THE MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

THE MILITARY CHAPLAINCY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

DEPARTMENT OF THE MINISTRY

BY

RUSSELL E. SIMMONS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE, 1937

C O N T E N T S

Chapter I, EARLY HISTORY----------1

Chapter II, MILITARY CHAPLAINCY IN THE UNITED STATES--12

Chapter III, THE CHAPLAINCY IN EUROPE----------26

Chapter IV, CHAPLAINCY CONTROVERSY SINCE THE WORLD WAR----------31

1. The Case for the Chaplaincy----------36

2. The Case Against the Chaplaincy----------43

3. Alternatives to Chaplaincy----------61

CHAPTER I

EARLY HISTORY

CHAPTER I

EARLY HISTORY

Anthropological research indicates that men have always eagerly sought the aid of supernatural powers in most of their dealings with their fellow men and in their relationships to the natural world about them. This universal faith in an outside and mysterious source of help was not confined to men's peaceful, ordinary round of life, but was found operating, perhaps with greater strength, when men fought each other, when tribes, and later nations, resorted to war in order to increase their wealth, or as the case often was, to protect their homes and possessions from attack by invading marauding bands or armies. Holy men, or medicine men, of the warring tribes were delegated to make appropriate sacrifices and to perform special rituals in order to align the god or gods on their side for the ensuing conflict. In more remote parts of the world today there may still be found the primitive methods of gaining the favor and the help of the tribal god for any proposed warlike undertaking.

The history of early Greece and Rome gives us accounts of the function of the priesthood in times of military activity. The augurs and the haruspices of those early times examined the entrails of animals, therein seeing omens of success or defeat in a military campaign. Other prognostications were based upon the flight of birds or upon interpretations of the signs of the heavens. Then as now no army would venture into the battle-field without first enlisting the mysterious agencies of divine

might.

The Book of Exodus shows us that the Hebrews also relied upon this method of ensuring military victories, for it relates that their priests always accompanied the armies on their expeditions. Led by the Lord God of Hosts, they went from Egypt in the vanguard of the armed forces, for their God, being a God of battles as well as a God of peace, it followed that they were to be his representatives in action, if not actually to carry him into the hostilities. We find these primitive chaplains before the walls of Jericho when the Hebrews were forcing their way into the Promised Land. All of the armed men were required to pass before the priests who were exhibiting the Ark of Jehovah. "They were the custodians of the divine relics--the tables of the law, and Aaron's rod that budded."[1] According to the legend, the walls of the city fell after these embodiments of heavenly power had been carried about the city seven times. Thus was the power of Jahveh demonstrated on the side of the right! This is a typical instance of the early use of the priestly function in times of military hostilities. The priest was expected to enlist divine favor, to call down the magic of heaven; and if we are to believe this legend-history, he was usually successful. At least occasions wherein failure and defeat resulted are rarely referred to.

The term "chaplain" which is applied today to the representatives of religion who accompany an army preceded historically the special duties which modern military chaplains discharge. The exact sequence in the genesis and application of

---

[1] Henry Bradford Washburn, D.D., The Army Chaplain, Papers of the American Society of Church History, Second Series, Vol. VII (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1923), p. 3.

the word is not quite clear. "Chaplain" is derived from the Latin word "capella" or "cappa", which means a cloak. Capella is generally recognized as pertaining to the cape or cloak of St. Martin of Tours (about 316-391). According to the story, young Martin, while a soldier of Julian, saw a beggar standing in the cold outside the city gate of Amiens in Gaul. Taking pity on the wretched creature, Martin divided his ample cloak and gave half of it to the beggar. The remnant of Martin's cloak became the sacred relic which has been preserved at Tours. The simple but devout Christians of that time were quick to read religious significance into ordinary events. Was it not true that Christ had appeared in the guise of a beggar, and was it not Christ who wore the cloak? After Martin had lived as a soldier, and later as a bishop, the remains of his cloak were guarded with scrupulous care. A special building was set aside for its preservation and two men were appointed to be its guardians. As time went on, the capella, or cloak, gave its name to the building which housed it, and even to the priests in charge. The shrine of St. Martin was very popular, and the faithful made pilgrimages to it, coming from all over Western Europe. Largely due to these pilgrimages of the devout, the capella became well-known and became so associated with the institution which preserved it, that both meanings came to rest in the same word.

The connection of the capella with the army hangs by a slender thread. It seems that the legends surrounding the relic and its owner, rather than the actual relic itself, connected Martin in a symbolic way with the army. Of course, Martin was a Roman soldier when the incident of the division of his cloak took place; yet, he was not a soldier in his heart. Martin was

of a mystical, religious turn of mind, and as soon as the opportunity presented itself, he abandoned the camp for the cloister and gave his life to the service of the church.

In the early days of the Greek Empire the office of chaplain was recognized, for history tells us that about 295 A.D., officials were being appointed in the palace of the Byzantine Emperors. This was when the Domestici were made commanders-in-chief of the army, and were the first civil and military officers of the empire. In the later days of the Byzantine Emperors, chaplains were given a semi-military office and were a part of the immediate personal retinue of the sovereigns, ever ready to minister to their spiritual needs. This practice later extended to the Western Empire and to the courts of petty Princes and Knights, continuing until after the Reformation.

But it was the Frankish kings who really established the army chaplaincy. Soon after the shrine of St. Martin had become famous, the cloak became imbued with supernatural power and virtue. One tradition holds that for a long time the Frankish kings actually wore St. Martin's cloak into battle, but finally laid it aside to prevent its being damaged and desecrated in the fray. At any rate, about the sixth century, the relic was taken into battle by the Franks. The two custodians were expected to carry the casket containing the relic to the field of battle, and in so doing to secure the cooperation of God through the protection of their patron saint. During the conflict, the relic was carried by its two unarmed protectors directly behind the standard. In this way the soldiers were strengthened by the heavenly presence and were able to fight more bravely and more hopefully. During intermissions in the fighting, the sacred relic was kept in a tent in which the mass or divine service of

worship was held. One theory is that the chaplains were so called because of this canopy or large cloak in which the relic was sheltered. Be that as it may, this tent itself became known as "capella", and hence the word "chapel." During the course of time, the name "capellanus" was generally applied to all custodians of sacred relics preserved in royal chapels, and the office slowly extended its range. The "capellani" soon acquired spiritual jurisdiction and increased greatly in number. Later an arch-chaplain was appointed to regulate the order, and from the time of Charlemagne, he was a high prelate, a bishop or an abbot, and an important personage in the realm. In France, the arch-chaplain was "grand-almoner", and both in France and the Holy Roman Empire, he was also the high chancellor of the government. From about this time on, all priests with benefices neither parochial nor quasi-parochial, those conducting religious services in private homes, or the courts of the nobles, those attached to hospices, or hospitals, those on troop ships, etc., were known as chaplains.

Chaplains constituted an important part of the army of Charlemagne, as did they also of the armed forces of later kings and emperors. The chaplain's duty was to celebrate the mass in the field before the battle, and though these chaplains were ever present, they were not officially members of the army; rather they belonged to the personal retinue of the royal person. They accompanied him in his warring adventures as well as on his peaceful missions. Charlemagne soon recognized the importance of the chaplain who carried the relics into battle, and he decreed that all chaplains should carry arms into conflict. It was not that the chaplain should become a belligerent, but he was to be armed so that he might better protect the sacred

tokens. The chaplains' arms were primarily for the protection of their sacred charge and not for their own personal safety.

In the time of the later Crusades, the chaplain's status was changed. He was often an officer of the military orders such as the Knights Templar, and the Knights of Malta or Hospitallers, and such chaplains were granted high military rank which was in keeping with their knighthood or assignments. Frequently, the chaplain was the active holder of one of the most exalted military commands, as well as an ecclesiastic of the princely retinue. The conception of the chaplain as a vital part of the staff of a military command had in a short time come to prevail throughout the entire Western Empire, and chaplains were found among the retainers of petty feudal barons and knights as well as with the larger forces of the kings. This state of affairs continued for a long time after the German Reformation. "The association of the chaplain with the military forces of the warring nobility led to the natural development that every other military leader must be attended by his ecclesiastic, whether it be the King of France with his Cardinal Richelieu, Cromwell with his fighting exhorter, or even Robin Hood with the miscreant Friar Tuck."[1] It is not strange, therefore, that careful provision was made for chaplains in the military regulations of Great Britain, and there is quite accurate information on chaplains associated with the early colonizing expeditions that came to America. There was Chaplain Hunt, who ministered to the early Jamestown settlers under the command of Admiral Newport, and Chaplain Francis Fletcher who was the representative of

---

[1] War Dept., The Chaplain, His Place and Duties, (Wash.,D.C., Government Printing Office, 1920), p. 1.

religion with Sir Francis Drake on the Pacific Coast.

With the advent of that period of history known as the pre-Reformation, the nature of the duties which the chaplain was expected to perform underwent great changes. It was at this time that many traditional religious beliefs were being questioned by rising groups of liberals. Many modern ideas about religion date from this period. As a result, the public exhibition of St. Martin's cloak fell into disuse, and after the middle of the fourteenth century, it was heard of no more. Quite naturally, his function having been taken away, the custodian of the relic suffered the same fate as did his holy charge. Thus ended the first phase in the history of the chaplaincy and there dawned the second period of its growth and development.

This next stage found the chaplain in a role quite similar to that of the modern army chaplain. By this time, the barbarians of the West had generally accepted Christianity, and with this there arose the need for a closer, personal relationship between the soldier and God. Prior to this time the chaplain's primary duty had been the guarding of the relic of the saint; now he was to minister to the personal religious needs of the men in the army. And so there appeared, at the threshold of the Reformation, a succession of chaplains whose names are well known to history and whose personal influence has left an indelible mark on the world. According to the right as they saw it, they tried to keep the individual soldier and the army close to God. By no means had the days of superstition passed away, but the day had come when the chaplain was to take a personal interest in the welfare of the men. The first about whom we have any record was Ulrich Zwingli who entered the Franco-Italian wars as a chaplain, going into action not as a

soldier, but ever ready to meet the religious requirements of the men. However, when he met his death some years later in the battle of Cappel, he died as a soldier rather than as a chaplain.

In 1587, Alessandro Cardinal Farnese created the modern type of military and naval chaplaincy. In that year he established a permanent corps of twenty-five army chaplains called the "missio castrensis". "Since then the term chaplain, as applied to an army or navy functionary, has come to be limited in proper usage to clerics ecclesiastically or legally obligated to attend to the spiritual needs of a military or naval unit."[1]

It will be remembered that Charlemagne ordered all chaplains in his command to bear arms. The Jesuits take pride in the fact that it was their order which freed the chaplain from this military duty. Apparently, it had been the universal custom for chaplains to bear arms; otherwise, the Jesuits would not have made so much of the issue. The real motive behind their demand is not known. It may have been that they took this step in order that the chaplain might be free to devote himself entirely to his spiritual duties; or they may have been moved by the desire to return to an earlier Christian custom which insisted that the chaplain should represent the ideal ethic and not subject his religious faith to compromises with the world. However that may be, it is true that the Jesuits reintroduced a custom which since has had almost universal Catholic approval and application.

It is doubtful if any of the armies engaged in the Thirty Years' War did without chaplains. The inestimable service that religion could render to the army was being recognized, and the

---

[1] Dom Aidan Henry Germain, Catholic Military and Naval Chaplains 1776-1917 (Washington, D.C.: A Dissertation for Phd., Introduction), 1929.

generals on all sides were careful to see that the men in their command had the benefits of moral stimulus and spiritual comfort which came with the chaplain's ministrations. Gustavus Adolphus saw the value of an army that was sound morally and spiritually, as well as on one that could move rapidly. He prohibited duelling among the soldiers and he forbade his troops to lay waste the country through which they passed. To strengthen his purposes, he appointed a chaplain-general and two chaplains in each regiment. To Fabritius, the chaplain-general, was given full direction of the religious department and the responsibility for the morale of the army. A very close relationship existed between Gustavus Adolphus and Fabritius. They held frequent conferences and the king revealed all of his plans to his chaplain and sought his advice. It was to Fabritius that Adolphus confided his premonition of death as he waited for the opening gun of the battle of Lutzen. Gustavus Adolphus was a sincere religious man, and Fabritius was encouraged by him to offer up prayers and to sing hymns with the troops before they went into action. Fabritius' religious work was not confined to periods of battle, for we find that his influence was ever-present between times of conflict.

The Romanist chaplains were no less conspicuous in the Thirty Years' War. Naegele describes the life of the chaplain in his book, Benedict Rauh Von Wiblingen. If Rauh's status was typical, it is evident that the chaplain-general was an appointee of the commanding officer who acted upon the receipt of papers of permission from the Pope. Rauh and other Roman Catholic chaplains were not subject to the bishop of the diocese through which the army might be passing, but were responsible to an army bishop especially appointed by the Pope. An excerpt from

Naegele's book reveals the soldiers' attitude toward Rauh and his service to the army: "He (Rauh) was so popular in camp that the men carried him on their shoulders. The generals confided in him the secrets of their hearts, sought his advice, imparted to him the plans of their campaigns, and the movements of their armies, and nothing of moment was undertaken until after it had been laid before the general-vicar. He prayed with the men before going into action; during the battle he cared for the fallen; he never ceased praying, like a second Moses, until his army had won the victory. Freiburg had him to thank that it was delivered from the enemy."[1]

---

[1]Washburn, op. cit., p. 13.

CHAPTER II

MILITARY CHAPLAINCY IN THE UNITED STATES

CHAPTER II

MILITARY CHAPLAINCY IN THE UNITED STATES

The chaplaincy in the United States took form in the very beginnings of our national life, in the Revolutionary war when General Washington issued the call to the colors to all men, including the gentlemen of the cloth. Like the surgeons, most of the chaplains served in the army under contract for periods of six months or a year. Actual commissions from the government were not given to either chaplains or surgeons under short-term contracts. When the Revolution broke, many clergymen accompanied their fighting parishioners and went into action with them. Many seemed to have no credentials apart from their willingness to give their services though some chaplains did get a commission from the governors of the colonies in which they lived. Those chaplains who had enlisted for the duration of the war apparently received commissions from the authorities of the national army. Chaplains assigned to a brigade headquarters were given the allowance of a major, but had no actual rank. The annals of this stirring period in the country's early history show that many of the best-known ministers of that day took their turn with the troops at the front and ministered to those in the hospitals and prisons.

Washington had a great respect for the chaplain's function in the army; in fact, during the French and Indian War, he had urged their appointment in the British army. He realized the necessity of the chaplain's work and the equal need of attracting more and better clergymen to the army in that period of

crisis. Accordingly, he wrote to the Continental Congress on Dec. 31, 1775, as follows:

> I have long had it in my mind to mention it to Congress, that frequently applications have been made to me respecting the chaplain's pay, which is too small to encourage men of abilities. Some of them who have left their flocks are obliged to pay the parson acting for them more than they receive. I need not point out the great utility of gentlemen, whose lives and conversation are exceptionable, being employed in that service in the army. There are two ways of making it worthy the attention of such. One is advancement in their pay; the other that one chaplain be appointed to two regiments. This last can be done without inconvenience. I beg leave to recommend this latter to Congress, whose sentiments hereon I shall impatiently expect.[1]

Many of Washington's General Orders referred to the chaplaincy question as it pertained to the Continental Army. On July 9, 1776, he wrote:

> The Honorable Continental Congress having been pleased to allow a Chaplain to each regiment, with the pay of thirty-three dollars and one-third per month, the Colonels or Commanding-officers of each regiment are directed to procure Chaplains accordingly:--persons of good character and exemplary lives, and to see that all inferior officers and soldiers pay them a suitable respect. The blessing and protection of Heaven are at all times necessary, but especially so in times of public distress and danger. The General hopes and trusts that every officer and man will endeavor so live and act as becomes a Christian soldier; defending the dearest rights and liberties of his country.[2]

In regard to the holding of religious services, Washington again writes a year or so later, Oct. 7, 1777:

> The situation of the Army frequently not admitting of the regular performance of Divine service on Sundays, the Chaplains of the Army are forthwith to meet together and agree on some method of performing it at other times, which method they will make known to the Commander-in-Chief.[3]

---

[1] Henry Bradford Washburn, D.D., The Army Chaplain, Papers of the American Society of Church History, Second Series, Vol. VII (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1923), p. 15.

[2] J. B. Ketchum, ACtive Service (U.S. Army Aid Assn., 1897), p. 9

[3] Ibid., p. 9

The deportment of these Revolutionary chaplains gives ample justification for the esteem in which Washington held them. Their bravery and courage and self-sacrifice have never been excelled by chaplains of earlier or later wars. Samuel Spring shared with his men the awful privation and man-killing hardships of the unhappy winter expedition to Quebec. The food supply being nearly exhausted, he drank soup made of boiled moccasins, following the meager diet with a sermon to restore hope and confidence in the men whose spirits were being beaten down by the spectre of despair and defeat. Thomas Allen held two positions at once. He went into action with his men, ministered to the wounded and the dying, and then returned to his parish in time for the Sunday service. Many thought that he was not following all of the Jesuit principles, for he was often suspected of using other than spiritual weapons against the enemy. One of his parishioners, hearing rumors as to his belligerency, asked him if it were true that he had fought in the battles like a common soldier. "Yes", he said, "I did. It was a very hot, close battle, and it became every patriot to do his duty." "Well, but," said the parishioner, "Mr. Allen, did you kill anybody?" "No," he replied, "I don't know that I killed anybody; but I happened to notice a frequent flash behind a certain bush, and every time I saw the flash one of our men fell. I took aim at the bush and fired. I dn't know that I killed anybody, but I put out that flash."

John Gano was another chaplain with Washington's army who distinguished himself in action at Harlem and White Plains. After the fight at Chatterton's Hill, he said:

> My station in time of action I knew to be among the surgeons; but in this battle I somehow got in front of the regiment, yet I durst not quit my place for fear of dampening

the spirits of the soldiers, or of bringing on me an imputation of cowardice. Rather than do either, I chose to risk my fate.[1]

Data on naval chaplains are quite scarce, but it is known that there were chaplains on some vessels during the Revolution. It is difficult to determine exactly when the first chaplains were appointed to this office, though it is likely that it occurred sometime in 1777. Between the years 1794-98 various acts were passed reorganizing the navy, and provisions for chaplains were included in these.

It has been said that these Revolutionary War chaplains showed all the marks of the courage which characterizes a crusade, and all the unconventionality which attends a mission. Generally speaking, they were a wholly unorganized lot, for they had no chaplain-general. They were more like officers of a regiment than members of a chaplains' corps. But it was their function as clergymen rather than their rank as officers which they considered as a justification for their presence in the army. Yet, they did what chaplains are supposed to do, they did what chaplains had always done and what chaplains still do today--they manifested those characteristics of bravery and personal interest in the men, with the view to heartening the soldiers for the fighting. This they did by ministering to their spiritual needs, comforting the wounded and the dying and keeping the idea of God constantly before the minds of the men.

The organization of the army, after the United States became a nation, dates from September 29, 1789; yet it was not until the act of March 3, 1791 that the chaplaincy received formal recognition as an integral part of the armed forces. At

---

[1]Washburn, op. cit., p. 16.

that time the strength of the army was fixed at 2,232 officers and men. The chaplaincy was recognized by the creation of the chaplain's office, carrying with it the rank of major, and having jurisdiction over the entire military force. This act did not ensure the appointment of the chaplain; it merely established the office, and the President was given power to fill it should he think it necessary to the public interest. A Revolutionary War chaplain, Rev. John Hunt of Virginia, had the distinction of being the first chaplain in the army of the United States.

From this time on the chaplaincy in the American army has had a checkered history. It has been abolished and re-established many times. In 1796 the army was re-organized, with no provision made for chaplains. Two years later, another re-organization act was passed which revived the chaplaincy (consisting of one chaplain), and increased the standing army to 14,000 officers and men. A year later, in 1799, because of the increased size of the army, the chaplaincy was augmented by the addition of three chaplains. This arrangement was short-lived, for on May 14, 1800, the entire chaplaincy was abolished. Two years later, on April 12, 1802, the chaplaincy was again restored and the number fixed at eight. An act of March 13, 1813, increased the chaplaincy to sixteen, but when the strength of the army was reduced two years later, the number of chaplains was brought down to four. A complete re-organization of the army again took place in 1821, and again the office of chaplain was abolished and remained so for seventeen years. However, on July 5, 1838, the office was again revived. This act which re-established the chaplaincy provided that a chaplain was to serve at each army post, and that he was to be selected by the post council of administration, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. A candidate for the position

also had to have the endorsement of the highest ecclesiastical authority of his denomination. The chaplain was to receive a monthly stipend not to exceed $40, allowances of four rations per day, quarters and fuel. Because of the isolated locations of many of the army posts, the chaplain was also to act as schoolmaster and teacher for the children of both enlisted men and officers. Because of this addition to the chaplain's duties, an act of July 7, 1838, set the number of chaplains at twenty, to be apportioned to the various posts in accordance with their needs.

The chaplaincy again underwent changes when the United States declared war with Mexico. On that occasion, Congress authorized the appointment of one chaplain for each regiment raised for the war. As a result, an act of March 2, 1849, increased the number to thirty. In the next few years, there were scarcely any acts passed pertaining to the chaplaincy. The one significant Congressional Act fixed the pay of chaplains at a sum not to exceed $60 per month, subject to the post council's approval. This Act was passed February 21, 1857.

In the stirring days of the Civil War, a chaplain was authorized for each regiment of volunteers with the pay and allowances of a cavalry captain. This became mandatory under an act approved on July 22, 1861. The act of August 3 of the same year specified that only ministers of some Christian denomination were eligible for appointment. The next year the chaplaincy was increased by the addition of a chaplain for each of the general hospitals. At this time, some revision was made in the chaplain's pay and allowances, and it was stipulated that his rank carried with it no command.

The Civil War broke at a time of great spiritual activity, especially in the South. Religious enthusiasm and activity, how-

ever, were vigorous on both sides, among the enlisted men and civilians. In the minds of the more religious soldiers of the Union and Confederate troops, the war was a crusade. The fact that so many soldiers turned to the ministry as their life work after peace had been established bears witness to the widespread influence of a general sharpening of the country's religious consciousness. The popularity of the non-sectarian Army Church also was an indication of the power of a common cause in creating a fellowship of religion.

The religious needs during the Civil War gave rise to three kinds of chaplains. First, there were the ministers of parishes near which the camps were maintained for a fairly long period of time. The ministers of Richmond were very active among the Confederate soldiers who were stationed there. Secondly, there were the voluntary chaplains, ministers who had given up their parishes to devote all their time to the army camps. Thirdly, there were the commissioned chaplains who were an official part of the army and followed the troops into action. Many historical and biographical works have been written about the religious work in the armies of the Civil War. J. Henry Thayer, Edward Hill, Henry Clay Trumbull, and Randolph McKim have left graphic accounts of the parts they played in Christianizing the Civil War.

> Nevertheless, in all that they did there was that old element which is forever new: they tried to keep their men near God through the word and the sacrament and through personal interviews; they attended personally to the wounded and the dying; they tried to maintain a high standard of individual and corporate morality; they attempted to convey to the soldiers their own conception of the lofty nature of their mission. In these things they frequently cooperated with their superior officers who wished their men to conduct themselves like Christians, whether they were on the march, engaged with the enemy, or preparing for another world.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18

Upon the close of the Civil War, many of the war-time chaplains were retained as post chaplains. Section 31 of the act of July 28, 1866, made provision for the continuation of the existing force of chaplains, and in addition, a chaplain was provided for each regiment of colored troops. Such chaplains were also to act as instructors of the enlisted men in the common branches of education. On March 2, 1887, an act was passed regarding the rank and pay of chaplains. The rank of captain of infantry, without command, with the pay of a first lieutenant, was conferred, and all chaplains were placed on equal footing with other commissioned officers of the army in respect to retirement.

The distinction between post and regimental chaplains was abolished on February 2, 1901, and chaplains were assigned to regiments on the line or to stations occupied by troops of the Artillery Corps. The status of the chaplain was again altered by a Congressional Act of April 21, 1904, which provided that all newly-appointed chaplains receive the grade, pay and allowances of a first lieutenant, and after seven years' service, be promoted to the rank of captain, enjoying all the privileges attached to that office. The President was also authorized to confer the grade, pay and allowances of major upon chaplains having ten years' service as captain who had been recommended as worthy of special distinction because of exceptional efficiency. In 1906, one chaplain was authorized for the Corps of Engineers. This raised the number of chaplains to sixty-six, exclusive of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy at West Point, who is a civilian appointee, holding his office for a period of four years.

When the United States entered the World War in 1917,

twenty chaplains were added to the existing number. As the war progressed, the need for even more spiritual leaders in khaki was felt, and a law approved on May 5, 1918, provided one chaplain for each 1,200 officers and enlisted men, plus twenty at large. This ratio prevailed during the remaining months of the war. During the period when the United States was participating in the great attempt to "make the world safe for democracy," April 6, 1917 to November 11, 1918, 2,364 chaplains were commissioned in the three main subdivisions of the army, the Regular Army, National Guard and the National Army. Of this number, five were killed in action, six died of wounds, twelve succumbed to disease and accidents and twenty-seven others received wounds in action. The distinguished service medal was awarded to five chaplains, twenty-three were presented with the distinguished service cross and fifty-seven were decorated by the allied nations.

The World War brought with it a new development in the history of the chaplaincy. This was the chaplains' training school which was brought into existence, both in England and in the United States, "to meet the double demand that chaplains shall be at once well-informed soldiers and men conscious of a spiritual mission."[1] In England, the greater emphasis was placed on the spiritual mission, while in this country, the military training was stressed. A special training school in France was also established by the American army, "the primary and apparently sole object of which (was) to impart to the men on their way to the front a vivid realization of the spiritual opportunities opening before them."[2] How fortunate it was that the war came along;

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19

[2] Ibid., p. 19

otherwise, the men would never have seen the great spiritual vistas which the mass slaughter at the front provided!

There were two independent attempts in this country which finally resulted in the Chaplains' Training School, first opened at Fort Monroe, Virginia, on February 9, 1918, and moved April 9 of the same year to Camp Zachary Taylor, Kentucky, where it continued to operate until the Armistice. One of the plans for the training of chaplains was proposed by the General War-Time Commission of the churches, but was abandoned when the Commission was assured by the War Department that nothing could or would be done. The other plan, developed by representatives of the Episcopal Theological School and of the Harvard Divinity School in Cambridge, was proposed within a few days after the outbreak of the war to the deans of the two schools. With this beginning, the plan was soon enlarged so as to include also the Methodist School in Boston and the Baptist School in Newton. Early in February, 1918, the completed plan was laid before the War Department. Coincident with this event, however, the War Department had appointed Major A. A. Pruden to the task of establishing a training school. The Federal Council of Churches became interested, and both plans were examined and explained at the meeting of their Washington Committee on Chaplains. The result was that the Federal Council threw its support to Major Pruden's plan, and the training school opened under military auspices at Fort Monroe. The plan which was adopted differed radically from the proposal of the Cambridge group. Under military sponsorship, the religious emphasis was openly neglected, while the Cambridge plan would have given special attention to the spiritual mission of the chaplain.

The chaplains who participated actively overseas were of

a three-fold character. First, there were the chaplains commissioned for the duration of the war; secondly, were the chaplains of the regular army, men whose life work was with the military forces; thirdly, there were the Red Cross chaplains. Wherever it was possible, this latter group was given commissions in the army, for the War Department wanted all chaplains subject to one authority, purely in the interest of efficiency. Overseas the chaplain corps was organized and directed by a senior-headquarters chaplain and two associates, representing respectively the Protestant Episcopal, the Congregational and Roman Churches. Each division had a senior chaplain who was responsible to this governing body.

Perhaps as never before in history was religion so mobilized to aid in prosecuting a war. "Like Gustavus Adolphus and Washington, General Pershing has shown the profoundest concern in the organization and in the work of the chaplain; like his illustrious predecessors, he has looked to the chaplains to conserve the morale of the soldiers so that every atom of their manhood may be ready for the fight, and to stimulate the religion of the soldiers so that they may look upon their work as a mission and may carry it through with credit to themselves, their country, and mankind."[1] And it seems that the Christian Churches needed no prodding to get them to fall into line. In this country the churches exhibited an unparalled effort to supply chaplains and whatever supplies they would need. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were raised so that the chaplain might have the "means for administering the sacrament in a reverent manner, and so that

---

[1] Ibid., p. 21.

he may have the resources with which to keep the minds and souls of his men on a high plane."[1] How the soldier's mind and soul could be kept on a high plane while he mowed down the enemy with a machine gun or ran his bayonet through a German's stomach is difficult to understand, but, if the reports are to be believed, it was done.

Militarists have been loud in their praises of the chaplain's work, and have considered him as a very necessary cog in the war machine. Dr. Washburn says:

> It would also be wrong to leave the chaplain without a word in regard to the spirit in which he has done his work in this last war. The records of his story are legion. He has remained without complaint in the dull training camp; he has plied to and fro across the Atlantic in the transport; he has held conferences and personal interviews with soldiers at home and abroad; he has ministered in evacuation and base hospitals; he has prayed with his men before going into action, and he has, with his men, prayed for the enemy the instant before meeting them in battle. Although he has in one instance discovered the snipers with his glasses and directed the fire of the artillery toward the right point, he has almost invariably gone into battle and gone over the top unarmed; he has laid down his life through accident, disease, and battle for the cause; he has been called into council by his commanding officers; he has been praised by them for supplying the character which wins dreadful battles; in the heat of fighting he has made it plain to his comrades that there is a Kingdom of God. He and his colleagues have vastly increased both in numbers and in power that glorious company of the ministers of God, who since the days of St. Martin, have kept the soldier aware of a loving Father and righteous God.[2]

In 1920, the office of Chief of Chaplains was created by the passage of the National Defense Act. The act provided:

> There shall be one chaplain for every twelve hundred officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts and the unassigned recruits, authorized from time to time in accordance with the law and within the peace strength permitted by this act. Chaplains shall hereafter have rank, pay and allowances according to length of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

[2] Ibid., p. 23.

> active commissioned service in the Army, or since April 6, 1917, in the National Guard while in active service under a call by the President, as follows: less than five years, first lieutenant; five to fourteen years, captain; fourteen to twenty years, major; over twenty years, lieutenant colonel. One chaplain, of rank not below that of major, may be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be Chief of Chaplains. He shall serve as such for four years, and shall have the rank, pay and allowances of colonel while so serving. His duties shall include investigation into the qualifications of candidates for appointment as chaplain, and general coordination and supervision of the work of chaplains.[1]

Because of the important contribution made by the wartime training school, Congress directed the establishment of a permanent school for commissioned chaplains on April 21, 1920. This school was first located at Camp Grant, Illinois, and four sessions were held there. In the fall of 1921, the school was transferred to Camp Knox, Kentucky, where it remained until the next autumn when it was again moved, this time to Fort Wayne, Michigan. The summer of 1924 saw the school moved again, to its present location at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The purpose of the school is "to give chaplains such special training as may be calculated to fit them to minister in a comprehensive, liberal and efficient way to the moral and religious needs of the military service, both in peace and war."[2]

---

[1] War Dept., Op. cit., p. 4.

[2] Ibid., p.4.

CHAPTER III

THE CHAPLAINCY IN EUROPE

CHAPTER III

THE CHAPLAINCY IN EUROPE

The military chaplaincy takes various forms in the European countries. Generally speaking, there are three main types existing in Europe today.

The first, known as the British type, has been the pattern for the American system as well as for the German Army before the World War. With slight changes, Italy is included in this classification. The British chaplain does not receive a commission from the King, as the American chaplain does from the President. Instead, he receives his appointment to the Royal Army Chaplains Department from the Secretary of State for War, after the usual recommendation has been made on the part of some accredited representative of his church denomination. In England, more consideration is given to denominational differences, and the chaplain is expected to care only for the spiritual welfare of the men of his own denomination and to hold services as are required by his faith. Anglican chaplains are in the majority, and are supervised and directed by a Chaplain-General. The Roman Catholic chaplaincy is administered independently by the Permanent Under Secretary of State. All other Protestant chaplains are directed by the nominating committees of their respective communions. Rank is given to British chaplains as a matter of precedence and efficiency, but no power of command is attached to it. In an emergency situation, the chaplain may not take command as an ordinary officer, as he may in the American system. (There have been occasions in American military history where

army chaplains have assumed command during an emergency and navy chaplains have taken over the command of a ship and have directed the battle.) There is perhaps more personal freedom allowed the British chaplains than is given the American chaplain, for "being under the direction of the governing body of their denomination and not under military command, (they) can exercise their private judgment as far as their own church permits."[1] British chaplains wear the military uniform, but are distinguished from their brother officers by black insignia.

In Italy the chaplain wears the military garb, but has no military title. The only military insignia are stars on his uniform which indicate the length of his service. The Roman Church has consecrated an "Army Bishop" whose sole duty is to direct the army chaplains in their work.

In France, military and naval chaplains ceased to exist after the separation of church and state. In peace time, no department of chaplains functions; in time of war, the churches take the initiative and appoint clergymen to minister to the soldiers. The chaplains are headed by a Chaplain-in Chief who is usually a Roman Catholic. However, Protestants and Jews have the privilege of appointing their own chaplains. The clergy is not exempted from military service in France, and chaplains are given no military rank. A study made in 1934 by the Church Peace Union reports that the "French people are amused by the idea of a non-combatant clergyman with military rank and trappings."[2] With the exception of an officer's hat, clerical garb is worn. The

---

[1]Fed. Council of Churches. Study of the Army and Navy Chaplaincy. A Report prepared by the Dept. of Research and Education. New York: Fed. Council of Churches, 1937. App. II, p. 1

[2]Ibid., p. 2

French Colonial Army has a clergyman permanently attached to each regiment.

The armies in the Scandinavian countries and in Switzerland have chaplaincies which represent the second main type. In Switzerland, there is no standing army, and officers in the conscripted army receive no pay. Each regiment has appointed to it both a Catholic and a Protestant chaplain who retain their clerical garb and are chosen from among the local pastors. Chaplains, however, meet with the officers' mess and are looked upon and treated as officers by men in the ranks. Nevertheless, they have no official military rank and cannot be called upon to take command. There was a time when military rank was bestowed upon Swiss army chaplains, and they wore military uniforms with the appropriate insignia. Later, this practice was discontinued by common consent because it was regarded as making the chaplain ridiculous.

In Sweden, chaplains wear ordinary clerical garb, are given no military rank or title, but do have rank for seniority of service. Most of them continue their work as pastors of local churches, for they receive no pay for their religious service to the army, and are on a basis of absolute equality. There is no chief of chaplains, though there is a private union among them which is simply a clergymen's association. Similar conditions prevail in Norway and Denmark.

The third type of chaplaincy is found in the Balkan countries where the organization of the army is similar to the French system. However, the point of difference lies in the close relationship of Church and State. In Bulgaria, Greece, Jugoslavia and Roumania a military bishop, who gives supreme allegiance to the high army command, heads the corps of chaplains

who are appointed by the church with the approval of the ministry of war. As in France, Balkan chaplains have no military rank, and in recent years, have not worn the uniform of the army. Their function, however, is the same as prevails everywhere; they go into battle and are expected to strengthen the morale of the soldiers for their grim task.

> Of all the countries cited, the United States is the only one which confers a regular military commission upon chaplains. Moreover, the emphasis upon military rank and uniform appears to be greater in the chaplaincy system of the American churches than in any other.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p.3.

CHAPTER IV

CHAPLAINCY CONTROVERSY SINCE THE WORLD WAR

CHAPTER IV

CHAPLAINCY CONTROVERSY SINCE THE WORLD WAR

After the Great War the churches in America took a livelier interest than before in the army chaplaincy. Heretofore, its organization had been loose and haphazard, the initiative resting largely with the army. Recruiting was a matter of commissioning individual clergymen who made application. The various denominations showed little interest in the affair. Most denominations, indeed, gave little attention to the matter of supplying chaplains. The Catholic Church, with its customary orderly and systematic grasping of an opportunity, placed its communion at the head in both numbers and quality of chaplains, quite out of proportion to the relative strength of their faith. Perhaps it was the Protestant fear of Catholic strategy which brought the churches actively into the picture. They united through the agency of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ. This body organized to do what the independent denominations could not do alone. Many religious tasks were going by default because of denominational jealousies and independence, but in the army chaplaincy was discovered a matter upon which all the denominations could most easily cooperate. Accordingly, a Washington office was established to direct the appointment of Protestant chaplains. The government was only too glad to give to this willing organization the responsibility of filling the chaplaincy corps in the army and the navy, and by a steady policy of cooperation, the Council soon found itself in the good graces of the War and Navy Departments.

Three successive aims were developed by the Council. First, it set about to apportion the Protestant and Catholic quotas in the chaplaincy service, and, in the Protestant quota, to assign appointments according to the relative numerical strength of the denominations. The first objective was soon realized; a satisfactory adjustment was arranged between the Catholics and the Protestants, and the Federal Council found itself in charge of the Protestant branch of the service. Each denomination was assigned a certain number of chaplains, together with the responsibility of seeing that their quota always was filled. The second aim of the Council had to do with the enlarging of the service. To this end it succeeded in introducing into Congress in February, 1924, a bill to increase the number of chaplains from one for every 1,200 officers and enlisted men to one for every 800 officers and enlisted men. The secretaries of both the War and Navy Departments backed this bill, and Generals Hines, Martin and Pershing earnestly supported it. General Pershing was in a position to know of the chaplain's contribution to the efficiency of the military machine, and he said the following about them:

> Their (the chaplains') usefulness in the maintainance of morale through religious council and example has now become a matter of history and can be accepted as having demonstrated, if need be, the wisdom of the religious appeal to the soldier. As a consequence, the efficiency program of the army has taken the religious element more deeply into account and the force of spiritual uplift has been given larger considerations.[1]

Along with their proposal for an increase in the number of chaplains, the Council presented its third major aim which was to make possible the higher promotion of chaplains in military rank. The Council's committee on army and navy chaplains said that "the most outstanding thing for which it is working at the

---

[1] Ed., "Get the Churches out of the Chaplaincy!", Christ. Cent., XLII (1924), 1493-1495.

present time is a provision for an adequate chaplain ministry and the removal of all discriminations against chaplains that they may go forward in their work without handicap."[1] Up to this time, the chaplaincy was not affected by the ordinary rules of military promotion. Other non-combatants such as the medical, dental and veterinary units had easier access to promotion. A veterinary could become a colonel while a chaplain's rise ceased at the grade of lieutenant-colonel. The chief of the medical and dental corps was a major-general and two of his assistants were brigadier-generals, while the chief of all the chaplains could rise only to the rank of colonel. Professional pride motivated the Council to seek elimination of these "handicaps" and "discriminations" for chaplains, and they asked that the grade of colonel be open to chaplains, after a certain term of service, and that the chief of chaplains have the title of at least brigadier-general.

The perfection of this friendly alliance between the churches and the War and Navy Departments, and the increasing importance of the Federal Council's activities on behalf of chaplains' recognition in the military establishment led the Christian Century, a liberal, undenominational, religious periodical, to begin in 1924 a campaign to sever the alliance of the church and the war system as represented in the military chaplaincy. It directed its campaign specifically against the Federal Council and its cooperation with the military authorities, charging that such activities are not Christian but pagan. It urged the Council, as representative of the Protestant churches, to discontinue its policy of sponsoring the chaplaincy and to in-

---

[1] Ibid.

form the War and Navy Departments that it could no longer furnish them with ministers of Christ to be put into uniform and adorned with titles symbolizing principles the very opposite to those ideals that Christ sent them forth to proclaim. It did not suggest that the services be left without chaplains. In fact, the Christian Century would even countenance military chaplains if they became such as individuals, not as official representatives of the church which finds itself with a growing repugnance to the institution of professional war-making. Should the Federal Council withdraw its sponsorship of the chaplaincy, the suggestion was made that it offer to provide the army and navy with ministers to serve the soldiers and sailors as ministers of Christ, not as servants of Mars. To the writer this stand seems to forfeit the principles upon which the Christian Century's disapproval of the chaplaincy is based. The difference seems to be slight, if there is any at all, between the Federal Council sponsoring a military chaplaincy and sponsoring a non-military ministry in the army and navy. Technically, such ministers would not be official parts of the war system, actually they would still be working "hand in glove" with those forces in society which the church is duty-bound to oppose. In civilian clothes or in military uniform, the chaplain would still be a servant of Mars, else he would not be tolerated by the officers of the military establishment.

This does not mean that churches and their pastors should not minister to soldiers. They should do so wherever possible and whenever army regulations permit. However, a Christian minister in khaki, subject to military control, is a contradictory figure that can serve neither the army nor Christ without disloyalty to the other; for army ethics are in direct opposition to the principles of Christianity. That minister who gives his

supreme allegiance to the state,as a military chaplain must do, subordinates his profession as a Christian minister,the profession highest known among men. Those who sincerely believed in the Christian message, who felt that their faith was warranted only if they tried to apply Christian principles to human society, saw in the military chaplaincy a vulnerable spot. There they began their attack on war preparedness. If the Prince of Peace were to reign, it seemed logical that the first step to take would be the complete withdrawal of the church's support of war in an official way:

> The most obvious place for organized religion to begin in its effort to disengage itself from the war system is at the point where the war system and the church come officially together. That point is the institution of the military chaplaincy. It is high time for the church to quit standing sponsor for army chaplains. Whatever doubt and differences of opinion may exist in respect of the attitude the organized church should take in the event of actual war, there can hardly be a reasonable apologetic for the unholy alliance of the Church of Christ with the war machine in times of peace. The point at which this alliance becomes formal and official is the military chaplaincy. Here is the vital nexus between the Church and Mars, by means of which Mars keeps Christian ideals and impulses in his control, and by which the church gives the lie to all her fine speeches and resolutions about the exceeding sinfulness of war.[1]

The editor of the Christian Century took the Federal Council of Churches to task for "this business of feeding Christian ministers to the war system(which)has been one of its chief and proudest functions." He began in the columns of that journal a persistent campaign against what he called "the hypocrisy of the chaplaincy", and against the institutional participation of the churches through the Council in the war system. The reason for the starting of such a campaign is not difficult to find. Usually newspaper support of reforms is a response to

---

[1]Ed., "Get the Churches out of the Chaplaincy!", Christ. Cent., XLI (1924),1493-1495.

aroused public opinion, not the initiator of it. Ever since the signing of the Armistice, disquiet concerning war as a means of settling international disputes has been evident among such people as constitute the bulk of the Christian Century's constituency. What is sometimes called "the Christian Conscience of America" was being aroused. Both from the economic and moral points of view, war's claim to recognition was being questioned by an increasing number of people. Everybody was saying, "It won't happen again", either from conviction or as an expression of wish-thinking. The League of Nations, the World Court and similar other movements led the world to believe that the nations were really in earnest about preserving peace and banishing war from the civilized world. Numerous peace pacts and treaties, and one, commonly called the Kellogg Pact,were signed, definitely outlawing war as an agency in solving international problems. The spirit of the times brought intense enthusiasm and fervor for world peace and a sincere abhorrence of war. The memories of 1917 were too vivid. It was in this setting that religiously minded people began to see the incongruous relationship of the church's official connection with the army and the church's doctrine of love and peace and good-will. As a result, the banners of reform were unfurled by the Christian Century which has continued the fight down to the present day.

1. The Case for the Chaplaincy

Perhaps the best way to approach this whole problem would be to marshal the arguments for and against the military chaplaincy, as it now exists, on opposite sides. What are the reasons set forth for the continuation of the chaplaincy in its present form?

One interesting argument is based on scriptural references. Colonel Alva J.Brasted,Chief of Chaplains, has attempted to justify the chaplaincy by such appeals. He said, "Christ honored a soldier more than he ever honored anyone else,when he said to the Centurian,'I have not found such a faith,no,not in all Israel'."[1] He quoted Jesus as saying also,"I come not to send peace,but a sword."[2] The Colonel argued that heaven itself must be organized on a military basis because Jesus had said that there were twelve legions of angels at his disposal:

> A legion in Christ's time meant an armed force of from three to six thousand men, and might have meant an entire army. Christ did not call these legions, but the point I wish to make is, that in the divine order of things, these legions were in readiness.[3]

And in concluding his defence of the chaplaincy, he claimed that if it is sinful to have an army, it is also wicked to maintain a police force.

The service the chaplain can render to the men in the army is also submitted as an argument in favor of the present arrangement. The army is seen as a great opportunity for service which the church must not over-look. The chaplains should not be considered in the service of the god of war, but rather as engaged in the divine task of curing souls. An army chaplain said:

> We still have faith in that splendid institution which calls herself the church of Christ. We cannot believe that she will refuse to be the good friend of thousands of homeless boys in military camps, to work among the sick and dying in army hospitals, to send messages of comfort to thousands of homes bereaved of their sons. In this service she will find a sacred privilege and her highest honor. In it, too, she will hasten the day of ever-lasting peace for which we pray.[4]

---

[1]Ed., "Mind of a Chaplain", Christ. Cent., LII (1935), 1368-1369.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ed., "Federal Council and the Chaplaincy", Christ. Cent., XLII (1925), 1403-1406.

The argument is also advanced that should the chaplain be taken out of uniform, his identity would be forfeited. Rev. James Greene, a senior chaplain, has stated that the uniform is not worn for purposes of "swank", but for military recognition. In his estimation, the khaki is as clerical a garb as the Geneva gown, and any propsed action to remove the chaplain's uniform is looked upon as a personal insult, comparable to the unfrocking of a priest. Another chaplain also believes that there is a decided advantage in wearing the uniform. There develops a deep sense of belonging to the organization which one would serve if the chaplain submits to the same regulations, eats at the same mess and endures the same hardships as do the men:

> During the months of the campaign together there is cultivated a fellowship, an understanding sympathy, a nearness of relation which increases the value of any service one may attempt to render and which endures through the years. If we would help men, we must live with men.[1]

In the interests of military efficiency, chaplains are considered indispensible by the authorities, and their points of view are held by the Chief of Chaplains. He plainly says that the purpose of the chaplaincy is to make better men and more efficient soldiers. And to accomplish this, the chaplain must be a firm believer in the mission of the army. He must be conscientious in his belief that a soldier must learn to shoot as well as to pray. "The gun is important, but the man behind the gun is more important."[2]

An ex-chaplain of the British Army has much to say about the employment of religion to sustain morale. Through the study

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ed., "Federal Council and Chaplains", Christ. Cent., LII (1934) 1096.

of the wars of history he has reached the conclusion that success in battle does not depend so much on the numerical strength of the troops, but on the morale. A good sword is determined not by the quantity of the metal in it, but by the temper; likewise, it is not a large measure of nervous and muscular force which makes for a strong man. Napoleon understood this well, for he said, "Moral is to physical power as three to one." Instances are taken from history to issultrate this thesis:

> The triumph of the Prussians, for example, in their late contests with Austria and France, was due less to the superiority of their arms than of their education, intelligence and religion; under Providence, these, not numbers or the needle gun, turned the fortunes of the campaign. To the same or similar moral causes, Oliver Cromwell owed his remarkable success. Fanatics or not, right or wrong in their religious and political views, his troops were thoughtful men, of strict and even severe manners; within those camps there was little swearing, but much psalm-singing; soldiers, who if they did not because they could not in conscience, honor the king, feared God. It was from their knees in silent prayer, or from public assemblies held for worship, those men went to battle, who almost never fought but they conquered, bearing down in the shock of arms the very flower and pride of England's chivalry.[1]

The official organ of the Congregational Church, The Congregationalist, defends the chaplaincy, not so much on its own merits, as it is looked upon as a necessary evil. It pointed out that the existence of an army is a responsibility of the nation and arises from the unsatisfactory and imperfect development of society itself. Until that day arrives when the principles of Christianity have so taken hold of society so as to eliminate war and the possibilities of war, it would be unwise, it maintains, as well as unjust, for the nation to recruit large bodies of men without making some provision for their spiritual welfare. Some injustice is seen in the attacks upon

---

[1]Active Service, op.cit.p. 89.

the chaplain himself:

> To assail him because of his relationship to a military establishment for which the country as a whole is responsible, seems both unjust and unwise. A chaplain who thinks of himself primarily as an officer of the army and as an apologist for militarism can be of little service as a prophet of Christianity. But on the other hand, a chaplain who feels it his duty to interpret higher ideals and a better way of living in an institution frankly regarded as anomalous, and as indicative of the backwardness of society, may do a useful and truly work in his sphere.[1]

The Congregationalist believes that the chaplain's chief aspiration should be to bring a correct understanding of the military profession to minds of all soldiers, from the lowest private to the greatest general. It should be understood by all that the army, in its highest conception, completely fulfills its function only when it renders itself unnecessary. "The better that ideal is understood, the more effective will be the chaplain's work in the development of personal character among those whom he serves."[2]

The Christian Century's attack upon the chaplaincy called forth many responses from chaplains themselves. One chaplain maintained that if one were not an absolute pacifist, there was no reason for his not serving in the army or navy in the capacity of military chaplain. There would be no place, he said, for a minister in a training camp in time of peace or in the army in time of war if he were convinced that under no circumstances would a people be justified in preparing for war or engaging in war if it were thrust upon them. Such a person would not be tolerated either as an official member of the military organization or as a civilian minister. On the other hand, if

---

[1] "Taking Christ out of Khaki", Literary Digest, XXCIII (1924) p. 33.

[2] Ibid.

a minister believes that the time may come again when his country may be called upon to preserve the priceless heritage of the nation and its ideals, it is only wise and reasonable to prepare for such an eventuality, undesired and terrible though it may be. If one accepts this point of view, this chaplain can see no moral reason why a minister should not serve as chaplain in the army of his country. This position has been taken by many chaplains, one of whom said:

> I do not see that it would be wise to abolish the regular army and navy even if the Paris Pact and other treaties were actually more than bits of paper and did actually guarantee an end of international war. So long as in this imperfect world Christians must defend their lives, property and social peace by maintaining armed forces, it seems to me logical to have the state pay ministers of religion to do what they can to make the defenders of the public welfare conscientious and righteous men.[1]

This line of argument is also set forth in William Adams Brown's book, Church and State in Contemporary America. If all Christians were agreed that military service is inherently and always wrong, since in principle it commits the recruit to possible service in war, then the position of those like the Federal Council who represent the churches would be clear and undebatable. If such were the case, the conscientious objector would be championed by the Federal Council and chaplains would be refused for service in the army and navy. However, since all Christians are not, as a matter of fact, pacifists in the absolute sense, the question of what the church's stand should be in the interests of peace becomes a perplexing one. This argument seems to be a telling one, for as long as the churches admit that an individual Christian may serve in the army and navy and still be true to his religious faith, it hardly seems consistent for

---

[1] Correspondence, Christ.Cent., LI (1934) 1179.

them to deny ministers the right to serve as chaplains. Until the churches decree that all Christians must be absolute pacifists, it is clearly their duty to provide for the religious needs of the soldiers and sailors.

There is yet another argument for the present chaplaincy. It is to the effect that the chaplains, and especially those in the reserve corps, act as an effective antidote for the wave of pacifism which is sweeping through the churches of the land. The hundreds of reserve chaplains are spoken of as having vindicated the churches against the pacifists who are described as "peace-at-any-price slackers". The Boston Transcript has seen fit to keep the public informed as to the necessity for chaplains, and on one occasion said:

> The existence of a strong body of reserve chaplains-- men who do not want war, but believe that at times there are worse things for the country than war--has already proved one of the most effective antidotes against the wave of ultra-pacifism that is deriving much of its strength from church organizations. .... Scores of reserve chaplains are on duty at this summer's training camps, they are doing their bit to reduce the possibility of war by trying to make the name and the might of the United States respected abroad, and thus they are doing far more for real peace than all the organizations that are trying to scrap the navy and demobilize the army.[1]

In affiliating himself with the army, a chaplain proclaims that his outlook is in many respects that of the army. He believes that armies are necessary, that they always will be necessary. At a conference of British Territorial Chaplains in London in 1925, a representative of the commander-in-chief of the army said to the assembled gathering:

> You have proclaimed that in your outlook on life, your point of view is, in some respects at any rate, that of the army. You realize to the full the necessity for armies.... Wars will not cease so long as human nature remains as it is,

---

[1] Boston Transcript, July 3, 1924.

and no human agency can possibly change the main characteristic of human nature.[1]

This philosophy seems to be held by the supporters of the chaplaincy in this country also if we are to judge from newspaper editorials. The Transcript of the above mentioned issue went on to say:

> They (the chaplains) are carrying the war into the pacifist's own territory, and their missionary work has done much in preaching the gospel of rational preparedness and of exposing the specious errors upon which rest the arguments of the ultra-pacifists.[2]

2. The Case Against the Chaplaincy

Let us now turn to the case against the present military chaplaincy. Due to the interest of The Christian Century in abolishing the system, much has been said and written on the subject. The opponents of the chaplaincy believe that it presents a logical starting point for the churches to begin their attack on war. Since the chaplaincy represents a formal and official alliance of the church and the war system, it would be a potent gesture if the churches would terminate the relationship as it now stands. If the Prince of Peace is to reign, it seems logical that the first step to take would be the complete withdrawal of the church's support of war in an official way. Those who believe in the Christian message, who feel that their faith is warranted only if they try to apply Christian principles to human society, see in the military chaplaincy a vulnerable spot. On this point The Christian Century has said:

---

[1] Ed., "Federal Council and the Chaplaincy", Christian Century, XLII (1925) p. 1403-1404.

[2] Boston Transcript, July 3, 1924.

> The most obvious place for organized religion to begin its effort to disengage itself from the war system is at the point where the war system and the church come officially together. That point is the institution of the military chaplaincy. It is high time for the church to quit standing sponsor for army chaplains. Whatever doubt and differences of opinion may exist in respect of the attitude the organized church should take in the event of actual war, there can be a reasonable apologetic for the unholy alliance of the Church of Christ with the war machine in times of peace. The point where this alliance becomes formal and official is the military chaplaincy. Here is the vital nexus between the Church and Mars, by means of which Mars keeps Christian ideals and impulses in his control, and by which the church gives the lie to all her fine speeches and resolutions about the exceeding sinfulness of war.[1]

The editor resents "the subtle fashion by which the war system sucks the Church's conscience into its control." In the matter of the chaplaincy, however, the subtle element is lacking, and it is so plain that any open-eyed observer might see it going on. Protest is raised against the minister of Christ accepting a status in which his profession as minister is subordinated to his profession as a soldier. The effect of this is to strengthen the military control in the eyes of the rank and file.

> What other dramatization of military absoluteness could be so effective? The rank and file see the clergyman, who symbolizes the highest authority which the non-military citizen knows, the authority of Jesus Christ and the moral law, divesting himself of that authority and making it subject to the command of the war system. The effect upon the fighting branches of the army is, of course, profound. There are ways innumerable, oblique and indirect and subtle ways, by which war maintains its place at the alters of religion, but the institution of the chaplaincy is so bold and frank a method that its very insolence is admirable.[2]

Dissolving the military chaplaincy would make the church's position on war clear to the public and to the government. The chaplaincy is plainly not a function of religion; it is a function of the war system. The chaplaincy is used quite as much to militarize the churches as to Christianize the army, and as many have pointed out, the Christian ministers decked out in the regalia of Mars do not disappoint their masters and really earn

---

[1] Ed., "Get the Churches out of the Chaplaincy!" Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1487-1495.

[2] Ibid.

their rank.

The Christian Century has repeated time and time again that if the church was actually to do anything about war, the most obvious, the least hazardous, the most revealing and the most liberating single act which it could perform would be to sever its connection with the war system where that connection is official:

> So long as this official connection exists, the resolutions adopted by the churches are hollow words. To talk of religion renouncing war or, in the words of the Presbyterian General Assembly, of making 'a complete break with the whole war system', while the church continues officially to bless war by maintaining this official connection with the war system, is to deny with the hand what the lips profess.[1]

The churches are steadily making up their minds that they will never again allow themselves to be used as recruiting agencies for the military service. Many pronouncements to this effect have been announced by various denominations. These resolutions have been very general; yet they carry implications of further action, implications which the Christian mind should explore before the day of overt decision arrives. The integrity of the church is at stake, and to show its good faith, it should be moved to action. "In the institution of the military chaplaincy we have a perfect test of the sincerity of the church's purpose not to lend itself, in the event of actual war, as a recruiting agency for the war system."[2]

There are more fundamental reasons for the church getting out of the chaplaincy. One is the matter of freedom of speech and action. Many look upon the chaplaincy as a means employed

---

[1] Ed., "Chaplaincy Question", Christian Century, LII (1935) 70-72.

[2] Ibid.

by the army to bring as many men as possible into a condition where their thoughts and actions will be under rigid regimentation at a time when they should be most free and prophetic. That this is not mere idle speculation is brought out in the experience of a minister who applied for a commission in the reserve corps. Under the heading "remarks", this minister (who had a war record) wrote, "I must reserve my rights, as a Christian minister, to speak freely on all questions relating to war and peace." At the suggestion of the examining board, he elaborated his thesis. He argued that as a Christian minister, his highest loyalty was due to what he believed to be the principles and teachings of Jesus. "A Christian, and particularly a Christian minister, can have only one loyalty in his life which dominates his every word and action."[1] He stated his belief in the anti-Christian character of war and expressed his faith in the possibility of settling international differences by peaceful means. He did not hold to the ultra-pacifist's position, for he admitted that in some cases there may be more of the right on one side than on the other. He went on to say that he would feel it his duty to accept the gage of battle if his country were invaded. After some time, the applicant received word from the office of the adjutant general of the army to the effect that due to adverse recommendation of the examining board, his application had been unfavorably acted upon. In order to discover the specific reasons for his rejection, the clergyman sought the help of the commanding general of the department who happened to be a personal friend. The following is a digest of their conversation:

---

[1]Ed.,"Christ or Caesar--The Chaplain's Choice", Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1297-1298.

Question: Do you consider that a citizen loses part of his constitutional right of free speech when he accepts a commission in the army?

Answer: He voluntarily relinquishes that right, insofar as it extends to criticizing adversely any fixed policy of the United States or any official act of the President or of Congress.

Q: Does this disability apply equally to officers in the reserve, when not on active service?

A: Yes. It would be considered equally a violation of the oath of allegiance, which all officers take, irrespective of their rank or service.

Q: Then the army admits no higher intelligence than to itself and the policy of the nation it represents?

A: That is true. If you consider that obedience to religious principles is or might be in conflict with this institution, you ought not to accept a commission.

Q: If I held a commission as chaplain in the Officers' Reserve Corps, at the same time retaining my civilian pastoral connection, should I have the right to oppose, for example, the Japanese exclusion provision in the recent immigration act?

A: It would be extremely bad taste for you to do so, and might lead to more serious consequences.

Q: If a chaplain considers it his duty, as a clergyman, to protest against some governmental act or policy which he deems un-Christian, what ought he to do?

A: He ought to resign from the service. Holding a commission commits him to support as willingly and cheerfully any order or policy which he does not approve of, as one with which he agrees.

Q: Is this only your personal view, or would it be the view of the department?

A: I certainly think it would be the view of the department.

Q: Suppose a "wet" congress should accomplish a reversal of the present governmental policy regarding prohibition. Would a clergyman holding a commission as chaplain in the reserve be obliged to approve, or at least remain silent in such a situation?

A: (No categorical answer was given to this. The general believed in the 18th amendment.)

Q: Does this not commit us to the proposition, "vox populi, vox Dei," and make us assume that the majority is always right?

A: It cannot be otherwise, or else we should have no army at all. Discipline requires it.[1]

This clergyman was not content with this conversation, and he wrote to the president of the examining board for more information. The letter which he received in reply clearly revealed the position of the military men. The clergyman was con-

---

[1] Ibid.

ceded the right to "speak freely on all questions relating to war and peace," but in the minds of the members of the examining board, they thought that this freedom be exercised as a civilian rather than as an officer in the army. The letter of the War Department was more of an apology for war than an explanation of the clergyman's rejection. The letter read in part:

> You place God above the nation, where the divine power of any people belongs if that nation is to have permanency. And you declare yourself to be the arbiter of divinity. Therein I don't agree with you. The divine interpretation of the justice of a cause which threatens to lead to war, is an individual attribute, before war comes. After that it becomes a national attribute, an attribute of the masses. In this last war, no handful of self-seeking, ambitious statesmen, or others led the several nations into war, against the wishes of the masses.
>
> The mass of Serbia demanded war; the populace of Austria demanded war; Russia came in because of mass sentiment, and so did Germany, France, England and Italy. The United States followed later because the mass of the people demanded such action. My belief is that when war is once made, divinity and national necessity merge into one; that the nation and the individual become an entity to fight for the life of the country, its civilization, its homes, its honor, its very existence; and that at such a time God speaks only in one message, "As you serve your country, so you serve me."
>
> War is not bestial and demoralizing to the individual. It seems so to some while preparing for it, but when the supreme test comes and the soldier goes forward into battle, it is with the sub-conscious knowledge that he is walking close to God, and is encompassed by a radiant halo of divinity that leaves an impress upon him, never eradicated.[1]

The validity of many of the statements in this letter can surely be questioned. The Colonel shows an appalling ignorance of the causes of war and of the way in which mass sentiment is created by just such a "handful of self-seeking, ambitious statesmen or others." The deadly weapon of propaganda seems unknown to this naive patriot. "As you serve your country, so you serve me." What a preposterous philosophy! To think that God is pleased by the sight of men fighting and killing one another

---

[1] Ibid.

is to entertain a very primitive conception of religion. Such a picture must be repugnant to every sincere Christian, for his God is a God of Love, and not one who revels in the spectacle of men murdering each other by the thousands.

As a result of the Christian Century's campaign, one minister wrote announcing his resignation from the reserve corps. He had reached the conclusion that his conscience would no longer permit him to serve two masters. He indicated that an editorial entitled,"The Chaplain's Choice," should make the issue clear for many a chaplain hesitating on the verge of resigning from the reserve corps and for many a minister hesitating on the verge of applying for a commission.

> The Defence Test made it clear to me that I could no longer conscientiously remain a chaplain in the reserve corps and forced me to resign, though I had been contemplating taking that step for some time. I am convinced that important as is the ministry to soldiers and to citizens in training, yet infinitely more important is it that ministers should keep their consciences unshackled and their mouths unstopped for the saying of those things that are necessary if war is to be abolished.[1]

Edward Shillito, in his book, Nationalism, Man's Other Religion, also attacks the chaplaincy as being a threat to the church's freedom. He points out that the supreme test of the church's freedom comes at that hour when war is at hand. If at that time there exists a relationship between the church and the state which makes impossible the unhampered exercise of this freedom, that relationship should be condemned and abolished as soon as possible. In spite of the oft heard arguments that the church should be the conscience of a people, sufficient evidence can be found to show that at times the church should step out of this role and should speak for something higher than the nation

---

[1]Correspondence, Christian Century XLI (1924) 1408.

and represent a higher authority. In our day, war may be the question which can transform our priests into prophets.

The freedom as well as the integrity of the church is at stake, and a warning is taken from the European situation in which the churches of many countries are involved in distressing complications and restraints because they have never dared to cut the ties that bound them to the public treasury. American churches have always boasted of their freedom and of their disestablishment; yet, perhaps unconsciously, we have permitted an establishment to grow up in the form of the military chaplaincy. And now that we are aware of this unwholesome relationship, it should not surprise us to find religion subservient to the state and to that particular part of the state's structure from which it derives its support. Changes are always difficult to make, especially when they affect the status of a well-entrenched group. The chaplains are not expected to welcome any change; the clergy of an established church seldom do. It is very comfortable to have an income as sure as taxes and the prestige that goes with official status. It is usually not difficult for individuals so situated to persuade themselves that the honor of religion can be maintained upon no other terms. But it can, The Christian Century maintains:

> Outside of the military and naval chaplaincy, American religion has learned to live without support by the government and to like it. The American churches, with their ability to support themselves and to maintain missions at home and abroad, are not so poor that they cannot meet the cost of the needed ministry to soldiers and sailors. And they must do it if they are to be truly free churches.[1]

The supporters of the present system of the chaplaincy have insisted that the spiritual work among the soldiers could

---

[1]Ed., "Demilitarize the Chaplaincy!", Christian Century, LIII (1936) 1416-1418.

be carried on in no other way than by chaplains who were officers in the service. The validity of this argument can be very legitimately questioned. As it has been pointed out previously, the chaplaincy in Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and the Balkan countries is comprised of civilians who find their lack of rank no barrier in carrying on their work. In fact, the efficiency of the present chaplaincy in this country is questioned because of the official status given to chaplains. The Christian Century received testimony to this effect. An ex-soldier wrote that, in his estimation, a man does not have to wear a uniform to minister to the men in the army. His experience of a year in the army led him to believe that the trappings of the army officer with which chaplains are adorned were a barrier between them and the men:

> Privates are taught from the day they enter the army to regard officers with great deference. They may not talk to the commanding officer without securing permission from the sergeant. This puts officers in a kind of unapproachable class, and that is just what a chaplain should not be.[1]

During the year that he was in the army, he recalled listening to but one address by Col. Axton, the Chief of Chaplains. He did not remember that any other addresses or conferences with chaplains were ever advertised. Most of the men, he said, found their spiritual stimulus from contact with Y.M.C.A. men who were not separated from the men by being "dressed up" in an officer's uniform.

Such was the reaction of an ordinary soldier to the role of the chaplain in the army. Many a soldier has remarked about the work of the Y.M.C.A. as contrasted with the ministrations

---

[1]Correspondence, Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1569.

of the military clergy. Another soldier wrote:

> But never did it occur to me to approach a chaplain for conference and advice. On the contrary, I remember vividly how a packed Y.M.C.A. hut at worship on Sunday would literally dissolve under the inspiration of the morning discourse. Men who were looking for bread not infrequently received stones. And let it be remembered, that some of these chaplains in civilian life were distinguished preachers. Shorn of the freedom upon which spiritual vitality subsists, they were often powerless to help the men who were in desperate need. The military machine had made of them frozen fountains.[1]

Another minister who had served as a chaplain's assistant in the navy added his approval of the stand taken by The Christian Century, and gave further evidence of the fallacious reasoning which upholds the present system. His experience as a soldier in the United States Marine Corps and as a chaplain's assistant gave him the conviction that the donning of the uniform by a minister does not "put Christ in khaki," but it does put the church in khaki. He revealed that the chaplain with whom he served had a great influence with the prussianized officialdom of which he was a part, and he was much sought after for official favors, but very seldom for genuine religious service. This minister also praised the work of civilian religious bodies which were active during the war:

> The more effective religious institutions of religious and spiritual power in the army during the war were the Y.M.C.A. and the Knights of Columbus with their religious secretaries who were the direct representatives of Christ and the Church, free from all the official and social trappings of the chaplaincy. It seems to me that when the church accepts a commission in the war system, there is at least a danger that the ruling motive is for power and social position, and that motive is no more justified today than when Jesus put the devil behind him in the wilderness.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

Another former naval chaplain put forth his views in a not too delicate manner as he indicated what happens to the personality of ministers who become naval chaplains:

> I must write you about your editorial on the chaplaincy. You see, I was one, in the navy, and it was terrible! A chaplain prays to three gods: 1. Rank; 2. Regulation; 3. Retirement(early age and good pay). The world's population is divided into two parts: 1. Officers; 2. Men. Another year and I would have lost my personality, habits of study, initiative and all religion. Now when I read a letter from a chaplain to your paper I can visualize the whole thing. He blows, he bluffs, he storms, pausing only to see that he does not disarray his uniform. I hold dear to my heart that single moment of greatness when they told me if I would stay in the navy I might get "another stripe." And I remarked that I would not stay if they put stripes up both my coat sleeves and down my pants legs.[1]

Throughout its entire campaign against the military chaplaincy, The Christian Century has continually emphasized the point that the Christian minister need not become an official part of the war system in order to do Christian work among soldiers. Not a single Christian reason can be found for it. The editor has tried to make it clear that the proposal to withdraw the official sanction of the Christian Church from this military institution involves no purpose to deprive the army of the Christian ministry. It is recognized that soldiers need the ministrations of religion, and the churches should offer their ministers for the purpose:

> But they should go as Christian ministers, not as army officers. Their own profession is the highest known among men, and should not be smothered or subordinated to any other allegiance.[2]

One of the arguments against the chaplaincy which has received perhaps more emphasis than all the rest is that it is inconsistent for the church, which has repudiated war, to con-

---

[1]Correspondence, Christian Century XLI (1924) 1633.

[2]Correspondence, Christian Century LI (1934) 718.

tinue to support war in this official manner. It is difficult to see how the two institutions can logically be linked together--"the institution of Mars and the institution of Christ, the institution of fratricidal strife and the institution of brotherhood and universal good will, the institution of the sword and the institution of the cross."[1] At one time the Federal Council proclaimed that war was the world's chief collective sin. If these were not mere empty words, says The Christian Century, how can the Council rationalize its continued support of the unholy alliance between the church and the war system; and what is more, why should it be so concerned about facilitating the promotion of chaplains to higher honors and influence in the army system to the end that it might become the "most outstanding" service to the army? Many see in this activity a prostitution of the ministry of Jesus Christ.

In November 1925, The Christian Century resumed its attack on the chaplaincy and stressed this argument. It pointed out that more and more the Christian conscience was discovering the infernal character of war, and as a consequence, the time honored position of the chaplaincy could not but be challenged. In fact, it was asserted, the chaplaincy as a military institution is not an honor to the Church of Christ, but a dishonor. The growing interest in the cause of peace has led to an intense demand that the church sever every official connection with the war system. This would mean the refusal of lending its auspices or resources in any way to further the "designs and programs of those to whom war preparation and war-waging is a profession." This growing feeling for peace and abhorrence of war resulted in

---

[1]Christ or Caesar, op.cit.

the passing of resolutions in many religious conventions. The Congregational Council,held in Washington,D.C. in 1925 adopted a resolution declaring "that the church as an institution should not be used as an instrument or agency for the support of war." Adopting a resolution and putting it into practice are two quite different things, yet it was evidently the intention of this religious body to withdraw completely the church's blessing from all military activity, in peace or in war.

With characteristic boldness The Christian Century launched its verbal barrage at the chaplaincy. It was repeated again that the chaplain is a military officer, and thus, is a part of the system of war-making. But he is also a representative of the church which becomes implicated directly in the war scheme by virtue of its sponsorship of the chaplaincy. There can be little doubt that the church is being exploited by the military machine. The War Department exploits the churches through the chaplaincy and has good grounds therein for so doing. "So long as the chaplaincy as a religio-military institution exists, with the church's blessing, it will be impossible for the church to declare that war is the direct and absolute antithesis of Christianity, and until the church is able with clean skirts to take that position, the world will hardly seriously concede that she represents what we know the spirit of Jesus to be.[1]

The great newspapers of the land have been exploiting in heroic descriptives the advantages of military training in the state universities, and the profession of arms is bring to bear its vast power to establish itself by such devices as the so-

---

[1]Ed., "Federal Council and the Chaplaincy", Christian Century XLII (1925) 1403-1404.

called Defence Day, and other holidays devoted to the glorification of things military. As a result, the conventional "set" of the secular mind has become favorable to the machinations of the militarists. The church should really be concerned with this development, for she alone can break this "set" and turn the public mind toward the Christian ideal. She can do this by refusing to have anything to do whatever with the glorification of war. It is plain that the Federal Council cannot excommunicate Mars from his insolent but immemorial place at the church's alters. That is a task for the churches themselves. But the Federal Council should see that its own hands are clean and should make certain that it is not embarrassing and hindering the deeper work of the spirit of Christ in the churches by keeping alive such an official relationship with the war interests as the military chaplaincy.

In the Lenten season of 1930, Dr.Peter Ainslee, pastor of the Christian Temple, Baltimore, occupied the pulpit of the First Congregational Church in Washington, D.C. In his sermon he expressed his views on the chaplaincy and said that since war was adjudged un-Christian by the church, it should not have the blessing of the church. He maintained that the chaplaincy was a wicked anachronism and should be abolished. "There is no more justification for being a chaplain in the army or navy than there is for being a chaplain in a speakeasy." A considerable furor was raised as a result of Dr. Ainslee's sermon, due, no doubt, to the fact that Dr. Jason Noble Pierce, the regular minister, was himself an army chaplain, and that the chief of the army chaplains, Colonel Yates, was sitting directly in front of the visiting speaker. There was at once a deluge of press comments and letters. The New York Herald-Tribune referred to

his sermon as a "blatantly outrageous slander on the chaplains," while the New Haven Journal-Courier defended it on the grounds that "we shall never have entirely done with war until such statements are received with equanimity." The way that the public felt about this matter was revealed by the fact that of the hundreds of letters Dr. Ainslee received, there were five which praised his stand to every one which condemned him. Dr. Pierce, in whose church the sermon had been preached, sent him an indignant open letter in which he said that Dr. Ainslee had insulted his country, the churches of the United States, and en masse the chaplains of the army and navy. Dr. Ainslee wrote a reply in which he apologized for the unwitting discourtesy to his host(he was unaware that Dr. Pierce was a chaplain and that Colonel Yates was in the congregation),but he held steadfast to the principles of his thesis:

> My government made one of the greatest days in history, when on January 15,1929, it passed an act which made war an outlaw. I believe Mr. Coolidge, Mr. Kellogg and the Senate meant exactly what they said. The governments of the world have concurred in it, and we must henceforth look for gradual disarmament. Now the next move is for the churches to withdraw their chaplains from an institution that is outlawed.[1]

The Congregational Assembly again considered the chaplaincy question at its meeting in 1931. A scathing attack was directed at the present system by Dr. Frederick W. Norwood, pastor of the City Temple, London. He pointed out, as many others have done, that the chaplains are officials in the army, being differentiated from other officers only by a cross. They represent the alliance of religion with the purpose of the army, and at all times they are expected to assume the justice of any cause which the mili-

---

[1]"Those Wicked Army Chaplains", Literary Digest XV (1930) 30.

tary forces are called upon to support. He emphasized the fact that a chaplain with thoughts of his own is out of place in the army. In times of peace, vague references to the blessings of peace are made, but at the same time there is implicit the belief that the army to which the chaplains belong is essential to its preservation. In war-time,of course, the chaplain must talk war, for it is his task to creat and maintain the fighting morale of the troops:

> Whenever victory is achieved--which coldy speaking means that their side has slain more than the opposing side--they give God thanks for it. Victory does not always come to the people whose cause is the most righteous, but it is the chaplain's duty to assume that it is so when his side has been victorious.[1]

How can this fit into the scheme of Christianity's doctrine of universal love and brotherhood? The engine of war goes on its mad way of destruction to its appointed end greatly aided by the chaplain. He may minister to the sick, give the last rites for the dead, work against venereal disease and other evils, yet the fact cannot be ignored that he is an important cog in the grim machine, using his prayers and exhortations instead of commands, or the cross instead of the gun. It is quite naive to suppose that a minister must actually fire a rifle to contribute to the slaughter of the enemy. The military authorities have found that it can be more effectively performed by soldiers whose "morale" is fostered.

> In this dire work the chaplain renders real service. The dull private with his gun slays his thousands, but the elequent cleric, his tens of thousands. Without his "white collar" performance the bloody business of war would be much less successful. He need employ no "inflammatory propaganda", Traditional patriotism joined with conventional religion is sufficient. He earns his right to the rank of army officer.[2]

---

[1]"Chaplains,Part of the War System", World Tomorrow XV 55.

[2]Correspondence, Christian Century XLIX (1932) 324.

Victory in war is measured by the number of the enemy dead; it is the chaplain's duty to ensure victory for his side. Dr. Norwood asked if the time had not come when the cause of Christ should be disentangled from the war system:

> Can anyone deny that the appointment of chaplains identifies the church too closely with the system? Can one wearing its uniform, taking its pay, be regarded as entirely free? Can the good work which chaplains undoubtedly do quite atone for the sinister support which their presence as military officers gives to the system which has already half wrecked the world and still threatens to destroy it?[1]

The holding of divine services is one of the duties which the chaplain is commanded to perform. Yet, if such a service is to be more than mere mummery, it involves teaching the principles of Jesus. It is evident, however, that for a chaplain to do so would be impossible; of necessity he must preach a mutilated and poisoned gospel. The chaplain tries to serve two masters; if he is loyal to Jesus he is disloyal to the army. He cuts a sorry figure:

> Then he is required to 'counsel and advise those who are in trouble.' This is a large order. Every nominal Christian in the army who awakes to the meaning of the teaching of the Master is in grievous trouble. What can that chaplain say to him? In his clerical kit is naught but cold and dismal comfort. The two flies are entangled in the same web.
> Pity the poor chaplain of gathering years, but pity more any young man of this generation entering the ministry who cannot see the stark inconsistency of the chaplain's position with the religion of the Prince of Peace.[2]

Edward Shillito has a word to say about the inconsistency of the church's position in regard to the chaplaincy. In the days when the church and state were but two expressions of the same society, a military chaplaincy offered no problem to either church or state; it was accepted as a matter of course. The modern state, however, and particularly the United States, has

---

[1] World Tomorrow, op.cit. p.58.

[2] Christian Century, op.cit. p.58.

succeeded in freeing itself from the age-long partnership with the church. The state is not committed to any common faith, for as we know, it is a union of citizens holding to various forms and degrees of Christianity and Judaism, ranging from the agnostic and atheist to the Roman Catholic, and from the reformed Jew to the preservers of the orthodox Hebrew faith. The greatest day for religion, and for the state too for that matter, was when it was separated from the civil government. If the gains made by that change are to be preserved the church is bound to refrain from pledging beforehand any blessing or approval of any action which the state may see fit to undertake. This angle of the problem borders on the arguments that stress the freedom of the church as being essential to a vital Christianity:

> It cannot let its servants be like town clerks reading as a matter of duty the decrees of the state. When war begins, the churches invoke the divine blessing, but on both sides. In the war between America and Spain Mr. Dooley pictured the praying forces going forth to war, even as the rival fleets went out; the war was waged on sea and land, and also in the spiritual world. There must be few examples in the history of the church of a nation which was prepared to condemn kings going forth to war. The prophets might do so, but not the chaplain churches. On the other hand, it will be argued that the church which acts as a chaplain keeps alive the reverence for religion, and there can be no perfect state which is unhallowed by God. But the church which is so attached finds it hard to bear its independent testimony--hard for it to be an independent witness to the Lord of the world. The church which is catholic must be as free to witness for the Name of the Most High as Isaiah and Amos were free in the eighth century before Christ. But can a church be catholic and at the same time the chaplain to a state?[1]

The late war presented a strange picture of civilization, but perhaps no more strange than the pictures painted by past wars. The Christian churches, churches of universal brotherhood, as well as the nations of the world, were divided into two camps,

---

[1]Edward Shillito, Nationalism, Man's Other Religion, (New York & Chicago: Willett Clark &.Co.,1933),p.154.

and in so doing, added more evidence to the belief that the church, in relation to the state, has not exercised its freedom; on the contrary, it has almost universally shown itself to be a nationalistic society in the hour of crisis. Few if ever have been the times when the church has separated itself from the policy of the nation and has pronounced judgment against the action of its people. Shillito goes on to demonstrate further the ridiculous policy of the Christian church:

> It has sometimes been claimed that the clergy should be free from military service on the ground that they are the officers of a catholic society. This is an appeal to our sense of the fitness of things. It is a shocking thing to imagine one representative of a Christian society using the bayonet upon another fellow-minister of the body of Christ. If that is a just feeling, it cannot be left alone; it involves far more than the calling of the priest. If he is a minister of a catholic society when the call comes for fighting men, he is no less a minister of that society in the days which preceded that hour. He is the minister of the catholic church, for example, when he is called to bless a battleship; in this capacity he blesses an instrument of war, which is only provided with a view to its use against other nations, in which the catholic minister of Christ, just because he is catholic, has brothers in Christ, nearer to him than any others can be. If the priest is not permitted to use a bayonet himself, he ought not to bless the provision of ships and guns which others will use against fellow-members of the body of Christ.[1]

3. Alternatives to Chaplaincy

Such in essence have been the arguments for and against the present system of military chaplaincy. It should not be thought that all the criticism has been negative and destructive; on the contrary, the opponents of the chaplaincy have had definite suggestions to make in regard to substitutes for the present arrangement. Dr. Frederick W.Norwood, at the Congregational assembly in 1931, pointed out the evils of the present system and

---

[1]Shillito, Ibid. p.156.

offered a plan which might be given some thought. He said in part:

> My plea is not that we should refuse to serve soldiers, either in peace or in war, but that we shall only serve then as free men, openly dedicated to the destruction of the war system. Quakers and others have shown us how to do this even in war time. We could conceivably give pledges of neutrality, as ambulance men and others do in war-time. We should not use subversive propaganda while on duty. But if they demand that we shall only serve as tied, paid, silent officials of a system that we openly, deliberately and resolutely repudiate, then our answer should be a ringing 'No!'[1]

Whenever the question of the chaplaincy became sidetracked, The Christian Century would direct attention to the one fundamental aspect of the whole problem: Is the function of recruiting and recommending Christian ministers for the military office of the chaplaincy compatible with the character of the Christian Church? The editor has laid stress upon the contention that it is imperative that this issue be presented to the Christian Church in a form which is simple, clean-cut and undebatable. A hyothetical resolution has been suggested:

> The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America hereby discontinues the function of recommending or allocating ministers to the army and navy for appointments to the military office of chaplain, and the president and executive secretary of the Federal Council are hereby instructed to inform the War and Navy Departments that the Federal Council cannot continue to perform this function or to assume any responsibility in connection with the chaplaincy inasmuch as it regards such function and responsibility as incompatible with the character of the Christian Church.[2]

This does not mean that the Federal Council has no service to offer to the army and navy because it refuses to provide chaplains implicated in the military scheme. The declaration of withdrawal from official connection with the war system

---

[1]World Tomorrow, op.cit. p.58.

[2]Ed.,"Chaplaincy Question", Christian Century LII (1935) 70-72.

should be followed by an offer to provide the army and navy with ministers to serve the soldiers and sailors as ministers of Christ, not as servants of Mars. In other words, they would be civilian ministers, paid by the church. All of this involves a great deal of planning if the transition is to be completed smoothly. In October 1936, the Disciples of Christ in their national convention at Kansas City stepped into the lead of the movement to break the chaplaincy link between the church and the state. For a long time the Disciples have been voicing their abhorrence of war and their adherence to the Kellogg Peace Pact which renounced war as an instrument of national policy. They have always protested against making willingness to bear arms a test of citizenship for aliens, and against compulsory military training in public educational institutions. For some time they have been demanding consideration for the consciences and the civil rights of their members who have moral scruples against military service. Several times the Disciples have urged the church to dissociate itself from the war system. So the action of the 1936 conference was the culmination of a series of pronouncements and courageous stands on the issue. Their resolution was twofold: first they renounced the Disciples' representation in the chaplaincy commission of the Federal Council, and secondly, they petitioned the Federal Council to abolish that commission and to cease to exercise that function. It was made clear that there was no intention of depriving the soldiers and sailors of spiritual ministration, for the resolution ended, by saying: "Be it further resolved that the Federal Council be requested to provide a non-military ministry of religion to men in the armed services at the church's expence and under their own authority, without involving the church of Christ in any

alliance whatever with the state or the military system."1 It has been pointed out that besides the church's withdrawal from the present chaplaincy, there are at least three other things which must be done: first, the organization of a non-military chaplaincy; secondly, adequate provision for its financial support; thirdly, the copperation of the government in eliminating the present system and giving opportunity for non-military ministers to discharge their function.

One of the most exhaustive studies made of the chaplaincy question was the subject of a report of the Department of Research and Education at the Biennial Meeting of the Federal Council held at Asbury Park, N.J., December 9-11,1936. The report was prefaced by a brief historical resume which outlined the main developments during the last twelve years. It was pointed out that many Christians have come to believe that war in all its forms is wrong, and this new consciousness brings with it the possibility of conflict between the church and state. Many religious bodies have reflected this growing sentiment in resolutions renouncing war and any participation in it by the churches. The General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church had rejected a resolution which called for continued participation in the work of the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains. The action taken by the International Convention of Disciples of Christ has already been referred to. The Newark Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1934 enjoined its bishop to refrain from appointing any of its members to the chaplaincy, and in the same year, the New England Conference of this same denomination solicited the Federal Council "to perfect a plan and provide leadership for our various Protestant denominations whereby there may be effected, in cooperation with the

proper governmental authorities, a Protestant chaplaincy to be supervised through a board or a department of the Federal Council."[1]

In view of these many pronouncements and recommendations to the Federal Council, and of the fact that in 1932 the Federal Council declared for the "repudiation of war," the Department of Research and Education undertook their study, aiming to render to the constituent denominations such a representation of facts and issues that would point the way to desirable and feasible action. The procedure was that of the questionnaire. A total of 376 questionnaires were sent out, 265 to army chaplains and 111 to chaplains in the navy; approximately fifty-one percent of the total were returned. It is not necessary here to go into the questions asked in detail; a brief summary will be sufficient. This study revealed that the vast majority of the army and navy chaplains approve the present system in which chaplains are commissioned by the President and paid by the government. The wearing of the uniform and the insignia of rank were considered very desirable, for as they said, it helped to create a sense of belonging. The value of military rank for chaplains is highly esteemed by the chaplains themselves; in fact, sixty-three percent of the army chaplains replying indicated that a chaplain should be eligible for higher rank than the present regulations allow. Many of the replies indicated that there was a widespread concern on the part of the chaplains regarding the movement in the Protestant churches against war. Nearly half of the army chaplains stated their disapproval of the present agitation in the churches by pacifist Christians, and most of the rest admit-

---

[1]Dept.of Research and Education, op.cit. p.3.

ted embarrassment because of this new meed which is becoming officially vocal in the church bodies. There was practically unanimous testimony that the chaplains have never been censored or their utterances interfered with in any way by the military officials. However, this does not necessarily give evidence of the existence of free speech; it may mean that chaplains in general are not disposed to say anything of which the command would be likely to disapprove.

This study has emphasized two important facts which must be reconciled. There is first the salient obligation on the part of the churches to provide a religious ministry to men who now are or who may be, in the event of war, enrolled in the military service of the government. This responsibility is generally recognized by the many religious bodies. Secondly, there is the equally potent circumstance that the churches are increasingly expressing a determined opposition to war, and as a consequence, a disapproval of the chaplaincy as an official part of the military and naval establishments. The objection to it is on the grounds that it is inconsistent with the true function of the church. If the churches continue to decry the unethical and immoral character of war, it is likely that organized religion will more and more cease to support the present chaplaincy, the uniformed clergy, with officer's rank and government pay. Hence, the problem of continuing religious service to the members of the army and navy, preserving all the functions of a religious ministry, meeting the needs of the men in the service, and yet remaining consistent with the church' true function, the church's principles and the church's testimony against war. This problem was framed in the form of a recommendation by the Department of Research and Educaion in these words:

> We recommend, therefore, that the Federal Council of Churches create a special commission representative of the Protestant church bodies which are now represented in the Chaplains' Corps with the instructions to take counsel with religious leaders, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, with the chaplains in the services, and with such other persons as may be appropriate, and to prepare a plan embodying such a modification of the status of the army and navy chaplains as will make clear that they are a part of the regular ministry of the churches rather than of the armed services of the nation. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that such a change would be in the interest of chaplains themselves. It would operate to overcome their growing sense of separateness and isolation from their own churches and from their brethren in the ministry.[1]

The committee did not go into the many difficulties and problems which such a commission would encounter. Does the average Protestant church-goer recognize his church's inconsistent stand in relation to the war system? Is the laity sufficiently "peace-conscious"? Would the Federal Council be justified, as the official representative of the Protestant churches, to take such action? Then again, there is the old problem of engaging the cooperation of the Roman Catholic Church. In the event of failure to accomplish this, would not the Protestant churches, for fear of Catholic domination in the army and navy, hesitate to make such a move? There is some reason to doubt that Catholic participation in such action would be effected, for in spite of statements to the contrary, the Catholic Church is not anti-militaristic. She sees in the military service a great opportunity to extend her influence, and it is not likely that she would willingly give it up. The Catholic attitude was voiced by Patrick J.Hayes in a letter to Catholic chaplains in the World War on April 15,1918. He said in part:

> The fair repute of the Church and the good of religion are in the keeping of the chaplain as a very precious and

---

[1]Dept. of Research and Education, op.cit. p.6.

sacred trust. The Church in army and navy has really but one way of expressing her life, her doctrine, her practice; and that is through the chaplain, who, without the impressive symbolism of temple, alter, chant and liturgy, is, in a sense, the solitary symbol of the Church in camp and on battleship. Let not then a priest of the Most High, a minister of Christ, a dispenser of the mysteries of God, be a sign contradicting himself and a stumbling block in the way of eternal salvation unto the brethren in arms.

It is this very blessed and assuring beginning that urges me, with all the appealing power of my soul, to beg our chaplains not to waste or miss their wonderful opportunity for the Church in this terrible adventure of the world's greatest war.[1]

The services of the Catholic chaplains were not unappreciated by the government as this letter from the United States Shipping Board indicates. W.S.Benson wrote at the close of the war:

It gives me very great pleasure to take the opportunity here afforded me, to give public testimony to the very high degree of spirituality, efficiency and devotion to duty which always has characterized the priests who have been chosen to represent Holy Mother Church in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy. They have been and are a credit to the Church and to the Service, and besides, have earned the eternal gratitude of countless souls to whom they have been, in reality, spiritual fathers and guides.

Most particularly have they stood out in the great World War, under the leadership of His Grace, Archbishop Patrick J.Hayes, the Chaplain Bishop. With the number of Catholic chaplains increased correspondingly to the personnel of the Navy, they kept the same high standard. By their self-sacrifice and courage in the face of dangers and hardships, they proved invaluable in keeping up the morale of the officers and men of the Navy.[2]

The militaristic spirit of the Catholic Church is well stated by a Catholic writer in Catholic Military and Naval Chaplains, 1776-1917. If this is typical of the Church's point of view, the difficulty of obtaining Catholic cooperation in a movement to abolish the military chaplaincy is apparent. In

---

[1]George J.Waring, U.S. Catholic Chaplains in World, (New York: Ordinariate, Army and Navy Chaplains, 1924) Intro.

[2]Ibid.

speaking of the activity of Catholic chaplains in the last war, the author said:

> They flocked to the standards of state and nation when our country was overwhelmingly Protestant, yet, so Catholic that all dioceses stood in crying need of clergy. That the days of the Church might be long in the land to which God had sent them, the vital necessity was that that land endure; and the pastor was needed to encourage his flock in battle to that end. More prosaically, a Catholic, and a priest, is a man, and has in common with all his fellows the instinct of self-preservation whose extension is patriotism. Far from suppressing this instinct, the teachings of our Church ennoble it.[1]

The question as to whether the government would cooperate with the churches in establishing a civilian chaplaincy is another important issue. We know that the military command wants a chaplaincy which is under its control; it is doubtful if a civilian chaplaincy, wholly free from censorship, would be tolerated.

The committee of the Department of Research and Education which made this study of the army and navy chaplaincy undoubtedly forsaw the obstacles in the way of any plan which sought to end the official relationship between the churches and the war system. Yet, in conclusion, the research committee sounded an optimistic note:

> However, we wish to say that our study of this entire question leads us to believe that a system which provides for greater independence of the Chaplains' Corps is practicable, that the creation of such a service as here contemplated is supported by precedent in other countries and that it will vindicate itself in the judgment of the chaplains themselves and ultimately of the responsible military and naval commands.[2]

This brings the chaplaincy question up to date. It cannot be denied that progress has been made in bringing the

---

[1] Germain, op.cit.

[2] Dept. of Research and Education, op.cit. pp. 6,7.

Christian churches to a conscious recognition of the inconsistency of their support of such a military institution with the principles of their religion of universal love. There was a time when but few people could see this; now the number is rapidly growing. What the outcome will be is difficult to determine. Yet, the integrity of Christianity may be lost or maintained as a consequence of this issue. If Christian principles are only to be mouthed, if Christianity is a religion of conformity, of compromise, then the church need have no qualms of conscience over participating in the military chaplaincy. But if the teachings of Jesus, the principles of a humanitarian religion, have any intrinsic value, if they are suitable guides for conduct, then the church has no choice but to repudiate, once and for all, its unholy alliance with the "world's greatest collective sin", war!

If all the implications involved in the military chaplaincy question are followed through, we are brought face to face with the question, if it is un-Christian for a church to endorse or participate in the military organization, through the chaplaincy, is it not equally un-Christian for an individual, who professes to accept the principles of such a religion, to serve as a civilian chaplain or even as a common soldier? This raises the whole problem of the conscientious objector which is a question worthy of study in itself. This phase of the problem has not been touched upon by the opponents of the present chaplaincy system; perhaps it is premature to raise it. Yet it must be realized sooner or later that the problem of war and participation in it, to whatever degree, involves not only the integrity of an institution such as the Christian church, but also the uprightness of the individual Christian's character. But reform is slow and is reached through small changes. Perhaps it is best to concentrate

our energy and enthusiasm in the common task of freeing the church from the bonds which tie it to the chariot of Mars.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

The following are examples of some of the thought-provoking letters received by the Christian Century.

Editor, the Christian Century:

Sir: Why should it be regarded as surprising that, from the governmental viewpoint, the justification for employing ministers as commissioned chaplains of the armed forces is that such chaplains are deemed valuable aids in promoting military efficiency? The principle work of chaplains is and should be spiritual ministry to officers and enlisted men, but in a country wherein any established religion is specifically forbidden by the constitution and, in theory at least, there is a separation of church and state, it would be contrary to such principles for the government to provide services of private benefit to any special class of government employees or other citizens, unless such services were also conducive to the public good. Mistakenly or not, the general welfare has by immemorial usage been regarded as demanding the use of armed forces to preserve civil order and prevent foreign invasion. The army and navy provide medical services for their personnel, not to enhance the soldier's comfort, but because a sick man cannot do the work for which he is paid.

We as Christians may deplore the use of religion as a means of enhancing military efficiency, but examples of similar attitudes toward religion are equally common in civil life. Is it not notorious that employers have been known to help support churches because of the supposed value or religion in reducing crime and in making labor satisfied? It might be embarrassing to analyze contributions to church causes to find out how many dollars are given as a result of personal religious fervor and a desire to win souls for Christ, and how many for more worldly reasons.

It seems to me that attacks on the chaplaincy strike at fruits, not at roots. If we think nationalism with its competitive commercialism is evil and brings about war as an inevitable consequence, let us disown the system as a whole and not waste ammunition on such a small detail as the commissioning of chaplains. Refusals of conferences to recommend their ministers for commissions as chaplains leaves me cold. Let us read of churches, endowed church colleges and other ecclesiastical institutions refusing income from the bonds and stocks of corporations engaged in selling war munitions, or gifts from members whose incomes are derived from this traffic. In the past, some church organizations refused to allow a saloon owner or any other person engaged in the liquor traffic to continue church membership. This

was done though the civil government legalized the traffic. The churches should make up their minds whether or not the institution of national defence by military means as practiced to date is Christian or not. If the system is justifiable, the employment of chaplains by the government is logically also justifiable; if the system is totally un-Christian, it calls for a far more radical break and infinitely greater sacrifices on the part of the church than merely to disown a few chaplains in the armed forces.

I wonder if we are clear sighted in thinking only of military and naval forces in the light of international warfare. Some of us are of the opinion that the United States will probably not be called on to engage in international war for decades, if ever, but some of us believe the relatively tiny regular army is none too large for the preservation of civil order in this era of strikes and industrial unrest. Of course, politicians soft-pedal this function of the regular army, but to any informed observer it is patent the nation has not so far advanced that the ultimate sanction for law and order is the wisdom and fairness of supreme court decisions or acts of Congress, but is the ability and willingness of the people to enforce their will by force on selfish and recalcitrant minorities. I do not see that it would be wise to abolish the regular army and navy even if the Paris Pact and other treaties were actually more than bits of paper and did actually guarantee an end of international war. So long as in this imperfect world Christians must defend their lives, property and social peace by maintaining armed forces, it seems to me logical to have the state pay ministers of religion to do what they can to make the defenders of the public welfare conscientious and righteous men.

First Presbyterian Church
Bordentown, N.J.

Roberts Williams[1]

* * * * * *

Editor, the Christian Century:

Sir: I read the article of Kirby Page, "War is Sin," with deep interest and as deep appreciation. Certainly this interest and appreciation do not blind me to his own illogical conclusion when, true to his personal convictions, he finally departs from his own major premise; nor can I accept his major premise without my own mental reservations.

But for the moment, granting that major premise and granting the major premise of the editorial, "The Chaplaincy Question," is it necessarily true that for an individual Christian to serve today in the army or navy is sinful? Certainly for me to remain a chaplain is (for me) not sinful and to withdraw might become (for me) just that. Certainly, too, few of the churches, if any, have taken this position. The Presbyterian General Assembly, the Methodist General

---

[1]Correspondence, Christian Century LI (1934) 1179.

Conference, the general synod of the Reformed Church in America, have never said that Presbyterians, Methodists, members of the Reformed Church must lose their church standing if they joined the army or the navy.

Have churches then any moral right, or indeed, ecclesiastical right, to refuse to minister to their members or to others who are in the army or navy?

I might grant--though without reservations I do not--that it is preferable to have a civilian ministry which is entirely detached from the military and naval organizations; but your editorial seems to assume that the existing form of ministry should be terminated abruptly by the churches without first considering whether there is a practical alternative. This was, of course, essentially the argument of the proponents of prohibition repeal, an argument to which, if I remember correctly, the Christian Century did not consent.

It may be that an alternative ministry could be rendered to certain military groups. Local churches might provide a ministry to men located in bases near a city. But certainly this would not be a possible solution under all conditions. The local pastor could not follow a battleship to minister to the men on board. Again, some form of civilian ministry might be worked out by agreement with the war department or navy department, or by arrangement with the Y.M.C.A. Whether some such plan would be satisfactory or even possible, is, however, an open question.

The point I would make is just this. Here is a problem that should be faced at the same time we face the other question of giving up the military chaplaincy. Should we follow your proposal as I understand it, should we terminate the chaplaincy without giving thought in advance to a substitute ministry, it would mean logically that the church had in effect declared herself to have no responsibility for men who join the army or navy. I do not grant this. If I did, I would be bound first to promote a campaign to persuade the denominations and communions to insert in their disciplines or corresponding rules of government, prohibitions against individual members joining the army or navy.

Reading the editorial, I question its factual accuracy as to the study of the whole subject by the research department of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.....

The cause of peace needs today, as I see it, needs imperatively, a drive for unity--unity, not uniformity; unity of action without prejudice to our individual final convictions. I believe that there is a length of agreement for all peacemakers; that there are things strategic and imperative that we may do together. As to the things to be done, there is little, if any, disagreement among us. I believe that when we actually unite to do these things, we shall destroy war. But again and again insistence upon uniformity, or upon the conclusion of absolute pacifism wrecks a program of promise.

I have never found it difficult to grant the moral integrity of those who go a length in pacifism to which as one man trying to be Christian I cannot go. I have honored these in their courageous position. I have cooperated with them in questionnaires and conferences. I shall continue to cooperate with them, but I do regret a militant pacifism that divides and disperses the peacemakers.

New York City Daniel A.Poling[1]

---

[1] Correspondence, Christian Century LII (1935) 245,251

My Dear Chaplain: In the movies last night I watched the christening of the Yorktown. A grand sight too. With a mighty heave Mrs. Roosevelt hurled the bottle of champagne against the carrier and the airplane carrier slipped down the ways, duly baptized. Everybody cheered.

But I failed to see you there. I know you were there, because the Times said so. I read about that a few days before. But you weren't in sight--I saw nobody with a gown or a clergy collar. That is about the only way we can tell a clergyman unless he has his hand raised in benediction or is holding a Bible. I was sorry about that. For when I had read that you had "blessed" the Yorktown, curiosity got the best of me. I was really anxious to see what happens when a ship of war is "blessed".

I wondered too, just how you happened to be invited to that ceremony. Do all warships get "blessed"? Is that part of the Navy Chaplain's regular religious duties? Maybe I am woefully uninformed, and am asking a lot of stupid questions. But, you see, a day may come when somebody asks me about it--and then where will I be?

The national guard or the R.O.T.C. may even ask me in some time to bless a gun or two, and I would not know in my ignorance where to turn for the proper ritual. I hope you will help me out, Mr. Ellis. Did you use the imprecatory psalms? Did you use Mark Twain's prayer--you know, the one that runs along like this: 'O Lord our God, help us to tear their soldiers to bloody shreds with our shells?'

So often when I don't know what scripture to read, I find myself going back to the sermon on the mount. of course, we would have to watch out there. I saw a Nazi version the other day. Maybe we could use that; I'll look it up.

I am awfully stupid about this sort of event. Of course, I have witnessed dedications where the minister spoke about "the glory of God." Just what does one dedicate an airplane carrier to anyway? You couldn't quite say "to the glory of God"--that would be a little bald. And to dedicate it to the memory of men still to be killed is a bit premature, I suppose.

I have been reading about Ethiopia. There are no airplane carriers over there, but the Italians have some very nice bombing planes. They are much like the kind the Yorktown will carry. I don't know if they were properly "blessed", but I have seen pictures of chaplains on the Italian front, so I suppose that has been taken care of all right.

The other day, Edward J.Neil of the Associated Press foreign staff accompanied a squadron of Italian planes on a bombing flight--the sort of excursion your Yorktown planes may take some day. May I tell you what happened? Down below were columns of retreating Ethiopians, says Mr. Neil ecstatically: 'Our plane wheeled, dove and thundered at them less than 600 feet from the ground, so close we could see the black men sawing desperately at the reigns of their mules... Then Francesco started pulling levers. We dropped twenty-four fifty-one pounders in clusters, and I saw at least ten strike squarely in the middle of frantic groups....shattered bodies were easily visible flying through the air. Piero radioed headquarters: "Found thousand quadropeds at zone indicated. They received our caresses. Estimated 200 Ethiopians killed, 100 animals. Rest fled, demoralized."'

But never mind, Mr. Ellis. We musn't let our sentiments turn us from the stern call of duty. Please bless us another airplane carrier, will you?

Yours in Christ,

---

1 Correspondence, Christian Century LIII (1936) 665.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, William Adams. Church and State in Contemporary America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Germain, Dom Aidan Henry. Catholic Military and Naval Chaplains, 1776-1917. Wash. D.C.: A Dissertation for Ph.D., 1929.

Ketchum, J.B. (Ed.). Active Service. Wash. D.C.: United States Army Aid Assn., 1897.

Shillito, Edward. Nationalism, Man's Other Religion. New York & Chicago: Willett Clark & Co., 1933.

Waring, George J. U.S. Catholic Chaplains in World War. New York: Ordinariate, Army and Navy Chaplains, 1924.

Washburn, Henry Bradford. "The Army Chaplain," Papers of the American Society of Church History, Second Series, VII New York.: Putnam's Sons, 1923.

* * * * *

War Department. The Chaplain, His Place and Duties. Wash.D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926.

* * * * *

Federal Council of Churches. Study of the Army and Navy Chaplaincy. A Report prepared by the Department of Research and Education. New York: Federal Council of Churches, 1937.

* * * * *

Encyclopedia Britannica. 14th ed. Vol. 5. article, "Chaplain."

Nelson's Perpetual Loose Leaf Encyclopedia. Vol. 3. article, "Chaplain."

* * * * *

"Chaplains of Future Wars," Christian Century, LIII (1936) 603.

"Chaplains, Part of the War System," World Tomorrow, XV (1932) 55.

"Chaplaincy Question," Christian Century, LII (1935) 70-72.

"Christ or Caesar--The Chaplain's Choice," Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1297-1298.

Correspondence, Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1408.

Correspondence, Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1569.

_____, Christian Century, XLI (1924) 1633.

_____, Christian Century, XLIX (1932) 324.

_____, Christian Century, XLIX (1932) 486.

_____, Christian Century, XLIX (1932) 555.

_____, Christian Century, LI (1934) 718.

_____, Christian Century, LI (1934) 838.

_____, Christian Century, LI (1934) 855-7.

_____, Christian Century, LI (1934) 951.

_____, Christian Century, LI (1934) 1096.

_____, Christian Century, LI (1934) 1179.

_____, Christian Century, LII (1935) 245,251.

_____, Christian Century, LIII (1936) 665.

"Demilitarize the Chaplaincy," Christian Century, LIII (1936) 1416-1418.

"Federal Council and Chaplains," Christian Century, LII (1934) 1096.

"Federal Council and the Chaplaincy," Christian Century, XLII (1925) 1403-1406.

"Fun and Fighting in the War as seen by a Human Irish Chaplain," Literary Digest, LXIV (1920) 65-8.

"Get the Churches out of the Chaplaincy!" Christian Century, XLII (1924) 1493-5.

"Let the Army and Navy Reject Methodists!" Christian Century, LIII (1936) 982-3.

"Mind of a Chaplain," Christian Century, LII (1935) 1368-9.

"Ministers of Peace as Ministers of War," Christian Century, L (1933) 76.

"Should Army Chaplains Go?" Literary Digest, CXV (1933) 19.

"Taking Christ out of Khaki," Literary Digest, XXCIII (1924) 33.

"Those Wicked Army Chaplains," Literary Digest, XV (1930) 30.