

"Unerwünscht"

One of the Lesser Known Confrontations

With the National Socialist State,

1933-1937

Compiled by Marjorie Hindley (Hutterian Brethren Archives)

An ever-increasing number of publicationsⁱ appears dealing with aspects of the resistance movement in Nazi Germany, either on the part of individuals or of groups, researching in detail the reasons for their success or failure; and in the present climate of neo-Nazism this is inevitably a continuing source of concern. Nevertheless one small movement, very real to the participants (some of whom are still with us), very active in its protest, has almost escaped notice: the Bruderhof, its members now known as Hutterian Brethren.

The compiler, aware that this article is not a scholarly piece of research, proffers it as an attempt to record a lived and living history, and would like to thank the editors for considering its inclusion in this journal.

The Bruderhof to which this present history relates was founded in 1920 by Dr. Eberhard Arnold and his wife Emmy. It grew out of the disillusionment which followed Germany's defeat in the First World War, and the innermost seeking of many for the expression of a radical and genuine Christianity. Eberhard Arnold's earlier search had already taken him on unorthodox paths. The son of a Professor of Church history, he had distressed the parental home first by his enthusiasm for the Salvation Army, and later, while studying theology in Halle, by becoming involved in the revival movement there and accepting adult baptism (as did also the young woman, Emmy von Hollander, who was to become his wife). At this point he was not allowed by the Board of Examiners at Breslau to sit for his final divinity examination because adult baptism is not one of the tenets of faith of the State Lutheran Church. Whereupon he changed his course of studies to philosophy and education--and rejected membership of the State Church. From that time, in 1909, until the Rhönbruderhof was accepted into the Hutterian Anabaptist Church in 1930, Eberhard Arnold and his wife Emmy and the community that gathered round them belonged to no recognized church. It was not, however, a time of indifference or anarchy. In the first years of their marriage in 1909 and up until 1924, Eberhard lectured extensively in Halle, Leipzig, Berlin, Dresden, Hamburg, Magdeburg, Erfurt. The topics are revealing, such as: "Jesus in contrast to ecclesiasticism", "The bankruptcy of the religious system", "Jesus as He really was", "The individual and world need", "The corruption of the sex life", "World revolution and world redemption"; and then, in Tübingen in 1933, "The Bruderhof, its task and its goal". The Hutterian Brethren archivesⁱⁱ has preserved an informative collection of posters advertising these lectures, often in series of three or four.

It was clear that Eberhard would become a publisher, and during the war years he began to work for the Furche Verlag, first as editor of their journal Die Furche, and on the Assistance Committee for literature for prisoners of war, and later as Literary Editor. Discharged from the army during the first year of the war because of poor health, he came to feel that war was against the Christian teaching, a recognition that he stood by steadfastly for the remainder of his life. His first book, published in 1914, was entitled *Der Krieg, Ein Aufruf zur Innerlichkeit*.

Scholars, intellectuals, and a host of lively young people met, sometimes in considerable numbers, in Eberhard and Emmy's house, at that time in Berlin. They were perhaps all influenced by the many branches of the Jugendbewegung which swept Germany in the early part of the century. Antje Vollmer, in her doctoral thesis in 1973 on *Die Neuwerkbewegung, 1919-1935*, after an impressive coverage of the many aspects of the Jugendbewegung which were striving for expression, tells of the Neuwerk movement which began to emerge in 1919ⁱⁱⁱ. This movement was searching for a new relationship between Church and social democracy; and a surprising number of young theologians (who later became important names on the Lutheran scene in Germany) were active in it, 'something like a group of Church revolutionaries'. At the Conference which was held at Tambach (bei Erfurt) on 22-24 September, 1919, there were present among others Carl Mennicke, Paul Tillich, Heinrich Schultheis, Gerhard Günther, Emil Fuchs, Eugen Diederichs, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, Edward Thurneysen, Eberhard Arnold, and the Swiss Karl Barth, the latter having come instead of the religious-socialist Leonhard Ragaz who had originally been invited to attend. Karl Barth was the main speaker, and lectured on 'The Christian in society'. Eberhard Arnold spoke on 'The radical pacifism of the Sermon on the Mount', and here already was an indication of the parting of their ways.

There is considerable complexity in the development of the thinking which led some to move away from the Neuwerk movement after this conference; but Antje Vollmer makes it clear that Neuwerk had a significant contribution to make:

'The beginning of the Neuwerk movement would have been unthinkable without Eberhard Arnold. He alone succeeded, within a short time, in setting so many young people on fire for his cause all over Germany that 200-300 of them already answered his call to the first conference in Schlüchtern at Whitsun 1920 -- the hour of birth of the Neuwerk Movement.'^{iv}

Soon it became clear that the new fire for a radical Christianity could not remain 'theology', but had to find a new life form, 'a community of life, a community of work, a community of meals and of goods, and a community of faith.' Günther Dehn, who was at that time a pastor in Berlin, a religious socialist concerned especially for working-class youth, writes, '...What has come to life again reminds us of the 16th century--of course not of Luther or Calvin, but of the so-called fanatics, the Mennonites and other Baptizers, men like Thomas Münzer and Hans Denck, who were persecuted by the Church.'^v In

that same year the Bruderhof at Sannerz, near Schlüchtern, was founded, with a mere handful of co-workers who were prepared to be so radical, but with a stream of guests.

Begun with great expectations, there were stormy years ahead. The outward form was not clear, and the forty who had gathered by 1922 were reduced to seven with five children in a major crisis, especially on the count of whether it was possible to live by faith or whether it was necessary first to have economic security. All those who left felt that they could not continue without economic security. At this point Eberhard Arnold resigned from the Neuwerk Verlag. Then the long pull began, out of which the present life and faith of the communities has emerged.

How is economic security to be measured in a life built on faith? The main sustenance of the community was clear. The Eberhard Arnold Verlag (as the publishing house became) published and expected to continue publishing books of considerable interest to the scholarly Christian world, including the 'Quellen Sammlung', twenty-two volumes under the heading 'Lebensbücherei christlicher Zeugnisse aller Jahrhunderte'. (There is an interesting note in July, 1934, that Ex-Kaiser Wilhelm II, from his exile in Dorn, Holland, ordered twenty-five copies of the *Außerbiblische Erlöser-Erwartung*). The land was to be worked to provide the basic foods--in the first years hindered by the sheer ignorance of the land-workers. The great desire to care for children in need led to the fostering of a number of children, support for whom was forthcoming from the State. But capital sums for the building up of the community in all its aspects were constantly raised either by direct appeal or by the joining of new members who brought resources with them -- which happened in a remarkable way at crucial moments.

Eberhard Arnold was always clear that the community he had founded was not to be his own creation. He sought for some years to link up with other groups before discovering through Robert Friedmann, an Austrian Jew, that the Hutterian Anabaptists still existed in North America. He had long known as an historical fact that in Reformation times a group of Anabaptists had decided to pool their goods and unite in Christian brotherhood. They stood especially for non-violence, community of goods, refusal to swear oaths, and adult baptism. Jakob Hutter became their leader in 1533, and today, 460 years later, their descendants live by the same faith. Robert Friedmann had from 1923 onwards become a major interpreter of Austrian Anabaptism, and his studies on Hutterian codices 'gripped him profoundly'^{vi}. He was responsible for a number of Anabaptist publications, and a warm friendship sprang up between him and Eberhard Arnold.

Several years of correspondence ensued with ministers of the North American Hutterian communities, and in 1930, when the community in Germany numbered seventy-five including about twenty children, Eberhard paid a year's visit to the North American communities. At the close of this time the German Bruderhof (now moved to the Rhön and named the Rhönbruderhof) was accepted into the Anabaptist church known as Hutterian. At this point too Hannes Boller, a Swiss pastor of

considerable means, joined the community with his family, which gave the Rhönbruderhof the means it needed for building up.

The Bruderhof, unique in having maintained the peasant costume of earlier days, has often been accused of being 'cut off from the world'. Nevertheless, copious material in the Bruderhof Archives indicates that the community in Germany was keenly aware of the political forces at work in the 1930s, of the rise to power of a dictatorial, anti-Semitic and nationalistic state, and of the need to draw a clear line between the demands of the state and the demands of Christian beliefs. In a talk at the Rhönbruderhof on January 1, 1933, Eberhard Arnold said, 'It is necessary to see things quite apart from the daily newspapers, ...Man's confusion has reached its peak. The present hour is such that a political catastrophe must be approaching, because the present suspense is not tenable. Moreover, capitalism and its supremacy is in decay, while fascism and bolshevism inspire no confidence, and are nothing less than the mad lust for rulership by a predatory state.'^{vii}

Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany in that same month, on January 30. The Bruderhof had many plans for building up at this point, but changes were ahead. On March 7 the Landjäger (village constable) visited the community to inform them that there had been complaints in Fulda (the neighboring town): that they were Communists, that they print communistic, inflammatory pamphlets, and have hidden weapons.^{viii} At first these charges were not difficult to disprove, for the Bruderhof had many friends in Fulda, foremost among them the District Administrator Baron von Gagern, and Dr. Friedensburg, the President of the administrative district. But in March, 1933, the President was removed, and the District Administrator informed the Bruderhof that they could expect a house-search 'to ascertain what weapons and inflammatory communist leaflets you have.'^{ix} The general climate is shown in the following extracts from meetings and talks during that time:

Guest Meeting, Sunday, March 26, 1933, at the Rhön Bruderhof:

'... It was evident in the last speech of the Chancellor of the Reich (Hitler) in which direction the swastika is moving. The cause of the Cross is a completely different one, and consequently its movement is going in an absolutely opposite direction.' ... '[If the situation deteriorates] I would feel authorized by the Brotherhood to reach out to the President of our government, if at all possible to Hitler himself personally, not just to recognize his power as our governmental authority, but rather to bring it to his consciousness more sharply, in the sense of God's justice, that he should only judge and punish evil with true justice, without any exaggeration, and not in a way that innocent, good elements which appear to be close neighbors of evil, are also punished...'.^x

Brotherhood Meeting, March 26, 1933: Our Mission to the present World Order. 'We do not withhold our respect from God-ordained government (Rom.13:1). Our calling, however, is a completely different one....We oppose outright the present order of society. We represent a different order, that of the

communal Church as it was in Jerusalem after the Holy Spirit was poured out....On the economic level it meant that they gave up all private property and lived in complete community of goods, free from any compulsion....And so we are called to represent the same in the world today, which quite naturally will bring us into conflicts.^{xix}

Brotherhood Meeting, before Eberhard Arnold's journey to the Authorities, March 28, 1933. At the Rhön Bruderhof:

'I shall be very grateful to receive from the brothers and the whole brotherhood a direction for all the charges which I shall take with me from God and the church community.'...`We must be aware that this journey brings a decision as to whether we want to stay here or leave the country. We must consider the following: if part of the Brotherhood is deported (the Swiss or Baltic members) we must see that as a good reason for us all to emigrate together. It will require a vital decision.'^{xii}

On April 12 the first police search took place, carried out by the Head District Constable, five country constables, five S.S. men, and one representative of the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei.^{xiii} This was a 'friendly visit', but on May 28th sixty S.A. men from the surrounding villages carried out maneuvers on Bruderhof land in proximity to the houses. They marched, exercised and practiced shooting directly towards the barn. Eberhard Arnold, travelling to Fulda and Kassel to protest this situation, found that earlier friends had been replaced by convinced National Socialists. In the midst of decisions in the Brotherhood to continue building up, the whole household was also informed of the seriousness of the situation, and asked to make a decision as to where they would stand; and at this point several novices and guests left.^{xiv}

It was on 11th October 1933 that a very brief note (written in the third person) was received from *Reichsbischof* Ludwig Müller, Charlottenburg 2, in Berlin (Head of the German Evangelical Church, the title created by the government in 1933), asking Eberhard Arnold to let him know how he and his community stood to Christianity and to the Church. Eberhard replied at considerable length, thanking the Bishop for his interest, and stating fully the allegiance of the brotherhood to the Gospels, the Sermon on the Mount, the early Christian Church, and to the Hutterian Confession of Faith as set forth by Peter Riedemann in the year 1540. This letter received no reply.^{xv}

Now followed a number of letters and visits to local and national government authorities. In early November a public notice was received calling all men fit for service in the Sturmabteilung (Storm Troops) to attend a meeting in the Veitsteinbach hall on the evening of November 4. 'Those failing to come will show by their absence that they have no interest in their nation and fatherland.' The brothers sent a letter by hand to say that they were unable to attend, because they would be gathering for worship that evening, 'We testify that we have the greatest interest in our nation and fatherland, and that this evening too we shall intercede from our hearts for the government of Hindenburg and Adolf Hitler.'^{xvi}

On November 7 Eberhard Arnold as representative of the whole church-community sent a very detailed letter 'to the Reich Minister of the Interior' and 'the Advisor for Church Affairs', with copies to the Reich President, the Reich Chancellor, and the heads of the Bruderhof's administrative area and rural district. The letter was headed 'Re the ecclesiastical and political stand of the Bruderhof, P.O.Neuhof, rural district of Fulda,' and contained a full account of the uniting with the Hutterian Church with the names and addresses of the leaders of the three main groups in America. It pointed further to the fact that all communities were of German origin; at the same time making it very clear that while the brotherhood acknowledged the God-given necessity of the calling entrusted to the government of Hindenburg and Hitler, they themselves had no other calling and could represent no other views than apostolic evangelism and the gospel of Jesus Christ. The letter pointed out that accusations of communistic activity were completely unfounded, and ended with the request that a representative of the Minister of the Interior might visit the Bruderhof.^{xvii}

On November 12 a much-heralded plebiscite was held. Emmy Arnold, wife of Eberhard, describes the situation in her book, 'Torches Together':

'It was not a free election; it was closely watched. Everyone was compelled to go to the polls, and they made a point of informing us of this. We agreed that we could not simply say "No" like anarchists; we felt we had to give an answer which would give a positive witness to our attitude.

'Eberhard then formulated a sentence which said that we would support a government that was appointed by God, but that our mission was a different one; our task was to live according to the way and example of Christ, as a corrective for this world. Each one copied this sentence onto a piece of gummed paper. Then we all went together down to Veitsteinbach, the village in whose district we belonged. Each of us pasted this piece of paper on the ballot, and threw it into the urn.^{xviii}

The Fulda district plebiscite results proclaimed Veitsteinbach unanimous in support of Nazi policies, ignoring the Bruderhof's stand.

On November 16, 1933, the Gestapo organized a raid on the Bruderhof with over one hundred SA (Sturm-Abteilung) and SS (Schutz-Staffel) men, revolvers at the ready, searching for hidden weapons.^{xix} Of course they found none, but the men were ordered to take away all the books with red covers (as proof of 'communist' leanings!) and some minutes of Brotherhood meetings.^{xx}

It was after this raid that Eberhard Arnold wrote "A Song of the fighting Church", since published in the community's song-book, three verses of which (in translation) are given herewith:

1. The powers of wrath and darkness rage and take up steel and weapons;
Their cohort's icy mass rolls on and Christian witness threatens.
The State, with power base, demanding greatest place,
Would totally enthrall, grasp altar, throne, and all--
Who dares to stand against this force?

5. Our Brotherhood may never hate but holds the foe in honor
And faces him, upright and free--real love will be the gainer,
No ballot, war, nor hate, idolatry of State,
No violence or force, smooth lying that distorts,
Shall e'er destroy Christ's image true.

6. So marching on with joyful stride, in poverty rejoicing,
This band, united, strong, at peace, glad praise to God is voicing.
Their covenant, renewed, in this dark hour is proved.
It shows earth's greatest need for God's own rule to come.
It honors God, our Lord and King!^{xxi}

It was after this raid, too, that Hans Meier, a Swiss brother, was sent to Switzerland with minutes of the Brotherhood meetings packed into rucksacks, to be kept in safe hiding till sometime in the future.

Numerous letters continued to be written: On November 9, to the Reich Chancellor, Adolf Hitler, about the Bruderhof's loyalty to the Government in all that is good; but stating clearly that 'our belief in love as the highest good will not allow us as ministers of Jesus Christ to take part in military service and governmental or judicial actions'; on November 10, to Field Marshal von Hindenburg, about the Bruderhof's deep roots in German antiquity and early Christianity; also on November 10, to Prince Philip of Hesse, President of the province, and on November 11 to Dr. Burkkhardt, Rural District Magistrate, both letters on the political and religious stand of the Bruderhof.^{xxii}

(It should be said that at this time Eberhard Arnold was suffering acutely from a complicated leg fracture sustained as he returned from a visit to some of the authorities. It entailed a series of operations, and eventually, in November 1935, led to his death under an operation for amputation. Some voices at that time suggested that without Eberhard Arnold the community would not hold out. Events proved otherwise.)

On November 20, 1933, a long letter was written to the Secret State Police at Kassel, attention of the Assessor Hütterot.^{xxiii} This letter was delivered to him by hand by the two brothers Hans Zumpe and

Hannes Boller. It was on this visit that Hütterot gave them the information they asked for: the school would be closed, the children's home would be closed, guest visits would be terminated. This was confirmed in a letter of December 29 from the President of the Administrative Area of Kassel, Department for Churches and Schools. Permission to operate a primary and intermediate school (which had been granted by the Government, Decree B IV 7420, January 30, 1928) was withdrawn.^{xxiv}

In the meantime the Brotherhood, without waiting for the Administration's confirmation of this order, had made the earnest decision to send the children away, out of Germany, "until our future in Germany is clearer;" and on January 4, 1934, the `Directors of the Bruderhof` replied that the school had already been dissolved, and that there were no children of school age and of German nationality at the Bruderhof. The children with two teachers had in fact been transferred first to the relatives of Swiss members, then to a sympathetic children's home in Switzerland, and later to the Principality of Liechtenstein, where shortly afterwards a small Bruderhof was founded, high up in the mountains. Here again, a sick woman in hospital gave them, unsolicited, an amount which was more than they needed to rent for six months the summer hotel which became the Almbruderhof. Their benefactress recovered, and became a member.

One lengthy petition from the Hutterian Brethren in America was received in December 1933 (otherwise undated) addressed to the Reich Government on behalf of the Bruderhof. It too laid down the principles of faith of the Hutterian believers, and asked `the high government authorities of Germany to recognize and appreciate that such an example of a Christian life of practical brotherhood is both necessary and a blessing for the German people, especially at the present difficult time.'^{xxv}

On December 6 a ten-page letter from the Brotherhood addressed to the Chief of the Secret State Police at Berlin, with a copy to the local Chief of Police at Kassel, laid out explicitly in what way the Bruderhof would support the State and in what way it could not. The following is taken from the translation of this letter:

`Over many months we have expressed in numerous meetings our special love and respect for the present government and its leader and chancellor as regards the following specific points:

1. The demand that the common good must everywhere come before self-interest, a demand we respond to completely.

2. The goal of bringing about unity among the German people--a centuries-old goal also for our Hutterian Brethren--and the avowed will to work for a more just and peaceful relationship with other nations.

3. A cleansing of the prevailing atmosphere of bolshevism and its evils, of mammonistic corruption, of sexually provocative impurity, and unfaithfulness in family life--a cleansing strongly demanded and represented as part of our church's task also.

4. The extremely successful fight against pernicious unemployment--an endeavor that on a small scale our Bruderhof, too, has been actively engaged in for many years at no little sacrifice.

`While fully acknowledging the above, we have taught the fundamental distinction between the original mission of Christ and whatever form a state, including the present one, may take. As an inevitable consequence, the Christian church, as confessed by our Bruderhofs on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, cannot take any active part in the state's use of force....

`On the basis of that faith and in that positive context, we meet in our brotherhood...In these meetings we have repeatedly expressed misgivings, springing from a deep inner Christian conviction, with respect to the following points. We ask that these differences not be mistaken for animosity, for our faith commits us to love and honor from our hearts all men in government.

1. The present government demands the primacy of the state more strongly than ever before, claiming absolute authority and dominating the nation with its Weltanschauung. For a church bound to Christ, obedience to God and dedication to his kingdom takes precedence over everything without exception and must remain paramount. It disturbs us deeply that in the face of this situation, anyone who is committed to this obedience will inevitably come into a sharp inner conflict.

2. It seems to us that as a result the way of life demanded by faith may be in jeopardy, that the Church may be in danger of losing freedom of conscience. This freedom demands nothing else than the right to put into practice the utter goodness and purity of Jesus Christ in obedience to him. He is the only leader (Führer), master and liberator of his disciples.

3. A particular concern is the freedom of speech and of education that the apostolic mission of Jesus Christ requires and without which we cannot live....We would appreciate a clear statement about the extent to which that freedom will still remain in Germany.

4. Therefore we are beset by an extreme torment of conscience as to whether the national movement now prevailing places man and his supremacy, the state and its commands, above God and his Word, above Christ and his Spirit...

5. In particular, the seemingly absolute belief in the Aryan, and especially the Nordic blood arouses fear in a Christian that the divine measure of justice and equity toward other kinds of blood will suffer.

6. Finally, we are warned by the history of all centuries that in spite of the responsible leaders' best intentions, whenever a state executes judgment with extreme harshness, the wrath of punishment is apt to come down with full severity not only on the guilty but also on the innocent. In particular the severity is apt to come down on those who put into practice the love and righteousness of Jesus, Christians who want nothing to do with the evil and corruption that are the object of that severity.^{xxxvi}

This was five months earlier than the publication of the Barmen Declaration of the Confessional Churches (see below).

There were voices seeking to support the Bruderhof. Notable among them is the testimonial written on November 26, 1933, by Professor Karl Heim, the leading evangelical theologian at Tübingen University, who had first become acquainted with Eberhard Arnold in the revival at Halle, and three of whose students had since become members of the Bruderhof. He established his contact over many years with Dr. Eberhard Arnold; describing the hard agricultural development work of the Bruderhof, their constant help to people in need, and making clear that the Bruderhof's practice of community of goods had nothing whatsoever to do with political communism.^{xxvii}

On December 16 the Brotherhood made a petition to the Foreign Minister, Baron von Neurath, to take up the Bruderhof's cause, as a branch of a German church abroad. The petition presented the social work of the Bruderhof, the need that emigration (if that were put upon them) would entail, and giving the names and addresses again of the three main leaders of the Hutterian Brethren in Canada.^{xxviii} This was followed on December 18 by the visit of brothers Hans Meier and Hannes Boller to the Secret State Police in Berlin in an attempt to ascertain what the government intended to do with the Bruderhof. Assessor Wittig was non-committal, but read from his dossier a telegram from Veitsteinbach about the Bruderhof's non-participation in the plebiscite; and also declared that the evidence they had collected from the minutes was sufficient for a dissolution. (The 'evidence' in the minutes proved to be the statement that the state was showing its nature as a beast of prey [Rev. 11:7]).^{xxix}

The life of the Brotherhood and of the Bruderhof community during this time did not only consist of struggles with and representations to the governmental authorities. Meetings were constantly held to direct the young community in matters of faith, whether concerning baptism, the celebration of marriages, or in questions of discipline and the education of children. In addition the economic problems of maintaining both the Rhön and the Alm Bruderhofs in this inorganic stress of division, the standing need for building up in the face of a very unclear future, the precarious position of the publishing house, the sheer necessity of producing the basic food requirements, all engaged the members fully. Nevertheless there were continual and constant attempts to inform different government departments about the true standing of the Bruderhof.

Thus still in December 1933 letters were written to the Prussian Minister of Education, to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister for Foreign affairs (this last to establish again that the Rhönbruderhof was part of the Hutterian Church in Canada and the States). Rumors of a possible dissolution were rife, and had already travelled abroad, so that on January 19, 1934, there is a letter from the German Embassy in London to Professor Otto Piper in Birmingham, assuring him that there had been no occupation of the Bruderhof by a detachment of the SA, and there was no intention of occupying and

dissolving it. The letter agreed that the premises had been searched.^{xxx} On June 1, 1934, there was a reply from the Department of Agriculture to the Bruderhof's letter of December 14, 1933: '...The farm improvements carried out to date being given full recognition, there is no intention here of impairing the rights of the Brotherhood or its utilization of its farming property.'^{xxxii} It was clear that the left hand did not always know what the right hand was doing.

It was on May 31, 1934, that the Barmen Declaration^{xxxiii} of what became the German Confessing Churches was made public. Klaus Scholder in his 'Churches and the Third Reich'^{xxxiiii} gives a fascinating and incredibly detailed, almost day-by-day account of the enormity of the struggle in Germany, not only between Church and State but between the representatives of the churches themselves.

The outcome at Barmen was the protest of one hundred and thirty-eight representatives from nineteen State Churches against the extreme nationalism which was being adopted by Protestant 'German Christians', in support of Hitler's regime. The Declaration reaffirmed under six headings their faith in Jesus Christ, and the Church's commission to deliver, in Christ's stead, ...the message to all men of the free grace of God. 'We repudiate the false teaching that the church can and must recognize yet other happenings and powers, images and truths as divine revelation alongside this one word of God, as a source of her preaching.'^{xxxv} Thus they rejected the decision, accepted by the 'German Christians', to dismiss Jewish pastors and to look to Hitler as their leader in church matters.

Karl Barth and Martin Niemöller were prominent in drawing up the Barmen declaration, and Hans Meier reports that he and Hannes Boller were given the task to call on Martin Niemöller in Dahlem to ascertain whether the Confessing Churches would in any way support the stand of the Bruderhof. The vital difference, however, soon became clear. The Confessing Churches were making a renewed statement of faith, but were prepared to take up arms; and Martin Niemöller himself was ready to take on the command of a U-boat again if required. (By 1938 Pastor Niemöller's views had changed, and he was removed to a concentration camp as Hitler's 'personal prisoner'^{xxxvi})

In summer 1934 too Eberhard Arnold's eldest son, Eberhard C.H. Arnold, who was studying in England, met Dietrich Bonhoeffer in London, at the latter's request.^{xxxvii} 'He intends to found a brotherhood with some of his students, solely on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount', Eberhard Jr. wrote to his father. 'He heard about us from Pastor Niemöller.' But Bonhoeffer, 'although not absolutely rejecting marriage, is critical enough to fear that the love between two and the care of the family would cause married people to digress from what is essential.' He hoped to visit the Rhönbruderhof, but this visit never took place, as also his proposed visit to India in that year^{xxxviii}. Eberhard Arnold, after a phone call with Bonhoeffer, writes to his son^{xxxix}: 'Although following the Sermon on the Mount and living according to the words of Jesus is important for [Bonhoeffer's group], everything is put into question by

their thoughts on the cloistered life of monks and their tendency to Eastern Indian religion. This was true also for Leo Tolstoy.'

On March 16, 1935, a phone message from Switzerland gave the news that military service in Germany had become compulsory. That would have involved several single young men and some young fathers, none of whom would have felt able to participate in fighting, neither on behalf of the National Socialists nor under any other circumstances, and immediately precautions were taken. During the night and on the following day all those concerned travelled on various roads over the border to the Almbruderhof. Two weeks later twenty-four women and children followed them, and were replaced at the Rhönbruderhof by a few families (mostly non-German) to whom the military service question did not apply. One English Quaker friend, who had himself suffered imprisonment for several years under threat of death during the First World War, suggested to Eberhard Arnold that the best witness, and certainly a test of character, might be for the young men to dare death and take on imprisonment. The Brotherhood felt as always that their inmost desire was to witness to a life of peace and brotherhood which could demonstrate, in the face of all the warring nations, that a different life was possible. Nevertheless Eberhard Arnold, hearing that the young men in question seemed at a loose end and were not pitching in to the work at the Almbruderhof, wrote on April 18 a stern admonition, pointing out that they of all people should be conscious of what it was costing to maintain their life at the Bruderhof; and suggesting that if they could not within a short time give evidence of their loyalty to the faith they had chosen, it might be better if they returned to the Rhönbruderhof and took a stand there on the question of bearing arms.^{xxxix} The admonition bore fruit.

Soon the struggle shifted to Liechtenstein. A law was passed on May 23, 1935, recruiting for military service all Germans living abroad--to take effect after the end of the year 1935. The Liechtenstein villagers were becoming alarmed, fearing the increase in numbers of those living at the Almbruderhof which might lead to a food shortage, and fearing the possibility of provoking German hostility if they continued to shelter German nationals. During a visit to the Almbruderhof, Eberhard Arnold, on October 12, 1935, spoke at the Triesenberg village hall, assuring the villagers that the Bruderhof would not act in any way against the Government of Liechtenstein and would not house stateless people; there was no member of the Brotherhood in this position. Put to the vote, the parish agreed that the Alm Bruderhof could stay, but should not exceed 90 people.^{xl}

On November 16, 1935, Eberhard Arnold had to go to Darmstadt hospital for a further operation on his leg. The operation was unsatisfactory; but his mind was on the need of Germany. Emmy Arnold relates how, on Bußtag, November 20 in that year, her husband called out in the ward, 'Have you read whether Goering and Goebbels have repented?' On her plea to him not to talk so loudly, he shouted even

more loudly, 'Have they repented?'^{xli} The following paragraph covers in briefest measure the exceedingly great pain and sorrow that hit the Bruderhof communities at this time:

'After the second operation [this time for amputation] on November 22, [Eberhard Arnold] did not recover consciousness. It is known to the Brotherhood of that time what a serious situation and what struggles followed the death of the Word Leader of both Bruderhofs. It cannot be described in detail here; but it must, nevertheless, be affirmed that in spite of much unclarity, one thing was plain to the Brotherhood: the church community must continue on the path it had trodden till now.'^{xlii}

There were now 160 men, women and children at either the Rhönbruderhof or in Liechtenstein, which included thirty Swiss and fifteen English people.

The German Reichsgesetzblatt (Law Gazette) for 11 February, 1936, informed the Bruderhof that the mobilization to military and labor service of Germans living abroad had become law. Germans born in 1915 and 1916 were liable, and shortly afterwards the age groups 1913 and 1914. Seven young men at the Almbruderhof were in this category, and it was clear that they could not remain in Liechtenstein. At this point the decision was made to found a Bruderhof in England. Hans Zumpe's Report^{xliii} describes how they found and occupied the Ashton Fields Farm at Ashton Keynes, in Wiltshire; how several English members made fund-raising journeys round the country to pay for the first half-year's lease; and how the Home Office then gave permission for the German Bruderhof members to enter and to stay. The adventures of the young men who with the support of the British Government eventually arrived there safely is told by Hans Meier.^{xliv}

The pressures in Germany continued. The Bruderhof had hoped to enlist the support of the Mennonites, on the basis of their common Anabaptist history. Already in December 1933 Eberhard Arnold had word from Professor Benjamin Unruh, a prominent Mennonite who had done much to facilitate the emigration of Russian Mennonites to America, that he would journey to Canada and represent the Bruderhof's need to the Canadian authorities.^{xlv} But when later Hannes Boller and Hans Meier called on Professor Unruh, Unruh explained that the German Mennonites had a different attitude to the State and its government, which would prevent them standing together with the Bruderhof in Germany. The German Mennonites were prepared to accept military service. Under the new statutes, accepted by the Federation of the German Mennonite Church on June 11, 1934, the principle of nonresistance (Wehrlosigkeit) had been given up.^{xlvi} There were further repercussions from German Mennonite circles after the dissolution, as will be seen below.

The Bruderhof seemed to be standing alone, and the saying, voiced already by Eberhard Arnold in the preceding years, rang now with all the more truth: 'Wenn wir verschwinden, so kräht kein Hahn danach.'['If we disappear, nobody is going to care two hoots.']

Economically the Rhönbruderhof was now in dire straits. Creditors, anticipating a dissolution, pressed for money. The young men who normally supplied the outside work force were already in Liechtenstein or England. The government had forbidden the sale of the books of the Eberhard Arnold Verlag, and after repeated applications for a permit to sell, an answer was received from the chief of police, on June 10, 1936, which threw light on the situation. 'My rejection of permission for [names of four Bruderhof members] is based not on the personal unreliability or unsuitability of these four persons, but exclusively on the fact that the propaganda that emanates from the Bruderhof is dangerous to the State.^{xlvii} The Eberhard Arnold Verlag is only a part of the Bruderhof... therefore there cannot be any doubt that the publishing house is active in the same direction as the Bruderhof itself. And this activity is dangerous to the State....' . The income which the Bruderhof had received for its work of caring for needy children was at an end with the dispersion of the children. A mortgage on the children's house was foreclosed, and shortly afterwards a second mortgage.^{xlviii} A turning shop for the production of wooden bowls was set up at the Alm Bruderhof, and brothers made constant efforts to sell these along with books in Switzerland, but the fact that it was necessary for the German members to obtain selling permission in every single canton was frequently a hindrance. At both the Rhön and the Alm Bruderhofs vegetables were grown which provided some sustenance for the members and children. But the poverty was real.

There were, however, other forces at work. On December 9, 1936, a Conference of Canadian Hutterian Brothers was held in Manitoba, at which it was decided to send two brothers to visit "the Hutterian Church which the late Eberhard Arnold had founded in Germany and Liechtenstein, and later also in England", and these two brothers, ministers David Hofer and Michael Waldner, set sail on February 2, 1937, for Southampton, arriving safely on February 8. They proceeded to the new Cotswold Bruderhof, where there were now seventy people in residence.^{xlix} The two brothers spent two very active months assisting in the setting up of the farm and in the inner life of the little group when news came of increased difficulty at the Rhönbruderhof. Then David Vetter and Michael Vetter, as they were affectionately known, left England for the Rhön, and arrived on April 9. On April 14 the Rhönbruderhof was dissolved, and the members given 24 hours to leave.

The ministers' diaries give a first-hand account of all that took place. The following is the story as told by David Hofer:

April 14, 1937: 'Michael Waldner and I were in Eberhard Arnold's room writing letters, about 10 a.m. Then Hans Meier opened the door and said, "Brothers, prepare yourselves, for I have just come from the hill and saw behind the wood a large number of police. They may come to the Bruderhof, but they

cannot do anything to you." Then he closed the door and went to his office to tidy up. And as I thereupon went to the window and looked out, I saw the police already hurrying down the hill. I went to the door and down to the second storey of the house and out of the corridor to see what would happen.

There were already 25 policemen standing at the door. "Where is Hans Meier?" one shouted at once to me. I answered quite simply, "Doubtless in the house." "Call him out here!" was the next order. As I went to Hans Meier's room he met me and introduced himself quite calmly and fearlessly to the police. Then the chief officer read Hans Meier the order. "I inform you herewith that the Rhönbruderhof is now dissolved by the state and must exist no longer. From now on it is to be called 'Sparhof', and as you are leader of this Bruderhof, I demand all books and keys from you. I inform you also that within 24 hours [later changed to 48 hours, because of sickness] all must leave the place!" Then he went straight to the office with Hans Meier.

The other police surrounded the whole Bruderhof and drove all brothers and sisters, young and old, into the dining room. There they were guarded by two policemen, and no one was allowed either out or in....In the meantime we saw through the window how all the rooms were searched, and how they carried all that they wanted to their cars....I called Michael Waldner and we went together to our room. Before long, searchers came and began to search. We pointed out to them we were aliens, of German extraction, and did not want to have our things searched. They asked us what we wanted with these people here, where we came from and what had brought us to these people. We told them, "These people are our brothers in the faith, to whom we have sent much help from America to build up this Bruderhof and we are therefore very much interested in what happens here.'...We saw at once that our presence was no pleasure to them, and that we were in their way....

The police, however, stood outside the dining room and spoke together. Then I went out to them and began to speak to them about this occurrence. I told them that what we had experienced here today was quite uncalled for, that we had not expected such a thing of Germany....They were worse than the Americans. Then they at once asked me, "How?" I told them that we as Germans were called up in the last war to do military service against Germany. We objected and refused to do it, as these, our brothers, had just done. Then we asked our government in U.S.A. to let us have the freedom to leave the country, as we could not obey it in doing military service. We asked to sell all we had and to leave nothing behind us--all of which was not refused us by the government; but during wartime we were allowed to emigrate to Canada and this under government protection that nothing might happen to us. I asked them why they could not treat this community so. Then they said to me, "Why can't you show your obedience to the government like the others, and do as it says?" I told them clearly that we respected the government highly, but that we could not obey what it demanded against our conscience. Then he asked me, "To

what extent?" I told them that the Word of God says I must love my neighbor and not kill him, and for this reason we could not follow and obey the government.¹

None of them was to dare to take anything with him connected with the farm, household goods or community property. Then the police left till the next day. There was more tribulation to come.

David Hofer's diary reports again: `April 15th:... We were in our rooms for half an hour after eating, when Hans Meier came in in very great haste, and told us that a gentleman from Fulda was in the yard with his car, demanding that the executive committee go with him to Fulda to settle some trifling matters....I did not believe the gentleman from Fulda at all...'ⁱⁱ

The `executive committee' consisted of Hans Meier (Swiss), Hannes Boller (Swiss) and Karl Keiderling (German), all married men with young families. The meeting had been called in Fulda ostensibly to arrange the details of the members' departure to Liechtenstein and England, but the three brothers were then taken by the Gestapo into "protective custody". The indictment was changed some days later to `criminal bankruptcy', and the brothers were in prison for three months before the judge gave his decision that the Bruderhof had not committed any criminal act, and the charge was withdrawn. The brothers were released on a Saturday morning, when, as they discovered later, the Gestapo chief of Fulda was conveniently absent at a rally.ⁱⁱⁱ

Meanwhile the Dutch Mennonites housed and cared for the refugee group of eighteen adults and thirteen children who were on their way to England, including the wives and families of the three imprisoned brothers. They were in Holland for two months while arrangements were being made with the British Home Office for immigration, and during that period several Dutch men and women decided to throw in their lot with the community.

During these weeks the Swiss and Dutch newspapers reported `Mennonites expelled from Germany'. The German Mennonites published a rectification, stating that no Mennonites had been expelled from Germany, emphasizing that their situation was very different from the Hutterites. Whereupon the Dutch Mennonites protested, pointing out their common Anabaptist roots, and a considerable controversy arose between Dutch and German Mennonites. Michael Horsch, a Mennonite acquaintance, accepted the indictment of criminal bankruptcy as the truth, and published a pamphlet on the dissolution of the Rhön with this information.

[It should be said that later, when the Bruderhof in England was seeking for a country which would give permission for such a large, international group of pacifists to enter, the North American Mennonites were very helpful, in particular Orie O. Miller, who had met some of the Bruderhof members in Amsterdam in 1936. He facilitated their entry into Paraguay on the same terms as had already been offered to the immigrating Russian Mennonites earlier.^{liii}]

The whole complicated story, which had repercussions for years afterwards, as to whether the Bruderhof was dissolved because of its faith or because of its debts is told in outline in Hans Meier's booklet, 'The Dissolution of the Rhönbruderhof in Retrospect'.^{liv} The Bruderhof's lawyer Dr. Eisenberg fought tirelessly to clear the brothers' name. On May 10 he put in a complaint at the Oberlandesgericht against the warrant, stating: 'There are no grounds for suspicion....A swindle or an attempt to defraud is out of the question....To meet debts on the current account, the designated commissar has the inventory of the whole property at his disposal. According to existing records this is entirely adequate to pay everything if sold on the open market.' The community's auditor, Dr. Werner Braun, also added his support. He wrote to Hans Zumpe on May 20: 'I phoned to Hanau immediately after receiving your telegram, which took me completely by surprise....It is very sad that you had to leave Germany for the sake of your faith. I know that you stand before God and have not done any wrong. From the figures you have given to me a bankruptcy offence is out of the question.'^{lv}

This issue of fraudulent bankruptcy brought the question to the notice of a Methodist historian living in East Germany who later had access to the files of the former Reichskirchen- ministerium in Potsdam, E.Berlin. It is almost refreshing to hear what he has to report in contrast. In 1986 Dr. Karl Zehrer, of the Karl Marx University in Leipzig, published his book *Evangelische Freikirchen und das "Dritte Reich"*; and a number of documents quoted therein throw considerable light on the Hitler State's approach to Christian minorities such as the Bruderhof community. The issue of debts scarcely appears, but the 'damage to the interests of Germany' is very evident:

On 22 May, 1936, the State Police Department of Kassel quickly made a renewed list of all names of members of the Bruderhof community, whether they were there on that day or in Silum, Liechtenstein, or somewhere else. In this list of members, which is to be seen in the Kassel State Police Office, there were on 22 May, 1936:

66 German adults with 38 children, and
38 from other countries, with 15 children, in all
104 members with 53 children.

'It is certain that six members are doing active propaganda. As guests are no longer allowed to stay at the Bruderhof they stayed at nearby guest houses and hotels. [This order had been imposed by the Gestapo when their proposal of 12 April, 1934, to dissolve the Bruderhof had been rejected by the Minister of the Interior of the Reich. Zehrer] 'The kind of propaganda abroad on behalf of the Bruderhof greatly damages the interests of Germany. [The members] are as many Protestants as Catholics, Christians and non-Christians, in a most motley mixture.

`They reject completely any form of military service....They deny the unquestionable right of the German people and of the State to be placed above the calling of the individual...and they are against the National Socialist race plans to prevent the danger of sickly offspring being born. Formerly they called themselves `thoroughbred communists' [Edelkommunisten] [This is untrue, they had been called that by others.Ed.] ...Also from the economic standpoint the presence of the Bruderhof must be reckoned to be totally undesirable. The whole thing looks more like a Russian collective at present.... So far we have found no link between them and the German Communist Party....'^{lvi}

Diether Götz Lichdi, of a new generation of Mennonites, continues to clarify the situation so far as the German Mennonites are concerned in his book, Mennoniten im Dritten Reich.^{lvii} He quotes E.Händiges, (Elder of the Elbing-Ellerwald, West Prussia, Mennonite Gemeinde): `I find this whole matter terribly difficult (`unendlich schwer')...The Mennonite Lexikon time and again has emphasized that the Hutterites and Mennonites belong together...I am amazed that now the German Mennonites withdraw from these "brothers in need", out of fear that something might happen to us.'

Perhaps it is fitting to let the Gestapo have what was meant to be their last word:

Evidence (on the Hutterian Brotherhood) offered by the Oberpräsident of the Hessen-Nassau Province, 14 December, 1936:

As is clear from the enclosed edict, the matter of the Hutterian Brotherhood gave me cause to investigate its conduct already in the year 1934. In the report of my District Department of Culture, dated 7 March 1934--A.Z.LK.460 G.Nr.III 227--because of the favourable pronouncement on the agricultural work of the Brotherhood at that time, it was suggested to me by the Prussian Minister of Agriculture that the rights of the Brotherhood should not be withdrawn; which was then the decision of 25 May, 1934, Gesch.Nr.IV,2989, announced by the Prussian Minister of Agriculture. In appreciation of the extremely unfavorable judgment on the agricultural work of the Brotherhood given me through the Prussian Secret State Police, of the Secret State Police Office in their report of June 16, 1934, B-Nr.IIE-S.33/33 --and in consideration of the recent efforts of the Regierungspräsident of Kassel in his report of 17 October of this year, I have now used the occasion, with the participation of the District Magistrate in Fulda, to allow a surprise on-the-spot inspection to be made of the agricultural properties of the Hutterian Brotherhood through the competent Overseer of the Department of Culture.

A copy of the report on this inspection, by the Fulda Magistrate's office and by the Department of Culture is likewise enclosed. This report fully supports the unfavorable judgment of the agricultural work as made by the State Police and by the Regierungspräsident in Kassel.

Therefore I am in agreement with the remarks of the Regierungspräsident in his report of 17 October this year, and I am likewise of the opinion that the dissolution of the Bruderhof for political reasons, and especially also for agrarian-political reasons, is to be welcomed. Nevertheless I think I should for my part also point out the great difficulties attached to the confiscation of the property, because for years, in this undertaking, property of considerable value has been brought in from abroad. Hence the suggestion of the Regierungspräsident seems to me to be a particularly happy one, to draw the attention of the military authorities to the Bruderhof's holdings, and for purely military reasons to have their land taken from them, with legal compensation as required by the land confiscation law.

Under the given circumstances I also ask for your agreement that we refrain for the time being from a dissolution of the Brotherhood, and go ahead with the above suggestion of the Regierungspräsident and of the District Magistrate in Fulda. I should be thankful for your early decision.^{lviii}

The official date in the Gestapo records of the dissolution of the Rhönbruderhof is 9th April, 1937. They actually took over on the 14th April. The military authorities did not want the Bruderhof lands. Instead it was parceled out and sold by auction at very low rates.

It was not, after all, the last word. The stone on Eberhard Arnold's grave bears the words from Revelations 14:13: "Blessed are they who die in the Lord; for their works follow after them." Today, apart from the old Hutterian colonies, there are eight communities that derive directly from the beginning at the Rhönbruderhof--six in the United States, one in England and one in Germany. And they number more than 2,000 men, women and children.

Why was the Bruderhof allowed to 'get away', when other groups suffered incarceration and death? Annedore Leber and Freya Gräfin von Moltke, themselves at the heart of the church resistance movement, write compassionately of the persecution threatening individuals and smaller communities of faith, the Seventh Day Adventists, the Christian Scientists, the Anthroposophists, the New Apostolic Church, and very especially the Jehovah's Witnesses. They estimate that there were 6034 Jehovah's Witness members in Germany in 1933, 5,911 of whom were arrested before the end of the war, and of these more than 2,000 died or were killed.^{lix}

Christine King, in her study of the Nazi State and the New Religions, makes an extensive study of four of these same groups, and in addition of the church of the Latter-Day Saints.^{lx} She concludes that all

except Jehovah's Witnesses found a possibility of compromising sufficiently to avoid direct confrontation with the national socialist state, especially since they were prepared to take up arms. The Jehovah's Witnesses compromised not at all. 'The movement is strictly hierarchical and authoritarian...They are not pacifist, they simply believe that they are already enlisted in the army of Jehovah...(p.248)' 'The real reason for the clash between this sect and the Nazi state lies...in the clash of two totalitarian systems (p.176)'.

Neither of these studies mentions the Hutterian Bruderhof.

The Bruderhof, too, compromised not at all. Joachim Haas, in his study 'Abseits der "großen" Geschichte: Opposition und Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus im Raum Fulda', points out in respect to the Bruderhof, 'The spectrum of NS-Opposition in Kalbach was by comparison markedly broad and exceptional, because in addition to representatives of the Catholic and Confessing Churches and of the Workers' Movement there were the Hutterites, who lived according to the example of the early Christians at the Rhönbruderhof, near Veitsteinbach.' And then he makes a very similar observation to the above: 'Through their attempt to live consistently by the Sermon on the Mount, with absolute non-violence, community of goods, church discipline, adult baptism --conflict with the Nazis was a foregone conclusion.'^{lxi} Numerically the Bruderhof was negligible. Yet this small community was marked as 'dangerous to the state'. Perhaps it will never be known just why their lives were spared. The Bruderhof members think it was because of the presence and support of the two American members, and certainly there were friends and relatives in England too. The final answer lies beyond our knowing.

Darvell Bruderhof, August 1992

FOOTNOTES

Translations of archive material are by members of the Hutterian Brethren

ⁱ The following is a short list of sources used by the compiler, apart from translations and publications of the Hutterian Brethren:

- a. Vollmer, Antje, Die Neuwerkbewegung, 1919-1935, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Jugendbewegung, des Religiösen Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbildung. Berlin, 1973.
- b. Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, 'No Rusty Swords', Letters, Lectures and Notes 1928-1936, Vol.II. Original German 1947, (English version Harper and Row, New York, 1965):
- c. Niemöller, Martin, Pazifistische Realpolitik, Neue Wege, Zürich, Dec.1959; 53.Jahrgang, Heft 12, pages 329-336.
- d. Leber, Annedore, and Gräfin von Moltke, Freya, Für und wider, Entscheidungen in Deutschland 1918-1945. Vg.Annedore Leber, Berlin 1961.
- e. Lichdi, Diether Götz, Mennoniten im Dritten Reich, Mennonitischen Geschichtsvereins Nr.9, 1977.
- f. King, Christine E.: The Nazi State and the New Religions; five case studies. New York 1982. Jehovah's Witnesses Declaration of Facts,(p.151).
- g. Haas, Joachim, Abseits der "großen" Geschichte . Opposition und Widerstand...im Raum Fulda. Frankfurt/Main 1989.

-
- h. Scholder, Klaus, *The Churches and the Third Reich. Vol.II: The Year of Disillusionment, 1934.* Barmen and Rome. SCM Press, London 1988.
- i. Zehrer, Karl, *Evangelische Freikirchen und das 'Dritte Reich'.* Evangelische Vg., Berlin 1986, pp.42-43, 92-93, 153-156
- j. Dehn, Günther: *Die alte Zeit -- die vorigen Jahre.* München 1962.
- ⁱⁱ The archives of the Hutterian Brethren, or Bruderhöfe, in the eastern ('new') communities is situated principally in Pennsylvania, U.S.A. with a secondary source of copies of much of the material housed at the Darvell Bruderhof in East Sussex, England.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Vollmer, op.cit. p.52.
- ^{iv} Vollmer, A., op.cit. p.54.
- ^v G.Dehn, op.cit., S.231.
- ^{vi} Robert Friedmann, who viewed Anabaptism as 'existential Christianity'. See *The Mennonite Encyclopedia, Vol.V, p.311-312.*
- ^{vii} EAE53, p.1 and p.9. Unpublished material.
- ^{viii} H.Zumpe, *Unsere Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Nationalsozialistischen Staat. Bericht über die Jahre 1933-37 in der Geschichte unserer Bruderhöfe.* In translation, pp.4,5. Unpublished.
- ^{ix} *Ibid.*, p.5
- ^x EAE85, p.2 and p.7
- ^{xi} EAE86, p.2
- ^{xii} EAE33/116, p.1
- ^{xiii} H.Zumpe, op.cit., pp.5-6
- ^{xiv} *Ibid.*, pp.6-7
- ^{xv} *Eberhard Arnolds Briefe an den Behörden des Dritten Reich, und andere verwandten Dokumentum, Oktober 1933-Oktober 1935, Nrs.1,2*
- ^{xvi} *Ibid.*, Nr.3
- ^{xvii} *Ibid.*, Nr.4
- ^{xviii} Emmy Arnold, *Torches Together*, p.185. Plough Publishing House, Rifton, NY, 1961
- ^{xix} H.Zumpe, op.cit, p.14
- ^{xx} minutes of Brotherhood meetings
- ^{xxi} 'Die dunkle Schar der Zornsgewalt'..., *Songs of Light*, No.111, Plough Publishing House, Rifton, NY, 1977. Sung to the tune of Martin Luther's 'Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott.'
- ^{xxii} EA Briefe, op.cit, Nrs.6,7,10,11
- ^{xxiii} *Ibid.*, Nr.13
- ^{xxiv} *Ibid.*, Nr.27
- ^{xxv} *Ibid.*, Nr.16
- ^{xxvi} *Ibid.*, Nr.18, and quoted in *The Plough Journal*, No.21, April/May 1989
- ^{xxvii} EA Briefe op.cit,Nr.15
- ^{xxviii} *Ibid.*, Nr.22
- ^{xxix} From Hans Meier's shorthand notes, included in EA Briefe Nr.23
- ^{xxx} EA Briefe op.cit., Nr.31
- ^{xxxi} *Ibid.*, Nr.32
- ^{xxxii} The original text of this Declaration appears in full in Annedore Leber and Freya von Moltke's book, *Für und Wider, Entscheidungen in Deutschland 1918-1945*, Verlag Annedore Leber, 1968, pp.186-9. And in English in 'The Times' newspaper for June 4, 1934, thanks to the efforts of Bishop G.K.Bell of Chichester.
- ^{xxxiii} Scholder, K., op.cit.
- ^{xxxiv} K.Scholder, op.cit., p.149
- ^{xxxv} See the collection of 28 sermons published in England under the title, "The Gestapo Defied", (Wm.Hodge & Co., London 1941) compiled from shorthand notes after Niemöller's writings had been confiscated; and his article *Pazifistische Realpolitik*, published in *Neue Wege*, Zurich, December 1959.
- ^{xxxvi} EA Briefe 1934, June 14, (No.18A): 'Hardy' Arnold in Birmingham to his father Eberhard.
- ^{xxxvii} For Bonhoeffer's interest in community living, see also the Bishop of Chichester's letter to Gandhi, 22nd Oct.,1934, quoted in Bonhoeffer, op.cit., p.295: 'A friend of mine...Pastor Bonhoeffer...is most anxious that I should give him an introduction to you....He wants to study community life.'
- ^{xxxviii} EA Briefe 1934, June 26. (No.21)
- ^{xxxix} EA Briefe 1935, Nr.12c

-
- ^{xl} H.Zumpe, op.cit.,pp.53-4
- ^{xli} Emmy Arnold, op.cit., p.205
- ^{xlii} H.Zumpe, op.cit., p.55
- ^{xliii} H.Zumpe, op.cit, pp.57-62
- ^{xliv} Hans Meier tells his Story to a Friend, Printed Pamphlet `e', pp.14-16, Plough Publishing, Rifton, NY, 1979.
- ^{xlv} Quoted in EA Briefe 1933, letter of 28 December 1933 to `Zacharias Vetter' in Manitoba.
- ^{xlvi} Hans Meier, op.cit.p.12, but the actual date of their visit to Professor Unruh is uncertain.
- ^{xlvii} Hans Meier, op.cit., pp.8-9
- ^{xlviii} H.Zumpe. op.cit., pp.76-77
- ^{xlix} See Progress at the Bruderhof, THE FRIEND, July 21, 1939.
- ^l David Hofer Vetter's Diary. His visit to Europe with Michael Waldner Vetter in 1937, pp.36-40. Translated 1971. Plough Publishing House, Rifton, NY, 1974.
- ^{li} Ibid., p.42
- ^{lii} Hans Meier, op.cit., p.20
- ^{liii} Hans Meier, op.cit., pp.29,35
- ^{liv} The Dissolution of the Rhönbruderhof in Retrospect. Hans Meier reports to the Woodcrest Community, May 24-25, 1979. Printed Pamphlet `g', Plough Publishing House, Rifton NY.
- ^{lv} H.Zumpe, op.cit, pp.91 and 97
- ^{lvi} Zehrer, K.,op. cit. p.153.
- ^{lvii} Lichdi, D.G., op.cit., p.93.
- ^{lviii} Zehrer, op.cit, pp.154-155
- ^{lix} Annedore Leber and Freya Gräfin von Moltke, op.cit. p.81.
- ^{lx} King, Christine E., The Nazi State and the New Religions, New York, Edwin Mellen Press, 1982, p.250.
- ^{lxi} J.Haas, op.cit., p.93.