

War zeal, nationalism and unity in Christ: evangelical missions in Germany during World War I

Elmar Spohnⁱ & Christof Sauerⁱⁱ

Department of Christian Spirituality, Church History and Missiology,
University of South Africa, Pretoria

Abstract

World War I brought unspeakable destitution to humankind. The question arises: Which ideals drove people to march so enthusiastically toward battle and death? Church history research has called attention to the role of theology and the church. World War I was not merely welcomed; rather, it was understood to be God's word and was vigorously glorified theologically. To date, however, the role played by the evangelical missions has not been addressed by church history research.

The historical evaluation of mission journals of important evangelical mission societies of that era demonstrated that the evangelical missions also welcomed the war and justified it, as did the other Protestants. They shared in the over-glorification of their own nation and the propounding of negative platitudes about the wartime enemy. They professed to uphold the unity of all evangelical Christians; nevertheless, irritations arose between German missionaries and their international partners.

Introduction

In light of the millions of dead and wounded and the unspeakable suffering during the wars of the 20th century, the question arises: What idealism motivated young men to march enthusiastically towards combat and death? As far as World War II and the situation in Germany were concerned, this question can be answered by pointing to the seductive power of National Socialism. With regard to World War I, however, this question is more difficult to answer. At that time there was neither a *Führer*, nor a party calling to war, yet many Germans blindly followed the overrated nationalism and religious war zeal. A sense of elation prevailed and this evoked a limitless willingness in the population to make sacrifices for the fatherland. All class distinctions and religious differences were abrogated at the outbreak of the war. An overwhelming feeling of brotherhood was experienced (Besier 1984:17). The fear that enemies could surround Germany, as well as the sense of political and diplomatic stagnation, had disappeared. A decision had finally been taken and this was experienced as liberating. War was at hand and with it a hope for the solution of numerous social and political problems. Christian theology and the church played an inglorious role in this euphoric atmosphere. For example, war was transfigured to represent the mighty voice of God. By analogy with the theophanies of the Old Testament, God was now declared to show himself in gunfire and cannon thunder (Hammer 1971:94-113; Erdmann 1985:148-157). The heroic death for the fatherland was compared to Christ's death on the cross and the German nation was considered to be God's chosen people. Many theologians were not merely staunch nationalists, but also warmongers, who enthusiastically welcomed the war against "materialistic England, inflated by its own obscurity", "the irreverent and morally depraved France" and "land-hungry Russia". These stereotypes, which were repeated like prayer wheels by Catholics and Protestants alike, had a devastating effect on the credibility of Christian theology and churches.ⁱⁱⁱ

Church history research has called attention to this tragic time (Hammer 1971; Hoover 1989). The role that German Protestantism played during World War I was investigated especially intensively because German Protestant theologians and church leaders were exceptionally susceptible to nationalism and war zeal. However, according to Huber (1970:135, 215), a more differentiated analysis of the Protestantism of the time is called for, as there were also theologians and groups who developed approaches to overcome the war theology, which he considers worthwhile investigating today. This research thus heeds Huber's appeal in that it investigates evangelical missions as a particular group of Protestantism. Since church historical research has given little attention to evangelicalism^{iv} in general, the examination of this dark chapter is also just beginning.^v

The evangelical missions (the interdenominational faith missions), which were rooted in the Holiness Movement of the 19th century, represented a new type in the mission movement at that time. They differed from the mainstream Protestant mission movement by, above all else, their striving to cooperate internationally as well as interdenominationally (Fiedler 1994:32-69). Although classical

missions also had international contacts, especially with the International Missionary Council (IMC) later on, this powerful international opening of the evangelical missions was new (Fiedler 1994:129-135). The founding fathers of these new missions established their mission societies with the consciousness of belonging to a “community” larger than a particular confession or denomination, namely to the international movement of those with a kindred spirituality. In this manner, the strong criticism they encountered from the established churches and missionary societies could, from the onset, be borne with grace, because evangelicals believed that they belonged to a greater ecclesiological community. The unifying ecclesiological category was found in spiritual experiences, namely conversion, often followed by later sanctification or healing experiences. At international conferences, this spirituality was nurtured and propagated. Charismatic figures played an integrating role in holding the Holiness Movement together over national and denominational boundaries. One of these integrating figures was the Englishman Hudson Taylor, who was highly respected and esteemed, particularly in Germany. Taylor’s appeal for the evangelisation of China is regarded as the origin of the evangelical mission movement in Germany. A number of these newly created evangelical mission societies willingly joined Taylor’s China Inland Mission and subordinated themselves to his authority.^{vi} That was unique at the time. It is true that in the past, some missionaries had joined English missions and worked under English leadership. However, the affiliation of entire mission societies to an international mission was a new concept and could only be explained by the common spiritual experience and by setting aside denominational and national differences. A proper English–German network existed, in which the new spiritual impulses flowed primarily from England to Germany (Holthaus 2005:237-241). This was especially the case with the “faith principle”, which was conceived in England, readily received by the German evangelical missions and spread throughout Germany (Franz 1993:1-64; Schnepfer 2007). Without these stimuli from England, the German evangelical missions would never have come into being. They were especially thankful for the spiritual stimulation from the Anglo-Saxon regions and felt closely associated with British evangelicalism, at least until the outbreak of World War I. Owing to the war, irritations and tensions arose between German and British evangelicals, resulting from excessive patriotism and a martial war zeal, the influence of which could not be prevented from entering the circles of evangelical missions. The views of the representatives of these evangelical missions with regard to nationalism and war zeal, and whether any signs of a peace ethic could be observed in them, will be examined below.^{vii}

The rhetoric of war in evangelical missions

During the war years, it was not unusual – in either Germany or England – to insist on the inevitability of war. At the same time, popular opinion did not hesitate to discredit pacifism; only a few resisted this sentiment. The majority of evangelicals were also caught up in the war zeal. The question now arises whether the representatives of the evangelical missions also held these views. It should be remembered that World War I had a devastating effect on mission work. Communication with the mission fields was almost completely disrupted and, in addition, German missionary efforts came to a standstill in British colonies. The war also had negative effects on other aspects of missionary work; the recruitment of missionary workers became increasingly difficult as young men signed up in droves for voluntary duty on the military front instead for missionary service. World War I was a catastrophe for missions, unsurpassed in the earlier history of missions (Pierard 1996:362). It could therefore be assumed that the leaders of evangelical missions would have reached negative conclusions about the war. But that was not the case. Although they complained about the obstacles that the war posed for the missions, the war itself was not questioned.

The editor of the evangelical *Pilgrim Mission St. Chrischona* considered the war to be inevitable on theological grounds (Glaubensbote 1914:102). According to his view, while this war was not analogous to the Old Testament wars in which Israel had fought against gentiles, war was now led against Christian nations, and a Christian in this unredeemed world nevertheless had the duty to participate in the war (Glaubensbote 1914:102-103). Just as court officials had to enforce the decision of the judge, so a soldier had to fulfil his duty to secular authorities and defend his fatherland militarily (Glaubensbote 1914:103). He should go to war without fear, since fear was caused by a lack of trust in God and an impure conscience. The German and Austrian soldier should be convinced of the “purity of the sword”, for their Kaiser certainly had “not entered this war for territorial gains or mean revenge, but rather due to an irrefutable necessity to defend the fatherland”. The phrase “God with us” was engraved onto the belt buckle of the German soldier; the Christian soldier was to carry the same phrase in his heart (Glaubensbote 1914:104). The editor of the *Glaubensbote* did not answer the question on whose side God fought in the war, and whether only for the Christian German soldier or to the same degree for the Christian French or the English soldier; he sensed how grotesque such an assumption

would have been. As though God would side with one or the other bellicose nation! He thus added a warning to his explanation, saying that in World War I God's judgement was intended for the purification and the awakening of the nation (*Glaubensbote* 1914:104).

The anonymous author of a lead article of the *Liebenzeller Mission* also interpreted the war as the rod of God for the moral improvement of his people (Chinas Millionen 1915:77). However, according to this author, the majority of Germans would not grasp this. God had nevertheless shown his grace in that he had, at the appropriate time, provided the German people with men who could wield their swords in a manner pleasing to God. For example, he made mention of some high-ranking German military officers, such as Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg (1847-1934), who gave God the honour after battles were won, and compared him to a shining light and the saviour of Europe (Chinas Millionen 1915:77).

A further thought, which was meant to justify the war, was the assumption that the gospel could be spread in the Allied (Engler 1914d:130) and conquered countries (Engler 1915:27). An example mentioned repeatedly was Turkey (Chinas Millionen 1915:80), because the impression existed that the Turks, as allies of Germany, would open themselves up to the gospel. Exactly the opposite occurred. The Turks began to deport and murder the Christian populations, especially the Armenians (Baumann 2007:74-85). But since Germany needed the Turks as allies, not too much political pressure was exerted on them. Therefore the protest of the evangelical missions against the genocide of the Armenians was rather muted (Chinas Millionen 1915:80).

For the leader of the German China-Alliance-Mission, Karl Engler^{viii} (1914e:145), the war was primarily a defensive against the "treacherous, numerous and mighty" enemies of the German Reich. He therefore had no qualms about offering prayers for the victories of the German army. He also saw positive aspects of the war, one being that the war had offered a chance for spiritual repentance (Engler 1914e:145-147). Major General Georg von Viebahn, a person highly regarded in evangelical circles, also concurred with this interpretation in the journal of the Neukirchener Mission. According to Von Viebahn (1914:386), God spoke through the war to the German people; the war was a call to repentance and a turning away from sin, infidelity and immorality. This close relation between war and devout morals can also be observed in an essay by Carl Polnick (1915:8), the founder of the German China-Alliance-Mission, when he complained that, in spite of the "earnest language of God, by which thousands were killed daily in the thunder of howitzers, in the crashing of bombs", the theatres and concerts were still attended. This thought found common consensus in the Catholic and the Protestant theology, as well as in evangelical circles. This view was based on the theological conviction that the course of history is predetermined. There was no perception of human responsibility for the course of history – war or peace – therefore, it was not considered to be under man's control whether war broke out or not; it was under God's control. In 1919 Engler (1914e:45) still held the view that the causes of war were firmly grounded "in the depths of God's judgment, in the mysterious connection of his plans with the peoples of the world". Therefore peace was not viewed as a result of human planning and efforts, but rather as a consequence of the moral reform of humankind (Misalla 1968:127-129).

But there were other voices in the circles of the evangelical missions that could not reconcile the bearing of arms with their Christian belief. Nevertheless, the leaders of the evangelical missions argued against this pacifist conviction. Karl Engler (1918:171) and the editor of the *Glaubensbote* (1914:103) insisted on Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms, without mentioning this by name. According to this doctrine, Christians may neither inflict suffering on any other person nor fight evil with evil. The use of weapons in a defensive war, however, should be judged entirely differently. In war, an individual (including a Christian) served the authorities in defence of the fatherland and not as a private person with personal interests. The authorities – according to Engler – did not merely have the right, but also the duty to defend their country and people against enemy attacks. Engler insisted, as did many evangelicals before and after him, that Rom 13:1-7 required a Christian to obey the authorities that have been appointed by God. Engler (1918:171) also cited other biblical examples, such as the Old Testament wars, commanded by Joshua, Gideon and David, which showed that the biblical teachings did not fundamentally prohibit the use of weapons. In addition, Engler mentioned that Jesus and his disciples also never said a word against the soldier status. Consequently – according to Engler (1918:171) – war was compatible with the will of God and Christians could not refuse to bear arms.

This argument was based on the conviction that this war was forced on Germany from outside. Engler and the other evangelical authors accordingly assumed that Germany was not engaged in an aggressive, but rather a defensive war (Bender 1915:12). Historically, this is only partly true. There is no doubt that Germany started the military aggression: In a swift action, the German army marched into neutral Belgium and attacked France from a strategically advantageous position (Erdmann 1985:86-90). Germany regarded this as a preventive measure, since war seemed unavoidable and only a question of time. Confronted by the militarily superior Entente, Germany and the Axis needed the

advantage of entering the war with a surprise attack. Viewed in this light, therefore, Germany rationalised that no aggressive war was being waged.

Even at this early stage of the war, this action led to the discussion of war-guilt. The rationale for this action was the conviction that each nation had the God-given right to defend itself. In his famous speech at the beginning of the war, the German Kaiser Wilhelm II repeatedly stated that Germany was a peace-loving nation on whom war was forced against its will (Besier 1984:11). Furthermore, the representatives of the evangelical missions often spoke about peace. According to Eduard Zantop's^{ix} interpretation, peace was part of the relationship between God and man (1915a:118; 1915b:70). Especially during the horrors of war, "hearts mourning, grieving, and yearning for comfort" were searching for peace. He continued by saying that peace would occur if and when people were willing to surrender themselves to God's punishment (Zantop 1915a:118).

In summary, it can be said that the representatives of the evangelical missions did not uphold a specially refined war theology. However, they perceived war as a divine turning point and justified it theologically. At the same time, they referred to the traditional concepts of Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms, to Old Testament examples and, naturally, to the key passage in Romans 13, in which Paul – according to the representatives of the evangelical missions – demands unconditional obedience under every authority. In addition, a deterministic theology, which interpreted war as God's instrument for moral improvement or spiritual awakening of the population, was adhered to. Eventually the biblical calls to peace were interpreted as a mystical heartfelt peace, which had no influence on politics. These concepts made the evangelical mission leaders blind to the real effects of war. A moral and spiritual renewal did not occur. Rather, the opposite took place. The war caused brutalisation and a spiritual dulling. Nevertheless, silence was maintained about the unspeakable horrors of war. The wretched destitution, the physical and psychological wounds soldiers sustained and the suffering of the people should have moved the representatives of the evangelical missions to reflection about the war that they had sanctified. But that was not the case. Instead, they faithfully held onto some of these theories, even until after the war (Engler 1919:33ff). They did not want to acknowledge that, during the war, they had taken on board the heavy burden of guilt. It thus happened that they later agreed with the aggressive war policies of the National Socialists – they did not even have the moral strength to protest against the criminal Nazi regime.^x

A survey of the publications of the evangelical missions actually revealed that, when put in perspective, positive statements regarding war and nationalism did not take up any significant space in those publications. While at the onset of the war, a few articles had paid attention to political and military events, this hardly occurred later. Actually, in the journal of the Neukirchener Mission, political commentaries were rigorously avoided.

The rift between the German and the English evangelicals

The German evangelical missions that joined the China Inland Mission were answerable to the international leadership in Shanghai, which was headed by the British.^{xi} Although each mission received a certain amount of autonomy and its own field of work, cooperation with international colleagues was unavoidable in practice. During the initial years, such cooperation was not a problem; in fact, it was welcomed. Later, during the years following the turn of the century, and as nationalism in Germany received new impetus, cooperation became ever more difficult and calls for more independence became more vocal. As a result, the evangelical missions achieved more autonomy, yet they remained with the China Inland Mission (Franz 1993:110-111).

When World War I broke out, the relationship with the China Inland Mission was severely tested. As the Holiness Movement had lost its integrative power, national sentiment suddenly reigned. The atmosphere in the mission journals became more biting, for example the editor of the *Liebenzeller Mission* tended towards nationalistic ideas in a lead article. He declared that it was high time that German Christianity assume its share of responsibility for the nations of the world. In contrast to the more superficial and businesslike manner of English Christianity, he claimed that German Christianity had greater emotional depth and a more thorough understanding of divine truths. He alleged that English missionary work acted according to the motto "Go into the world and teach the nations English!" Therefore, he urged German Christians not to make the same mistake and attempt to bring German culture and influence to the nations (Chinas Millionen 1915:82). This view reflected the tradition of the faith missions, which regarded colonial and imperialistic movements critically. According to Chinas Millionen (1915:81), Christianity was global and had brought about unique contextual manifestations among the various peoples.

Significant animosity developed between English and German Christians following an open appeal, on 4 September 1914, in which renowned German theologians and heads of mission societies

criticised English politics. As a result of this, British church leaders and heads of mission societies refuted this criticism and blamed Germany for the outbreak of the war (Ludwig 2004:12; Besier 1984:11-27, 40-45). The German China-Alliance-Mission was, to some extent, also drawn into these disputes. The British director of the China Inland Mission, Walter B. Sloan, wrote to the head of the German China-Alliance-Mission and contended that the China Inland Mission had to side with the English government. The leaders of the German China-Alliance-Mission did not understand this (Engler 1914c:180). Karl Engler (1914a:162) was of the opinion that the time had come to cleanse the Germans of the spiritual influences of English Christianity, since by copying English manners, the German Salvation Army, the fellowship movement and the German mission societies had suffered far-reaching damage. When, owing to the general anti-British sentiment, voices arose in circles close to the German China-Alliance-Mission, claiming that English Christians could no longer be considered “children of God” (Engler 1914b:179-180), the leaders of the German China-Alliance-Mission were forced to express their views on the matter. Engler (1914b:179-180) and Eduard Zantop (1915:73-75) agreed that they could not deny the English Christians their belief in God. However, Engler was somewhat confused by the fact that there were “dedicated children of God” who sided with the English government. Although he attempted to understand the English Christians (1914c:180-183), he fell victim to the nationalistic ideas of the time. Engler maintained that this regrettable statement by the English Christians could only be explained if one understood the peculiarity of the English, who made no effort to understand other people or to read foreign reports. Likewise, the English understood the “German militarism” – and especially the German fleet – to be aggressive provocation and not a legitimate means by which Germany was defending itself. Furthermore, according to Engler, the English Christians were given biased information by their government, in terms of which Germany was blamed for the outbreak of the war, having failed to honour Belgium’s neutrality. However, Engler stated this was incorrect, since Belgium had already relinquished its neutrality. On the basis of such misinformation by the British government, Engler “excused” English believers for trusting the official publications of their government.^{xii}

Although Zantop no longer actively lead the German China-Alliance-Mission, he saw it as his responsibility to come out against the fanaticism of the German Nationalists. During the heyday of the Holiness Movement, it was hardly necessary to justify the “brotherhood” of believers across national and confessional boundaries, but this changed at the beginning of World War I. The shared experiences of conversion, sanctification and healing, which had proved to be an integrative power, seemed to lose their effect when war broke out. In addition, the charismatic leading lights of the Holiness Movement had all died by then. As unifying figures, they had previously held the movement together over national and confessional boundaries (Franz 1993:111). Zantop therefore had to rely on other arguments; the former emotion-based notion of belonging that had characterised the Holiness Movement was replaced with a thorough biblical-theological rationale. Zantop referred to the biblical texts 1 Pet 3:9; Col 3:11; Eph 1:15 and Ps 133 to emphasise the unity of everyone who was “born from God”. Accordingly, whoever was “born again” belonged to the “church of God”; the nationality of the individual thus played a secondary role. Furthermore, Zantop modified the verse in Gal 3:28 in order to clarify the unity in Christ against the background of historical, political and social tensions (Zantop 1915:75): “There is not Japanese, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Austrian, German, baron or servant, but rather all are in Christ. All recognise that they are one in Christ.” Zantop maintained that it was true that the believer had a duty towards his fatherland; yet, even in times of war, he should show love towards his fellow Christians. After all, duties towards the fatherland were not long-lasting; these were merely earthly ties. Much more important were the heavenly bonds, the loyalty towards the heavenly kingdom (Zantop 1915:74). Finally, he raised the argument that Satan enjoys sowing discord amongst the “children of God” (Zantop 1915:74). In a Christmas meditation on Luke 2:14, Zantop had already made it clear that, since God had made peace with humankind, they in turn should learn to live in peace with one another. Through the belief in the peacemaker Jesus Christ, it should be possible for the worldwide church – as a sign of the fellowship of peace – to love and help one another in spite of the war (Zantop 1914:178-179). Zantop’s style may have been ruled by a basic patriotic tenor, yet his was a voice imbued with biblical truths, which were diametrically opposed to the spirit of that time.

Looking at the situation from the British perspective, it is interesting to note that the leaders of the China Inland Mission showed a high degree of loyalty towards the German missions with whom they were linked. The mission leaders in China greatly supported the German missionaries on the mission fields. When in 1915, the authorities required the China Inland Mission to terminate the membership of its affiliated German missions, the General Director, Dixon Edward Hoste – despite the threat of imprisonment – gave his support for the retention of these missions within the alliance of the China Inland Mission (Chinas Millionen 1949:22). When the news of England’s entry into World War I reached the missionaries in China, the missionaries assured each other that they wanted to remain

“brothers in the Lord.” As a show of consideration for the German missionaries, English missionaries took down their flag in the dining rooms – this indicated their wish not to take the war and nationalism to the mission field (Chinas Millionen 1949:22). The credibility of Christian missions had suffered enough damage, since the Christian nations Germany and England fought a bitter war. For that reason, evangelical Christians wanted to set an example and bear a better witness, which was apparently achieved.

***Zeitgeist* and hermeneutics in evangelical missions**

The evangelical missions always attempted to design their publications attractively for their reading public and to include relevant articles; for this reason, social trends were taken into consideration and adopted in the style and content.^{xiii} The most significant social trends in Germany at that time were nationalism and militarism. These trends were addressed as a way of relating to the readers’ everyday life, but also as a way of defending such trends theologically. In fact, nationalism and militarism could only be pursued if a biblical rationale could be proved. This had an effect on the hermeneutics of evangelicals. The spirit of the times (*Zeitgeist*) became the hermeneutic key, rather than only a measure against which the actuality and social relevance of the Christian gospel and teaching were measured. At least the evangelicals did not get completely swept up – as did some notable voices of German Protestantism – into heretical teaching about war and nation. But they were, with a few exceptions, incapable of being critical about the war and nationalism, despite their international friends and contacts. Rather than challenging militarism and nationalism, the evangelicals justified the war theologically and overemphasised the duties of a Christian in respect of his or her fatherland. Instead of denouncing the sinful and inhuman character of the war, it was praised as a pedagogic instrument of God for the moral improvement of the people. In the hermeneutic coordinate system of the evangelical missions, a preferential option was made for family and sexual ethics, while there was a determined exclusion of the social and peace-ethical realms. Nothing was said – perhaps because of official censure (Deist 1991:153-163) – about the bellicose invasion of neutral Belgium, about the suffering of the Armenian people, or about the deployment of chemical warfare. Since conservative convictions and loyalty to the Kaiser were at an all-time high in Germany – which unfortunately went hand in hand with nationalism, militarism and unconditional obedience to authorities – not even a rudimentary ethic of peace could develop. With an astounding one-sidedness, this conservatism was ‘sold’ to the faithful as biblical teachings.^{xiv} Granted, the evangelical missions did some good in that they neither represented a nationalist chauvinism, which elevated the German Reich to the people of God, nor propagated martial war theology, which attempted to compare the sacrifices of war to the sacrifice of Jesus. They emphasised the unity of the worldwide church of Jesus Christ and took a firm line against German imperialism. Likewise, the theory was advanced that one should respond to a wartime enemy, not with hate, but rather with love. Whatever this was meant to mean in practice on the battlefield, where soldiers stood against each other in close combat, was not explained. In this instance, the evangelical missions could at least have made an appeal to treat the opponent with respect and the wounded and prisoners decently and humanely. In summary, it can be said that the conservative spirit of the times strongly influenced the hermeneutics of the evangelical missions. These circumstances made the representatives of these missions blind to the dangers of nationalism and war zeal, as well as to the politically immoral behaviour of Germany.

Works consulted

- Baumann, A 2007. *Der Orient für Christus: Johannes Lepsius – Biographie und Missiologie*. Basel: Brunnen.
- Bender, J 1915. Aus Briefen von unseren Arbeitsfeldern. *China-Bote* 23(2), 11-13.
- Besier, G 1984. *Die protestantischen Kirchen Europas im Ersten Weltkrieg. Ein Quellen- und Arbeitsbuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Chinas Millionen: 50 Jahre Liebenzeller Mission 1899-1949*. 1949. Bad Liebenzell: Buchhandlung der Liebenzeller Mission.
- Chinas Millionen 1915. Jahresbericht der Liebenzeller Mission für das Jahr 1915. *Chinas Millionen* 17, 75-83.
- Deist, W 1991. Zensur und Propaganda in Deutschland während des Ersten Weltkriegs, in Deist, W (ed.), *Militär, Staat und Gesellschaft: Studien zur preußisch-deutschen Militärgeschichte*, 153-163. München: Oldenbourg.
- Engler, K 1914a. Deutsche und englische Gotteskinder. *China-Bote* 22, 162-164.

- Engler, K 1914b. Deutsche und englische Gotteskinder. *China-Bote* 22, 179-180.
- Engler, K 1914c. Die englischen Brüder und wir. *China-Bote* 22, 180-183.
- Engler, K 1914d. Des Glaubens Bewährung in Not. *China-Bote* 22, 131.
- Engler, K 1914e. Was uns heute Not tut. *China-Bote* 22, 145-147.
- Engler, K (ed.) 1915. *Das Evangelium in China: Illustrierter Jahresbericht der deutschen China-Allianz-Mission vom Jahre 1914*. Barmen: Verlag der Buchhandlung der deutschen China-Allianz-Mission.
- Engler, K 1916. Zeichen der Zeit. *China-Bote* 23, 11-12.
- Engler, K 1918. Darf der Gläubige die Waffe gebrauchen? *Evangelisches Allianzblatt* 28, 171-172.
- Engler, K 1919. Die Ursachen unseres Zusammenbruchs. *Der Gärtner* 9/10; 11/12, 36f.; 44f.
- Erdmann, K D 1985. *Der Erste Weltkrieg*. 5th edition. München: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag. (Gebhardt Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte; vol. 18.)
- Fiedler, K 1994. *The story of faith missions*. Oxford: Regnum.
- Franz, A 1993. *Mission ohne Grenzen: Hudson Taylor und die deutschsprachigen Glaubensmissionen*. Giessen/Basel: Brunnen.
- Glaubensbote 1914. Kriegsgesinnung. *Der Glaubensbote* 37, 102-104.
- Hammer, K 1971. *Deutsche Kriegstheologie (1817-1918)*. München: Kösel.
- Holthaus, S 2005. *Heil-Heilung-Heiligung: Die Geschichte der deutschen Heiligungs- und Evangelisationsbewegung (1874-1909)*. Giessen: Brunnen.
- Hoover, A J 1989. *God, Germany and Britain in the Great War: a study in clerical nationalism*. New York: Praeger.
- Huber, W 1970. Evangelische Theologie und Kirche beim Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges, in Huber, W (ed): *Historische Beiträge zur Friedensforschung*, 134-215. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett. Ludwig, F 2004. Der Erste Weltkrieg als Einschnitt in die Kirchen- und Missionsgeschichte. *Berliner Beiträge zur Missionsgeschichte* 4, 1-32.
- Misalla, H 1968. "Gott mit uns!" *Die deutsche katholische Kriegspredigt 1914-1918*. München: Kösel.
- Mojon, H 1919. Weltdemokratie und Weltfrieden im Lichte der Wiederkunft Christi. *Der Glaubensbote* 42(2), 15-17.
- Ohlemacher, J 2000. Gemeinschaftschristentum in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, in Gäbler, U (ed.), *Der Pietismus im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert*, vol. 3, 393-450. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pierard, R 1996. World War I, the Western Allies, and German Protestant Missions, in van der Heyden, U & Liebau, H (eds), *Missionsgeschichte, Kirchengeschichte, Weltgeschichte*, 361-372. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Polnick, C 1915. Gabenverzeichnis vom Dezember 1914. *China-Bote* 23(1), 7-8.
- Sauer, C 2005. *Reaching the unreached Sudan belt: Guinness, Kumm and the Sudan-Pionier-Mission*. Nürnberg: VTR.
- Schnepper, E A 2007. *Mission und Geld: Glaubensprinzip und Spendengewinnung der deutschen Glaubensmissionen: Genese, Struktur und Legitimation*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.
- Spohn, E 2009. "Wir haben mehr oder weniger geschwiegen dazu." Verwicklungen – Ambivalenzen – Opportunismus: Die Allianz-China-Mission in der NS-Zeit. *Monatsheft für Evangelische Kirchengeschichte des Rheinlandes* 58, 205-217.
- Von Viebahn, G 1914. O Land, Land, Land, höre des Herrn Wort! *Der Missions- und Heidenbote* 36(12), 386.
- Zantop, E 1914. Dennoch "Friede auf Erden". *China-Bote* 22, 178-179.
- Zantop, E 1915. "Liebe zu allen Heiligen", auch im Weltkrieg. *China-Bote* 23, 73-75.
- Zantop, E 1915a. Gottes Friedensgedanken. *Der Glaubensbote* 38(10), 117-118.
- Zantop, E 1915b. Ein göttlicher Gnaden- und Friedensgruß. *Der Glaubensbote* 38(16), 69-71.

Endnotes

- 1 Corresponding author. Partly based on his MTh dissertation, The German Alliance Mission and the Federation of Free Evangelical Churches in Germany: The history of their relationship and its theological rationale, Unisa 2007. Email: MuESpohn@gmx.de.
- 2 Dr Christof Sauer, as the supervisor, had the idea for this article and finalised its English form. Email: Christof@Sauer-fam.de.

-
- 3 In the first two years after the war, 200 000 and 300 000 people left the church respectively (Hammer 1971:172).
- 4 In this essay, Christians of the Holiness Movement, Fellowship Movement, the interdenominational faith mission movement as well as Christians from Evangelical Alliance circles and free-churches are designated as evangelicals. The term “evangelical” did not exist at that time, since it only became popular in Germany during the 1970s, but it includes the whole spectrum of neo-pietist movements and groups that arose in the second half of the 19th century.
- 5 An exception is Ohlemacher’s (2000) description of the attitude of the fellowship movement towards war. While he deals with one particular evangelical group only, the general mood seems to apply to the evangelical movement of the time at large.
- 6 The German China-Alliance-Mission joined in 1889, the Liebenzeller Mission in 1895 and the China branch of the Pilgrim Mission St. Chrischona in 1906. Smaller missions followed later.
- 7 The publications of the largest and best-known evangelical missions, namely those of the Pilgrim Mission St. Chrischona, the Liebenzeller Mission, the Neukirchener Mission and the German China-Alliance-Mission were evaluated. See Sauer (2005:168-170) for an overview of the origins and history of these missionary societies.
- 8 Karl Engler (1874-1923), a teacher, led the German China-Alliance-Mission from 1910 until his death.
- 9 Eduard Zantop (1865-1924), a representative of the Holiness Movement and Bible teacher, was mission inspector of the German China-Alliance-Mission (1903-1910) but remained active on the board until his death.
- 10 Research on the evangelical missions in Nazi times is still in its initial stages (see Spohn 2009).
- 11 Hudson Taylor was succeeded as leader by Dixon Edward Hoste in 1900 and by Frank Houghton in 1935.
- 12 Additional platitudes about the wartime enemies of Germany are found in Engler (1915:8).
- 13 Thus reports from the front were reproduced or propaganda was made for religious pamphlets with titles such as: “Through Blood and Iron”, “God Speaks in the Storm of War”, “With God for Kaiser and Kingdom!” In the publication *Chinas Millionen*, “mission reports” were renamed “war reports”, possibly alluding to the spiritual battle (Eph 6:10-19).
- 14 For example, Mojon (1919) polemicised against modern developments such as democracy, voting rights for women and world peace efforts. Engler (1916) criticised social democracy and liberalism.