

The Verdict of French Protestantism Against Germany in the First World War

CHARLES E. BAILEY

At the end of August 1914, with German troops having violated Belgian neutrality and rapidly advancing toward Paris, German Protestants made a desperate bid for a show of solidarity from the Protestant majority of Britain and the Protestant minority of France. In an "Appeal to Protestant Christians Abroad" leaders of the German Protestant missions movement expressed their hope that the war would not spread to Africa nor result in an "incurable rent" in the Protestant fellowship. Recalling the spirit of cooperation at the international Missionary Conference of Edinburgh in 1910 they urged that the mission fields not become battlefields, lest the gospel message of love be discredited in the eyes of the heathen.¹

Led by the archbishop of Canterbury and several Oxford and Cambridge theologians, British clerics, though likewise concerned about the fate of the mission fields, immediately replied that the righteous Allied cause must be prosecuted to the full.² In the summer of 1915 the French Protestants responded and, like the British, showed no inclination to lessen Germany's guilt for precipitating the war or to limit its scope. French Catholics took the same accusatory stance; the excommunicated theologian Alfred Loisy dismissed the appeal as a clumsy attempt to save the German colonies in Africa from invasion.³ The Germans, however, were particularly disappointed with the response from the French Protestants. Given their century-long persecution begun by Louis XIV, their professed admiration of German scholarship and participation in European religious conferences, and their reaction to recent attacks by the right-wing Catholic press, the French Protestants might have been expected to maintain at least a sympathetic silence toward their brethren across the Rhine.⁴

1. Karl Axenfeld et al., "Germans to Christians," *New York Times*, 5 Sept. 1914; full text in "An die evangelischen Christen im Auslande," *Die Eiche* 3 (Jan. 1915): 49-53; W. H. T. Gairdner, *Edinburgh 1910* (Edinburgh, 1910), pp. 179-214.
2. Archbishop of Canterbury et al., "German Theologians and the War," *The Guardian*, 1 Oct. 1914.
3. "Réponse à L'Appel Allemand," *Revue Chrétienne* 62 (May-Aug. 1915): 114-122; Loisy, *Guerre et Religion* (Paris, 1915), p. 17.
4. An official edict of toleration, nullifying the 1685 revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was not secured until 1787. Catholic calumnies were rebutted by Emile Doumergue, *Calomnies Anti-Protestantes* (Paris, 1912), who was sponsored by the Protestant and Evangelical Action Commission, and by John Viénot, who tried to organize another watchdog association, The Christian and Protestant Defense Society; see Viénot's articles in *Revue Chrétienne*, 57 (Mar., Apr., Dec. 1910): 272, 352, 1039.

Mr. Bailey is professor of history in Adirondack Community College (State University of New York), Glens Falls, New York.

Such was not the case. Like the ties of international socialism and Roman Catholicism, the fraternal bonds of European Protestantism were cut asunder by the war. French Protestants showed themselves ardent patriots, whose commitment to *la patrie* far exceeded any sense of loyalty to a particular ecclesiastical community. In the final months of the war Germany's most eminent theologian, Adolf von Harnack, complained that the worst display of animosity from any religious group had come not from Britain or Italy but from France, and especially from the Protestants, whose Calvinism, he claimed, had driven them to "blind fanaticism."⁵

The French Protestants, however, were certainly no more chauvinistic than their German or British counterparts.⁶ Some of their fierce zeal emanated from the Alsatian émigrés, angry exiles whose painful memories of 1871 had been reawakened by the ugly Zabern Affair of 1913.⁷ But there was more at stake than just the longing for lost territory. There was also the desire to refurbish a tarnished patriotic image, and in this sense the war provided a welcome relief. Though comprising only 1.5 percent of the population (650,000 out of 40 million), Protestants had flourished in the liberal, anticlerical atmosphere of the Third Republic and had survived the 1905 separation of church and state with fewer scars than their Catholic brethren.⁸ During the Dreyfus Affair they had sided with the Jews, Free Masons, and free thinkers; they were cool toward the three-year service law of 1913; and their enthusiasm for international arbitration had given French pacifism a distinctly Protestant hue.⁹ The war therefore gave them the opportunity to

5. Harnack, "Die Religion im Weltkrieg," in Harnack, *Erforschtes und Erlebtes* (Giessen, 1923), p. 311.
6. Charles E. Bailey, "Gott mit uns: Germany's Protestant Theologians in the First World War" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1978); idem, "The British Protestant Theologians in the First World War: Germanophobia Unleashed," *Harvard Theological Review* 77 (1984): 195–221.
7. During the period from 1871 to 1914, although about 400,000 Alsatians (including 100,000 Protestants) indicated a desire to leave, only 125,000 (including 30,000 Protestants) actually left; see Christian Wolff, "Les protestants des départements annexés ayant opté pour la France," in *Les protestants dans les débuts de la Troisième République*, ed. Société de L'Histoire du Protestantisme Français (Paris, 1979), pp. 545–566, 705–709. Their wartime zeal is noted by Maurice Barrès, "Les diverses familles spirituelles de la France," *Echo de Paris*, 8 Dec. 1916; cited in *Foi et Vie*, 1 Feb. 1917, pp. 55–57.
8. Figures vary from 600,000 to one million; 650,000 is given by Samuel Lambert, *Témoinage*, 15 Feb. 1917, pp. 13–14.
9. Jean Baubérot, *Le Retour des Huguenots* (Paris, 1985), pp. 77–109, 183–184; Daniel Robert, "Les Protestants français et la Guerre de 1914–1918," in *Francia*, ed. Institut Historique Allemand de Paris, vol. 2 (Munich, 1975), p. 415; Viénot, "Le Mois," *Revue Chrétienne* 60 (May 1913): 497–500; Frank Puaux, "A propos de la loi de trois ans," *Évangile et Liberté, La Vie Nouvelle et Le Protestant Unis* (hereafter cited as *Evan. et Lib.*) 28 (17 Aug. 1913): 265–266; Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and a World Without War* (Princeton, 1975), pp. 378–381. To borrow A. J. P. Taylor's distinction in *The Trouble Makers* (London, 1957), p. 51, the French were "pacifist" rather than strictly "pacifist."

prove that their love of country was as fervent as that of any champion of the army or Roman church.¹⁰

The patriotic passions unleashed by the European conflict affected all levels of French society, from the simple worshipper in the pew to the preacher in the pulpit to the scholar in the academic world. Not even the intellectual elite was immune from the war fever, including the high priests of French Protestantism. These were the twenty professors who taught at the two Protestant schools of theology: the older, more conservative, and exclusively Reformed faculty of Montauban, in the South, and the newer, more liberal and mixed (Lutheran and Reformed) faculty of Paris.¹¹ Several of these professors had studied at Berlin, Marburg, and Göttingen and had shared the podium with their German colleagues at the World Congress for Religious Progress held at Berlin in 1910 and Paris in 1913.¹²

When the war broke out, they did not remain detached scholars, dispassionately surveying the carnage from the ivory towers of academe. Far from holding themselves "above the battle," they jumped headlong into the fray.¹³ Some went to the front as chaplains (Eugene de Faye, Henri Monnier, Elie Gounelle), following their students, who had eagerly traded their textbooks

10. Previous work on the French Protestants in World War I includes: André Vovard, "Les Protestants français et la Guerre," *Revue Chrétienne* 65 (July–Aug. 1918): 221–227; Jean Vic, *La Littérature de Guerre* (Paris, 1918), pp. 56–69; various chapters in Raoul Stephan, *Histoire du Protestantisme français* (Paris, 1961), and Philippe Wolff, ed. *Histoire des Protestants en France* (Toulouse, 1977), and André Encrevé, *Les Protestants en France 1800 à nos jours* (Paris, 1985); and the works by Wolff in note 7 and by Baubéot and Robert in note 9 above.

11. Montauban was founded by an edict of the national Reformed Synod of Montpellier on May 1598 and lasted until 1919 when the theology faculty was transferred to the University of Montpellier; see Doumergue, *L'Académie et la Faculté de Montauban 1598–1906* (Geneva, [1919]).

To compensate for the loss of the University of Strasbourg when Germany annexed Alsace, a government edict of 27 May 1877 transferred the Protestant faculty of theology to Paris; the faculties of arts, science, medicine, and law were reestablished at Nancy; see Gaston Bonet-Maury, "The Protestant Faculty of Theology of the Paris University," *The New World* 7 (March 1898): 113–129; Bernard Reymond, "L'École de Paris," *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 52 (1977): 371–383.

12. Bonet-Maury, "Le Congrès Religieux de Berlin," *Revue Chrétienne* 57 (Sept. 1910): 745–748; Jean Rouffiac, "Ve Congrès International du Christianisme libre et progressif," *La Vie Nouvelle* (forerunner of *Evan. et Lib.*) 27 Aug. 1910, pp. 281–282; Viénot, "Programme Provisoire," "Le VIe Congrès International du Progrès Religieux," "Le Mois," *Revue Chrétienne* 60 (May, July, Aug.–Sept. 1913): 476–483, 635–641, 810–828; "6e Congrès international du Progrès religieux," *Evan. et Lib.*, 5, 12, 26 July 1913, pp. 218, 225–226, 241–245; Johannes Rathje, *Die Welt des freien Protestantismus* (Stuttgart, 1952), pp. 163–169, 229–230.

13. From his self-imposed exile in Switzerland, Romain Rolland urged European intellectuals to avoid the excesses of nationalistic fervor, but, far from remaining neutral, he loudly proclaimed France's innocence; see his much-cited *Au-dessus de la Mêlée* (Paris, 1915) and the perceptive criticism of Roland Stromberg, *Redemption by War* (Lawrence, Kans., 1982), pp. 153–156.

for a sword, while others remained at home and also fought with their pens.¹⁴ They contributed numerous articles to newspapers and journals, wrote pamphlets, gave sermons and speeches, and organized their own Protestant Committee for French Propaganda Abroad, under whose auspices they spoke at patriotic pep-rallies in France and went on lecture tours of Scandinavia, Holland, Britain, and America.¹⁵ In other words, they exhibited precisely those political passions that the philosopher Julien Benda labeled as “treasonous” for true intellectuals.¹⁶

Upon reading the pronouncements of their German brethren they were filled with horror and stupefaction. *Nobless oblige*, they asserted, and they could scarcely believe that men whom they had held in such high regard, morally and intellectually, had sanctioned the actions of the German government and army. Shocked and saddened by the German protestations, they charged their former mentors with a betrayal of both academic and ethical trust and reluctantly concluded that they had sold their soul to the god of blood and iron.

In their vigorous war of words they made clear that their prewar support of the peace movement did not mean an endorsement of doctrinaire pacifism. On the contrary, they all upheld the Augustinian theory of the “just war,” and its most emphatic champion was Eugène Ménégoz. Though recently retired from the chair of Lutheran Dogmatics in the Paris Faculty he remained the uncrowned king of liberal French Protestantism. In a series of articles he

14. Eugène de Faye was a pastor of the Free church and professor of Early Church History in the Paris theology faculty; Elie Gounelle, though not on the Paris faculty, was a close friend of its members and editor of *Christianism social*, which promoted a non-Marxist Christian socialism; Henri Monnier is discussed in note 44 below.

15. The *Comité Protestant de Propagande Française à L'Étranger* was organized under the auspices of the Protestant Federation of Churches on 11 June 1915. The committee's sponsors, including the Paris theologians John Viénot and Henri Monnier, had viewed with alarm the work of the Catholic Committee for French Propaganda Abroad, whose book *La Guerre Allemande et le Catholicisme* (April, 1915) had portrayed the war as a war of religion directed against Catholic France by Protestant Germany. Consequently, the committee's manifesto of August 1915 underscored the patriotism of the French Protestants. The committee's president was André Weiss, professor of Law at the University of Paris; its three secretaries-general included the Paris theologians Raoul Allier and John Viénot; another Parisian theologian, Wilfred Monod, was an assessor; its charter members included another Parisian, Gaston Bonet-Maury, and three Montauban dons: Emile Doumergue, Henri Bois, and Leon Maury. In December 1915 it began publishing a monthly bulletin. See Edouard Soulier, “Propagande française dans les pays neutres protestants,” *Témoignage*, 15 Aug. 1915, pp. 147–148; idem, “Appel,” *Foi et Vie*, 1 Aug. 1915, pp. 359–360; André Monod, “Le Comité des Amitiés Françaises,” *Bulletin Protestant Française, Organe du Comité Protestant de Propagande Française à l'Étranger* (hereafter cited as *Bull. Prot. Fran.*) Jan. 1927, pp. 1–10; letter from Mme. R. M. Monod to Charles E. Bailey, 11 April 1985.

16. Julien Benda, *La Trahison des Clercs* (Paris, 1927), pp. 67–71; Benda lamented that French moralists had followed the bad example of German intellectuals, especially ecclesiastics like Harnack, who had succumbed to political passions.

inveighed against pacifist literature from Switzerland, which he believed was undermining the morale of Christians in the French army. Jesus' disciples had carried swords, he noted, just as the police rightly do, and since the army was nothing more than the *gendarmérie* of the state, Christians could in good conscience take up the sword in defense of their homeland.¹⁷

With that matter settled, the theologians devoted the bulk of their diatribes to the issue of German guilt—guilt for willfully precipitating the war, for violating Belgian neutrality, and for atrocities against civilians. As noted earlier, in August 1914 a group of German clergy issued an “Appeal to Protestant Christians Abroad,” which argued that the origins of the war lay in a “net of conspiracies” secretly spun around Germany.¹⁸ Outraged by the audacious claim of German innocence, the French Protestants were all the more disappointed to find it endorsed by the illustrious theologians Wilhelm Herrmann, Adolf Deissmann, Julius Richter, and the leader of the liberals who had so impressed the French at the 1910 World Congress in Berlin, Adolf von Harnack.¹⁹ As proof of France's innocence, they insisted that had it wanted war France would have waited until 1916, when the three-year service law would have yielded a more formidable army.²⁰

Even greater revulsion was felt in October 1914 when ninety-three German intellectuals signed an “Appeal to the Civilized World.” With no attempt to muster evidence they claimed that Germany was not guilty of starting the war, that its violation of Belgium rested on the certain knowledge that France and Britain, with Belgium's consent, planned to do the same, and that far from having wantonly molested Belgian civilians the German army scrupulously observed the rules of international law. Among the ninety-three were the liberal theologians Harnack and Hermann; the leader of the conservatives, Reinhold Seeberg; and Adolf Deissmann, who held a middle position.²¹

17. Eugène Ménégoz, nine articles published in *Evan. et Lib.* from 30 Jan. 1915 to 15 Jan. 1916; see especially the first, “L'Épée de Pierre”; all are reprinted in his *Publications diverses sur le Fidélisme et son Application à L'Enseignement Chrétien Traditionnel*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1916) pp. 173–206; Emile Doumergue, “Une refractaire par ‘conscience religieuse,’” *Le Christianisme au XXe Siècle, Journal des Eglises Réformées Evangeliques de France* (hereafter cited as *Chrt. au XXe*) 24 and 31 Aug. 1916, pp. 267, 276–277.

18. See note 1 above.

19. Hermann was professor of Systematic Theology at Marburg. The others taught at Berlin: Deissmann was professor of New Testament Greek; Richter, a vice-president of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee, was professor of Missions; Harnack was professor of Church History.

20. “Réponse à L'Appel Allemand aux Chrétiens Évangéliques de L'Étranger,” *Revue Chrétienne* 62 (May–Aug. 1915): 114–122; “Revue de la Presse,” *Chrt. au XXe*, 15 Oct. 1914, pp. 335–336.

21. The origins of the appeal are still shrouded in uncertainty. Matthias Erzberger, the leader of the Catholic Center Party and coordinator of German propaganda efforts, had a hand in gathering signatures, and the support of seven Catholic theologians as against only five

No other German declaration achieved so much notoriety, indeed, worldwide infamy. Since its claims seemed both servile and in blatant contradiction to presumably well-established fact, the faculties of Paris and Montauban thought their German colleagues had taken leave of their intellect as well as their honor.²² The most detailed indictment came from Wilfred Monod, a fourth-generation member of a distinguished family of Protestant clergy, president of the Union of Reformed Churches, and professor of Practical Theology at Paris. A zealous advocate of international understanding, he had recently attended both meetings of the World Congress for Religious Progress and was a member of two Franco-German Friendship Societies. After analyzing the document he sadly concluded that its sponsors were “pathologically” self-deluded; indeed, that the German nation was like the captured Samson—blind but extremely dangerous.²³

Other theologians attacked the specific German assertions. Leon Maury, professor of Practical Theology at Montauban, echoed the sentiments of his nation when he insisted that Germany had launched a carefully premeditated war of conquest. Gaston Bonet-Maury, honorary professor of Church History at Paris, who had helped plan the 1913 Religious Congress at Paris, ridiculed the official German declaration of war of 3 August which said that French aviators had bombed Nürnberg the previous day, and he rejoiced in 1916 when Bavarian authorities issued an official recantation.²⁴

Protestants may suggest that his influence was preponderant. See Hans Wehberg, *Wider den Aufruf der 93! Das Ergebnis einer Rundfrage an die 93 Intellektuellen über den Kriegsschuld* (Charlottensburg, 1920).

22. “Protestation de la Faculté Libre de Théologie de Montauban,” *Revue de Théologie et des questions religieuses de Montauban* (hereafter cited as *Rv. de Mont.*) 24 (Jan.–July 1915): 1–4; “Nouvelles,” *Evan. et Lib.*, 19 Dec. 1914, pp. 384–385.
23. Monod, “Le Manifeste des Quatre-Vingt-Treize,” *Revue Chrétienne* 61 (Sept.–Dec. 1914): 646–677. Monod frequently described himself as a “three-fold internationalist: pacifist, socialist, and Christian”; see his *Jusqu’au Bout. Lettre à un Américain* (Paris, 1916), p. 1, and his letter to Archbishop Randall Davidson, 11 Jan. 1916, in Davidson’s general war papers, Box 27, Lambeth Palace Library, London. Monod, John Viénot, and J.-Émile Roberty were the three pastors of the Oratoire Church of the Louvre.
24. Maury, “La Guerre et l’Économie politique,” *Rv. de Mont.* 24 (Aug.–Oct. 1915): 378–379; Bonet-Maury, “De la Puissance du Mensonge,” *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, Aug. 1916, pp. 1–2. On 3 August the German ambassador in Paris, Baron Wilhelm von Schoen, received a telegram signed by Bethmann Hollweg containing the declaration of war on France. The message had somehow become jumbled during its transmission and decoding, but the original draft as well as the mutilated text that arrived in Paris and Schoen’s final version given to the French all claimed that French airmen had dropped bombs on Karlsruhe and Nürnberg. Bethmann repeated the charge in his address to the Reichstag on 4 August. See Karl Kautsky, ed., *Outbreak of the World War. German Documents collected by Karl Kautsky*, trans. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (New York, 1924), pp. 531–532; Schoen, *Erlebtes* (Stuttgart, 1921), pp. 182–184; idem, *Sechs Kriegsreden des Reichskanzlers* (Berlin, 1916), p. 10; Pierre Renouvin, *Les Origines Immédiates de la Guerre (28 juin–4 août 1914)* (Paris, 1927), pp. 244–248.

The violation of Belgian neutrality evoked similar protests, and it was the chancellor himself who came under the greatest fire. On the evening of 4 August, according to the British ambassador, Bethmann Hollweg had dismissed the 1839 Treaty of Neutrality as a “scrap of paper,” and earlier that day he had frankly admitted to the Reichstag that Germany was committing a “wrong” by entering Belgium. But Harnack, Bethmann’s close friend, scolded him for being too conscientious, insisting that Germany’s confrontation with a two-front war had forced it into a position where there were no “formal” duties at all but only the moral duty of defending itself. When Harnack further justified the invasion by citing an Old Testament incident of law-breaking of which Jesus had approved—the desperately hungry David had eaten holy bread reserved for the High Priest—the professor of Old Testament at Montauban, Edouard Bruston, accused him of a “profanity just short of blasphemy.”²⁵

Maurice Goguel was similarly indignant. After sitting at the feet of Wilhelm Herrmann in Marburg he had returned to Paris, where his doctoral thesis on Herrmann had earned him the chair of New Testament. Writing to his former master, he asked how the famous neo-Kantian could dismiss such well-founded allegations and rebuked him for failing to follow the “categorical imperative.” When he asked what proof there was that Belgium had agreed to an Allied violation of its neutrality, Herrmann merely replied that Germany did have “irrefutable” documents but declined to elaborate.²⁶

25. Sir Edward Goschen to Sir Edward Grey, 8 Aug. 1914, document 160 in British Blue Book, Great Britain, Foreign Office, *Collected Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War*, Misc. no. 3649 (London, 1915), p. 111. Both during and after the war Bethmann insisted he had been misquoted, even though he spoke in English. In January 1915 he publicly stated that he had told the ambassador that “among the reasons which had impelled England to war the Belgian neutrality treaty had for her only the value of a scrap of paper”; thus it was England, and not Germany, who had held the treaty in low regard. See his press interview in *Der Tag*, 27 Jan. 1915, and in “A Scrap of Paper,” *Current History of the European War*, 1 (Mar. 1915): 1120–1125. He gave a slightly different version in his postwar memoirs, *Betrachtungen zum Weltkrieg*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1919), pp. 180. See also Otto Hammann, *Bilder aus der letzten Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, 1926), p. 76; Harnack, “Meine Antwort auf den vorstehenden Brief [from eleven English clergy],” 10 Sept. 1914, *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* (hereafter cited as *Inter. Monats.*) 9 (1 Oct. 1914): 20; Bruston, “L’Attente silencieuse de la France,” *Rv. de Mont.* 24 (Jan.–July 1915): 82–83.
26. Goguel to Herrmann, 24 Oct. 1914, and Herrmann to Goguel, 14 Nov. 1914, in *Die Eiche* 3 (1915): 36–37. Herrmann apparently was alluding to the “Brussels Documents” of 1906 and 1912. After the two Moroccan crises, British and Belgian officers had discussed the contingency of a German invasion of France through Belgium, and the British had offered to protect the neutral country by landing troops there. Records of these conversations were found when the German army captured Brussels at the end of August 1914. On 13 October the government announced the discovery, which Herrmann’s letter of 14 November seemingly reflects. Not until 25 November 1914 did the German public learn the full contents of the documents, which then became Germany’s standard defense when it retrospectively tried to justify the invasion; see *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 Oct. and 25 Nov. 1914. Modern scholarship generally dismisses the conversations as incidental; see Samuel R. Williamson, Jr., *The Politics of the Grand Strategy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 86–89, 215, 353–371.

If the issues of war guilt and the violation of Belgium were somewhat debatable, the mounting evidence for Germany's inhumane conduct of the war seemed incontrovertible. Though rejecting the allegations of wholesale atrocities, Germany did admit that its army had carried out summary executions of Belgian *franc-tireurs*, regarded not as soldiers entitled to the rights of prisoners of war but as "assassins."²⁷ But in the official bulletin of the Protestant Propaganda Committee, Bonet-Maury argued that they were organized units of local militia wearing special uniforms and therefore were to be treated as any other captured soldier. Léon Maury was more graphic, comparing the German terror in Belgium to the horrors of the Inquisition and Dante's *Inferno*.²⁸ The official British allegations were published in the Bryce Report of May 1915.

Three other events of that year helped to confirm the image of the merciless German "Hun."²⁹ Just one week before the Bryce Report appeared, the *Lusitania* was torpedoed, and the French were dumfounded to learn that Otto Baumgarten, professor of Practical Theology at Kiel and a champion of tolerance who had spoken at the 1910 Religious Congress, had told his fellow Germans that anyone who could not approve "from the bottom of his heart" the sinking of the ship was simply not a "good German."³⁰

The execution of the English nurse Edith Cavell in Brussels was considered to be another revelation of the German disregard for humanity. Involved in an underground railroad that helped wounded Allied soldiers escape to neutral Holland, she was convicted of aiding the enemy and shot in October 1915. The Protestant Federation of Churches honored this daughter of an Anglican vicar by holding a memorial service at the Oratoire, and Emile Doumergue, professor of Church History at Montauban and the most energetic Protestant publicist of the war, described her execution as simply the logical expression of the brutal philosophy contained in the official war manual of the German General Staff.³¹

27. Germany, Foreign Office, *The Belgian People's War. A Violation of International Law. Translations from the Official German White Book* (New York, 1915), pp. 5–10.

28. Bonet-Maury, "De la Puissance du Mensonge," *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, Aug. 1916, p. 2; Maury, *Le Lendemain de la guerre et l'évangélisation de la France* (Paris, 1916), p. 22.

29. Great Britain, Foreign Office, *Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages appointed to His Britannic Majesty's Government and presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce* (London, 1915). Postwar studies have shown the report to be grossly exaggerated; see James Morgan Read, *Atrocity Propaganda 1914–1919* (New Haven, 1941), pp. 200–209; H. C. Peterson, *Propaganda for War* (Norman, Okla., 1939), pp. 53–58.

30. Baumgarten, "Der Krieg und der Bergpredigt, Rede am 10. Mai 1915," in *Deutsche Reden in schwerer Zeit*, ed. Zentralstelle für Volkswahlfahrt, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1915), p. 132; Doumergue, "Le Droit et la Force d'après les Manuels des États-Majors allemand et français," *Foi et Vie*, 1 and 16 June 1915, p. 277; idem, "Propos de théologiens allemands sur la guerre," *Témoignage*, 1 Aug. 1915, p. 134.

31. "Service religieux en souvenir de Miss Cavell," *Témoignage*, 1 Dec. 1915, p. 231; Doumergue, "Encore le Manuel du grand État-Major allemand," *Foi et Vie*, 1 Nov. 1915, p. 449; Rowland Ryder, *Edith Cavell* (New York, 1975) p. 5. In addition to his special

The martyrdom of another Christian group, the Armenians, provoked an even greater outpouring of sympathy and rage. In April 1915 Turkish authorities arrested 250 Armenian leaders in Constantinople on charges of conspiracy to commit treason. Then, in order to forestall a general uprising, the Sublime Porte ordered all Armenians deported to the hinterlands of Asia Minor, and in the process about one million were massacred or died of abuse and malnutrition.³² Various Protestant groups in France raised money for the proverbial “starving Armenians,” and Emile Doumergue took a special interest in their plight. He devoted several lectures and articles to a historical investigation of the Christian minority and laid indirect blame for the massacres on Turkey’s ally, Germany, which supposedly could have restrained its junior partner.³³

In light of the many indications of German immorality and of the heavy casualties that affected nearly every French home, it is understandable that the French had reservations about lenient peace terms and a postwar religious rapprochement. Three times during the war the primate of the church of Sweden, Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, had tried to convoke an international peace conference, but when Allied nations refused to participate, the result was only a meeting of neutrals.³⁴ In October 1919, however, the international committee of the World Alliance for Promoting Friendship through the Churches convened at Oud Wassenaar, near the Hague, the first postwar Christian conference. Sixty participants from fourteen countries met, but France was represented by only two Methodists, since in the absence of any sign of German repentance the mainline denominations refused to send delegates. As a prerequisite for the restoration of fellowship the French Protestants asked for a German confession of guilt for the violation of Belgium. In the eyes of Eugène de Faye, who had studied in Germany before becoming professor of Patristics at Paris and who had lost his only son in the war, this was a minimal demand, and his colleague at Paris, Wilfred Monod, president of the French branch of the World Alliance and France’s chief

wartime column, “Propos de guerre,” in *Foi et Vie*, edited by his younger brother Paul, Emile Doumergue also thundered forth in his own faculty’s journal, *Rv. de Mont.*, edited by his colleague Henri Bois, who succeeded him as dean in 1919, and in the conservative newspaper *Chrt. au XXe*, the organ of *les Églises réformées évangéliques de France*, edited by Benjamin Couve.

32. What amounted to a second “Bryce Report” was published in 1916: Great Britain, Foreign Office, [Arnold Toynbee], *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915–1916. Documents presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon by Viscount Bryce* (London, 1916).
33. “Pour l’Arménie,” *Chrt. au XXe*, 27 Jan. 1916, pp. 28–29; Doumergue, “En Arménie,” *Foi et Vie* (Cahier B), 16 Dec. 1915, pp. 245–246, and “L’Arménie: les massacres et le question d’Orient,” *Foi et Vie*, 1 and 16 April 1916, pp. 107–170 (the entire issue), wherein he notes that German Protestant leaders petitioned the chancellor to help the ravaged race.
34. Nils Karlström, “Movements for International Friendship and Life and Work, 1910–1925,” in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517–1948*, ed. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 521–529.

devotee of the postwar ecumenical movement, drafted an official request. To the delight of the assembly the five German delegates, including Adolf Deissmann and Julius Richter, complied, declaring that they regarded the violation of Belgium as a "moral wrong." Monod was pleased, but like most other French Protestants he lamented that the five spoke only for themselves and not as official representatives of the German churches.³⁵

The deeper issue was war guilt, and one month after the conference Harnack sent an open letter to Premier Clemenceau, boldly asserting that whereas Germany had opened her archives France had not, and that the available documents indicated that Russia, not Germany, was the culprit.³⁶ Therefore, when another Christian conference opened in Geneva in August 1920, the French raised the stakes. This time the Protestant Federation of Churches emphatically stated that there was a "moral impediment." All the evidence, the Federation insisted, from the collections of prewar diplomatic correspondence to the sensational revelations of the former German ambassador to England, Prince Karl Lichnowsky, and a former director of the Krupp Works, Wilhelm Muehlon, demonstrated that Germany was responsible not merely for violating Belgium but for willfully preparing and unleashing the war. France therefore demanded an official acknowledgment from the German churches of their government's guilt. To explain its ultimatum the Federation sent Raoul Allier, professor of Philosophy and new dean of the Paris Theology faculty. In August 1914 his son Roger had been wounded, taken prisoner by the Germans, and then, Raoul was convinced, brutally "assassinated" by his captors. In an attempt to console himself and others who had suffered a similar loss, he had given seventy-six public lectures during the war. At Geneva he solemnly informed the delegates that apart from a German admission of war guilt there could be no renewal of Christian fellowship. Echoing Luther at Worms he exclaimed, "We can do no other."³⁷

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 530–531; Monod, "La violation de la neutralité belge désavouée par les Allemands," *Le Christianisme social, Revue mensuelle d'étude et d'action*, Feb., Mar., and Apr. 1920, pp. 140–158, 181–199; "The Violation of Belgian Neutrality," *Goodwill* 4 (1 Nov. 1919): 10–11.
36. Harnack, "Offener Brief an Herrn Clemenceau," 6 Nov. 1919, *Journal de Genève*, 10 Nov. 1919; cited by Emile Doumergue, "Propos de Paix," *Foi et Vie*, 1 Dec. 1919, p. 338, and reprinted in Harnack, *Erforschetes und Erlebtes*, pp. 303–305.
37. *Le Mémoire Lichnowsky et les Documents Muehlon, avec une Preface de Joseph Reinach* (Paris, [1918]); see also *Dr. Muehlon's Diary* (London, 1918) and Lichnowsky's memoirs, *Heading Toward the Abyss*, trans. Sefton Delmer (New York, 1928) pp. 48–82. Unlike the other theologians at Paris, all of whom were ordained clergy, Allier was a layperson and a member of the Free church. He was dean of the Paris faculty from 1920 to 1933, succeeding Edouard Vaucher, who served from 1908 to 1920. The session at which he spoke was a preparatory meeting in Geneva, 9–12 August 1920, for the Life and Work Conference that met in Stockholm in 1925. For his speech, see André Monod, "Conferences internationales," *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, Oct. 1920, pp. 5–6; for the death of his son, see Benjamin Couve, "Roger Allier," *Chrt. au XXe*, 5 April 1917, p. 107, Raoul Allier to John Viénot, 22 May 1916, in

The theologians were just as adamant when it came to peace terms. Emile Doumergue was typical when he asked: How could the Reichstag Peace Resolution of July 1917 recommend a simple return to the *status quo ante bellum* in light of the enormous destruction wrought by Germany in northern France?³⁸ Even worse was the pope's Peace Proposal of August 1917, which suggested a similar return and lacked any condemnation of Germany. French Protestants were outraged by the Vatican's neutrality and labelled the pope's silence on ethical issues as moral treason. John Viénot, a member of the Paris faculty, reflected the general dismay when he exclaimed that the long-awaited moral note had come not from the Catholic pontiff at Rome but from the Protestant president of America.³⁹

Given the magnitude of the Teutonic iniquities, the French unanimously rejected the idea of a negotiated settlement and called instead for a fight to the finish, a "clear defeat" of Germany and a strong treaty ensuring a "durable peace."⁴⁰ But there were noticeable distinctions. Whereas the conservative Doumergue urged "enormous reparations" and "exceptional guarantees," including handcuffing Germany economically for the next ten years, the liberal Ménégos was less vindictive, expecting Wilsonian ideals rather than punitive safeguards to reestablish justice and looking to the League of Nations to bring about a secular version of the Kingdom of God on earth.⁴¹

On one issue, though, everyone was agreed: the return of Alsace-Lorraine. Especially during the early months of the conflict, when a short struggle was still envisaged, one could hardly mention the war without anticipating its happy ending. Early in 1915, in a series of public lectures sponsored by the periodical *Foi et Vie*, Doumergue proudly noted that France, unlike Russia

Papers of John Viénot, Mss. 1137, xxviii, Library of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, Paris, and [Raoul Allier], *Roger Allier 13 Juillet 1890–30 Aout 1914* (Paris, 1917), pp. 274–277.

38. Doumergue, "Propos de guerre," *Foi et Vie*, 1 and 16 Aug. 1917, pp. 343–347. For the origins of the resolution, see Matthias Erzberger, *Erlebnisse im Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart, 1920), pp. 251–269.
39. Viénot, "Le Mois," *Revue Chrétienne* 64 (Sept.–Oct., 1917): 477 and 65 (Nov.–Dec., 1918): 423. Doumergue voiced the same complaint in his "Le Vatican et la Maison-Blanche," *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, Sept. 1917, pp. 1–2. Benedict XV's appeal is in "Official Documents Looking Toward Peace," *International Conciliation*, no. 119 (Oct. 1917), pp. 5–7.
40. Typical was the title and thrust of Wilfred Monod's brochure *Jusqu'au Bout. Lettre à un Américain* (Paris, 1916); see also Doumergue, "Propos de guerre," *Foi et Vie*, 1 and 16 Aug. 1917, pp. 343–347.
41. Doumergue, "Propos de guerre," and "Propos de paix," *Foi et Vie* 10 Nov. and 10 Dec. 1918, pp. 302, 324; Ménégos, "Trois victoires assurées," and "Que ton regne vienne," *Evan. et Lib.*, 24 Nov. 1917, pp. 245–246, and 5 Jan. 1918, pp. 3–4. A similar relationship between liberal theology and moderate territorial goals, on the one hand, and conservative theology and extensive annexationist demands, on the other, was noticeable among the German theologians; see Charles E. Bailey, "Protestant Theologians and the War Aims Question in the First World War," *Red River Valley Historical Journal* 5 (1981): 201–219.

and England, fought merely to defend itself and had no material interests at stake—except for Alsace! His colleagues at Montauban expressed a similar nostalgia for the “lost provinces.” Léon Maury stressed that at the end of the war France would not be “annexing” Alsace but simply reclaiming what already belonged to France. Henri Bois, professor of Systematic Theology, rejoiced at the imminent “emancipation” of Alsace, and, while touring Britain at the behest of the Protestant Propaganda Committee, he could hardly talk of anything else. Edouard Bruston even indulged in the exaggerated claim that the only way to have avoided the war would have been for Germany to have freely relinquished the region.⁴²

The Parisian theologians were no less enthusiastic. In January 1915 the Federation of Churches sponsored a series of lectures specifically devoted to the Alsatian question, and Viénot spoke of the former glories of Strasbourg. At the end of 1917, just after Clemenceau became premier, Viénot used his prestigious journal, *Revue chrétienne*, to urge “the tiger of France” to recognize that the primary question before the world conscience was Alsace, the symbol of all other “crucified” peoples.⁴³ Jean Gabriel Monnier, professor of Reformed Dogmatics at Paris, found himself trapped at the outbreak of the war in northern France, where he had been devoting his summer vacation to a pastoral ministry. After spending more than two years in captivity he was released in January 1917, and as soon as his health permitted he responded to appeals to minister in liberated Alsace. His brother, Henri Monnier, dean of students at Paris, served as chaplain on the Alsatian front before and after it was liberated in 1917 and, subsequently, under the auspices of the Propaganda committee went on a lecture tour around France sharing his impressions of the region.⁴⁴

Thus on the major demands—German repentance, reparations, and the restoration of Alsace—Protestants stood shoulder to shoulder with one another and with their Catholic, Jewish, and nonreligious compatriots. From

42. Doumergue, “L’Empire de la Kultur,” *Foi et Vie*, 16 May 1915, p. 245; Maury, “La Guerre et l’Économie politique,” *Rv. de Mont.* 24 (Aug.–Oct. 1915): 396; Bois, “La Guerre et la Bonne Conscience,” and Bruston, “L’Attente silencieuse de la France,” both in *Rv. de Mont.* 24 (Jan.–July, 1915): 41, 73. Bois, “Les Assemblées presbytériennes d’Edimbourg,” *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, July 1918, pp. 2–4.

43. “Les Conférences de la Fédération protestante,” *Témoignage*, 1 Feb. 1915, pp. 7–8, and 15 Feb. 1917, p. 17; Viénot, *Épître au Tigre de France* (Paris, 1918), p. 9. Viénot’s brochure was a reprint of his editorials of November through December 1917 and January through February 1918. The Protestant Federation included five groups: the Reformed Church (a merger of the liberal and centrist groups in 1912), the Evangelical Reformed Church (the conservatives), the Lutheran Church, the Free Church (a small, conservative group of mainly Reformed churches), and the Methodist Church.

44. For Jean Monnier, see the “Rapport de M. le Doyen Edouard Vaucher,” in *Séance de Rentrée des Cours de la Faculté Libre de Théologie Protestante de Paris le Mardi 5 Novembre 1918* (Paris, 1919), p. 6; for Henri Monnier see “Comité protestant de propagande français,” *Evan. et Lib.*, 20 Oct. 1917, p. 217, and Victor Monod, “Une étape en Alsace et dans le Pays de Montébeliard,” *Bull. Prot. Franc.*, Aug. 1918, p. 7.

a distance, the much-touted *union sacrée* seemed intact. But a closer observation revealed breaches of the domestic truce. For one thing, Protestants had to refute charges made by certain right-wing Catholic publicists. Frédéric Masson, for example, portrayed the war as a war of religion launched by Protestant Germany against Catholic France. Both Lutherans and Reformed were quick to thank another Catholic, Maurice Barrès, for pointing out that Germany's substantial Catholic minority (one out of three) was just as fervent in its support of the war as were the Protestants, and they further noted that when combining the Hohenzollern and Habsburg Empires the Catholics far outnumbered the Protestants.⁴⁵

A slightly different allegation was that the war was an attempt of Lutheran Prussia to crush Catholic France. The French Lutherans, a minority within a minority (80,000), offered several rebuttals. Edouard Vaucher, an Alsatian Lutheran and dean of the Paris Theology faculty, where he taught Lutheran Dogmatics, contributed a series of articles to the official newspaper of the Lutheran church, pointing out that the Prussian state church was not strictly Lutheran but a united church, a merger of Lutherans and Calvinists, effected by the King of Prussia in 1817 on the 300th anniversary of the Reformation. Nathanael Weiss, another Alsatian of Lutheran origin and secretary of the Society of the History of French Protestantism, reminded his compatriots that Luther himself was not a Prussian but a Saxon.⁴⁶

The primary question, however, was Luther's political views and whether he was responsible for Germany's autocracy, glorification of war, and the political subservience of its citizens. On this complex issue Lutherans and Reformed laid aside their differences and closed ranks to defend the reformer. Eugène Ehrhardt, an Alsatian Lutheran and professor of Ethics at Paris, noted that Reinhold Seeberg's wartime proclamations were simply an echo of his prewar manual of Christian ethics, which had unabashedly proclaimed that might makes right, Ehrhardt's colleagues added that Seeberg reflected

45. Viénot, "Le Mois," *Revue Chrétienne*, 62 (Jan.-Apr. 1915): 102-103; Barrès, "Le Marteau de Thor sur nos cathédrales," *L'Echo de Paris*, 6 Mar. 1915; cited in "Revue de la Presse," *Chrt. au XXe*, 11 March 1915, p. 76, and in "A Travers les Journaux," *Témoignage*, 15 March 1915, pp. 36-37. According to the census of 1910, Germany had about 40 million Protestants, 24 million Catholics, and 1 million Jews. Austria-Hungary had about 39 million Catholics, 4.5 million Protestants, 4.5 million Greek Orthodox, and 2 million Jews, yielding a combined total of 63 million Catholics to 44.5 million Protestants; see Samuel Lambert, "Une mise au point nécessaire," *Témoignage*, 15 Feb. 1915, pp. 13-14.

46. Vaucher, "Variétés," *Témoignage*, 15 Apr., 1 May, 15 July, and 1 Oct. 1915, pp. 54-55, 64-66, 120-121, 180-181; Weiss, "Luther et la Réformation française," *Bulletin de Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* (hereafter cited as *Bull. de SHPF*) 66 (Oct.-Dec. 1917), p. 283. The Lutheran Church of France was comprised of two "inspections," that of Paris, with 35,000 members, and that of Montbéliard, with 45,000; see "Un hommage du protestantisme français," *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, Oct. 1917, p. 6. Its official paper was *Témoignage*, edited by Samuel Lambert.

not the teachings of Luther but of Treitschke, Nietzsche, and General von Bernhardt—the “unholy trinity” who had substituted for the teachings of Christ a new gospel of Social Darwinism.⁴⁷

Luther’s most avid defender was John Viénot. Though brought up as a Lutheran, he was serving the Oratoire Church as a Reformed pastor and was also teaching on the Paris faculty as a church historian whose specialty was the Reformation. In a much-noted address he argued that the primary principle of Lutheranism was individualism, whereas modern Germany stood for collectivism and regimentation.⁴⁸ Lutherans did concede, however, that Luther had given only a mild and belated (not until 1531) approval to the right of resistance, and therefore the former Lutheran Nathanael Weiss saddled Luther himself with some of the war guilt. The Calvinist Doumergue was kinder, blaming only the “neo-Lutheran Pan-Germans” for exaggerating Luther’s distinction between the “two kingdoms” or different moral codes for the state and the individual.⁴⁹

Men from both denominations also admitted that although Luther had freed the soul of the believer from ecclesiastical tyranny, he had stopped there. He had liberated humans religiously, but it took Calvin to free them politically.⁵⁰ As good French people the Protestants agreed that the real founder of modern political liberties was their own reformer, whose teachings had made a circuitous route from Geneva to Scotland and England, then to

47. Seeberg, “Das sittliche Recht des Kriegeres,” *Inter. Monats.* 9 (1 Nov. 1914): 171–176, which reflected his *System der Ethik im Grundriss dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 135–137. His wartime essay was noted in “Propos de théologiens allemands sur la guerre,” *Témoignage*, 1 Aug. 1915, p. 134; Samuel Lambert, “Christianisme allemand,” *Témoignage*, 1 Feb. 1916, p. 26; Eugène Ehrhardt, “Christianisme allemand,” *Témoignage*, 15 Feb. 1916, pp. 45–46. The term “unholy trinity” was Ernst Troeltsch’s summary of the Allied indictments; see his “Der Geist der deutschen Kultur,” in *Deutschland und der Weltkrieg* ed. Otto Hintze et al. (Leipzig, 1915), p. 58. The French references to the three German thinkers are legion; typical were Henri Bois, “La Guerre et la Bonne conscience,” *Rv. de Mont.* 24 (Jan.–July 1915): 31–34, and “La guerre et les historiens de l’Allemagne,” *Foi et Vie*, 1 and 16 June 1915, pp. 280–289. Beginning in March 1916, Bois contributed a regular column to *Foi et Vie* entitled “L’Opinion évangère.”
48. Viénot’s public lecture was given in Paris under the auspices of the Protestant Federation of Churches on 25 February 1916. It appeared in pamphlet form and was translated into Dutch the same year and was reissued in 1918; see *Evan. et Lib.*, 19 Feb., 11 Mar., 28 Oct. 1916, pp. 53, 68, 271; and 5 Jan., 16 Feb., and 16 Mar. 1918, pp. 4, 32, 55; Viénot, *Luther et l’Allemagne*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1918), pp. 41–42.
49. In every one of the four issues of the *Bull. de SHPF* for 1917, Weiss makes plain that Luther must bear his share of guilt for the war: “Protestants et Catholiques allemands à la lumière de quatre siècles d’histoire,” 66 (1917): 5–21; “L’origine et les Étapes historiques des Droits de l’Homme et des Peuples,” 66 (1917): 107–108; “Pour le Quatrième Centenaire de la Réformation” 66 (1917): 177; “Luther et la Réformation française” 66 (1917): 297–299. Doumergue, “Luther et la quatrième Centenaire de la Réformation en Allemagne,” *Foi et Vie*, (Cahier B), 16 Nov. 1917, pp. 213, 225, and “Propos de guerre,” *Foi et Vie*, 20 March 1918, pp. 95–100.
50. See Doumergue’s two articles in *Foi et Vie* cited in note 49 above; see also Viénot, *Luther et l’Allemagne*, p. 42.

America, and home again by way of Lafayette and the *philosophes*. The former Lutheran Viénot as well as the convinced Calvinist Doumergue revelled in tracing the origin of the 1789 Declarations of the Rights of Man and Citizen back to the founder of French Protestantism.⁵¹

In light of Luther's shortcomings, the question arose whether it was fitting, in October 1917, to join in the worldwide celebration of the 400th anniversary of the Reformation, or whether this implied an undue degree of solidarity with German Protestants. The Society of the History of French Protestantism insisted that not to participate would be a gross insult to the great liberator of the human conscience, and the Lutheran church's executive commission concurred, though it added that the religious services would be understandably less jubilant than in former years.⁵²

The only real area of disagreement was theology itself. The Great War did not silence but merely muffled the sounds of the civil war between French liberals and conservatives. The rivalry was basically between the older orthodoxy of the faculty of Montauban—supported by the Evangelical Reformed church and its organ, *Christianisme au XXe Siècle*, which upheld the authority of the Scriptures—and the more modern theology taught by the "School of Paris," supported by progressive Lutherans and Reformed, whose paper, *Évangile et Liberté*, championed free inquiry and acknowledged the evolutionary development of all religions. The focus of the conflict was a long-running duel between the venerable dean of Montauban, Doumergue, and the illustrious former dean of Paris, Ménégoz.⁵³

During *la bell époque* the liberals had freely confessed their admiration of German scholarship. Ménégoz, a disciple of Harnack, reflected the antimeta-

51. Curiously, Viénot's sermon at the Oratoire on 1 Nov. 1917 to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the Reformation scarcely mentioned Luther but honored instead the Huguenot publicists Hotman and Jurieu; "Les premiers Républicains Français," *Bull. Prot. Fran.*, Nov. 1917, pp. 1–4. Beginning in 1895 the noted authority on Calvin, Doumergue, had published several articles in the *Revue de Montauban*, tracing the origins of modern political rights back to Calvin. His most notable wartime essay on the theme was "Calvin et L'Entente," *Bull. de SHPF* 66 (Oct.–Dec. 1917): 301–312, which reappeared in slightly altered form as "Calvin et L'Entente. de Wilson à Calvin," *Foi et Vie*, (Cahier B), 20 Jan. 1919, pp. 12–22. The same route of Calvin's thought is traced in Henri Monnier, "Le dieu Allemand et la Réforme," *Revue Chrétienne* 62 (May–Aug. 1915): 154; and Nathanael Weiss, "Les Origine et les Étapes," *Bull. de SHPF* 66 (Apr.–June 1917): 113.
52. Weiss, "Pour le Quatrième Centenaire de la Réformation," *Bull. de SHPF* 66 (July–Sept. 1917): 177; C.-Edouard Caspari, "Aux Pasteurs et Fidèles de l'Église," *Témoignage*, 15 Oct.–1 Nov. 1917, pp. 157–158.
53. For examples of the prewar intellectual duel between the two men, see Doumergue's articles in *Chrt. au XXe*: "Deux Propos," and "Une Execution," 14 July, 11 Aug. 1911, pp. 229, 263; "La Bible," "Les Églises Réformées Unifiées," and "L'Unification," 26 Jan., 26 July, 20 Sept. 1912, pp. 29–30, 247–249, 311; and "Le Congrès international du Progrès religieux," 7 Aug. 1913, pp. 264–266. Compare Ménégoz's replies in *La Vie Nouvelle* (which became *Évangile et Liberté* in 1913): "Nouveaux coups de griffes," 23 Sept. 1911, p. 285; "Intransigence fidéiste," 18 May 1912, p. 155; "Un fruit béni des principes fidéistes," 7 Sept. 1912, p. 284; "Deux Explications," 31 May 1913, p. 175.

physical bias of his master in his own theory of "fidéisme." With a play on Luther's phrase he taught that humans are saved by faith, apart from actual beliefs or doctrines. Ménégoz's colleague at Paris, Bonet-Maury, spoke at the 1910 Religious Congress in Berlin, taking as his theme "The Debt of French Protestantism to German Piety and Theology."⁵⁴ This step was too much for Charles Bruston, the former dean of Montauban, who angrily retorted that France should shake loose from its shameful and unnecessary servitude to the so-called "scientific" findings of the German "higher critics." The war simply confirmed his suspicions about the Germans' intellectual stature and honor. "They doubt the words of the prophets and the apostles and even Jesus Christ," he exclaimed, "but never the words of the Kaiser." In a similar vein Doumergue continued to inveigh against the spirit of rationalism, negation, and doubt that threatened his evangelical brand of belief.⁵⁵

Ménégoz, on the contrary, sought to dissociate the positive achievements of the German scholars from their wartime behavior. In fact, he interpreted the war as the ongoing vindication and triumph of his liberal position. As evidence, he pointed to funeral of a famous liberal pastor who was given lavish eulogies by conservatives as well as liberals, and, claiming that the French as a whole had managed to rise above their sectarian religious and political barriers, he concluded that the spirit of the *union sacrée* was precisely the spirit of "fidéisme" that he had been advocating all along: what counted was one's faith, one's piety and morality, not the specific and divisive content of that faith.⁵⁶

Thus the war ended with mixed results for French Protestantism. By and large the internal ties of the *union sacrée* had held fast, while the international bonds of European Protestantism had been torn asunder. As Monod exclaimed, Protestants had shared with Jews, Jesuits, and even atheists a common patriotism that had enabled them to surmount long-standing disagreements.⁵⁷ Within the Catholic community the diatribes of Frédéric Masson were offset by the friendliness of Maurice Barrès. Lutherans and

54. Ménégoz, "La Religion interne et la Religion externe," in his *Publications diverses*, pp. 1–4. The "symbolo-fidéisme of Ménégoz and his colleague Auguste Sabatier (1839–1901) is discussed in Bernard Reymond, "L'École de Paris," *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses* 52 (1977): 371–383; Bonet-Maury, "La Dette du Protestantisme Français envers la Pieté et la Théologie de l'Allemagne," *Revue Chrétienne* 58 (Jan. 1911): 15–27.

55. Charles Bruston, "Addition au rapport de M. Bonet-Maury," *La Vie Nouvelle* 28 Jan. 1911, pp. 27–28; "Une dualité indiscutable," *Evan. et Lib.*, 29 Jan. 1916, p. 34; and "Le Périls du protestantisme allemand," *Evan. et Lib.*, 10 Nov. 1917, pp. 236–237; Doumergue, "La fin d'un protestantisme," *Chrt. au XXe*, 4 Apr. 1918, p. 107.

56. See Ménégoz's articles in *Evan. et Lib.*: "L'Union sacrée, la théologie traditionnelle et le fidéisme," 11 Nov. 1916, pp. 282–283; "Trois victoires assurées," 24 Nov. 1917, pp. 245–246; "Il y a quelque chose de changé [re the funeral oration for pastor Charles Wagner]," 7 Sept. 1918; "A propos de la Fédération protestante française," 22 Jan. 1919, pp. 21–22.

57. Monod, "Et après la guerre," *Evan. et Lib.*, 30 Nov. 1918, p. 237.

Calvinists narrowed the distance between Wittenberg and Geneva, and, apart from a few diehards at Montauban, conservatives ceased tarring the liberals as purveyors of Teutonic heresies.

Looking beyond the Vosges, however, the legacy was less happy. Fraternal relations with the Germans had been seriously strained, and only gradually did the wounds begin to heal. During the early twenties overtures from neither side seemed to satisfy the offended neighbor, but in 1925, while Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann hammered out a political agreement at Locarno, a Franco-German religious reconciliation was achieved at the Life and Work Conference in Stockholm.⁵⁸ Thanks to the patience and persistence of Wilfred Monod and Adolf Deissmann, the ecumenical spirit born at the Edinburgh Conference in 1910 had endured its baptism of fire.

58. Nils Ehrenström, "Movements for International Friendship and Life and Work, 1925-1948," in Rouse and Neill, *History of the Ecumenical Movement*, pp. 543-578; Reinhard Gaede, *Kirche-Christen-Krieg und Frieden* (Hamburg, 1975), pp. 70-77.