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"Jesus Christ does not stand for peace at any price. He stands for righteousness at any cost."
CHAPTER I

During the decade before the Second World War the American nation was in almost constant turmoil over its responsibilities in international affairs. Many of the most outspoken leaders of the time were representatives of the Christian churches in the United States, who had, since 1914, made various pronouncements on the subject.

In 1933 Ray Abrams challenged these Christian leaders with charges of inconsistency and subservience to popular opinion. Preachers Present Arms documented the statements of many of them and virtually condemned those who had supported the American war effort of 1914-1918. The attack had three elements. Before May, 1915, the greater part of the clergy seemed opposed to American participation in the war. After that time, when it became obvious that the nation was moving into the conflict, the clergy became strong supporters of the Allied cause and advocates of its righteousness. Finally, when the war had ended, the more vocal section of the clergy (at least) repented of their militant attitude and moved rapidly into pacifism.

Seeing this as a consistent behaviour pattern Abrams draws certain conclusions.

The first is the intimate connection between religion and capitalism . . . being part and parcel of the whole acquisitive society it was inevitable that . . .
the churches should have conformed in their judgements and should have been controlled by the will of the vested interests . . . .

Nationalism came to the fruition of its development during the late war. Christianity and Judaism in this country became its servants . . . .

... the clergy as a class, much to the chagrin of some penitents, took the verdicts of the Administration and proclaimed them as the judgements of Almighty God.¹

Having presupposed these conclusions in his book, Abrams is able to invalidate almost any statement by the clergy of their reasons for supporting America's war effort. His final judgement on the whole matter seems to be this: the clergy were right to oppose America's participation in World War I; they were wrong to support the nation's effort when war came; they realized their error and repented at the end of the conflict.

For his historical structure, Abrams accepts unquestioningly the work of the revisionist school of historians. He makes good use of its basic premise that America was skillfully and thoroughly propagandized by Great Britain, and that her ultimate action in entering the war was determined by this and by a lack of balancing German propaganda.

Later historians challenge the conclusions of the revisionists, and this is the first weak point in Abram's

argument. These writers feel that the national desire for peace was predominant at least until after the presidential election of 1916. Woodrow Wilson's speech for national preparedness, far from changing the national mood as Abrams implies, almost cost him the election. More basic, the whole question of Allied propaganda, its effectiveness and value, has been restudied.

It is doubtful that Americans of this period were as naive about the origins of the war as a later generation believed . . . .

The Germans had a full and free opportunity to present their case before the American public and did present it in a variety of ways, especially through the regular channels of opinion. Far from being inept and unsuited to the American mentality, much of the German propaganda was skillfully executed. In light of these statements the criticism of the clergy for their pro-Allied posture needs some reconsideration. If British propaganda was taken as true in this country it was not for lack of an alternative but through a conscious acceptance of its authenticity. This suggests, too, that those clergy who first opposed, and then later accepted the war, may have done so not because they were slaves of an "acquisitive society" or "servants of nationalism," but because they came to accept the moral judgements

---


of those few of their brethren who had been vocal for the Allied cause since 1914. Furthermore, and like the rest of the nation, the clergy were not converted to their pro-war attitude in vacuo. The course of the war called for a continuous stream of moral judgements. The sinking of the Arabic and the Lusitania, the Belgian deportations, these and other events forced many seriously to consider the moral issues and the justice of the Allied cause. The American course away from peace was not determined solely by Allied propaganda. Americans may have been naive about their role in the war, but they were not naive about its origins or its issues.

If Abrams is open to criticism through the more recent analysis of the pre-war period that historians have presented, he is also vulnerable from another side. Show that the actions of the clergy were consistent despite public and private attitudes on the matter of war and peace, and his conclusions are invalidated. Show consistent clerical internationalism in the face of vacillating public opinion, and it will be clear that the clergy sought to serve something other than that opinion.

For many of the leading figures in American Christianity such a consistent pattern cannot be shown. The roster of those whom Abrams lists as "penitents" after the first World War is impressive: Reinhold Neibuhr, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Sherwood Eddy, Stephen Wise, Charles Clayton Morrison,
Walter Russell Bowie, Bernard Iddings Bell. These men clearly followed the pro-war, anti-war pattern Abrams describes; almost to a man they repeated it in the period 1938-45. Only one clerical leader prominent during the first war and in the decades that followed shows this pattern of consistency that challenges Abrams' conclusions. He is one of the half dozen most frequently quoted by Abrams for his inconsistency and for the extreme nature of his remarks: William Thomas Manning.

Manning is clearly open to charges that something other than religious belief led him to advocate American intervention in both world wars. During the first he was rector of Trinity Parish, New York City, one of the wealthiest churches in the United States. From 1921 until his resignation in 1946 he was Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York. His work was done in that area of the country most vitally concerned with events in Europe. Then, too, he was an immigrant, coming from England to America in 1882. He was a member of the Society of Pilgrims and a staunch Anglophile. He married into a wealthy and socially prominent Cincinnati family. In every way he was susceptible


to the pressures of wealth, of position, of social status to determine his attitude in relating Christianity to world events.

Most of these factors may be dismissed. Manning was one of the first to attack the popular response to the outbreak of war: pacifism and neutrality. This was done in the face of what one historian has described as almost unanimous opinion "... that the United States had no vital stake in the war and that wisdom dictated a policy of complete neutrality."\(^6\) Supporting this, Leuchtenburg states flatly that "... neither Wall Street nor Reuters (the British News Service) played a decisive role" in leading America to war.\(^7\) This would suggest that the rector of Trinity had no great economic pressure compelling him to protest American neutrality. Accepting this we are left with only two points to explain Manning's actions: his Anglophilia and his Christian faith. It cannot be denied that the former affected the expression of the latter. It can be denied that it dictated that expression.

This thesis is intended as a detailed examination of Dr. Manning's activities and statements concerning war and peace. It will show his importance as a leader of public opinion on matters of American international responsibility;


\(^7\) Leuchtenburg, *Perils of Prosperity*, p. 30.
as a leader of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the same area; and as one of the very few Christian spokesmen of the past decades who anticipated and encouraged America's slowly growing understanding of her place in the family of nations.
CHAPTER II

During the summer of 1914 the rector of Trinity Parish looked forward to travel abroad. He was a member of a three-man commission being sent to Europe in an attempt to draw Pope Benedict XV, the Russian Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow, and the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople into the World Faith and Order Movement.1 Manning never made that trip. On June 28, 1914, Archduke Francis Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo. Five weeks later Europe was at war.

The immediate American reaction to war was one of shocked neutrality.2 The Federal Council of Churches requested President Wilson to set aside a day of prayer for peace. When he did so the Council mailed out literature which included prayers by Manning and his Diocesan Bishop, David Greer.3 Many churches responded to the situation immediately with special services of their own. On the day after war was declared in Europe, Manning began daily services of special intercessions at Trinity and at St. Paul's Chapel. He himself drew up a special form for these

2Link, Woodrow Wilson, p. 174.
3Abrams, Preachers Present Armes, p. 22.
services based on the Litany of the Book of Common Prayer. 4
Indicative of Manning's attitude, the chapels of Trinity Parish mobilized for service. Within two months St. Paul's had organized a Belgian relief group, gathering and repairing clothing. St. Agnes' Chapel and the Chapel of the Intercession worked on Red Cross supplies. 5 This was only the beginning of the work Trinity was to do in the next four years.

Other than organizing this parish-wide relief work and writing various prayers for peace, Manning seems to have bided his time, perhaps waiting for the proper moment to make his first public statement about the war. When Wilson, in response to the plea of the Federal Council, declared October 4 as a day of special prayer, the time had come. Manning preached that day on a text from Psalm 91: "The Lord is King, be the people never so impatient; he sitteth between the cherubim, be the earth never so unquiet." God, he said, is teaching the Christians of the world three things through the European war. First, the nature of war itself is being laid bare: the horror, the madness, the utter wickedness which can be brought on by human sin and error. Then, there is the clear fact that

5Bridgeman, Rectorship of Manning, p. 215.
the entire conflict is just as unnecessary as it is sinful, just as pointless as it is wicked. Finally, God is making unmistakably clear the fact that Christians have failed sadly to practice their Christianity.

Each of these points Manning developed in a way that takes them out of the ordinary and deserves some special attention. While God is showing the horror of war, this does not mean that pacifism is the only possible position for a Christian.

It is true that under present conditions, it is sometimes necessary to [sic] and right for a nation to fight in its own defense or in defense of others, but this only shows that the conditions are wrong and that they ought no longer to be tolerated. This is a position that Manning stoutly maintained the rest of his life: war is sometimes right and necessary, no matter how evil the particular events of war may seem to be. But it is also needless. Present conditions make war necessary, and as long as they exist it will be a possibility. Eliminate those conditions, and war itself might be eliminated.

Passing on to his second "lesson of the war," Manning had this point to make.

... the possibility of war can be enormously lessened by measures jointly undertaken ... when this present struggle is ended ... it would not be impossible for all nations to agree that never again shall it be in the power of any one nation to force war upon another nation ...

7 Ibid.
As prophet, he envisioned the prospect of an international army to keep the peace and an international tribunal to settle the disputes of nations.

The third point was one to which Christians are particularly sensitive. As Ray Abrams pointed out in *Preachers Present Arms*, one response to the outbreak of war was the charge that Christianity had failed completely. Like most clergy, Manning rebutted this attack in the obvious way: "Christianity has not failed, but we have failed to be Christian." There was nothing new to him in this statement; it was a reassertion of something he had said long before. Preaching at Columbia University in 1909 he had attacked what he termed the "... feminine side of our religion, as though all that is required of a Christian is to be gentle, and patient, and forbearing." This notion of the Christian religion was repugnant to Manning. He constantly emphasized that "The true Christian is one who shows in his life not only the gentleness and forbearance but also the strength and power which belong to the Spirit of God."  

---


10 Ibid.
In January, 1914, Manning repeated for a different audience an illustration he had first made in this sermon at Columbia.

Let us realize that the New Testament shows OUR BLESSED LORD Himself to us not only as 'the Lamb'; He is forever 'the Lamb as it had been slain,' but He is also the Lion of the Tribe of JUDAH, the One coming from Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah, treading the winepress alone, the One riding in triumph on the white horse . . . .

Manning constantly described a manly, vigorous, powerful religion. It was, to his mind, precisely as Christians failed to live this dynamic faith that they failed to live fully Christian lives.

Manning made only three more important statements in the few months left to 1914. Two of these, one an address to the Laymen's Efficiency Convention, the other a Thanksgiving Day sermon at Trinity, reiterated the lessons of the war and the possibility that America had a responsibility in it. "That the war in Europe is the 'mighty judgement of God upon the nations of the earth for evil and wrongdoing,' in which the United States is not free from responsibility, was asserted by the Rector in the Thanksgiving service in Trinity Church . . . ." Manning's October sermon sounded again the note of American responsibility, leading to a further possibility.

11 "The Church and Her Young Men," January 22, 1914, p. 5, Manning Papers.
We have had our part in the acceptance of conditions which inevitably lead to war. We must not complain if we are required to bear some of the resultant suffering. 13

The third of these sermons is as interesting for the press attention it attracted as for its content. It was Manning's first full-scale attack against pacifism in America.

I disapprove wholly of that sort of sentiment which condemns the naval and military of this country . . . . Our soldiers are not men of blood and destruction. They are the guardians and maintainers of our national peace. 14

Three points about this sermon are important. It is typical of the virile Christianity that Manning so frequently emphasized. It received widespread attention in the newspapers. 15

Finally, it indicates clearly that Manning welcomed Theodore Roosevelt's bandwagon of preparedness which was well under way within a month.

Manning did not give a great deal of public attention to the war in Europe for most of 1915. The United States quarreled with England over the ancient and honorable neutral right of "freedom of the seas." Germany declared a military zone around the whole of the British Isles and stepped up

13 Ibid.
15 As, for example, that cited above, and: Fall River [Massachusetts] Herald, November 17, 1914; Gloversville [New York] Republican, November 17, 1914; Wyoming Tribune, November 27, 1914.
her submarine warfare in an unsuccessful attempt to blockade the English. The sinking of the *Lusitania* in May, and the *Arabic* in August, aroused the ire of the American public. Only the latter received attention in Manning's poorly kept diary; he noted that, at a luncheon engagement, "The sole subject of discussion was the war and Germany's latest outrage, the sinking of the unarmed 'Arabic' with loss of many lives, including two Americans." At home, the preparedness campaign picked up tempo. The American Defense Society and the National Security League were organized, and in March General Leonard Wood founded the American Legion.

Despite ecumenical problems which kept him busy for most of 1915, Manning found two opportunities to speak out against pacifism. In April he was the speaker at a missionary mass-meeting in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. Never one to turn down a good platform, he restated his concept of the relationship between Christianity and the use of military force.

I do not believe that the use of force is never justifiable. I believe that there are clear cases where it is not only right, but our clear Christian duty to use force.

---


18 *Boston Evening Record*, April 21, 1915; *Springfield Republican*, April 21, 1915.
This is a clear echo of Manning's statements of 1914. Under present conditions war can be both right and necessary; it is the choice which must be made between two evils, war and the loss of truth, righteousness and justice in the world. The Church must strive to eliminate the causes of war, indeed, to end the whole system of militarism as an instrument of national policy. Until those causes are eliminated it is the duty of the Christian to fight if necessary: "... peace must be built on righteousness." 19

The second occasion to advertise his position came in November. Manning spoke at Governor's Island, as a part of exercises for members of the Veterans Corps of Artillery of the State of New York and the Military Society of 1812. By this time American distaste for the Central Powers had been fed by the sinkings of the Arabic and the Lusitania. Preparedness was the watchword of the day, but it was a preparedness to protect American peace only. 20 This, and the general public satisfaction with Wilson's diplomatic note to Germany over the Lusitania incident, brought forth a warning from Manning that more than diplomacy might be necessary.

We are in some danger ... of being misled by those who fail to recognize the facts of life ... and seem to forget there are still aggressors and wrong-doers ... whom we must be prepared to resist and restrain, if need be, both for our own sake and for theirs.

19 Ibid. 20 Abrams, Preachers Present Arms, pp. 32-36.
As long as sin continues to exist in the world some ultimate appeal to force will be necessary to control those who are not otherwise to be controlled.  

The drive for national preparedness received President Wilson's endorsement in November, 1915. In 1916 the United States approved outright loans to the belligerents, and trade quickly reached such proportions that a government merchant marine fleet was launched. Another German submarine attack brought a threat from the President to sever diplomatic relations between the two countries. Across the ocean, Britain sent its new volunteer army into the five-month battle of the Somme, while the Germans and the French fought for seven months at Verdun. In November came word of the deportation of Belgian workers to Germany.  

The Episcopal Church in its General Convention reflected the general drift of popular opinion. A resolution expressed "... cordial sympathy with the cause of the Allies ..."; the Bishop's Pastoral Letter pointed out that "No self-isolation on our part is possible ... the fortunes of the nations of the world are interwoven as threads of a tapestry ... God hates a Godless and empty peace as much as he hates unrighteous war."  

---

By October, when General Convention expressed these sentiments, Manning had gained even more widespread attention with his ideas on America's responsibilities in the war. Early in 1916 a group of mayors organized a nationwide network of "Mayor's Committees on National Defense." James Mitchell, mayor of New York, invited Manning to deliver the main address when this organization met at St. Louis in March. Six hundred American cities were represented. Manning rose to the occasion. The keynote of the meeting was "preparedness." Manning's address added a short phrase: "Preparedness—Our Christian Duty."

We do not want preparedness for war, we want preparedness against war . . . . Fearful as war is it is still not the worst thing that can befall a nation. Evil as it is, there are still worse evils . . . . We would rather face war if we must do so than prove false to those principles of justice, freedom and humanity . . . which are the foundations upon which our life is built.24

Manning had said all of this before, in one form or another. On this occasion, however, he found the epigram which served as his watchword for the rest of his life. "Jesus Christ does not stand for peace at any price. He stands for righteousness at any cost."25 This statement, sometimes in a slightly altered form, occurs in almost every address Manning delivered on matters of the Christian's responsibility

---

25 Ibid.
in war from this time onward. It summed up succinctly what he felt the Gospel said on the problem.

In this same address Manning set forth another concept basic to his position.

I believe in universal military training for the men of our country . . . . I believe in such training for its military value, but I believe in it also for its moral and spiritual value.  

For over three decades he gave his unswerving support to this issue.

The St. Louis speech received the newspaper coverage which might have been expected. Newspapers in Maryland, New York, New Jersey, California, Pennsylvania, and Canada covered it fully, while it received approving editorial notice in the Minneapolis Journal and the Milwaukee Journal. Manning had put his sounding board to good use.

Despite this widespread notice and seeming approval, Manning was not content. The nation, to his mind, was not yet aroused as it should be by the war. He made two efforts to jolt American complacency.

The first of these came in May. In a letter to the editor of the New York Times he described what the newspaper headlined "How a Nation May Lose Its Soul." Manning presented his complaint that the nation was much too content in the face of the European war, then gave three reasons

26 Ibid., p. 2.
27 March 28, 1916 and April 27, 1916, respectively.
for this complacency. A mixed population, "... including vast numbers of people who are not assimilated to our national life," was the first and least important. More vital was the fact that the American government had failed to give the proper leadership to the nation, and the nation had failed to stand for morality and justice in the world.

Where plain principles of right and wrong were involved, we have tried to be neutral in thought and feeling, as well as in act. The consequence is that our moral sense as a nation is dulled.28

This was completely in keeping with his earlier sermons and addresses: war involves matters of justice and freedom, it is caused by human sin and demands a moral judgment and action based on that judgment. Finally, the national complacency is partly a result of false teaching about peace.

Peace is, indeed, a great and blessed thing, to be inexpressibly prized and preserved by every right and proper means. But right and truth and justice are far greater things than peace, and they are the only two foundations upon which peace can rest.

May the prayer of our young men... be, not that America may be kept out of trouble... but that by God's grace and guidance America may do right and bear her true part in the world, let the consequences be what they will.29

For the 150th celebration of the founding of St. Paul's Chapel of Trinity Parish, Manning renewed the second of these charges. Since the Chapel was, and is, closely

associated with the early days of this nation, a great
many officials from all levels of government were invited
to the celebration. President Wilson was offered the
private pew used by Washington during the brief period
that New York was the national capital. When the day came
Wilson's personal representative, E. M. House, was absent,
due to a sudden illness. Manning spoke on "The Present
Crisis in Our Nation's Life." He repeated his fear that,
while America had prospered materially by the war, it had
suffered gravely in a spiritual sense. He did not question
the policy of government neutrality, but he did sharply
differentiate between what might be necessary for the
government and what was required of the individual.

Our indifference to the principles at stake in this
world crisis, our failure as a people to be moved
by deep moral indignation at some of the deeds which
have been committed may well cause grave misgivings
to those who love this land. 30

He then moved on to attack the identification of ultra-
pacifism with Christianity as "... a misapprehension of
the truth and an injury to religion." 31 The conclusion
was a repetition of his call for universal military training,
capped by the prayer

that America shall do right, that America shall bear
her fearless witness, that America shall do her true
brave part in the world, let consequences be what they
will. 32

31 Ibid., p. 5. 32 Ibid., p. 8.
Widespread newspaper coverage of this sermon justifiably characterized it as an attack on President Wilson and his policies. Clearly, Manning felt that continued neutrality would damage the ability of men to make any moral judgments about the war. This is brought out by an entry in his diary, marked July 31, 1923.

Am reading Page's Life and Letters with the greatest possible enjoyment . . . . In reference to President Wilson's appeal to us all to neutral [sic] in thought and feeling as well as in act Page says truly that as between plain right and wrong though a nation may have to be neutral a man cannot.

I am glad to say that I took exactly this position when that appeal was issued.33

Manning figured prominently in one more event during 1916. In the fall reports came from Belgium that the German armies were deporting thousands of Belgians to work in Germany. Manning served as chairman of a mass meeting condemning these deportations and demanding that the American government take action in the matter. The meeting was held at Carnegie Hall on December 15. The Rector of Trinity Parish made the opening statement. He referred to the German people who had been "... misinformed, misled and cruelly betrayed . . . ." by their "... autocratic and unscrupulous leaders . . . ." who had "led her (Germany) into crimes which have shocked and dismayed the world."34

33"Diary," entry dated 7-31-23. Walter Page was United States Ambassador to England, 1913, 1918.

Noting that the American government had protested the deportations to no effect, Manning recalled that strong diplomatic messages had curtailed German submarine warfare.

We call upon our President to speak, and we pledge to the President the unqualified support of all right thinking people of every party, creed, and race, if he will now demand in the name of America, in the name of Humanity, and in the name of God, that these unheard of outrages against the brave people of Belgium shall immediately cease . . . .

This incident seems to have been a turning point for Manning. Earlier he had not demanded any partisan action by the government, with regard to the war. He had pointed out, indeed, that official neutrality might be the wisest course, so long as it did not stifle personal and private opinion or damage the moral and spiritual life of the people. He had fought pacifism staunchly, but on moral grounds and not by a specific appeal to cases. He had called for national preparedness, but consistently emphasized that he did so feeling that preparedness was the best method to preserve peace. After the mass meeting, however, there is a change. As he commented three years later, "It was the martyrdom of Belgium that showed us the true meaning of the war." In December, after the meeting, he twice made headlines with his sermons. On the 25th he "... denounced the ultra pacifists and said that the call

of this Christmas is not for peace alone, but for peace after justice has been done."

Our government just now is speaking of peace. But has it no word to say for righteousness? The monstrous crimes against the Belgian people are going on day by day. Are we to speak words of equal approval and friendship both to the wronged and the wrong-doer? I say that it is false both to the principles of the gospel and our ideals as Americans.

When Wilson received and passed on feelers from Germany on possible peace negotiations Manning signed a petition of protest. The "Plea for Lasting Peace" warned against a premature peace ", . . . peace is the triumph of righteousness and not the mere sheathing of the sword."38

Manning's thought developed in a consistent pattern throughout this year. From the beginning he had rejected pacifism. Because of this he could and did emphasize the need for national preparedness. He admitted the propriety of governmental neutrality in the war but constantly urged the need for personal moral sensitivity to the issues involved. He came to feel that this personal moral awareness was being stifled by the failure of the government to protest effectively acts of injustice and immorality by the Central Powers. He became convinced that the moral issues had been made so clear-cut that not even the government could afford to neglect them, lest for that neglect the

38 Ibid.  
nation receive "a curse instead of a blessing." Still, it must be noted, he did not call for war, but only for stronger and more effective actions by the American government to protest German deeds.

In 1917 the war came to America. Popular opinion continued to swell in support of the Allies because of the Belgian deportations. In January the German government announced the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare. The Zimmerman telegram, suggesting a German-Mexican alliance against the United States, was made public by the American government. British intelligence revealed a German attempt to reach an alliance with Japan. Finally, on April 2, President Wilson called upon Congress to join America with the Allies against "... an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck." 40

There must have been considerable satisfaction for Manning in the response that the Episcopal Church made to the coming of war. A War Commission was set up by October, with William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts, as Chairman. By 1919 this Commission had spent over $600,000 in support of the one hundred seventy-nine army, twenty-four navy and ninety-five civilian volunteer chaplains of the Church.

40Dummond, America in Our Time, p. 244.
These were supplied with typewriters, portable altars and organs, an occasional automobile, and discretionary funds ranging from $50 to $100 per month. The Church Periodical Club furnished Prayer Books, hymnals, Bibles, New Testaments, and lesser but equally important impedimenta like cards, stationery and games. Twenty-five thousand dollars was appropriated for work in Europe, including support of a Soldier's and Sailor's Club in Paris. The Brotherhood of St. Andrew, a laymen's organization, compiled a Church Honor Roll and formed committees to insure the returning soldiers a proper welcome.41 For the Church the war was a great national project.

Manning was exceptionally busy during the two-year period, 1917-1918. His long-proclaimed stand on America's responsibility in the war made him greatly in demand as a speaker. His close friendship with Mayor Mitchell involved him in New York City politics and made him a frequent member of official committees of welcome for visiting European delegations. He served on Herbert Hoover's commission for food conservation. With the permission of his parish, Manning became voluntary chaplain to Camp Upton, Long Island, from December, 1917, until October, 1918. He remained the functioning rector of Trinity and in that

capacity planned and carried out the visit to America of Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of York. He became chairman of the executive committee of the Home Association for the 77th Division. Throughout all of this he still found frequent occasion to speak of the war, its meaning, and America's purpose in it.

Twice, early in 1917, Manning led protests over the German deportation of Belgian workers. He was the main speaker at a rally in Buffalo, New York, which resolved to

... respectfully but urgently request the United States to take such further measures as may be the more effective to stop additional deportations of Belgians and Poles by the German authorities ... and to restore to their homes those already deported. 42

Only a day or two later Manning helped draw up a resolution of the New York Churchman's Association using almost identical language. 43

In February Manning first opposed, then publicly supported, President Wilson. A private letter to Fredric Morehouse, editor of the Living Church magazine, condemned Wilson's "Peace without Victory" speech of January 22. Here Manning made clear a good bit of what he had said and was to say.

From the point of view of those of us who abhor war and who desire peace, no greater calamity could happen to the world than a peace, or rather a truce, with this power of Prussian militarism left strong and dominant.

If he meant only that Germany should not be utterly crushed . . . all would have agreed with him.

It reveals the same lack of moral perception as to the fundamental issues of the struggle and the same deadening neutrality between right and wrong which has done us so much harm already.44

Manning made a distinction between the German government and the German people in his first speech on the Belgian deportations, and he carefully maintained it from then on. He considered the war to be against only the Prussian autocracy which had misled its people. It is interesting to see that he made this same sort of distinction between the American government and the American people. What was perhaps proper conduct for the government was not possible for the individual. Thus he felt quite free to attack governmental demands for absolute neutrality when he felt they impinged on the ability of the people to make proper moral decisions. In fact, it seems he was attacking in America the first signs of what he felt had already taken place in Germany: the government-caused stultification of the moral sense of the people.

On January 31 Germany announced the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare. The German ambassador was given his passport on February 3, and diplomatic relations were severed. Manning was quick to give his support to the President in a statement to the press. On February 4

44Manning to Morehouse, February 2, 1917, Manning Papers.
he restated his principles in a sermon at Trinity. German
annihilation is not America's goal, he said. This nation
recognizes the horror and cruelty of war; it is a great
evil, to be eliminated as far as possible. But:

... there are cases in which war is right and
peace is wrong and shameful. There is a worship
of peace which means the surrender of principle
and decay of manhood. There are things which we
may not sacrifice even for the sake of peace.45

On April 2 President Wilson asked Congress to declare
war on Germany. Manning preached again at Trinity on
April 8, Easter Sunday. His sermon expressed many things:
relief that the waiting was over, the idealism with which
Americans viewed the war, and a great hope for a future in
which America would accept her rightful place in the family
of nations.

This is a war against war ... It is a war
for truth, for righteousness, for justice, for
humanity ... .

For nearly three years the world has suffered
the darkness and agony of Crucifixion. The struggle
is not yet ended. We are called not to take our
part in it . . . .

We stand at the beginning of a new age, a new
epoch for the world. Let us all be ready and
prepared to hail and welcome it . . . . May it bring
us a full realization of our world citizenship, of
our responsibility as a member of the great family of
nations . . . . Never again must there be talk of
our isolation, our separateness, as though we were a
people dwelling apart and aloof from the world.46

45 "Our Present Duty as Americans and Christians,"
February 4, 1917, p. 4, Manning Papers.

46 "The Easter Call to America," April 8, 1917, pp. 2,
4, Manning Papers.
Manning believed what he preached. His call was not one of expediency, not the response of a suddenly blossoming spirit of war. It was, as it had been and would continue to be, the call of an almost naively idealistic America that Manning expressed, a call for justice and truth and righteousness to find their embodiment in American actions, their hope in American strength. For Manning this was already a reality, to be applied whenever necessary. It was not that he believed American actions always to be right, but rather that America would naturally act whenever right was to be done and justice to be upheld.

As Christians and Americans, we enter this war... to help put down hideous and infamous wrong, and to secure right and justice and lasting peace for the world. 47

Before Manning left for Camp Upton as volunteer chaplain he managed to get involved in New York City politics. The election for mayor pitted James Mitchell, the incumbent and Manning's close friend, against John Hylan. Hylan had connections which made his candidacy questionable, to say the least. There was some talk that he was connected with the Tammany machine and its corruption. More important (to Manning) was his connection with William Randolph Hearst. Hearst was an open supporter of Germany. He had championed the policy of unrestricted submarine warfare and objected

frequently to America's sending supplies to Europe. After America entered the war Hearst continued to support Germany at every opportunity. "In New York, his political creature was . . . John F. Hylan, a public servant conspicuous neither for intelligence nor integrity." Manning joined most of the clergy of New York to oppose Hylan's election. Mitchell and Manning lost; Hylan and Hearst won.

From the time that Manning went to Camp Upton, December, 1917, until his return at the end of October, 1918, there is little that need be said. His work among the newly recruited soldiers was effective, and he was held in high regard by his military superiors. His experience at camp had the effect of confirming almost everything that he had thought. In an interview with the New York Times he spoke enthusiastically about the values of the training: "Life here has improved them [the trainees] in physique, in appearance, in manners, in morals, and in everything that goes to make a man." He wrote in an editorial for the Trinity Parish Bulletin: "Camp Upton is a conclusive, concrete demonstration of the value to our country of Universal Military Training."

---

50 Trinity Parish Record, excerpt in William Thomas Manning's "Camp Upton Notebook," Manning Papers.
While at Camp Upton Manning was involved in two sharply contrasting events. In February, 1918, a proposed Sunday parade of the soldiers from Upton was postponed through the efforts of a Sabbath Committee. Manning obviously enjoyed the sharp rebuke which he publicly administered to the committee. The next month he joined with a group which protested a concert planned for Carnegie Hall, at which the guest conductor was to be Karl Muck. There was considerable debate over Muck's antecedents, and Manning's opposition was based on his understanding that the musician was "... the open and avowed friend and supporter of the Kaiser." Whether or not this was true, the action was decidedly unfortunate, based as it was in unproven allegations about Muck. On Manning's part it was a sign of that excessive zeal for which Abrams criticises the American clergy in general.

Manning gave four addresses during 1918 which deserve some examination. Three of them may be grouped together. In March he addressed a meeting honoring the Archbishop of York on his visit to New York. In June, and again in November, he preached at Trinity. All three sermons showed a clear reflection of the rising tide of fear which the Russian revolution brought to America.

51New York Sun, March 13, 1918.
Our danger today is not from the Germans who are in the trenches. Our boys 'over there' and those beside whom they fight will take care of them. Our danger is from the so-called Pacifists, the American Bolsheviks who are seeking to break down the morale and weaken the fighting spirit of our people...

This threat was to occupy Manning's attention for some time to come. In his June sermon at Trinity he warned against "insidious propaganda" which made the Allies compare the relative abilities of their armies, this being another activity encouraged by the "Bolshevik." At the same time he called for help to Russia, lest it be totally disrupted by the "anarchists" who had taken power. In November the threat seemed even more direct. Manning noted that another danger was replacing that of Prussian militarism.

It is the movement we have come to speak of as Bolshevism . . . . We have reasons to watch the tendencies in this direction which are manifest in some high places . . . . Any in this land who uphold them [Bolshevik leaders] must be recognized and regarded accordingly.

Finally, in August, Manning reiterated the plea he had been making in one form or another for four years.

It is the hope, the prayer, and the firm purpose of us Americans that out of this great struggle shall come a league and brotherhood of nations that shall

---

52 "Patriotic Meeting, etc.," March 7, 1918, p. 3, Manning Papers.


54 "A Thanksgiving Day Address," November 28, 1918, p. 3, Manning Papers.
maintain justice, and preserve peace . . . . We hope that this true brotherhood of nations will be the good result of the war, and its greatest compensation.55

Wilson only picked up the idea for a League after 1916. Manning had been preaching on it since 1914.

The year after the war was in many respects anticlimactic. Wilson went to France to negotiate the Treaty of Versailles and establish the League of Nations, then returned home to fight fruitlessly for their acceptance. American soldiers began to return home. The whole process of disillusionment with the war began to set in. Manning concerned himself with two things. His sermons reflect the Versailles peace discussions, and his activities reflect the general concern about the returning army.

Because of his associations at Camp Upton, Manning was chairman of the executive committee of the Home Association of the 77th Division. He took the responsibility seriously. On two occasions it brought encounters with the Hearst organization. Mayor Hylan refused to attend a dinner honoring F. A. Wallis, allegedly because Manning was a guest. On another occasion Manning refused to serve on a committee to welcome home the American troops, because Hearst had been appointed its chairman. In this second instance Manning roundly condemned Hearst in a Madison Square Garden

55 "Great Britain's Part in the World War," August 4, 1918, p. 6, Manning Papers.
rally. These were relatively minor incidents. Functioning more in his official capacity Manning took the lead in arranging a proper welcome home for the men of the 77th, the heroes of the Argonne Forest, and protested vigorously (whether or not successfully) a proposed amendment to the state constitution which would have given civil service job preferences to veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War.

More important than this, however, was Manning's attitude on the subject of peace. He realized the difficulty of the task faced by the nations at Versailles. "The ending of the war is only the beginning of the task . . . . We now face the harder task of putting those ideals [for which America fought] into practical effect." That was the problem—to avoid the loss of everything for which the Allies had fought. American liberal opinion was opposed to a stringent peace treaty, and that opinion was castigated in Manning's sermons. "We want a peace imposed on Germany which shall secure full justice for France and Belgium and the other nations she brutally assaulted. We want America

---


58 William Thomas Manning, untitled speech, Episcopalian Club Dinner, Diocese of Massachusetts, January 27, 1919, Manning Papers.
no party to a peace of soft justice and wishy-washy sentiment. This demand for justice took precedence even over the proposed world league of which he had so often spoken. It was, as far as Manning was concerned, the sole standard by which the lasting value of the peace might be determined.

The general development of Manning's thoughts during the first World War is one which fails in almost every respect to conform to that general analysis furnished by Abrams in his book. There is generally no advance in his thought corresponding to the fluctuation of American public opinion; indeed, there was generally an actual conflict between the two. In the light of what has been shown, it is more reasonable to think that Manning accepted the position of the government during the war not because he was in any way subservient to it or to American nationalism, but because the ideals upon which America officially based her war efforts were those very ideals that Manning had been advocating since 1914, and for lack of which he had criticised the federal administration.

As far as can be told, Manning made no immediate pronouncements on the League of Nations as it was finally

---

established, nor on America's failure to adapt the Versailles Treaty. When next he was heard on matters of American international responsibility, he spoke from a level more important still than that of rector of Trinity Parish.
CHAPTER III

The years from 1921 to 1933 were crowded with activities aimed at the prevention of another world war. The Senate had rejected the Versailles Treaty and membership in the League of Nations. The election of Warren G. Harding confirmed that rejection and created something of a dilemma for those who advocated United States participation in international affairs: how was that participation to be accomplished?

The report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends, issued in 1931, analyzed the activities of post-war America.

In international relations, the World War first intensified the agitation for military preparedness, then led to a wave of enthusiasm for international courts and international government and finally produced a new and growing demand for reduction of armaments.¹

The search for armaments reduction actually occupied American interest intermittently through the whole twelve-year period. The Republican Party adapted it as their alternative to the Democratic concept of peace through collective security.²

¹President's Research Committee on Social Trends, Recent Social Trends in the United States (New York, 1933), p. 442.
At the insistent urging of Senator W. H. Borah a Congressional resolution calling for a conference among America, Great Britain and Japan blossomed into the Washington Naval Conference and Treaty of 1921. In 1928, with the return of Germany to international affairs, President Coolidge called for another conference to meet at Geneva and to extend the reaches of that naval agreement. The success of 1921 was not repeated.

Like the hope of disarmament, the enthusiasm for American participation in international courts was sporadic and unsuccessful. By 1922 the Permanent Court of International Justice had held its first session. Although an American, Elihu Root, had been one of the leading figures in setting up the court, the Senate refused to let the United States join. This action, like the defeat of the League, was taken in spite of the fact that "... undoubtedly the overwhelming majority of the American people favored such a course [as joining the court]."3 Coolidge proposed the matter again in 1928, and again the Senate rejected it. The same pattern continued under Hoover and Roosevelt.

Finally only two possible courses of action remained. The first was the unlikely hope that war itself might be outlawed. This led delegates to Paris again, in 1928.

3Ibid., p. 145.
There representatives of fifteen nations signed the Pact of Paris, pledging to outlaw war "as an instrument of national policy."4 By some stroke of fate the Pact tickled the fancy of Senator Borah and was ratified smoothly in the United States. Its value was questionable from the start, however; by the time of ratification, July, 1929, Coolidge had proposed, and Congress had approved, a billion-dollar naval construction program.5

During this period the churches generally were staunch supporters of internationalism in any and all of its manifestations. They were strong advocates of the League of Nations, and various denominational publications were urging its acceptance even after the Harding election had settled the issue.

The cause of this rabid internationalism is not difficult to find. As Ray Abrams shows, the end of the war had brought a general attitude of repentance on the part of American clergy and a determination that never again would they be responsible for supporting war. The churches sought alternatives to war; internationalism was the obvious answer. The war had shown that fighting anywhere in the world could spread to any other part. If general war was to be prevented, local outbreaks must first be made impossible. Thus the churches first rested their hopes on the League of Nations,

4Ibid., p. 151.  
5Ibid., p. 149.
then worked for American participation in the International Court. So, too, the Federal Council of Churches supported an active lobby at the Washington Conference of 1921.\(^6\)

Eager support was furnished for the abortive Geneva Conference, and the Kellogg Pact was enthusiastically endorsed and supported. "Let church bells be rung, songs sung, prayers of thanksgiving be offered and petitions for help from God that our nation may ever follow the spirit and meaning of the Fact."\(^7\)

In addition to supporting these practical attempts to make war an impossibility, the churches spent a great deal of time passing resolutions that "outlawed," "excommunicated," or "denounced" war. This anti-war sentiment fostered general opposition to any increase in American military strength. The corresponding growth of pacifism in clerical ranks brought with it a rejection of any program that might suggest readiness for war. Naval expansion was fought, and military maneuvers were condemned as nothing better than renewed militarism. All of this reflected to some degree the temper of the day. As Paul Carter states it, the anti-war stand was not so brave as it may seem in retrospect. Herbert Hoover, a Quaker, was elected President. The


The Kellogg-Briand Pact was popularly accepted. Russia, the source of some trepidation earlier in the Twenties, seemed to be settling down. A conscientious objector of World War I was Prime Minister of England. The whole mood of the day was one favorable to pacifism. The churches generally reflected that mood.

The problem was precisely this fact: that the churches reflected the attitude of the public rather than leading it. This made most of its work of questionable value. The churches' alliance with prohibition; the internal battle between fundamentalism and modernism; its identification with social and intellectual ineffectiveness, all these made it an institution heard but not heeded in the Twenties. Then, as institutions do, the American churches became entrenched in their position. This development proved to be fatal, for behind the pledges by churchmen of the 1920's not to engage in war, nor to support it, was always the implicit idea that there would be no war to support. Here was the key to the internationalism of the churches, and the hidden condition of pacifism. In the decade of the Thirties it was to be the source of much discomfort to American Christianity.

---

Everything that has been said about the attitudes of American Christianity in general may be applied to the Protestant Episcopal Church in particular. Speaking by its official voice, the General Convention, the Episcopal Church endorsed the League of Nations in 1919, and its press gave strong support. In 1922 the Convention gave its support to the Washington Disarmament Conference. In 1925, and again in 1928, General Convention endorsed the Permanent International Court. The 1928 endorsement coincided with Coolidge's attempt to persuade the Senate that the Court was a good thing. In 1928, once again, it endorsed the Pact of Paris. As R. M. Miller describes it, the Episcopal Church had the same reason for its actions that every other denomination had: "... if America was to be kept out of war, war must first be kept out of the world."

The problem in all this was the essentially selfish motive which lay at the heart of the drive for peace and internationalism. The reaction against the support the churches gave World War I was good insofar as it signaled a determination to work wholeheartedly for world peace. But the American churches seemed to work with a disastrous qualification: world peace was sought not because it was

---

a good thing in itself, but because it meant peace for America. Peace became an obsession. There was little talk of justice, of honor, of righteousness, or of America's responsibility to stand for these things in the world. If there had been, perhaps the churches would not have been caught in the dilemma that awaited them in the Thirties.

In 1921 Dr. Manning was elected Bishop of the Diocese of New York (over the opposition of the Hearst newspapers). The combination of the diocese, the strongest in every way of any in the Episcopal Church, and Manning, one of the most vocal leaders of both the Church and the city, was fortunate. In Manning the diocese had a strong, determined leader certain of his convictions and not easily cowed by opposition. For Manning, the diocese was an admirable platform from which he could give voice to his understanding of the faith and be effective in the councils of the Church.

The many demands on the attention of a Bishop, especially one like Manning, makes it difficult to trace his ideas on any one subject. The material relating to this period and this subject is scattered and fragmentary. This, together with the episodic nature of the events of the decade, mean that only a sketchy picture can be drawn of Manning's opinions on the great international events of the day.

The first indication that Manning was even concerned with world events from 1920 to 1921 comes late in the latter
year. In October he spoke at a mass meeting at Madison Square Garden, calling attention to the need for disarmament, for the sake of world peace. Beyond the fact that Manning accepted the invitation there is no indication of what happened. We may be sure that he called for disarmament, however, and that he almost certainly spoke of America's responsibility to uphold justice and truth in the world. In December of that same year Manning made what appears to have been his only public comment on the Washington Conference. In the context of a sermon at Trinity Church he noted that "We are all thanking God for the Washington Conference and for the hope which it holds out of peace and brotherhood among the nations."  

The first episode of which there remains any great detail began in November, 1922. G. H. Paelian, president of the Armenian Students Association, wrote Bishop Manning to ask that he use "all his influence" to get the United States to push for a fair settlement of the Armenian problem at the upcoming Lausanne Conference. The Conference was to write a new peace treaty with Turkey. Since 1894 the Armenians had been subject to sporadic massacres at Turkish hands, and brief Armenian independence in 1920 was ended within a year. Now Manning was one of those asked by Armenian emigres to plead their cause in America. "Publicity

12"Steadfastness in the Lord," December 18, 1921, p. 6, Manning Papers.
is the best means of creating sentiment, and we believe you can do much in this direction by reason of your nation-wide influence."\textsuperscript{13} Manning gave his reply on Armistice Day.

"There are some who tell us," he began in his sermon on November 12, "that since the war, our country has fallen completely from her high ideals. I do not agree with them." Evidently Manning did not share the general depression of the American people over the aftermath of the war. "I believe that . . . there is a growing realization among us that we must play our full part in the affairs of the world." Having made this gentle beginning, he turned to talk of Armenia. He pointed out that the Armenians had been America's allies during the war. In return for that support they had been promised freedom from Turkey. The promise had not been kept. Now the Armenians were being "massacred, outraged, in large part exterminated."

We have a duty to the Armenian people from which we cannot escape and upon the fulfillment of which world issues of the gravest sort may depend . . . . We do not want a recurrence of war anywhere. Nothing is further from our desire. But this does not free us from the responsibility of taking our stand for the protection of the helpless from brutal outrage and wrong . . . . It is our duty to declare that religious minorities in the Near East, Armenians, Greeks, and others must be protected . . . .\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13}G. H. Paelian to Manning, November 3, 1922, Manning Papers.

\textsuperscript{14}Untitled Armistice Day Address, November 12, 1922, Manning Papers.
This opinion was a reversal of the general American approach to matters of international import. Where the United States generally sought world peace to preserve her own, Manning was still insistent that, though peace was greatly to be desired, it could not be bought at the price of abandoned responsibility. It was a theme that was to be heard from him with increasing frequency in the next dozen years.

When the Lausanne Treaty came up for Senate confirmation in 1926 Manning was one of those who protested that Armenia had not been fairly treated. He added his name to a petition directed to Senator Borah, urging the rejection of the treaty. James W. Gerard, former ambassador to Germany and head of a committee to defeat the treaty, made public a letter from Manning in which he said that he was well acquainted with the arguments of both government and business interests, and both seemed to ignore the moral issues at stake. "It would seem to me a very sad thing for the Eastern Church to see the bishops of our Church lending their . . . support to the Treaty which was practically written by the Turks to suit themselves." This last statement was Manning's reply to Charles Brent, Bishop of Western New York, who had recently switched sides in the debate and now attacked those who opposed the treaty.

Earlier in the same year Manning had written personally to

---

15 Living Church, October 9, 1926.
Senator Borah, repeating his disapproval of the treaty and urging that the Senate refuse to ratify it.

Meanwhile the Bishop had made the first of what was to be a series of protests over the reported persecution of Christians inside Russia. In April, 1923, he wrote the New York Herald, commenting on the recent trial in the Soviet Union of several Roman Catholic clergy and their Archbishop. The group was sentenced to be executed, and Manning wrote with an undertone of wondering fury, "Is the Christian world to stand by and make no protest?" He had telegraphed the same sort of question to President Harding only to be told that the government was doing what it could.16

In 1930 Manning repeated his protest to the continued persecutions taking place in Russia. The occasion was in response to a call from Pius XI for world-wide prayers that the Russian "anti-religious activity" might be brought to an end. In February he set a special service in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

As Bishop of the Diocese of New York I feel that I must speak, . . . as I hope the ministers of all faiths all over the land will speak, in support of the protests which have been made and in condemnation of these wicked, cruel and inhuman acts.17

Significantly, this call brought an immediate objection from eighty-seven leaders of American Protestantism and Judaism.

16 Manning to New York Herald, April 6, 1923, with attached letter from Charles Evans Hughes, Manning Papers.

17 New York Herald Tribune, February 17, 1930.
Among others, Reinhold Niebuhr, Roland Bainton, Henry Sloan Coffin, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John H. Holmes and Samuel Schulman protested that Manning’s attitude failed "... to strike the 'proper note of humility' and take cognizance of the historical and social background behind the anti-religious policy of the Soviet Government." 18

The meeting took place on March 16, as scheduled. It was opposed by a large Communist rally in the Bronx Coliseum which spent its time denouncing religion as "... organized superstition and bigotry ..." In the course of his sermon, Manning took note of the objections to the service voiced by his fellow clergy.

We must bear our witness before God and man in this matter ... We must pray for the persecuted of all faiths, we must pray for those who are inflicting these wrongs upon their fellow men, and we must also pray for ourselves that we and all other Christians may be forgiven for whatever share of this wrong rests upon us ... .19

The keynote was the obligation that rested on every Christian to bear witness. There is no attempt to suggest that those who protest are themselves free from any taint of wrong-doing. Yet, so far as Manning was concerned, failure to bear witness against the evil which made itself known at particular times and in particular places in the world was to fail in a vital

18 New York Times, March 6, 1930.
aspect of the Christian faith. This work of witness was to become even more necessary with a short space of three years.

Apart from the one instance of a brief comment on the Washington Disarmament Conference in 1921, Manning seems to have taken little notice of the course of diplomatic events in the world until 1925. In December of that year a special service of thanksgiving was held in the Cathedral, celebrating the Locarno Pact. The seven leading nations of Europe had negotiated the pact, and by it Germany returned to international diplomacy. The United States was not present, did not sign, and refused to associate with the pact when the opportunity was given.

Manning was enthusiastic in his sermon. "It is no understatement to say that it marks an epoch in the world's spiritual history." He saw in it renewed hope for the forces of peace and a new source of courage for its advocates. Yet, "... in our thanksgiving there must be a note of regret that our own country was not there present." He also used the opportunity to criticize the government for its failure to act favorably on United States entry into the International Court.

... we send to the Senate ... the message that a small group of irreconcilables shall not be allowed to hold back America from the service that she owes to the world ... and that our participation with the other forty-eight nations in the World Court must no longer be delayed.20

20 New York World, December 14, 1925.
So forthright was this statement that the newspapers almost forgot the actual purpose of the service! Manning here gave voice to what was undoubtedly the popular sentiment of the nation, and he did so in no uncertain terms.

It is only by searching through Manning's diary that his opinion on the League of Nations can be found. While returning from France in 1928 he jotted down notes in preparation either for an anticipated interview with the press, or for a sermon. The League was, he noted with a hint of satisfaction in the phrasing, justifying itself. It seemed to be meeting its problems wisely, and the entry of Germany, in 1926, was a "momentous step." The United States would undoubtedly enter it in due course of time, and with due safeguards and reservations.

These same notes give an over-all view of Manning's thoughts on the general trend of world affairs. They reflect something of the optimism of the time, and give a curious picture of how idealism could be mixed with matter-of-fact realism.

... a war such as that which was brought upon us in 1914 would today be an impossibility ... the world today is one—Policy of isolation belongs to bygone age ... I believe we are on the way to substituting world law for world war. This in no way conflicts with a true and helpful national ... preparedness. So long as evil and wickedness endure it will be necessary to use force [to] repress evil and uphold right ... [But] the day of war for aggression is ended.

Time was quickly to show which of Manning's ideas were a reflection of the somewhat naive temper of the times and which were to be of lasting value and truth.

One more comparison needs to be drawn between the general feeling about military preparedness (for lack of a better term) and the ideas that Manning preached. The spirit of pacifistic internationalism was generally opposed to any form of military preparedness. Coolidge's bill for naval appropriations had brought loud protests from many of the American clergy, as did any indication of undue emphasis on the armed forces of the nation. Manning did not share this attitude. Nor did he share the disillusioned attitude that the Great War had been fought in vain.

Speaking in 1928, at a memorial service for Field Marshall Earl Haig, Manning denounced such ideas roundly.

All honour to those who laid down their lives for the right. In the face of what those men, and our own heroic dead with them did for the world, and for us, let no one dare to tell us that their lives were wasted, that the war accomplished nothing, and that their self-sacrifice was a mistake . . . . We will honour the memory, and thank God for the example of those who, when that call came, gave themselves, as, in such an issue, every true man would. 22

This statement leaves some doubt as to whether or not a sizable number of American clergy of the day would have come under Manning's definition of "a true man."

22 Untitled address at Memorial Service for Field Marshall Haig, February 19, 1928, pp. 5-6, Manning Papers.
If his position were not clear enough, Manning took another occasion to restate it. In 1931 he was invited to speak at the dedication of a World War Shrine at St. Paul's Church, Hoboken. In a day when pacifism was running rampant, when denunciations of war and the military in general were the popular subject of clergy addresses, Manning continued to move against the crowd.

The sermon happened to come just after a program of maneuvers by the Army Air Force had drawn fire from all quarters. Manning spoke to the issue. "Every sensible person knows that our army and navy exist not for the promotion of war, but to uphold the law and maintain peace." With this remark he further demolished the ranks of American clergy who, being not true men, were now not even sensible ones. The army maneuvers, said Manning, were no more a demonstration for war than was a police parade which had recently taken place in New York a demonstration for crime. Repeating his famous slogan about peace and righteousness, he pointed out the hard fact that as long as sin and evil exist in the world, "... the occasion may arise when force will be needed for the defense of the right." He concluded with an attack on those clergy who had signed various pledges that they would not support war, or, if war came, would in no way support American combatants.

"... as Christians and sensible people we will not say that whatever the circumstances we will refuse to bear arms. As Christians we will not listen to
those who, with singular ingratitude, seek to belittle the service of those who fought in the World War and who declare that they accomplished nothing. And we cannot countenance those who, in their pacifist ideal, say they will not lift a hand for the right.  

Fragmentary as this period is in Manning's writings and statements, the essential continuity of his thought is still clear. He was dogmatically an internationalist and supported America's participation in all of the international organizations that were open to her. He urged membership in the League of Nations, attacked the Senate for refusing to allow America to enter the World Court, and severely criticized her failure to enter wholeheartedly into international diplomacy. In this he was one with the general attitude of American clergymen, as he was in his hope that a war such as that of 1914 would never again take place. But he stood firm on his basic belief that, while peace is the hope and goal of the nation, it is not itself the highest good. More important than peace is truth, freedom, the right of men to live as men. "Whatever arises in the future, we can never agree to abandon armament so long as sin and evil exist in this world." Armed with this combination of beliefs, Manning was one of the few American Christian clergy prepared to speak clearly and with authority when the descent into holocaust began in 1933.

\[23^\text{New York Times, May 25, 1931.} \quad 24^\text{Ibid.}\]
CHAPTER IV

In January, 1933, Adolf Hitler succeeded in his drive to take control of the government of Germany. In March Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States. The world was never again the same.

Winston Churchill described the period from 1933 to 1938 as one of "...long, dismal, dawling tides of drift and surrender, of wrong measurements and feeble impulses."Outside the United States, dictatorship seemed the dominant form of national government; it was certainly the only effective form. Within a year Hitler had begun his drive to purify the German race by eliminating Jewish blood from the nation. By 1935 he was strong enough, or confident enough, to denounce the clauses of the Versailles Treaty limiting German armaments and to reoccupy the Rhineland. In the fall of 1936 Hitler and Mussolini established the Rome-Berlin Axis. Austria was seized in March, 1938, and by September England had been frightened into the Munich agreement by which Germany took the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia. After that concession war was inevitable.

Germany was not alone in her drive for world power. In 1935 Italy invaded Ethiopia, completing that conquest.

in 1937. The Spanish Civil War began in 1936 and ended three bloody years later with Franco in control of the nation. In the Far East Japan opened its war on China in the wake of an "incident" in 1937, having already occupied Manchuria in 1931.

The United States had an inglorious part in these events. Crippled economically by the depression, militarily by isolationism, and morally by pacifism run rampant, the nation spent the first five years of the second world crisis avoiding issues. "Had any pollster been looking for one idea on which the vast majority of the American people agreed ..., it would have been that if Europe were so wicked or stupid as to start another war, America would resolutely stay out."2 Between 1935 and 1939 Congress passed a series of Neutrality Acts designed to prevent the recurrence of the causes which many felt had led America into the First World War: the sale of munitions to belligerents was forbidden, and so was the entry of any American ships into war zones, wherever they might be established. In the President's inaugural address of 1937 foreign affairs were not mentioned.3 Later, when the President suggested that lawlessness and violence such as that in China must inevitably involve the United States, he was denounced as a warmonger. In January, 1938, the President approached Great Britain on the possibility

2Ibid., pp. 987-988. 3Ibid., p. 988.
of a conference on European affairs. He was rebuffed. In September he reminded the signers of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of their pledge to outlaw war. He was ignored.

The American churches began to feel the difficulties of their self-oblation to pacifism and anti-militarism by 1933. While polls by Kirby Page showed that, as late as 1934, fifty per cent of those asked indicated themselves to be pacifists, it was no longer a self-assured pacifism that was espoused, but rather one sternly challenged by the events of the day. The Japanese invasion of China posed a choice for America between unilateral neutrality or collective security, between taking a stand with other nations against such acts of aggression, or pursuing an independent path of isolation from world events. One sign of the breakdown was the sudden upsurge of warnings against it. In 1933 Ray Abrams published Preachers Present Arms. A year later Walter Kirk announced that Religion Renounces War. Hubert Herring recalled the churches' failure in World War I with And So to War. Published in 1938, this book pointed out the growing parallels between contemporary world events and those of the first war and suggested that the churches would not repeat their failure of 1917-1918.

---


5Meyer, Protestant Search, pp. 353-354.
Pacifism did manage to find some things to support its hope for world peace. Hitler's speech of May, 1933, seemed to suggest that he favored world peace and prized it above all things. United States recognition of Russia in that same year argued well for peace, as, it seemed, did Roosevelt's emphasis on a "good neighbor" policy toward Central and South America. Events moved too swiftly, however. Reinhold Niebuhr summed up the dilemma of the American churches, bound as they were by pacifism, in this way:

... pacifism no longer meant self-righteous obedience to an anti-war treaty to which one's country was a signatory. ... Pacifism meant the robust awareness of being in dissent. ... Unfortunately, it meant also a blurring over of moral distinctions in international matters. ... There was among Pacifists ... a nearly fatal lack of understanding of the nature and reality of aggression.

Although the Episcopal Church had problems with pacifism it did not share the general attitude which ultimately forced many American Protestant pacifists to become isolationists. General Convention in 1934 issued a strong anti-war statement, condemning militarism in no uncertain terms. In 1931 and 1934 it took the opportunity to endorse American membership in the World Court. The same 1931 convention repeated its support of the Pact of Paris. There was nothing either strange or daring in these pronouncements, and a good indication that pacifism did not rule the Church was found in

---

its dissent from the generally popular Ludlow Amendment to the Constitution, a proposal that a declaration of war by the United States should be made dependent upon a national referendum.7

Bishop Manning's work during these years can be described under three headings: opposition to pacifism (and neutrality), opposition to racial and religious persecutions, and opposition to autocracies and dictatorships. Necessarily, the three sometimes are combined one with another or all together.

On January 30, 1933, Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. Soon a campaign began to eliminate all opposition to the National Socialist Party in Germany, and so gave it a clear majority in the Reichstag. Proclaiming that a communist conspiracy was about to take over Germany, Hitler received legal authority on February 28 "... to take over complete power in the federal states when necessary and impose the death sentence for a number of crimes, including 'serious disturbances of the peace' by armed persons."8 This delegation of power began Hitler's campaign of terror in Germany. He now controlled the nation.

New York Jewish leaders held a mass meeting on March 3 to protest the persecution of their people inside the Third

Reich. Fifty-five thousand people packed into Madison Square Garden. One of the speakers was Bishop Manning. With this address Manning set the pattern for all his future protests against religious persecution. He insisted that no one nation could be condemned for such activity, or protest be made for only a particular religious body. So, in this speech in the Garden, Manning addressed himself to the wider issue. Disclaiming any desire to "... arouse animosities or appeal to passions ..." he began by stressing that, as far as he was concerned, the purpose of the meeting was to show the basic fact that "God has made of one blood all nations of men on the whole earth, and that, because we have one Divine Creator and Father, we are all brothers." Having established himself on this level he got to the heart of the matter. Every human being has, he said, the right to liberty, to justice, to life. And we are assembled here because this basic truth of humanity, this common right of all men, has, we believe, been transgressed. This right has, we believe, been transgressed by anti-Semitic propaganda and inflammatory utterance, and also by acts of violence and persecution ... We are here to lift up our voices against the possibility of such acts anywhere, and against any policy, or propaganda, or utterance, that might encourage or induce such acts.

Then, to emphasize the wider nature of the meeting, he turned to other areas.

We are here to condemn and denounce racial or religious persecution, whoever may be guilty of it, in Germany or elsewhere, and we must not forget the tyrannical

---

and cruel persecution carried on against those representing all religious faiths, and the brutal attempt to stamp out all religion, which still continues under the Soviet Government in Russia. 10

After noting that such activities as those in Russia should not be countenanced by any nation, Manning closed with a general condemnation of any persecution of any race or religion anywhere in the world. Maintaining the distinction he had developed under different circumstances many years earlier, he expressed confidence that the German persecutions were as deeply opposed by the "real Germany" as by those present in Madison Square Garden. He ended with one swing at the isolationist element in American affairs: "Race prejudice, oppression, religious persecution, have no right to exist anywhere in this world, and we have no right to condone or countenance them." 11

In this one address there is a summation of all that Manning had to say against religious persecution. Several points are worth some attention. First, there is the stress throughout the address on the idea that "we believe" such religious persecutions to be taking place. This quickly faded from use in later months, but it shows the caution with which Manning made his charges. Then there is the basic premise for his position: "... God has made of one blood all nations of men on the whole earth ..." This

10Ibid. 11Ibid.
immediately protects the speech from the charge that it represents undue interference in the internal affairs of another country. Finally, there is the obvious note of American international responsibility. Manning had not changed in over fifteen years. He still insisted that America had an obligation to stand in the world for justice, for freedom, for righteousness. These are the rights of every man, wherever he may be. Denial of these rights constitutes an offence against humanity, an offence to which "... none of us who call ourselves Americans have [sic] the right to be indifferent ... ."¹²

Manning returned to the subject once more in 1933. Addressing a meeting of the Bronx Forum he warned that, while Americans must be wary of quick judgements, "... that does not mean ... that we must hesitate to speak out against wrongdoing that is destroying the foundations of peace and goodwill."¹³ As usual, he was adamant that this nation must take the responsibility of speaking out, of bearing witness against "... any manifestation of race prejudice or race discrimination, or racial or religious persecution, whether it be in Germany or Russia or wherever it may be in the world."¹⁴

The most important event of 1934 was an attack on the currently popular identification of pacifism with Christianity.

¹²Ibid. ¹³New York Times, December 28, 1933. ¹⁴Ibid.
In June the United States Fleet visited New York City, and Manning took the opportunity to hold a special service in the Cathedral for the officers and men. The Commander-in-Chief of the Fleet was present, with eight other Admirals, over two hundred lesser officers, and a Cathedral full of sailors. The situation was an ideal one for the subject that the Bishop had chosen.

A considerable number of Ministers of Religion just now, carried away by a wave of extreme pacifism, are announcing that no matter what the circumstances or conditions they will never give their assent, or moral support, to the use of force, and that in case of war they will refuse, even as Chaplains, to give solace and comfort to the sick, the wounded and the dying. Such statements are greatly to be regretted.

Those who take such a pledge, he said, do much more harm than good. They drive strong men from the Church. They reflect discredit on the movement toward world peace. They represent neither sound thinking nor true religion. There are times when the use of force is both necessary and proper, times when it represents the highest form of sacrifice. In view of this, "... the extreme pacifist position is not the Christian position. True religion is never out of accord with the facts of human life, as this extreme pacifist view is." The Christian must love nothing more than righteousness: not peace, not safety, not even his own life. "There are things in this life that are worth fighting for, and there are times when a man must be willing to die."

Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Master and Saviour of us all, stands not for peace at any price, but for righteousness at any cost. That is the Christian position, righteousness at any cost, and it is an immeasurably higher and nobler ideal than peace at any price.  

War cannot be abolished by decree. If the nation is to be protected, if it is to uphold law and right in the world, it must be prepared to do the necessary police work. That is exactly the purpose of the navy: "... it exists to protect us against war and to maintain right and peace."  

The sermon found strong support not only among the men present but also on the editorial pages of many newspapers. Perhaps the most succinct is this comment of the Boston Transcript.  

In the midst of so much unthinking sentimentality as is found in the ministry and out of it, this clear-cut and rational view is as refreshing as the breeze which the other day blew away the fog as the fleet approached New York.

There are direct references, in this same sermon, to statements that Manning made in 1914 and 1915. Peace is a wonderful thing, one of the goals of mankind, but "I disapprove wholly of that sort of sentiment which condemns the naval and military men of this country ... Our soldiers are not men of blood and destruction. They are the guardians and maintainers of our national peace."  

---

16 Ibid., pp. 3, 4.  
17 Ibid., p. 4.  
18 Boston Transcript, n.d. [June, 1934].  
19 See page 13 of this thesis.
repeated his slogan of 1916, the first use of it in many years but not the last.

In 1935 Manning again took the headlines for his unorthodox stand on American responsibility for the welfare of other nations. Italy invaded Ethiopia in October. Less than a week after the invasion Manning took the pulpit in his cathedral and spoke on the situation. He attacked American neutrality. He attacked America's failure to join the League of Nations, where it should be engaged in supporting Ethiopia. He attacked American pacifists, telling them bluntly to "... face the hard facts and think clearly and justly on this great question." Americans cannot act as though there is no difference between protective and aggressive warfare, he said. "Confused thinking of that sort does not help the cause of peace." America has a duty in the world, and she must not be deterred from it by blind emotionalism. "If this outbreak should lead to a European crisis—which God forbid—we shall inevitably become involved deeply. As the world stands today, we cannot separate ourselves from the issues and the consequences of the situation in Ethiopia." At least one newspaper noticed what Manning had said and that he had said it all before. In an editorial attacking this sermon the **Buffalo Times** noted that "The Bishop remains undeviatingly loyal to the Church militant.

---

He was preaching substantially the same doctrine to a conference of Mayors in 1916 . . . ." The paper went on to comment that its readers would undoubtedly honor Manning for his vocation, but would also note "... the same flaw in his logic that is so apparent in looking backward toward 1916." It did not take the space to point out that flaw to those who might have been interested.

In May, 1936, Manning was solicited for his views on various subjects in connection with the celebration of his fifteenth year as Bishop of the Diocese of New York. Here he stated again his views on war, peace and the state of the world.

If we are not carried away by hysteria . . . if we face the facts of life, we know that so long as sin and evil are in this world the use of armed force may be necessary to protect the weak or to maintain right and justice.

Today the whole world is one world. For better or for worse, we are all thrown into close contact and relationship. No nation can be a law unto itself, and, whether we wish it or not, we are all members of one community. The reverberations of what happens in Europe, Asia and Africa are plainly heard in this country. Our lives are affected by actions in the most remote parts of the world.

Both of these statements are important, for two reasons. Both conflict with the mood of the day, pacifism and isolationism, among the clergy of America. By 1935 the American clergy had turned their backs on the international

---

21 "Does He Want War?" Editorial in Buffalo Times, October 13, 1935.

organizations which they had so hopefully supported for
fifteen years. As the world moved toward chaos, the clergy
turned more and more to isolation as the one hope of re-
mainiug uninvolved. Further, on the issue of pacifism,
R. M. Miller quotes this pledge, taken by two hundred and
fifty-four New York clergy, Christian and Jewish:

In loyalty to God I believe that the way of true
religion cannot be reconciled with the way of war.
In loyalty to my country I support its adoption of
the Kellogg-Briand Pact which renounces war. In
the spirit of true patriotism and with deep personal
conviction I therefore renounce war and never will
I support another. 23

Manning's position was a return to the days of the First
World War. In November, 1915, he had pointed out that
while sin continued in the world some appeal to force would
be necessary to control its results. 24 In April, 1917, he
voiced the hope that the events of those war years would
make America aware of its place in the family of nations
and of the fact that the nation could no longer live apart
from the other nations of the world. 25

One incident at the cathedral during this year is
interesting because of later events. In July a special
service was held for the children enrolled in the vacation
schools of the city. As a part of the service the flags

23 Miller, American Protestantism, pp. 334, 340.
24 See page 16 of this thesis.
25 See page 28 of this thesis.
of the nations of the world were carried to the altar and presented while the children offered prayers for world peace. One of the flags used was that of the Soviet Union.

The editorial response to this, in the Church press, was surprisingly favorable. The Witness, The Living Church, and The Churchman all supported the action, as a sign of penance and prayer. Not so Manning. He objected strongly to the use of the Russian flag, drawing the fire of all three magazines. It was an honor, he said, for the flags to be presented before the altar.

It is one thing to pray for a change of heart on the part of Soviet Russia . . . . But it is quite a different thing to countenance, and honour by displaying it before the Altar in a Christian Church, any flag which stands avowedly for atheism, for destruction of religion, and for religious and racial persecution.26

This same attitude toward Russia was expressed in April of the following year, when Manning stated unequivocally that communism "... stands for rule by force and terrorism ... . . . . . . Communism stands avowedly for Atheism and seeks the total destruction of Christianity and of all religion."27 The day was to come when he would no longer make the point so frequently or so clearly.

In December Manning was invited to speak at a luncheon sponsored by the National Committee for Religion and Welfare.

---

26 Manning to Editor, Living Church, September 11, 1936.
27 Manning to E. L. Curran, April 12, 1937, Manning Papers.
Recovery. Here again his words are an echo from the past. After mentioning the glories of American citizenship he turned to consider the contemporary world scene. "We are seeing more and more clearly that the choice is between a world ruled by force and tyranny and fear, . . . or a world ruled--really ruled--by those Divine Ideals for which true religion stands." Those ideals are justice, brotherhood, liberty, democracy--in short, all the things that Manning always had maintained America should represent in herself and support in the world. This same split in the world between the forces of liberty and the forces of despotism concerned Manning when he preached, in April of 1937, at a special service honoring the new monarchs of Great Britain: ". . . the conflict today is between two distinct worlds in one of which personal freedom still lives and in the other of which it is dead. Communism, Nazism, and Fascism all alike stand for the extinction of liberty." Given this division the question was clear: which shall prevail?

Two events in 1937 are worth further attention. In a sermon at Governor's Island, Manning repeated his position vis-à-vis pacifism. The sermon received widespread attention in Washington, where it was undoubtedly a relief

---

28 Untitled address to National Committee for Religion and Welfare Recovery, December 3, 1936, Manning Papers.

to hear kind words for the military. It was printed in full, with a warm recommendation, in the Army and Navy Register. Among the responses that the Bishop received was one from Hannah C. Hull, president of the United States section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Miss Hull pointed out that the basic pacifist position was "... that there is nothing in this life worth killing people for ..." and that another way must be, and can be, found to do what must be done. 30 Manning's reply is interesting for the light that it sheds on his continued opposition to pacifism.

In this world in which we are living we cannot take the position that killing is never justifiable or necessary, and in taking this position extreme pacifism weakens its cause. I use the term 'extreme pacifism' because in a true sense all Christians are and must be pacifists. We must use every effort to promote peace and eliminate war but we shall best help the cause of peace by facing and recognizing the actual facts of life ... 31

Here Manning pointed out more clearly his basic objection to pacifism as a doctrine: its unqualified nature. It is the absolute statement that killing is never justifiable that is false. As bad as killing is, and there can be no doubt of its evil, there is something worse, and that is a refusal to stand up in the world for the truths of the Christian faith whenever they are challenged. To so refuse

---

30 Hull to Manning, July 19, 1937, Manning Papers.

31 Manning to Hull, July 26, 1937, Manning Papers.
is to deny the Christian faith, to deny that God rules in the world and His rule is absolute, and that denial is a far worse thing than suffering or inflicting death.

Some comic relief came in December. Manning had again protested the persecution of the Jews by Germany, before the National Board for Religion and Welfare Recovery. After all these years he finally drew some response from Germany. Shortly after his address the Berlin newspaper Der Stuermer lavished an entire editorial on him, denouncing him as "... a child of hell, a pseudo priest and a wolf in sheep's clothing ... [Christ] would take a whip and drive Bishop Manning from the Temple."32 It was a significant attack in that it showed the widespread attention Manning's remarks had obtained. He himself replied to the attack: "... I regard [it] as a compliment ... ."33

For most of 1938 it is necessary to follow Bishop Manning's diary to know that he kept up with world events. A campaign for funds to do more work on the Cathedral of St. John the Divine was launched that year, and it occupied most of his time and energy. These entries suggest, however, that he was not entirely ignorant of world affairs.

1-18-38 Issued appeal for our fellow churchmen in China who are suffering grievously from the Japanese aggression.

2-12-38 Hitler's seizure of Austria now adds to the dangers of the world situation.

9-24-38 Danger of war in Europe seems imminent but we are hoping and praying that it may be averted and that the madman, Hitler, may be restrained.

9-27-38 The terrible threat of war hangs over the world and we are all praying for Peace with Righteousness and Justice.

9-29-38 Service in Cathedral . . . for the guidance of those in Conference at Munich . . . .

9-30-38 Immense relief at the averting of the immediate danger of World War by the agreement reached at Munich though this is a grave concession . . . and there is much doubt as to whether it may lead to true Peace.

On October 9 Manning preached in the cathedral, in the wake of the Munich crisis. He pointed out the grave danger that the world had passed through and the horrors that another war would bring to the world. These, he said, were the factors that brought about the Munich Conference, this the threat that made England and Germany sit down together and talk.

There are grave differences of judgement as to whether the price paid for peace was too great, or greater than it need have been; as to whether the abandonment of Czechoslovakia was morally justifiable; and as to whether the present action will open the way to peace or whether it will strengthen the hands of the Dictatorships and only defer the coming of war.

What the Conference had done was give the world a "brief reprise." There was now time to work for a better situation in the world.

34 Manning, "Diary," dates as noted.
It is a time for prayer not only for Peace but for Peace with Righteousness and Justice, prayer that our own nation and the other nations may be given wisdom and courage to face the facts of this crisis and to do whatever is right, no matter what the cost, for the upholding of the Law of God in this world, for the sake of mankind and the future.35

America, like all the nations, shares the responsibility for the crisis, and the times call her to repentance "... for the folly, the blindness, the greed and selfishness, the narrowness of vision, which make war on this earth still possible ..." Christians, practicing their faith, are the one hope for averting war.

The most interesting thing about this sermon is its failure to take a clear stand on the division of Czechoslovakia. Manning understood the conference, obviously, as a device to gain time for the world to reconsider its problems and search for a peaceful settlement. Yet it seems most strange, and remains unexplained, that he did not immediately attack the injustice of Munich which was achieved with such world-wide relief.

The whole period from 1933-1938 shows once again the consistency with which Manning approached international affairs. The simple fact that for almost every sermon and address there can be found a parallel in the years gone by makes it quite clear that he was not subject to the pressures

35"The Present World Crisis a Call to World Prayer," October 9, 1938, Manning Papers.
of current American clerical opinion. The further conclusion might be drawn, on the basis of this pattern of consistency, that the interests of England did not dominate Manning's thought in the earlier period. His thought had a definite and intelligible pattern all its own, independent of outside national or political influences. This pattern, as it develops again from 1933 to 1938, can be explained purely on the basis of the effect of events on Manning and without reference to the pressures of public opinion, clerical attitudes, or economic necessity.36

36 The one exception to this would seem to be Manning's reluctance to place a moral judgement on the Munich Conference and its results. He was obviously caught in a dilemma. He could not, on the one hand, accept what had been done there as clearly just and moral. Yet, on the other hand, his Anglophilia and his belief that the English-speaking nations would stand for truth and righteousness in the world prevented a clear statement that the Munich agreement was immoral and unjust.
CHAPTER V

From the invasion of Poland to the attack at Pearl Harbor the attitudes of American clergy were sharply divided. Pacifism and isolationism shared the spotlight in the early period, and those who held these views led American clergy in a determined fight to keep the American Neutrality Acts in full force. Peace rallies were held over the nation, and the Federal Council of Churches called for American Christians "to repent" and to denounce war "as an evil thing contrary to the mind of Christ." The Christian Century, under the editorship of C. C. Morrison, proclaimed this point of view as late as December, 1941.

Gradually, however, the enthusiasm for pacifism slipped away. The "America First" and "Keep America Out of the War" committees were balanced by the strongly interventionist committees for "Aid to Britain" and "Defend America by Aiding the Allies." Christianity and Crisis, edited by Reinhold Niebuhr, challenged the influence of the Christian Century. By early 1940 a number of clergy felt called upon to issue a manifesto urging both moral and material support for the Allies, and this was followed by an ever increasing number of statements and petitions with a similar point of view.

Despite growing pro-Allied sentiment and the factors of the war which urged such feelings on, there was less of the exuberant spirit of patriotism among American clergy than had been in evidence during World War I. "One saw less of the wild-eyed patriot . . . . The war was a grim necessity—something to be gotten over as soon as possible." Refusing to repeat the pattern of 1914-1918, the churches gave general support to conscientious objectors, and the pacifist movement continued to enjoy minor but strong support throughout the war. There was less stress, according to Ray Abrams, on the sinfulness of war and more concern over the simple matter of national survival. Further, the churches strongly supported proposals for the United Nations to enforce a just and lasting peace when the war was over. As Paul Carter commented, "The wartime and postwar championship of the United Nations by the Churches was in a very real sense the cry of their pacifist conscience, transmuted." 

The Episcopal Church shared in the division of opinion. At the outset the greater part of its clergy were at one with other American ministers who strongly supported the Neutrality Acts and worked to preserve them. In 1939, Bishop William Lawrence, son of the chairman of the Church's War Commission in 1917, organized the Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship. On the other side, the General Convention of 1940

---

2Ibid.  
3Carter, Social Gospel, p. 219.
issued statements condemning American isolation as "... both immoral and impossible."\(^4\) The Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops made no significant statement about the conflict in Europe, except to urge that Christians might fight the conditions that bring on such wars by living more Christian lives. It did, however, condemn the use of the Church as "... an instrument of war propaganda."\(^5\) It is significant that the Pastoral Letter, the only official communication from the House of Bishops, failed to comment in any decisive way on neutrality, isolationism, or pacifism. Although it did condemn the spread of war propaganda through church channels, later church activities as a whole left such an impression that Abrams could repeat the charge he had directed against its conduct in the First World War. Episcopalians were, he said, "... the most conspicuous in arousing sympathy for Britain and promoting preparedness propaganda."\(^6\)

Donald Meyer took up the attack on American clergy who supported America's war effort by fulminating that they were

\(^4\)Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church (Hammond, 1940), p. 50.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 88.

\(^6\)Abrams, "Churches and Clergy," pp. 113-114. Abrams admits, however, that "... more research is needed on this point to determine how widespread the phenomenon was." p. 114.
... men for whom crusade was easy because they had never felt shame about 1917 and 1918, men who did not recognize the realities in play, who suppressed the facts of where moral responsibility for the war lay, who glossed the facts of economic injustice, who simplified the facts of the world revolution in progress.7

He particularly singled out Bishop Manning because of Manning's "Tory Kulturanglikanismus."8 Meyer was quite right about one thing: Manning felt no remorse about the events of 1917-1918. It is doubtful, however, that Manning failed to recognize the realities of the day, and he certainly was aware of the contemporary world revolution and its complexity.

In an address in Central Park, Manning spoke of the events which had recently transpired: the fall of Poland and the American declaration of neutrality. For the first time he was able to agree with the statements of an American president on America's attitude toward the European struggle. Germany and Russia, he said, have shown themselves as partners in the crime against Poland, and have forced war on the world. He prayed that the United States might find it possible to remain officially neutral in the fight, but stressed that personally, ". . . the American people 'have no right to shut their eyes to the facts.'" The real issue was clearly a fight to the finish between totalitarianism and democracy, and Americans must judge events in light of this issue. He called on Americans to "... pray that the present

7Meyer, Protestant Search, p. 388. 8Ibid.
'appalling conflict' be speedily ended and that its end might guarantee the preservation and maintenance of 'righteousness, justice and liberty for the sake of all nations, including Germany and Russia.' 9 While this was an echo of Roosevelt's stand on American neutrality, it also repeats Manning's own position throughout the years of American neutrality prior to her entry into World War I. President Wilson had earned the rebuke that Manning administered to the American government in 1916 by ignoring the fact which Roosevelt stressed, that while America officially must be neutral, her people could not be expected to maintain neutrality of thought and conscience.

The Bishop continued his analysis in an October sermon. He also repeated his stand on American neutrality. Placing the guilt for the war squarely on Germany and Russia, he called for all the aid "... that we as a neutral nation can rightly give" to both England and France. Whatever may be the right position for the government on neutrality, "A Christian cannot be neutral between right and wrong." He went on to attack those whom he termed "extreme pacifists" as people who had failed to recognize that Right is more important than Peace. "Peace can only come as the fruit of righteousness." Three things are clear: this is not just another quarrel between particular nations. All the countries

of the world are vitally affected, although all cannot equally be blamed for the war. Finally, it is clear that this is a world crisis, a battle between totalitarianism and democracy for world dominion. Germany and Russia stand for exactly the same thing. Their mutual intent is "... to destroy the very elements of civilization," and both are the open enemies "... of justice, of human freedom, and of religion."¹⁰ A new point was raised here, to be frequently stressed in later statements: all nations have done wrong. This was another point from Manning's World War I sermons, this recognition that every nation has contributed its part to the breakdown of justice and righteousness which war represents. He maintained a clear distinction, however, between this general failure and the specific sin of war, for which one nation or another must bear clear responsibility.

In an Advent sermon on December 4, Manning reacted to the Russian invasion of Finland, which had come in November. He denounced the "monstrous," "barbarous," and "almost incredible" attack on the Finns, and asked that people of all faiths pray "... that the spread of imperialistic communism and militant atheism may be checked ... ."¹¹ Then he took

¹⁰ *New York Herald Tribune*, October 2, 1939.
up another of his war themes. To the question, why do such things happen in the world? he replied that "... the Christian Church has in some real degree fallen short of its true mission; it has failed to bear its full clear witness for Christ. The church ... means the bishops, the clergy and the people who belong to it." This was Manning's response to the old charge that the failure of peace in the world represented the failure of Christianity. He had handled this in the first war the same way: Christianity has not failed, but "we have failed to be Christian."  

In 1940 Manning began to call for American aid to England. In January, preaching in his cathedral, he insisted that such aid, as much as possible, was all that could keep America out of the war. He pointed out that Britain's battle was the only thing keeping this nation secure, "... while our isolationists and defeatists discuss, and oppose, and do what they can to delay the aid which is so desperately needed." He attacked those who ignored the challenge of the war to America, asking if it could be the will of God that the forces which Germany and Russia represented should rule the world, or if there could be any peace in a world in which those forces were dominant. "We know that there have been many wrongs in the past ... wrongs in which our nation and all others have shared, but nothing can excuse the crimes now committed

\[12\) Ibid. \[13\) See page 11 of this thesis.\]
by Hitlerism and Fascism." Finally, not only is American aid necessary for America's own protection, but also because: "... it is right, because it is the only course that is worthy of Americans." 14

Several things here are worth attention. First, whatever the unofficial attitude of the American government, Manning's call for unlimited aid to Britain far precedes any official statements on the matter. Furthermore, at the very time when Fortune Magazine complained that the American clergy were not giving clear strong leadership to America, when men like Harry Emerson Fosdick and C. C. Morrison were to be found in the ranks of "America First," Manning was proclaiming America's responsibilities in the conflict. 15 This call came before the Battle of Britain had taken place, even before France had been invaded; the war in Europe was in the phase described by William Shirer as the "sitzkrieg." 16 Secondly, there is a theme in this sermon straight from World War I. America must help Great Britain not only because that nation is keeping the United States secure, but also because it is right, and therefore "... the only course worthy of Americans." He still held firmly to the belief that it was the task of America to stand in the world for justice, freedom, and truth.

14 New York Herald Tribune, January 6, 1940.
15 Miller, American Protestantism, pp. 342, 344.
16 Shirer, Third Reich, p. 633.
This call for aid to Great Britain was one Manning repeated frequently over the next two years. In May, 1940, his annual charge to the diocesan convention, according to newspaper accounts, brought delegates to their feet in a standing ovation.

In such a situation, can any Christian or any American, be neutral? In such a situation, is our entire moral duty covered by the phrase 'keep America out of war'? We all abhor the very thought of war. We all hope and pray that it will not be necessary for us to take military action.

But I hold that we owe our fullest help, both moral and material, to those who are fighting for the right of the democratic nations, large or small, to live. I hold that it is the duty of our great nation to let the world know where we stand and to give immediately our utmost material assistance to those who are struggling, at untold cost, to uphold the principles of human life for which our nations stands, and upon which Christian civilization and all that we hold most sacred depends.17

In an interview following that address, a reporter asked Manning what was included in the phrase "material assistance." "Everything we can send them for the present short of troops, which we cannot do. We are not prepared for that."18 He also suggested that it would be nice if one of the presidential candidates took this idea as a plank of his platform. By the time of the campaign, both Roosevelt and Wilkie had done just that.19

Manning continued to make this sort of statement at every opportunity. In a letter to the editor of the New

York Herald Tribune he urged support of a program to aid British refugee children coming to America. "The removal of their children to safety will give inestimable aid and support to our British brethren in their struggle . . . ." He insisted that England was fighting for American ideals, for all that Americans hold sacred in human life, and that she would never quit fighting. Repeating the same message in a letter to the Times, he added, "The fathers and mothers of these children are facing with magnificent courage the fury of Hitler's attack, and it is their struggle which is giving us time to prepare." 20 In a letter to Sir Harry Brittain, in October, Manning commented that everything possible was being done to strengthen American sentiment for aid to England. "It is," he said, "a clear issue between God and the Devil—between Paganism, Brutality, and Slavery on the one hand, and all that Christianity stands for on the other." 21 Here, for the first time in either war, Manning expressed the conflict in terms of absolutes, as a clear battle between God and Satan. He never did it again, and he never did it in public.

Speaking to the Church Club of New York, in February, 1941, he again stated his hope that Congress would authorize

---


21 Manning to Sir Harry Brittain, October 9, 1940, Manning Papers.
all possible aid to Great Britain. This time he coupled the plea with an attack on those who opposed America's taking part in the war in such a way.

I ask how can anyone dare to stand up in this land and say that it makes little difference whether Hitlerism prevails or whether democracy prevails in this world conflict. No matter how sincere he may be, any one who holds that view shows almost unbelievable moral and spiritual blindness.  

This statement was a repetition of his World War I utterances, the idea that anyone who persists in neutrality in face of the obvious facts of the war is in danger of losing his moral principles.

Support for Manning, and others like him, came in April, in response to an attack by the New York Daily News. A letter signed by sixty-four faculty members and laymen of the General Theological Seminary was given to the press. It pointed out that Episcopalians did not support war in the belief that United States participation was the will of God, nor did they assume that they were any less under judgement than the other nations taking part in the conflict.

If, in any way, the United States is an instrument of God in the extirpation of evil in the world, it is a very imperfect instrument. Any sense of a divine mission comes from the Christian obligation to engage in a struggle for the greater good over evil, wherever that evil be found, whether abroad or at home. The Christian . . . in all humility . . . looks for the triumph of right in a true peace.  

---


23 Living Church, April 4, 1941.
It was a good summation of Manning's attitude. He had no delusions that America was perfect in every way, but he was absolutely determined that, however defective she might be, this nation must stand against evil wherever it was made manifest.

Meanwhile, Manning had not, in these two years, pleaded for aid to England only. At a Church Club dinner in February, 1940, he voiced his hopes that Finland might likewise receive American aid. "I say that as Christians and Americans we are untrue to our ideals and traditions unless we give Finland not only funds for relief but also funds . . . for her continued resistance and defense . . . ."24

In March he denounced both Germany and Russia as totalitarian nations whose goal was the destruction of democracy, freedom, and Christianity itself. In an echo of his May, 1916, letter to the Times, he said,

As Christians . . . we must pray not only that we may be kept safe, not merely that our country may be spared from war, but that, no matter what may come, we may do what is right . . . . We must pray the conflict may be speedily ended, but that it may be so ended that righteousness, justice and liberty may be preserved and upheld for the sake of all people everywhere, including the people of Germany and Russia, and for the sake of our land now and in the future.25

In December he had a special service of intercession for Greece.

"We urge our government to send every possible aid to Greece

24New York Times, February 1, 1940.
with continued and greatly increased aid to Great Britain."

In connection with this address he explained his continual plea for peace with justice and freedom.

In this world conflict, when everything that Christians hold sacred is at stake, it is not enough for leaders of Christian Churches to call upon men to pray only for peace. That might mean a false peace, a peace that is no peace but a supine surrender to the powers of wrong or evil. . . . there can be no true peace until the tragically misled aggressor nations are brought back to sanity and set free from the wicked and iniquitous influences which now blind and enslave them.26

Here is the final step in Manning's reversion to the days of the First World War. Then he had taken every opportunity to condemn the idea of an "easy peace," one which would bring "a curse rather than a blessing."

When Congress passed the draft law in 1940 it included in the legislation an automatic exemption for theological students. Manning would have none of it. In another letter to the Times he reminded readers that there had been such an exemption during the first war, but added that he knew few who had taken advantage of it. Agreeing with another letter on the subject, he said, "... it deals an ill-deserved blow to innocent men who are enlisting for a hard life work. No matter how sincere those may be who have urged this exemption, it will make hundreds of eager young men . . . hang their heads in shame."27 Either the war and American

27 New York Times, August, 1940.
policy are so evil that the Church should oppose both, or those who are able should be allowed "... their equal share of sacrifice with their brothers." It would be a sad thing, he added, if theological students did not want to do their part on the same basis as everyone else, "... for the church needs today more than ever in the ministry men whose manhood, patriotism and moral vision are beyond question."

On August 19, 1941, Churchill and Roosevelt drew up the document which became known as the Atlantic Charter. The third point of this agreement endorsed "the right of all peoples to determine the nature of their own particular forms of government." Manning wholeheartedly approved of the charter, especially of that point which invited other nations to join in the agreement. "It cements the fellowship between our country and other English-speaking nations and united us irrevocably with them for the overthrow of tyranny and aggression and the maintenance of justice and human liberty."

In August, 1942, the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee made the suggestion that Britain should grant immediate freedom to India. This step, he pointed

---

28 DuMond, America in Our Time, p. 606. His date for the charter is incorrect. See Shirer, Third Reich, p. 633.

29 New York Sun, August 5, 1941.
out, would be acting in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, and actually seemed called for by its third point. Manning preached a response to this suggestion from the cathedral pulpit.

The Church must call upon our people of all races in this land to stand absolutely united in spirit with all our allies. In this war we are all one. We are all united in the one great common cause and all depend upon each other. Anything in the nature of anti-British propaganda, or anti-Russian propaganda, or propaganda against any of our Allies, is a dangerous and peculiarly despicable form of sabotage. It is directly helpful to the enemy, and is traitorous both to our own country and to those who are sharing this great battle with us. 30

This reply, and its implication that the Allies were not to be required to put their ideals into practice, received a great deal of correspondence which expressed amazement at Manning's position. It was obviously quite in accord with his general attitude toward war. In a conflict between good and evil the conduct of those fighting for good was not subject to criticism. Manning was not arguing against the validity of Senator Reynolds' contention that a course of action such as he suggested was in line with the Atlantic Charter. He was arguing that any attack on any of the Allies was a threat to their strength, therefore a threat to their chances of immediate or future victory. The problem was not the truth of Reynolds' statement but its unfortunate timing.

30 New York Herald Tribune, August 24, 1942.
Another incident of the same sort came up in March, 1944. At that time a furor was stirred up in the United States over the Allied practice of "obliteration bombing," the mass bombing of German cities which was excused as necessary to destroy the industrial war potential of the enemy. Manning strongly attacked those who opposed the bombings. In a letter to the New York Herald Tribune he denounced the general pacifist attitude of "peace at any price" as harmful to the nation and not in accord with Christian belief. He admitted that no one liked this sort of thing or had any great desire to do it.

... but this is brought upon us by the forces of aggression, cruelty and terror which we are fighting ... .

But as matters stand, the bombing of cities which are military objectives, fearful as this is, is only a necessary and inescapable part of our whole effort to end the war, to stop the bloodshed, cruelty and suffering, to liberate the enslaved and tortured peoples and to open the way for a just and righteous peace ... .

Manning had spoken frequently of his hope that the war would result in a just and lasting peace for the world, a peace based on Christian principles of truth and righteousness. He spoke only infrequently, however, of the means by which such a peace would be maintained. He praised the unity of the Allies with regularity, but seldom carried that praise any further than to hope that their battle would

---

31 New York Herald Tribune, March 11, 1944.
ultimately create this peaceful world of which he spoke. The phrase "collective security," for Manning, generally had reference only to the war period. This attitude is strange in light of his strong support of the League of Nations, and it may be due only to a lack in the material available for study. Two items during the war years suggest that this, indeed, may be the case. First, in 1942, Manning was one of a group which signed a statement calling for full support of the eight points of the Atlantic Charter. This document, it is to be remembered, became the basis for the United Nations. The statement which Manning signed pointed out that "While it is our first duty to win the war, we must not again lose the peace and should therefore begin an immediate study of worldwide collective security." 32

The second item comes in connection with Manning's statement on obliteration bombing. In concluding his remarks on that subject he said that the purpose of the bombing was liberation of the captive nations both to make clear the way to a just peace and to make possible "... such co-operation and fellowship of the peace-loving nations as shall safeguard the world against another such outbreak of barbarism." 33 It seems likely that the reference was to the growing movement for a permanent United Nations.

33 New York Herald Tribune, March 11, 1944.
Manning showed the same attitude toward pacifism and neutrality during the second war that he had displayed with such consistency from 1914 onward. In October, 1941, in a sermon that received almost total condemnation in his mail, Manning put his position on both subjects in this way.

We see now that the counsels of our isolationists and pacifists and appeasers would bring us to the same tragedy and ruin which these counsels brought to the countries now enslaved. We all want peace. But we see that there can be no peace, no security, no freedom or decency in this world until Hitlerism is defeated and destroyed. [Anyone who spreads propaganda against any of the Allies] . . . is acting against our own government and is giving aid to the forces of Hitler.

Both pacifists and those who defended strict neutrality fell under the judgement of those remarks.

In July, 1942, he attacked those who refused to pray for Allied victory. Not only is such prayer right, he said, but it is the Christian's bounden duty.

If it is right for us to work and fight for victory . . . it is right and our duty to pray for victory. You believe in God and in His power and goodness. You know that it is God's will that this shall be a world of liberty and brotherhood and justice. Then pray for victory for our nation and our allies.55

Twice in 1943 Manning found an opportunity to attack American pacifists. In a New Year's Eve service at the cathedral he was in top form.

34 New York Times, October 6, 1941.
Any Church, or any leader of any church, who is neutral or lukewarm in this conflict, any church which fails to condemn openly and clearly the unspeakable wickedness, the inhuman principles and the atrocious cruelties of Nazism is untrue to the eternal principles of right and justice and to the moral and spiritual realities for which the church stands in this world.36

The extreme nature of these remarks is matched by his comments on the Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship, and the two may be considered together. In February Manning received a letter from the Presiding Bishop, commending to the clergy of the church the view of the fellowship. The letter did not support the group, but urged Episcopal clergy to consider its position. Manning, as his notes on the letter indicate, would do no such thing.

They are not helping build a better world—they are in fact giving aid to Hitler—and leaving others to protect their families and build a better world—they confuse the minds of others—they help to undermine confidence and to weaken morale—very wrong of the Presiding Bishop to do this—I hold this to be disloyal to our men who are giving their lives.37

Much has been said about Manning's attitude toward Soviet Russia since the time of the First World War. He began to denounce the regime in power there in 1919 and continued steadily on that course—until 1942. Then, suddenly, a great change took place. One instance of this has


already been cited: the favorable reference to Russia in the context of Manning's attack on Senator Reynolds. The Bishop evidently followed Churchill's principle that any ally, whatever his antecedents, is to be supported. So Manning became strangely quiet about the totalitarianism of atheistic communism in 1942 and began to speak of that nation's "... heroic resistance to the Nazi onslaught." 38

In 1944 he joined with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on their "Salute to the Red Army" on the twenty-sixth anniversary of its formation. In a speech on that auspicious occasion he paid tribute "to the courage, devotion and heroism of the Russian people and to the invincible spirit of the Russian armies which have played so great a part in our common struggle against the forces of Nazism and Fascism." 39

He gave wholehearted support to Russia, by name, as a brave ally. Yet when the Russian War Relief Committee suggested that he help sponsor a visit of the Dean of Canterbury Cathedral, an avowed Communist, for purposes of aiding the work of that committee, Manning refused to cooperate, commenting that the American people wanted to give all possible support to the Russian army but none to Communism. Here was an old habit of Manning's, but here

38 The Witness, June 25, 1942.
it seems to break down. In the past he had successfully
distinguished between a nation's government and its people,
so that, for example, in the first war he could condemn
Prussian militarism and praise the German people at the
same time. Here, clearly, he made a similar distinction,
between the Russian armies, fighting on the side of the
Allies, and therefore friends, and Communism as a socio-
political system abhorrent to the democratic nations.

This process of rationalization went one step further
in 1943. In an undated statement, "Soviet Russia and Re-
ligion," Manning indicated his belief that religious
persecutions in Russia were a thing of the past. He cited
the fact that the Metropolitan of the American Russian
Church felt free to offer prayers before the altar of the
cathedral for the Russian forces. The episode was an ironic
one. "During the services, attended by representatives of
the Navies and merchant marines of all the United Nations,
the Soviet flag was placed among the others at the altar."40
Later on in this same statement the pragmatic nature of
Manning's attitude became clear.

We, as Americans, are utterly opposed to the principles
of Communist dictatorship. We are opposed to the
Communist system because it denies and suppresses
individual freedom of mind and spirit as well as of
action.

40"Soviet Russia and Religion," 1943, Manning Papers.
But it is not the menace of a militant Communism which now threatens the world. On the contrary, present indications are that the Russian Government means to attend to its own affairs and not to have any part in efforts to overthrow or undermine other forms of government in the postwar world.\footnote{Ibid.}

This pronouncement suggests an attitude foreign to everything that Manning had said in the past: that so long as nations confined their activities to their own people, those activities were of no importance to the rest of the world. On this basis he could never have spoken out against either Russia or Germany before the outbreak of war in 1939.

There is, clearly, a definite continuity of Bishop Manning's thought between this war period and the years preceding it. It is also obvious that this war forced him to take his principles to their extreme point, at which point they became highly questionable, as do any principles under similar conditions. The very nature of the war itself: the shift of Russia from enemy to friend; the new and devastating methods of warfare; the brutalities inflicted on non-combatants; all these played on Manning, pressing in on him (as on everyone) and demanding continual reevaluations. The extreme positions that he was forced to take indicate that he was trying to deal with new situations in terms of decisions made many years before. As an old man, in his seventies during the war, he was even more single-minded than he had been in past decades. It is doubtful if he
fully appreciated, for example, the nature of "obliteration bombing," a technique of warfare for which there was absolutely no precedent. He was forced to deal with that as he was forced to deal with another unprecedented event, the change of a nation from enemy and aggressor to companion and ally—on the basis of his constant principle that America and those with whom she aligned herself, were standing for justice and truth in the world, and that anything which seemed to threaten this stand was treasonable. Pacifism was such a threat. Any criticism of Allied war procedures was also a threat. An attack on any of the Allies in any way was a threat. Manning met these in the only way that he knew, with absolute denunciation, in the firm belief that the American nation would always uphold those principles which are at the heart of Christianity, and that, as a result, her conduct and that of her Allies would never violate those standards.
CHAPTER VI

With the end of the war Manning renewed his attack on Russia. Gone was the friendliness which an alliance between enemies brings. He quickly lost his delusion that Russia had set out on a more acceptable course in the world. The first indication of this disillusionment came in June, 1946, at a special victory day service for peace. Before representatives of the army, the navy, and Great Britain, he set out the way that Russia could indicate its desire for peace with the world.

It should abolish the 'iron curtain,' it should permit freedom of expression and action in smaller nations which are under its control . . . Russia should cease its present obstructive and enigmatic course in the United Nations . . . . We wish to cooperate with Russia and with all other nations for the establishment and maintenance of peace . . . . and we will cooperate . . . provided that cooperation does not mean the betrayal of those principles of justice and freedom upon which true and lasting peace depends.1

In his farewell sermon at the cathedral, having resigned his see after twenty-five years, Manning spoke of the contemporary moral confusion and spiritual aridity of the world. What was the cause? "In the midst of this world situation . . . we see the sinister power of Communist materialism, which rejects the whole concept of Christian morality . . . ." Everything, he said, which gives worth to human life, all

the rights of the individual, are denied by the Soviet Union to its own people and to those others over whom it exercises its tyranny. "The Christian gospel . . . is not reconcilable with any form of totalitarian tyranny whether it be called Communist or Fascist."2

Twice more Manning made it clear that he harbored no friendly feelings for communism. In 1947 a group of American ministers flew to Yugoslavia at the invitation of the government of that nation, to look over the country and to talk to religious leaders there. On their return the eight clergymen gave enthusiastic reports of the conditions which they found and asserted that the Yugoslavs enjoyed full freedom of worship. Religious beliefs and institutions, they said, were both tolerated and respected. The American ministers believed that the Yugoslavian clergymen, including Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, had been properly tried and convicted. Their convictions, concluded the Americans, were as criminals, not as clergymen.

Denunciations of this statement came promptly from both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox bishops. Manning, too, joined the fray. He wrote a letter to the editor of every newspaper in New York City. The eight clergymen had been well deceived, he began. The present "religious freedom" in Yugoslavia was of such a nature that if the two Serbian

---

Bishops in exile in America were to return to their land they could only expect martyrdom. Anyone with an eye for the facts of the matter can see, he said, "... that Yugoslavia under Tito is as completely a police state as Nazi Germany was—and that no man who loves right and freedom, unless he has been most strangely deceived, can approve, or commend, the Tito government."3

In 1949, only a few months before his death, Manning launched one final attack. Aroused over the trial and sentencing of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, he wrote to the New York Herald Tribune this denunciation of communism.

The spectacle presented by the trial calls the attention of the world to the ruthlessness and savagery of the Communist tyranny.

But this callous mockery of justice in Hungary does not stand alone. It follows the regular pattern under Communist regimes. It is of the same character as the deeds in Yugoslavia.

May the mock trial, the torture and sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty arouse all Christians, all Americans, all believers in God and human freedom, all civilized men and women, to realize the meaning of the cruel, inhuman and godless creed of Marxian communism and totalitarian despotism.4

Of the three enemies of the principles of Christianity that Manning had seen in the 1930's, this one remained. He could not be silent while even a single enemy of human rights and Christian belief continued in the world.

---

Three questions must be answered in order to evaluate the positions taken by a public figure. Is the position in accord with what he believes? Is it realistic in light of the facts of the given situation? Does it provide a workable means of dealing with whatever problems might arise in connection with the situation to which he addresses himself? If the answer to any one of these is in the negative, the value of the leadership is itself open to question.

What may be said about Bishop Manning, in response to these questions? All that has gone before shows that he consistently spoke on issues in light of his beliefs. He believed that Christianity was supposed to be a strong, vital and effective force in the world. He knew that, if it was to be so, Christians must be militant in their faith, quick to fight for justice and right, equally quick to oppose evil and oppression. He believed firmly that the very nature of Christianity meant that the Christian's proper sphere of action and concern was nothing less than all the world: "God hath made of one blood all men for to dwell on the face of the earth." He believed that Christianity itself is the guardian of human freedom, of truth, of all that is good.

With this belief in Christianity went a sincere and deep belief in the United States. It must not be supposed, however, that his Christian faith was determined by his
patriotism. Manning had an idealistic vision of his adopted nation. He firmly believed that it, and the other English-speaking nations, should and would stand forth in the world for what is right, what is good, what is just, what is Christian. When it did not do so he was quick to criticize. When it did he was equally quick to voice wholehearted approval.

Furthermore, there can be little doubt that, despite his tendency to view almost everything in terms of black and white, the positions that Manning took on important issues were eminently realistic. His view of the proper sphere of Christianity led him to be among the very first to condemn the Jewish persecutions in Germany. His belief that Christianity was the ultimate guardian of the rights of man led him to oppose totalitarianism in any form. His belief that America itself had the responsibility of upholding Christian principles led him to urge it on to take an ever-increasing part in world affairs. In every instance these positions were proved to have been right.

A point must be made here, however, with regard to Manning's statements during the Second World War, on Russia and on "obliteration bombing." What can be seen in his response to these events is not the breakdown of principles, or even an inconsistency in their application. Rather, Manning was trapped by that very idealism which had served him so well for so long. He firmly held to his belief that
America was defending justice and freedom. At seventy-seven, he was no longer flexible enough to admit that the nation could use means unworthy of the good ends for which it fought.

Finally, with the two notable exceptions mentioned above, Manning's principles gave him an adequate means for dealing with almost any development out of a given situation. Because of his belief in the Christian's responsibility to represent justice and truth in the world he was not the least hesitant to condemn the deportation of Belgians in 1916 or the Jewish persecutions of the 1930's. Holding to a dynamic and militant religion, he consistently opposed any form of pacifism which seemed to demand peace at the expense of justice and right. Because he held to this position he was one of the few American clergymen able to speak out clearly on Belgium, Ethiopia, the Russian persecution of Christians, and America's obligation to help those who fought for beliefs which she professed to represent.

For thirty-five years Manning held forth on matters of war and peace, first as rector of Trinity Parish and then as Bishop of the Diocese of New York. During that entire period he maintained a consistent concept of the relationship between the Christian faith and world events. He was an internationalist. He favored any means to obtain and maintain peace which did not conflict with the Christian obligation to witness for righteousness in the world. He
consistently urged upon his congregations the Christian's responsibility to uphold human rights wherever they might be challenged, and to do so no matter what the cost to themselves.

All of this makes Manning a figure of some importance in his time. In a day when American Christianity as a whole fluctuated (perhaps unconsciously) with the trends of public opinion Manning stood fast by his principles. In every instance where he voices popular opinion it is quite clear that before such an opinion became popular, his was a loud voice of the minority. When public opinion favored American neutrality Manning unhesitatingly urged the nation to take up its proper responsibility in the world, even if that meant going to war. When America was isolationist he spoke clearly of its obligations to Ethiopia. When it was pacifistic he spoke loudly of its responsibility to uphold righteousness at whatever cost. In every instance, too, it is significant that the minority for which he spoke with such fervor became ultimately the majority.

A good summary of Manning's position on the proper Christian response to war is given us by Manning himself in a letter written July 30, 1942.

The Love which Our Lord gives us is not weak sentimentality, and it is not moral pacifism between right and wrong. For a Christian hatred of evil must be just as real as love of the good. The Spirit of Christ in our hearts will enable us
to hate evil and to contend against it with our whole strength without hatred towards the wrong doers . . . but desiring their ultimate good.\footnote{Manning to Smiley Blanton, July 30, 1942, Manning Papers.}

Manning was a man strong in his love of the good and equally strong in his hatred of evil.
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