, and prohibitions of their pastors, priests, or rabbis. Some found greater meaning in socialist gymnastics clubs or nationalist associations like the Pan-German Leagues and cast their votes accordingly. Even the Catholic world was less unified than church leaders had made it appear. Not all Catholics followed the dictates of clerical leaders. Many disregarded church exhortations on

basic questions of what to read, which clubs to join, and even which political party to vote for.²⁴

As a result, confessional divisions were never as pronounced as those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. One could certainly speak of a “Protestant milieu” and of confessional Lutheran and Reform enclaves in regions like Pomerania and universities like Tübingen. But at the same time, Catholics and Protestants came into contact with each other more frequently than models of confessionalism would have assumed. Both at the grassroots and at the highest levels of politics, those of different confessions could cooperate, if only temporarily.²⁵

Beginning in the early 2000s, a wave of historians like Helmut Walser Smith, Michael Gross, Róisín Healey, Till van Rahden, and Lisa Zwicker accordingly began to focus on not just points of conflict but of intersection between Germany’s confessional communities. But they expanded their lens to include not only Catholics and Protestants but Jews.²⁶ Though frequently driven by conflict, these triangular interactions proved more complex than had been anticipated. All three groups triangulated against one another. Cooperation could give way to conflict—and vice versa. Confessional identity thus proved complex and prone to change. Crucially, these historians integrated gender into their analyses. In hindsight, it is astonishing that gender remained so conspicuously absent from earlier analyses. By the nineteenth century, women increasingly made up the majority of those regularly in the church pews, forms of piety were identified as feminine, and women often used the safe spaces offered by the church as tools of emancipation.²⁷ To be sure, paradigms of the “feminization” of religion have not remained uncontested, but this wave of research made it abundantly clear that perceptions of masculinity and femininity strongly shaped confessional perceptions and relations. In bullying confessional adversaries, gendered language became the norm. Jesuit priests were dismissed as feminine and weak, while Protestant politicians and theologians were exalted as masculine and heroic. It will take an analysis drawn from the history of emotions to analyze why these terms designed to hurt and extol resonated emotionally for so long.

This Volume’s Task: Analyzing Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in the Twentieth Century

This volume’s task is to pursue these lines of inquiry much further into the twentieth century than has so far been the case. Many analyses of confessional relations come to a close in the year 1914, an obvious caesura in light of the upheaval to come. While edited volumes from Olaf Blaschke

and others did include chapters on the Nazi and postwar eras, historians writing on the German churches have nonetheless generally focused on questions for which confessional relations were peripheral. How did the churches respond to dictatorships and persecution under National Socialism and Communism?²⁸ How did they deal with membership declines, the erosion of once vibrant subcultures and “secularization”? There have been notable exceptions to the scholarly neglect of confessional tension in the twentieth century. These are the vivid descriptions of the politics of the early Federal Republic provided by Frank Bösch, Maria Mitchell, and Kristian Buchna that underscore how confessional conflict pervaded the CDU, its interconfessional mantra notwithstanding.²⁹ At the core of their analyses was a simple reality: the altered demographics of the Federal Republic lent Catholics a political power that they had not enjoyed before, which rekindled Protestant fears.

With this observation in mind, this volume seeks to explore how political upheaval and demographic changes shaped and altered confessional relations. It starts from the premise that confessional tensions in Germany from the turn of the century through the early 1960s were not driven primarily by processes of confessionalization redolent of the Reformation era. Contrary to Blaschke’s claims, they originated instead in cultural, religious, and political developments of the nineteenth and early twentieth century that threatened to undermine confessional identities and self-understandings. They were the product of political upheaval that threatened to alter the political, societal, and cultural balance of power between Catholics and Protestants and that left behind a bitterly enduring sense of victimization. Such resentments were, in fact, a sign of the interdependence between the confessions, even where the cooperation between them was limited.

This volume thus specifically focuses on how confessional relations were altered by changes both abrupt and long-term. The abrupt changes included revolution in 1918, genocide under the Nazis, and the wave of expulsions and resettlements in 1918–19 and again in 1945–46, which destroyed the homogeneity of regions that for centuries had been neatly Catholic or Protestant. In the long term, both churches struggled with challenges posed by the Nazi and Communist dictatorship. During the postwar era and particularly by the late 1950s, moreover, they were forced to confront additional challenges. In the wake of the Holocaust, both churches were held to account for the tragic consequences of Christian antisemitism. Interest in dialogue with Jewish partners grew, perhaps not coincidentally, when membership in Jewish communities had dwindled in the wake of genocide and emigration. The gradual arrival of millions of Muslim immigrants over many decades also altered confessional relations. Jews and Muslims both were given an importance that extended far be-

yond their proportionately small numbers: antisemitism, philosemitism, Islamophilia, and Islamophobia were likewise out of proportion to the size of Jewish and Islamic communities. Not least, both major confessions were forced to confront the loss of their own—or what was variously referred to as religious erosion, secularization, materialism, the loss of God, the loss of faith, the loss of values, dechristianization or an exodus from the churches (*Entkirchlichung*).

Tellingly, the churches tended to address these challenges separately, even though both were profoundly affected. Different institutional structures and a legacy of mistrust certainly helps explain why they tended to “go it alone.” But another reason is arguably just as decisive: different theological understandings of the ecclesia. Few Catholic and Protestant conservatives shared understandings of what had caused “secularization.” For such Catholics, it was the spirit of Protestant individualism and the destruction of sacramental authority which had undermined religious authority. For Protestant conservatives (as well as liberal *Kulturprotestanten*), it was the remains of medieval superstition. Both positions were convenient rationalizations. Protestants knew that Catholics were more “intact” and less divided, while Catholics envied Protestant academic, cultural, and scientific achievement.

Though the churches continued to move on separate paths more often than not, members of both churches on occasion sought to overcome or at the least temper confessional strife. Their attempts, successful or not, are a focus of many of this volume’s chapters. Under what circumstances did Catholics, Protestants, and Jews seek to bridge the confessional divide? Did their efforts dilute confessional identities? Above all, how did changing confessional relations alter religious identities, allegiances, and practices?

Methodologically, the volume will draw on the insights and methodologies emerging out of the social, cultural, political, gender, and intellectual history of the last several decades. But it also weaves the findings of theologians into our picture of German church history. Many accounts of confessional conflict did not always show a full awareness of the theological; few historians are trained theologians. And yet without an understanding of theology, the confessional tensions of the nineteenth and twentieth century will make little sense, for theology was infused into how the churches approached those of other confessions and faiths. In such a context, churchmen naturally looked back to the Reformation era for guidance—but only selectively. They picked and chose. Truth claims from the Reformation era persisted but only partially, depending on confession. Which claims fell by the wayside, which were retained, which were altered? Understanding the confessional conflicts of the nineteenth and twentieth

century—as well as the attempts to overcome them—thus also requires an understanding of these truth claims and the modifications to which they were subjected in the wake of the Enlightenment. In most instances, it was the modification of earlier truth claims that inflamed confessional tensions. And yet by the last third of the twentieth century, it was these alterations that helped defuse them. Catholics and Lutherans could even come together on Reformation Day, 31 October 1999, to sign a highly lauded joint statement on justification and grace.³⁰

The specific chapters in this volume come from both senior and younger scholars. The products of recent research, they offer fresh interpretations. But all are shaped by the reality noted by virtually every observer of the German religious landscape: Germany was historically a biconfessional land in which confessional identity, even for the less devout and nonpracticing, continued to play a significant role in shaping social interactions, the choice of a spouse, levels of education, and career prospects. But as much as the Peace of Westphalia had sought to maintain the confessional peace by keeping the confessions apart as much as possible, doing so was increasingly difficult because of social, economic, and political changes following the defeat of Napoleon. These brought Germans of different faith backgrounds closer together, certainly at the highest level of politics but often locally as well. The Prussian state expanded, annexing predominantly Catholic states in the west of Germany. As Germany unified, newly created political parties had to identify their voter base and craft identities and platforms out of them. This was not hard to do. The dislocations brought on by rapid economic growth and industrialization led to massive internal migrations of both Catholics and Protestants into new regions during the course of the nineteenth century. The potential for conflict between a Protestant-dominated national state with a Protestant monarchy and Catholic and Jewish minorities was thus massive. Protestants, differences between Lutheran, Reformed, United, *Kulturprotestanten* notwithstanding, saw themselves as the *Leitkultur* and Catholics as a cultural threat.

Jeffrey T. Zalar's chapter accordingly explains how Catholics and Protestants clashed over the idea of culture. To Protestant charges that Catholics were dividing the nation, Catholics argued that Catholicism historically had provided the unity of Christendom: it was Protestantism that had destroyed this and continued to do so through its many fissures. As much as they refuted these allegations, Catholics could not overcome the specter of the *Kulturkampf*. Catholics responded by compensating—and overcompensating. They proclaimed themselves to be Germans as good as their Protestant cousins and strove to be their intellectual and political equals. Yet all of their striving paid few dividends. Protestants continued to perceive Catholics as a threat. They did so because Catholics neither folded

nor converted. They continuously found ways to respond in ways that Protestants could never equal. They mobilized; they created their own political party. They experienced a religious revival, one with no real equivalent in Protestantism. Jealous Protestants, and especially half-secularized *Kulturprotestanten*, were frightened because Catholics had withstood the onslaught. Protestants continued to see Catholics as cultural inferiors; all of the Catholic intellectual toiling merely diluted their confessional identity. According to Zalar, Catholics found themselves in a highly unstable place that he labels “Zwischenkatholizismus.”

Such fears were magnified by the Revolution of 1918, even though one of the bastions of a Protestant state—the Hohenzollern monarchy—had been toppled, the Catholic Center Party was a full-fledged partner in numerous coalition governments during Weimar, and four Catholics served as chancellor. Many Catholics of the day saw the 1920s and 1930s as a second *Kulturkampf*, as does Klaus Große Kracht. He points to the renewed ideological offensive against the church through the so-called Evangelical League (*Evangelischer Bund*). At the local level, violence frequently broke out between Catholics and Protestants during processions and pilgrimages in confessionally mixed regions. In response, Catholics took an approach that might seem schizophrenic. On the one hand, they assumed a defensive crouch, seeing themselves besieged by Protestants, liberals, socialists, and Communists, which they saw as part of the same larger materialist enemy. On the other hand, they went on the offensive, mobilizing laity under the aegis of the hierarchy through initiatives like Catholic Action and triumphantly proclaiming their hostility towards modernism in all of its forms. The result, Große Kracht argues, was a susceptibility to authoritarianism, particularly when it promised to sweep away common ideological and political enemies. The efforts of Catholic intellectuals to combat modernism through a religiously-centered quasi-authoritarianism thus proved illusory. Their initiatives were not strong enough to withstand the Nazi onslaught. Trauma ironically paved the way for its recurrence.

For Protestants, however, the trauma from the Revolution of 1918 was arguably even greater. The Hohenzollern monarchy was gone. The Weimar constitution brought about a much stricter separation of church and state than had hitherto been the case. Socialists and liberals clamored for further restrictions on the role of the churches in education and politics. Benedikt Brunner in turn focuses on how the revolution represented a fundamental rupture in Protestant self-understanding. It emerged fearful of an even more thorough separation of church and state than proved to be the case. Ironically, Protestants found succor through the efforts of Catholics, their confessional rivals, whose resistance to a more complete breach between church and state helped preserve the integrity of the Protestant state churches.

Yet even these joint efforts against the secularizing forces in the Weimar Republic did not bring about a rapprochement between Protestants and Catholics. The divisions between the two remained deep and seemingly unbridgeable. They were powerfully represented in the election results of 1932 and 1933. Jürgen Falter provides an incisive analysis of what is now commonplace: Catholics voted for the Nazis at far lower percentages than did Protestants, regardless of whether they lived in rural, semi-rural or highly industrialized regions. In the semifree elections of March 1933, only one-third of Catholics supported the Nazis in contrast to half of non-Catholics, whose ranks included Protestants, Jews, members of free churches as well as the religiously unaffiliated. Falter argues that confessional identities and political structures account for this gulf in support. Some Catholic bishops had threatened their flock with excommunication were they to join the Nazi party, the SA, or SS. Many Protestant clergy and theology students, often those chafing because of nationalist grievances, were attracted to the Nazi party because of its promises to resurrect Germany's national destiny. But social pressures arguably played an even greater role. The Catholic world, like the socialist world, had its own network of institutions and structures that made it more resistant to Nazi siren calls. Some, if not most, of this was the result of gender. Long a pillar of the Catholic milieu, Catholic women were far less likely to join and vote for the Nazis than men. Those openly supporting the Nazis were thus apt to be stigmatized, particularly in tight-knit communities, rural or urban. The confessional divide remained.

James Chappel argues that confessional tensions thus became a source of concern for a number of Catholic intellectuals, who in turn began calling for ecumenism. But this proto-ecumenical movement scarcely resembled the progressive ecumenical movement of the postwar era. In fact, its origins were Fascist—to use Chappel's term—in inspiration. They sought to build bridges not just to Protestants but above all to National Socialists, whom they saw as the only force capable of healing Germany's confessional divisions. Chappel thus suggests that the Nazis—and not the CDU—represented the first truly interconfessional German political party. Scholars like the *Kirchenhistoriker* Joseph Lortz accordingly argued that Luther was not as demonic as the forces of the Counter-Reformation had made him out to be. In fact, doctrinaire Catholicism bore some of the blame for the tragedy of the Reformation, which had divided Christendom and Germany. The true foils, instead, were the Jews.

But as was also the case with the German Christians, these bridge-builders rarely found their efforts welcomed by the Nazis. Both churches found themselves subjected to waves of persecution between 1933 and 1945. During these tumultuous years, the two major confessions painstakingly

observed each other and their responses to National Socialism. But even at the highest institutional levels, they rarely cooperated with each other to fend off persecution. It was not only lingering confessional animosities that were responsible: it was the reality that Protestants in particular were so caught up in internal schisms over theology and over how to position themselves vis-à-vis National Socialism that a united front with Catholics was impossible. Yet the multiple schisms within German Protestantism during the so-called *Kirchenkampf* did bring some Protestants closer to Catholicism. They prompted a not insignificant number of high-ranking Protestants to convert or consider converting to Catholicism during the 1930s. Benjamin Ziemann shows how their interest was not driven by ecumenism but by the fact that Catholicism appeared to them to be a bastion of Christian unity: it was a welcome contrast from seemingly ceaseless theological and political infighting. Conversion was, to be sure, the most radical of steps. Along with mixed marriages, it ranked as one of the greatest confessional irritants, particularly for Catholics. Since the days of the German Empire, the number of Catholics converting to Protestantism had consistently been higher than that of Protestants formally adopting Catholicism.

But in the years following the Nazi seizure of power, it was the prospect of Protestant conversions like that of the Confessing Church leader and Dahlem minister, Martin Niemöller, that sent shock waves through Protestant communities around the world. While interned in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp, Niemöller seriously entertained the idea of conversion, a consideration driven at least partially by frustration and despair at the state of the Prussian state church, the Old Prussian Union (APU). The international press picked up the story, even if it did not always relay it accurately. So too did the Gestapo, which sent him to Dachau along with two and then three Catholic priests, whom they hoped would provide the finishing touches for his conversion. But Niemöller stopped short. It was the entreaties of his wife, Else, as mediated by the Lutheran theologian Hans Asmussen, who persuaded him to put the brakes on any jump to Rome. This wave of conversions, both consummated and aborted, proved in hindsight to have been a dead end, Ziemann concludes. The end of the Nazi era spelled the death knell for the divisive German Christian movement, while the creation of the Protestant Church of Germany (EKD), an umbrella for the twenty-eight state churches, provided a unity of sorts for Protestants. Instead of pursuing ecumenical initiatives with Catholic brethren, Niemöller himself returned to the knee-jerk anti-Catholicism redolent of the old Evangelical League (*Evangelischer Bund*), which his father had enthusiastically supported.

It was thus only in resistance circles that Catholics and Protestants began working together in an ecumenical spirit, one born out of necessity.

Out of resistance, they forged the interconfessional CDU in 1945. The bridge-builders of the 1930s were thus not the political pathbreakers of the 1940s. But as Maria Mitchell argues the hallmark of the new party was not only its interconfessionalism, one that unlike that of the Nazis was now anchored in a commitment to democratic values. It was its commitment to traditionalist positions on culture and gender. The CDU, like the Center Party of the 1920s, was thus shaped by a paradox: it strove to legislate public morality in the hopes of rebuilding a Christian West and implement family values. It did so knowing full well that this might restrict the careers of women who had suddenly gained new employment opportunities in the aftermath of the war and also drive Protestant women over to other parties. And yet the CDU-CSU's electoral base was disproportionately female. How then did the CDU's interconfessionalism and its commitment to traditional gender roles coexist? Mitchell argues that confessional tensions rose in the CDU as its commitment to conservative gender norms increased.

It is those confessional tensions that are the focus of Mark Edward Ruff's chapter on the controversies in 1953 and 1954 over an American film, *Martin Luther*. Conceived in the late 1940s and early 1950s to combat "Catholic totalitarianism," this film was produced by an ecumenical consortium of rival American Lutheran synods for whom anti-Catholicism served as a rallying and unifying cry. Shot in Germany, *Martin Luther* was the equivalent of throwing gasoline on the fire, since relations between Catholics and Protestants had been deteriorating since the late 1940s. Several of its scenes ran afoul of the German film commission and had to be cut. Its release caused consternation within Catholic circles in the CDU, who saw it as endangering the "confessional peace." No less than Chancellor Konrad Adenauer had to intervene, but it was ultimately Protestants who succeeded in finding a solution. The German parliamentary president Hermann Ehlers, a devout Protestant, downplayed tensions by finding a common enemy—the superficiality of an American import. Also playing a crucial role in these discussions was Joseph Lortz, the one-time Catholic bridge-builder to National Socialism. He had objected to historically and theologically inaccurate scenes, but it was Lortz's monumental history of the Reformation that had informed the script. Lortz was quoted months after the release as being satisfied with the film.

It would be a mistake, however, to reduce German confessional tensions to a simple Catholic-Protestant divide even in the post-1945 era, where once vibrant Jewish communities had been greatly diminished because of emigration between 1933 and 1939 and genocide. Brandon Bloch argues that the absence of Jews shaped Catholic-Protestant relations in West Germany "like a spectral presence." Former religious dissidents, some perse-

cuted by the Nazi regime, urged their churches to renounce anti-Jewish prejudice and build ties to the few remaining Jewish communities. It was paradoxically, Bloch concludes, only the destruction of Jewish communities that allowed Christian-Jewish dialogue to emerge. Auschwitz became the pivotal and defining event for Christian reflection. Ecumenical activists could engage in theological dialogue without having to grapple with the practical challenges of a multireligious society. The same could not be said for Christian relations with Muslims, who today constitute a highly visible, vocal, and growing six percent of the population. Whether Muslims can be integrated into German society has remained one of the *Leitmotifs* of German politics—and these questions have spilled over to Germany's now growing Jewish communities. The arrival of Muslims has clearly complicated Jewish-Christian dialogue. Some immigrants brought with them anti-Jewish prejudice; the German left became increasingly critical of Israel following its conquests in the 1967 war. Complicating Christian-Jewish relations yet further was the fact that the two major confessions tended to pursue dialogue separately. This too should not surprise. Because of differing ecclesiastical structures, theologies, and institutional histories, Catholics could not speak for Protestants and vice versa.

Such dialogue was not present in East Germany. Claudia Lepp argues, moreover, that ecumenism was in short supply in the German Democratic Republic. Cooperation between Catholics and Protestants under the Communist dictatorship was scattered at best. In the 1950s, the relationship between both churches and the state became increasingly confrontational as the state began to assert its ideological agenda with greater severity. Consistent with its Marxist-Leninist ideology, it saw both churches as a threat, especially the majority Protestant church. The state strove to break up the coherent front that the Protestant churches had forced by measures such as making all *Jugendweihe*, a secular equivalent of confirmation, all but mandatory. It rewarded those Protestant clergy and seminarians who sought to build a “church within socialism.” The state also pursued a strategy of divide and conquer to ensure that cooperation between Catholics and Protestants would not materialize. To a significant extent, the churches played into its hands. Starting with the Berlin Bishop Alfred Bengsch, whose diocese straddled both sides of Berlin, Catholics opted for “political abstinence,” rarely speaking out publicly even on questions of growing importance in the late 1970s and 1980s such as the environmental and peace movements. Protestants, in contrast, played a much more substantial role in the revolution of 1989, helping steer it in a more peaceful direction. But even here, Lepp urges caution. The revolution of 1989 was not a Protestant revolution: it was a societal revolution, the product of happenstance and not design, for which the Protestant church had provided assistance.

Christoph Kösters elaborates on observations made by Lepp. He explains why Catholics proved less courageous than Protestants in standing up to the SED, particularly during the revolution of 1989. Catholics were not only a minority in East Germany: they were situated within the heartland of Lutheranism and historically had to rely on financial and administrative sustenance from the West and South. But this diaspora was subjected not only to the whims of a majority Protestant church but also to the ideological and political dictates of a revolutionary Communist state formally committed to atheism. Fears of state repression led the Catholic church to adopt a position of “political abstinence.” This *de facto* retreat from the public sphere was no doubt intended as a repudiation of Protestant attempts to build a “church within socialism.” But in practice, Catholic political abstinence turned this “double diaspora” into a ghetto, one impervious to the spirit of “aggiornamento” or openness coming from the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. The church lost influence and proved unable to stem the tide of state-driven secularization sweeping across the East by the 1960s and 1970s. Recognizing that their church was now operating within a “secular, materialist environment,” Catholic leaders were reduced to attempts to assert a relevant “Christian” presence. They did so by attempting to mobilize the laity, but their role had been consciously minimized by earlier church strategies of letting only priests and bishops speak politically for the church. The theological and structural deficits of this strategy, Kösters argues, became apparent in the 1980s as the church was unable to act with coherence, unity, and force. The church had indeed rejected Communist materialism but at the price of its larger societal relevance.

What then caused the decline in confessional tensions? Udi Greenberg has argued elsewhere that decolonization provided a decisive push.³¹ Catholics and Protestants had competed vigorously against each other in the mission field abroad. With the break-up of colonial empires, such competition ceased and cooperation could ensue. But this argument works far better for Great Britain and France, whose vast empires persisted into the 1950s and 1960s, than for Germany, whose colonial holdings were wrested from it during the World War I. Florian Bock argues that it was the need to assuage a guilty conscience following the crimes committed between 1933 and 1945 that led Catholics and Protestants to reengage with the “Third World,” this time in the form of vast development aid. By the late 1960s and with the end of decolonization, Florian Bock shows, church officials were pioneering new approaches for development aid that eschewed imposing religious beliefs and values in favor of cultural dialogue. The latter was far more in keeping with the ecumenical spirit gaining strength in some part of the Protestant and Catholic worlds by the late 1950s and

especially the 1960s in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. But as James Chappel's contribution also makes clear, even in the 1930s, the push towards ecumenism was a movement of well-educated religious elites. And the ecumenical movement was not present to any extent in the GDR. For Bock, ultimately, the impulse was one that transcended confessional boundaries—and ultimately brought Catholics and Protestants together, even if they retained their own organizations for administering developmental aid.

Thomas Großbölting argues that confessional tensions diminished because of changing patterns of religiosity. Catholics and Protestants alike distanced themselves from religious institutions; as they did so, earlier animosities waned. But what was cause and what was effect? Did German religious practices diminish because the old confessional identities handed down over generations no longer held the power they once did? Or did a decline in attendance at worship and in ancillary organizations allow Germans to let go of confessional stereotypes? If one were unsure about one's own religious identity, how could one condemn those of others? How could one object to marrying a Protestant if one didn't know what it meant to be a Catholic? Not least, the arrival of millions of Muslims, the majority of whom were Turkish, altered Germany's confessional landscape. No longer did Catholics and Protestant use a new religious minority to "triangulate" against each other. Instead, they saw themselves as sailing in the same beleaguered sea of religious indifference and religious pluralism in which church institutions continued to exist, but they were shorn of their cultural and spiritual power.

Reflecting on centuries of religious strife in Germany, Tilman Benedikowski observed that "a proper war of faith runs through our past and has changed human beings."³² But it is clear today that this "war of faith" has finally run its course. This volume's task is to ponder why.

Mark Edward Ruff is Professor of History at Saint Louis University. He is the coeditor of three volumes on Christianity and Catholicism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the author of two monographs, including *The Battle for the Catholic Past in Germany, 1945–1980* (Cambridge University Press, 2017). He has received research fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), the National Endowment of the Humanities (NEH), and the Alexander-von-Humboldt Stiftung.

Thomas Großbölting is Director of the Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte in Hamburg and Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Hamburg. From 2009 to 2020 he was Principal Investigator at the Cluster

of Excellence “Religion and Politics,” University of Münster. His recent books include *Wiedervereinigungsgesellschaft. Aufbruch und Entgrenzung in Germany since 1989/90* (2020), *Was glaubten die Deutschen 1933–1945?* (coedited with Olaf Blaschke, 2020), and *Losing Heaven: Religion in Germany since 1945* (2016).

Notes

1. Pew Research Center, “Five Centuries after Reformation, Catholic–Protestant Divide in Western Europe has Faded,” 31 August 2017. Retrieved 16 March 2021 from <https://www.pewforum.org/2017/08/31/five-centuries-after-reformation-catholic-protestant-divide-in-western-europe-has-faded/>.

2. Ibid.

3. Michael Maurer, *Konfessionskulturen. Die Europäer als Protestanten und Katholiken* (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 7.

4. Tillmann Bendikowski, *Der deutsche Glaubenskrieg. Martin Luther, der Papst und die Folgen* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 2016), 154–55.

5. Heinrich Böll, *Ansichten eines Clowns* (Munich: DTW, 1963), 95.

6. Helmut Walser Smith, *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict: Culture, Ideology, Politics, 1870–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 72. See also Manuel Borutta, *Antikatholizismus: Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter der europäischen Kulturkämpfe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010).

7. See Bendikowski, *Der deutsche Glaubenskrieg*. This book presents an overview both extensive and superficial (especially for the twentieth century) of the confessional tensions at the heart of German religious life.

8. Martin Greschat, *Die evangelische Christenheit und die deutsche Geschichte nach 1945: Weichenstellungen in der Nachkriegszeit* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002).

9. See for instance, Derek Hastings, *Catholicism and the Roots of Nazism: Religious Identity and National Socialism* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010).

10. John Connelly, *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1933–1965* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

11. For this position, see Rebecca Ayako Bennette, *Fighting for the Soul of Germany: The Catholic Struggle for Inclusion after Unification* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

12. For two notable exceptions, see Wolfgang Schieder, “Kirche und Revolution: Sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte der Trierer Wallfahrt von 1844,” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 14 (1974): 419–54; and Ronald J. Ross, *Beleaguered Tower: The Dilemma of Political Catholicism in Wilhelmine Germany* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976).

13. Mark Edward Ruff, *The Battle for the Catholic Past in Germany, 1945–1980* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 227–31.

14. See Georg Iggers, *The Social History of Politics: Critical Perspectives in West German Historical Writing since 1945* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1985); Philipp Stelzel, *History after Hitler: A Transatlantic Enterprise* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018).

15. Gerhard Schmidtchen, *Protestanten und Katholiken. Soziologische Analyse konfessioneller Kultur* (Bern: Francke, 1973); Gerhard Schmidtchen, ed., *Konfession—eine Nebensache? Politische, soziale und kulturelle Ausprägungen religiöser Unterschiede in Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984).

16. Margaret Lavinia Anderson, *Windhorst: A Political Biography* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1981); Richard Evans, “Religion and Society in Modern Germany,” *European Studies*

Review 12 (1982): 249–88; Jonathan Sperber, *Popular Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); Thomas Nipperdey, *Religion im Umbruch: Deutschland, 1870–1918* (Munich: Beck, 1988).

17. Arbeitskreis für kirchliche Zeitgeschichte, “Das katholische Milieu als Forschungsaufgabe,” *Westfälische Forschungen* 43 (1993): 588–654; Michael Klöcker, “Das katholische Milieu als historische Forschungsperspektive—mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rheinlande (Fazit 2010),” in *Religionen und Katholizismus, Bildung und Geschichtsdidaktik, Arbeiterbewegung—Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. Michael Klöcker (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011), 477–95.

18. Carl Amery, *Kapitulation oder Katholizismus Heute* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1963); M. Rainer Lepsius, “Parteiensystem und Sozialstruktur: Zum Problem der Demokratisierung der Deutschen Gesellschaft,” in *Die deutschen Parteien vor 1918*, ed. Gerhard A. Ritter (Cologne: Kiepenheuer and Witsch, 1973), 56–80.

19. According to the Arbeitskreis für kirchliche Zeitgeschichte, “Die Formierung von Milieus ist ein Phänomen der modernen Gesellschaft. Ein Milieu ist als eine sozial abgrenzbare Personengruppe Träger kollektiver Sinndeutung von Wirklichkeit. Es prägt reale Verhaltensmuster a.us, die sich an einem Werte und Normenkomplex orientieren, hier als Milieustandard bezeichnet. Institutionen führen in den Milieustandard ein und stützen ihn.” Arbeitskreis für kirchliche Zeitgeschichte, “Das katholische Milieu,” 588–654.

20. Olaf Blaschke, “Ein Zweites Konfessionelles Zeitalter?,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26 (2000): 38–75; Olaf Blaschke, “Der ‘Dämon des Konfessionalismus.’ Einführende Überlegungen,” in *Konfessionen im Konflikt: Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter*, ed. Olaf Blaschke (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 13–70.

21. For critiques, see: Carsten Kretschmann and Henning Pahl, “Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter? Vom Nutzen und Nachteil einer neuen Epochensignatur,” *Historische Zeitschrift* (2003): 369–92; Anthony Steinhoff, “Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter? Nachdenken über die Religion im langen 19. Jahrhundert,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 30 (2004): 549–70; Benjamin Ziemann, “Säkularisierung, Konfessionalisierung, Organisationsbildung. Dimensionen der Sozialgeschichte der Religion im langen 19. Jahrhundert,” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 47 (2007): 484–507; Christopher Clark and Wolfram Kaiser, *Culture Wars: Secular-Catholic Conflict in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009); and Benjamin Ziemann, “Kirchen als Organisationsform der Religion. Zeithistorische Perspektiven,” *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History, Online-Ausgabe*, 7 (2010): 440–46.

22. David Blackburn, *Marpingen: Apparitions of the Virgin Mary in a Nineteenth-Century German Village* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1993).

23. Todd Weir, *Secularism and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Rise of the Fourth Confession* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Rebekka Habermas, ed., *Negotiating the Secular and the Religious in the German Empire: Transnational Approaches* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2019).

24. On Catholic reading habits, see Jeff Zalar, *Reading and Rebellion in Catholic Germany, 1770–1914* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

25. Lucian Hölscher, *Geschichte der protestantischen Frömmigkeit in Deutschland* (Munich: Beck Verlag, 2005), 331–41; Derek Hastings, “Fears of a Feminized Church: Catholicism, Clerical Celibacy, and the Crisis of Masculinity in Wilhelmine Germany,” *European History Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (2008): 34–65.

26. Wolfgang Altgeld, *Katholizismus, Protestantismus, Judentum: Über religiös begründete Gegensätze und nationalreligiöse Ideen in der Geschichte des deutschen Nationalismus* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, 1992); and Dagmar Herzog, *Intimacy and Exclusion: Religious Politics in Pre-Revolutionary Baden* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Till van Rahden, *Juden und andere Breslauer: Die Beziehungen zwischen Juden, Protestanten und Katholiken in einer deutschen Großstadt von 1860 bis 1925* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000); Helmut Walser Smith, *Catholics, Protestants and Jews in Germany, 1800–1914* (New York: Berg, 2001);

Róisín Healy, *The Jesuit Specter in Imperial Germany* (Boston: Brill, 2003); Michael B. Gross, *The War against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2004); Uffa Jensen, *Gebildete Doppelgänger: Bürgerliche Juden und Protestanten im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005); Lisa Zwicker, *Dueling Students: Masculinity, Conflict, and Politics in German Universities, 1890 to 1914* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011).

27. Irmtraud Götz von Olenhusen, "Die Feminisierung von Religion und Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Forschungsstand und Forschungsperspektiven," in *Frauen unter dem Patriarchat der Kirche: Katholikinnen und Protestantinnen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Imtraud Götz von Olenhusen (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995), 8–21; Norbert Busch, "Die Feminisierung der Frömmigkeit," in *Wunderbare Erscheinungen: Frauen und katholische Frömmigkeit im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Irmtraud Götz von Olenhusen (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1995), 203–19; Patrick Pasture and Jan Art, *Beyond the Feminization Thesis: Gender and Christianity in Modern Europe* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2012); Michael O'Sullivan, *Disruptive Power: Catholic Women, Miracles, and Politics in Modern Germany, 1918–1965* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 12–15.

28. Mark Edward Ruff, *The Battle for the Catholic Past in Germany, 1945–1980*.

29. Martin Greschat, "Konfessionelle Spannungen in der Ära Adenauer," in *Adenauer und die Kirchen*, ed. Ulrich von Hehl (Bonn: Bouvier Verlag, 1999), 195–216; Frank Bösch, *Die Adenauer CDU: Gründung, Aufstieg und Erfolg einer Erfolgspartei, 1945–1970* (Munich: DVA Verlag, 2001); Maria Mitchell, *The Origins of Christian Democracy: Politics and Confession in Modern Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012); Kristian Buchna, *Ein klerikales Jahrzehnt? Kirche, Konfession und Politik in der Bundesrepublik während der 1950er Jahre* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2014).

30. For the full text, see: <https://www.lutheranworld.org/sites/default/files/Joint%20Declaration%20on%20the%20Doctrine%20of%20Justification.pdf>. Retrieved 16 March 2021.

31. Udi Greenberg, "Protestants, Decolonization, and European Integration, 1885–1961," *Journal of Modern History* 89, no. 2 (2017): 314–54.

32. Bendikowski, *Der deutsche Glaubenskrieg*, 9.

Bibliography

- Altgeld, Wolfgang. *Katholizismus, Protestantismus, Judentum: Über religiös begründete Gegensätze und nationalreligiöse Ideen in der Geschichte des deutschen Nationalismus*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1992.
- Amery, Carl. *Kapitulation oder Katholizismus Heute*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1963.
- Anderson, Margaret Lavinia. *Windhorst: A Political Biography*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Arbeitskreis für kirchliche Zeitgeschichte. "Das katholische Milieu als Forschungsaufgabe." *Westfälische Forschungen* 43 (1993): 588–654.
- Bendikowski, Tillmann. *Der deutsche Glaubenskrieg. Martin Luther, der Papst und die Folgen*. Munich: Bertelsmann, 2016.
- Bennette, Rebecca Ayako. *Fighting for the Soul of Germany: The Catholic Struggle for Inclusion after Unification*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Blackbourn, David. *Marpingen: Apparitions of the Virgin Mary in a Nineteenth-Century German Village*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Blaschke, Olaf. "Der 'Dämon des Konfessionalismus.' Einführende Überlegungen." In *Konfessionen im Konflikt: Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter*, edited by Olaf Blaschke, 13–70. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- . "Ein Zweites Konfessionelles Zeitalter?" *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26 (2000): 38–75.

- Böll, Heinrich. *Ansichten eines Clowns*. Munich: DTW, 1963.
- Borutta, Manuel. *Antikatholizismus: Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter der europäischen Kulturkämpfe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Bösch, Frank. *Die Adenauer CDU: Gründung, Aufstieg und Erfolg einer Erfolgspartei, 1945–1970*. Munich: DVA Verlag, 2001.
- Buchna, Kristian. *Ein klerikales Jahrzehnt? Kirche, Konfession und Politik in der Bundesrepublik während der 1950er Jahre*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2014.
- Busch, Norbert. “Die Feminisierung der Frömmigkeit.” In *Wunderbare Erscheinungen: Frauen und katholische Frömmigkeit im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Irma Götz von Olenhusen, 203–19. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1995.
- Clark, Christopher, and Wolfram Kaiser. *Culture Wars: Secular-Catholic Conflict in Nineteenth Century Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Connelly, John. *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1933–1965*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Evans, Richard. “Religion and Society in Modern Germany.” *European Studies Review* 12 (1982): 249–88.
- Götz von Olenhusen, Irma. “Die Feminisierung von Religion und Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Forschungsstand und Forschungsperspektiven.” In *Frauen unter dem Patriarchat der Kirche: Katholikinnen und Protestantinnen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Irma Götz von Olenhusen, 8–21. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995.
- Greenberg, Udi. “Protestants, Decolonization, and European Integration, 1885–1961.” *Journal of Modern History* 89, no. 2 (2017): 314–54.
- Greschat, Martin. *Die evangelische Christenheit und die deutsche Geschichte nach 1945: Weichenstellungen in der Nachkriegszeit*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002.
- . “Konfessionelle Spannungen in der Ära Adenauer.” In *Adenauer und die Kirchen*, edited by Ulrich von Hehl, 195–216. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag, 1999.
- Gross, Michael B. *The War against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Habermas, Rebekka, ed. *Negotiating the Secular and the Religious in the German Empire: Transnational Approaches*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2019.
- Hastings, Derek. *Catholicism and the Roots of Nazism: Religious Identity and National Socialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- . “Fears of a Feminized Church: Catholicism, Clerical Celibacy, and the Crisis of Masculinity in Wilhelmine Germany.” *European History Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (2008): 34–65.
- Healy, Róisín. *The Jesuit Specter in Imperial Germany*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Herzog, Dagmar. *Intimacy and Exclusion: Religious Politics in Pre-Revolutionary Baden*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Hölscher, Lucian. *Geschichte der protestantischen Frömmigkeit in Deutschland*. Munich: Beck Verlag, 2005.
- Iggers, Georg. *The Social History of Politics: Critical Perspectives in West German Historical Writing since 1945*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1985.
- Jensen, Uffa. *Gebildete Doppelgänger: Bürgerliche Juden und Protestanten im 19. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005.
- Klöcker, Michael. “Das katholische Milieu als historische Forschungsperspektive—mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rheinlande (Fazit 2010).” In *Religionen und Katholizismus, Bildung und Geschichtsdidaktik, Arbeiterbewegung—Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, edited by Michael Klöcker, 477–95. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Kretschmann, Carsten, and Henning Pahl. “‘Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?’ Vom Nutzen und Nachteil einer neuen Epochensignatur.” *Historische Zeitschrift* (2003): 369–92.
- Lepsius, M. Rainer. “Parteiensystem und Sozialstruktur: Zum Problem der Demokratisierung der Deutschen Gesellschaft.” In *Die deutschen Parteien vor 1918*, edited by Gerhard A. Ritter, 56–80. Cologne: Kiepenheuer and Witsch, 1973.

- Maurer, Michael. *Konfessionskulturen. Die Europäer als Protestanten und Katholiken*. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Mitchell, Maria. *The Origins of Christian Democracy: Politics and Confession in Modern Germany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012.
- Nipperdey, Thomas. *Religion im Umbruch: Deutschland, 1870–1918*. Munich: Beck, 1988.
- O’Sullivan, Michael. *Disruptive Power: Catholic Women, Miracles, and Politics in Modern Germany, 1918–1965*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018.
- Pasture, Patrick, and Jan Art. *Beyond the Feminization Thesis: Gender and Christianity in Modern Europe*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2012.
- Pew Research Center, “Five Centuries after Reformation, Catholic–Protestant Divide in Western Europe has Faded,” 31 August 2017. Retrieved 16 March 2021 from <https://www.pewforum.org/2017/08/31/five-centuries-after-reformation-catholic-protestant-divide-in-western-europe-has-faded/>.
- Ross, Ronald J. *Beleaguered Tower: The Dilemma of Political Catholicism in Wilhelmine Germany*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.
- Ruff, Mark Edward. *The Battle for the Catholic Past in Germany, 1945–1980*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. “Kirche und Revolution: Sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte der Trierer Wallfahrt von 1844.” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 14 (1974): 419–54.
- Schmidtchen, Gerhard, ed. *Konfession—eine Nebensache? Politische, soziale und kulturelle Ausprägungen religiöser Unterschiede in Deutschland*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984.
- . *Protestanten und Katholiken. Soziologische Analyse konfessioneller Kultur*. Bern: Francke, 1973.
- Smith, Helmut Walser. *Catholics, Protestants and Jews in Germany, 1800–1914*. New York: Berg, 2001.
- . *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict: Culture, Ideology, Politics, 1870–1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Sperber, Jonathan. *Popular Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Steinhoff, Anthony. “‘Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?’ Nachdenken über die Religion im langen 19. Jahrhundert.” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 30 (2004): 549–70.
- Stelzel, Philipp. *History after Hitler: A Transatlantic Enterprise*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.
- Van Rahden, Till. *Juden und andere Breslauer: Die Beziehungen zwischen Juden, Protestanten und Katholiken in einer deutschen Großstadt von 1860 bis 1925*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Weir, Todd. *Secularism and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Rise of the Fourth Confession*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Zalar, Jeff. *Reading and Rebellion in Catholic Germany, 1770–1914*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Ziemann, Benjamin. “Kirchen als Organisationsform der Religion. Zeithistorische Perspektiven.” *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History, Online-Ausgabe* 7 (2010): 440–46.
- . “Säkularisierung, Konfessionalisierung, Organisationsbildung. Dimensionen der Sozialgeschichte der Religion im langen 19. Jahrhundert.” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 47 (2007): 484–507.
- Zwicker, Lisa. *Dueling Students: Masculinity, Conflict, and Politics in German Universities, 1890 to 1914*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011.