

HITLER AND STALIN - EXAMPLES OF HYPOCRITES NOT TOTALITARIAN ATHEISTS

"Nazism is a religious phenomenon in its own right: a political religion that, whatever its content, appealed to the same critical issues and emotions that religion does: faith, ultimate meaning, redemption. And among these links are some of the most powerful forms any religious movement can take - the apocalyptic and messianic traditions that date back to the earliest centuries of Christian-Germanic relations." Landes, Heaven and Earth.

"Eric Hoffer believed that at the heart of the ideological true believer invariably lay a deep self-contempt, which was transmuted into hatred of others, since 'mass movements can rise and spread without belief in a god, but never without belief in a devil.' In other words, it is essential for the true believer to have someone or something to hate. The believer is defined in large measure by what he or she is not. Positions then are taken not necessarily because they are so believable, but principally because the alternative is so unthinkable." Phillips, Melanie, *The World Turned Upside Down*.

Hitler and Stalin are put forward as examples of the evil that can take place if an atheist rises to power. It is not admitted however that Hitler was devout in his own way to the end and that both he and Stalin recognised religious freedom and secular values but did not live up to them.

Hitler was a man who took solace in religious faith - a faith that he understood as Catholic. Catholics ignore that. Some go on as if as long as he were not Jesus or pope or a priest that he does not reflect on the religion! But even if he were that would not change their minds about the religion's role in his evil. And besides what he was is immaterial for the Church says that if Hitler was a Catholic then he enjoyed equality as a member of the faith with the pope.

Hitler believed totally in the power of relics of Jesus. He was obsessed with getting the spear that Jesus was stabbed with thinking he would get divine blessing and power from it. Johannes Stein documented that. It gave Hitler a "total eclipse of self-consciousness". This seems to describe the ecstasy reported by very religious people such as Joan of Arc.

Here is a good quote from a top psychiatrist, "We do not know whether Hitler is going to found a new Islam. He is already on the way; he is like Muhammad. The emotion in Germany is Islamic; warlike and Islamic." (Carl Gustav Jung, "Symbolic Life: Miscellaneous Writings (Volume 18 of The Collected Works of C. G. Jung)," Routledge, 1977).

Predictably religious supporters contest that. Christian Dinesh D'Souza says, "A Jew could not escape Auschwitz by pleading, 'I no longer practice Judaism,' 'I am an atheist,' or 'I have converted to Christianity.' This mattered nothing to Hitler because he believed the Jews were inferior racial stock. His anti-Semitism was secular."

That is deceptive for even if it were in practice secular Hitler could regard conversion as good but not enough.

When believers blame belief in natural selection and evolution for Hitler's racism, they never say if they mean divinely guided versions or atheistic naturalistic ones. Hitler's racism was more than just ethnic. Jews don't seem or look different from Hitler's own race. And why single them out for the worst and most intensive treatment? Making out this was about racism and not religious anti-Semitism is itself anti-Semitic. Racism was obviously only a little bit of it and was really just to bolster Hitler's hatred of Jews that he learned from his Christian cradle.

With the Nazis, we must not talk too much about how extremely committed to obedience they were. The real problem was how proud they were of their status and power and responsibilities. The pride in their actions is hard to fathom for they were laden with blood and ugliness and hate. It can only be explained by a sense that they were working out God's plan or some plan for the greater good.

Why does nobody who wants to be evil leaving the Church to be evil? Why did Hitler want to stay? Why is the Church letting that happen? Why is Church law considering and treating Hitler as Catholic? The Church applies law to the likes of Hitler and by law says it will do that against their will. A religion that tries to apply law to you that you do not recognise is clearly to be blamed for your sins if you are still a member or if it says you are one. Roman Catholicism and Hitler are both to blame. If a religion is about making goodness then it is more than a man is for man is both good and bad. Thus the religion is to blame if disaster follows. Thus the religion is to be blamed as much as the member who does evil - its disapproval means nothing.

James Waller wrote that instead of blaming Hitler and others for the Nazi Holocaust we need to remember that the ordinary people helped them carry it out and enabled it. Ordinary people can be as bad as sociopaths. You can be nice and kind and charming and still go and empower somebody to murder babies. That the people were raised by and on Christianity must be

allowed to say something though we may not be clear exactly what except that it is bad.

Hitler did not kill anybody. His words and writings did. Hitler only needed words to kill with. He did not even need to try to kill. The words did the work for him. Why do words dehumanise others so easily and quickly? Why do they make it so hard to see the damage and the harm that is coming until it is too late?

The word is powerful. Ideology is codified only in a book or books. Books alone spread it with the assistance of people. The people spread the book rather than the book spreading the people. That is why even just out of respect there is no right to honour pages of blood in scriptures that command evil or which praise a God who takes life. The written word seems so powerful probably because all the surviving world religions are word based and scripture based. It turns books into gods. That makes a ripple that extends to all ideological works.

The Hitler approved SS magazine statement from 1939 goes, "Harping on and on that God died on the cross out of pity for the weak, the sick and sinners, Christians then demand that the genetically diseased be kept alive in the name of a doctrine of pity that goes against nature, and of a misconceived notion of humanity." It looks as if this is a rejection of Christianity. But at the time Christians tended to see nature as God's book so the statements that care for the sick is against nature are saying that God does not want you to think about them but to see them as a hindrance and nuisance. The statement blames Christians rather than Christianity as such. The statement sees the term sinners as an insult and an accusation of weakness so the Nazis saw themselves as saints and divinely guided. They were the ones who were going to deal with sinners.

Those who think about, "With or without religion, good people can behave well and bad people can do evil; but for good people to do evil – that takes religion" will observe that religion and faith are the greatest evils of all when they can get the good to do evil in the name of good. Also we learn that you don't need religion to be good so if anybody in your religion is violent in the name of faith then stop supporting the religion. Wash its label off. Remember a religion can endorse violence tacitly or implicitly and that is worse than it commanding it outright. You cannot stay in case it is a master of disguise and it will be bigger and stronger than you. It will corrupt you by osmosis. Those who allege that the saying is wrong still agree that an unquestioned ideology can lead to violence. So they would have to say that anything including religion can lead to violence when it controls minds. Indeed the control is violent in principle never mind any violent acts. So the critics might agree with, "With or without religion, good people can behave well and bad people can do evil; but for good people to do evil – that sometimes takes religion." Would they have a problem if the saying was, "With or without religion, good people can behave well and bad people can do evil; but for good people to do evil – that takes politics or atheism"? No. They are only objecting when it is religion that is said to corrupt. In fact to deny that religion turns good people cruel is to blame some other social entity! They blame society in some way but as religion is a part of society and a society that makes no sense. Religious bigots have always tried to fan the flames of religious trouble by deflecting from the real causes. They protect religion's evil and strangely you can be a bigot who protects bad religion without being a member of the religion! They want you to oppress forces that turn good people into killers but if religion is one of those forces they want it to get a free pass!

Religion lies that Hitler was an atheist. There is no evidence of atheism. Christianity tries to avoid the blame for the Holocaust of the Jews. But the truth is Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*, "In defending myself against the Jews, I am doing the Lord's work". In Vienna in 1938, Hitler declared after the Anschluss, "I believe that it was God's will that from here a boy was sent into the Reich and that he grew up to become leader of the nation".

The Church says that Joseph Stalin the monster was an atheist and blames the blood on his hands on atheism. He ran a Communist atheistic regime. But read the 1936 Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was the law of Stalin's USSR. It guaranteed freedom of speech, of assembly, of meetings and street processions. It guaranteed the rights of the citizen. It specified that arbitrary arrest was forbidden and that his or her home or correspondence was his business and should not be invaded by the state. Atheism taught this. Stalin and the secret police violated it at every turn. Therefore what they did was the violation of atheism. Atheism cannot be blamed.

One wonders why Stalin needs so much condemnation when even the Christian women of his nation aborted babies the same as the communist sisterhood did. Most babies in the womb were aborted.

Stalin facilitated and protected many churches and the religious communities relevant to them. There was mutual co-operation. He did not then hate religion in itself. He hated it only when it contradicted him. He obviously perceived that religion and murder and genocide are indeed compatible. And so did the Christians who collaborated with him!

Hitler and Stalin did not scheme and kill in a bubble. They were part of a machine and the machine included religious people and the Church.

Christianity's refusal to take any of the blame for what these men did should be right up there with Holocaust Denial.

Mugabe, Nguema, Chiluba, Bokassa, Mobutu, Taylor and many other revolting dictators, past and present, were or are Christians. Some of them have been wined and dined by popes without any criticism of their bloodletting. Actions speak louder than words, dear Church. Nelson Mandela the greatest human being of all time was liberal about abortion and same-sex marriage and though he did say the Church helped him become what he was he did not attribute this to the Church as religion but to the Church as people. And helped is a very ambiguous word. He may only have been referring to the people in the Church who loved justice despite their religious errors. Mandela however cannot be counted much of a follower of Jesus - if at all - for he rejected Jesus' religiosity and fanaticism and arrogance. He divorced and remarried twice against the Bible.

There have been more religious monsters than non-religious. The atheist monsters did not kill because of their atheism. The attempts by religion to label blooddrinking dictators as atheists is an insult to their victims and incitement to hatred or potential hatred against atheists. It denies that religion often keeps the atheist monsters in power. Hitler had the support of Catholic and Protestant leaders in Germany even as he tried to liquidate the Jews.

People go to war not chiefly for material benefits for themselves or any benefits but to satisfy their sense of loyalty to the leader of the country. After all what is the point of fighting for benefits when your leadership will not distribute them to you? It is ultimately about trust in the leaders and by default that means the leader is to be trusted to ignore the plights of other nations and peoples and live by charity begins at home. Religion is a personality cult. Christianity is based on Jesus and Islam on Mohammed and so on. Atheists don't carry on like that so atheism should lead to less war than religion.

If Hitler and Stalin are examples of what happens when God is put out of the picture then how come Satan had them fighting each other as many believe? That makes no sense. Satan knows God will win if the disciples of evil fail to agree. It makes more sense to say that they felt God or something like God was on their side against the other even if they could not clarify or see that.