This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Methodist Responses to Labor Unrest
In Late Nineteenth Century America:
A Critical Theory

presented by

Robert James Henning

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

The Ph.D. degree in Interdisciplinary
Studies

Major professor
Milton Powell

Date October 20, 1994

METHODIST RESPONSES TO LABOR UNREST IN LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY AMERICA: A CRITICAL THEORY

By

Robert James Henning

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Arts and Letters
Interdisciplinary
History, Philosophy, Religious Studies

1994

ABSTRACT

METHODIST RESPONSES TO LABOR UNREST
IN LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY AMERICA:
A CRITICAL THEORY

By

Robert James Henning

This research project interprets late nineteenth century Methodist responses to labor unrest in the United States. The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas, modified by Reinhold Niebuhr's concept of irony, serves as the perspective from which these historical developments are interpreted. The responses are part of the rational process of modernization which calls for rational critique of economic and political orders controlling society, culture, and personality. The irony is that Methodist "success" became the source of its failure.

Methodist responses to labor "earthquakes" of 1877, 1886 and 1894 are summarized from three official Methodist publications, The Christian Advocate (New York), The Methodist Review, and Zion's Herald Data also come from writings of Methodists Rutherford B. Hayes, Frances Willard, and William Carwardine.

Background chapters explore liberation concerns of John Wesley's Methodism, marriage of Methodist liberation concerns to liberation concerns of American civil religion, and challenges to the marriage by events of 1877, 1886, and 1894. Three basic responses were discovered. First, some sought to maintain the marriage by "defending free institutions," especially by promoting a "Pentecostsl revival" of in-depth spiritual

experiences. Others sought to re-structure the marriage, either with a Gospel of Wealth, putting greater emphasis on the cultivation of economic virtue, or with a Social Gospel, putting greater emphasis on converting the society to the kingdom of God. Yet others, especially Hayes, Willard, and Carwardine, labored for a renewal of the union of concerns for spirituality and concerns for political liberty by listening and communicating with labor in quest of a solution. The first two responses exemplify Habermas's interpretation of modernization leading to "colonization" of the lifeworld by the rational demands of economic and political structures. The third exemplifies his hope in the rationality of the human lifeworld to resist and restore social ordering by free communication by all, rather than order controlled by money or power. Concluding reflections suggest limitations of this hope in the human quest for rationality.

To Barbara, the beautiful person who shares life with me,
and to Christy and Mark, the beautiful children God has blessed us with.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The patient support and encouragement of Professors Powell, Bailey, Peterson, and Anderson have made completion of the project possible. Milton Powell encouraged my efforts and guided my writing. David Bailey challenged me to express my theological convictions. Richard Peterson illuminated Marx, Hegel and Habermas and challenged me to clarity in philosophical expression. Robert Anderson started me on the project and supported my efforts. Each of these persons has not only contributed to this academic project but has also contributed to me as a person.

My mother and father, Richard and Mary Henning, led me into and encouraged me in the Christian way, a way of faith matched with social concern. That faith and social concern inspired a love of learning, especially learning about the Christian heritage and its relevance to the oppressed of our day. This project results from that love of learning.

My wife Barb and our children Christy and Mark have shared my time and energies with this time-consuming project. In spite of frustrations this has caused, they have steadfastly supported my efforts, for which I am grateful.

I am grateful for the help of these and many others in completing this project. Most of all, I am grateful for the grace of the One who said, "My grace is sufficient for you, for power is ;made perfect in weakness."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> The Methodists grow more and more self-indulgent, because they grow rich. ... For wherever true Christianity spreads it must cause diligence and frugality, which, in the natural course of things, must beget riches. And riches naturally beget pride, love of the world, and every temper that is destructive of Christianity.
>
> --John Wesley[1]

Wesley's Critique of Christian Discipline

Long before late nineteenth century Methodists faced problems and possibilities in relating to labor, John Wesley had succeeded in methodically organizing many of his English fellow citizens "to reform the nation, particularly the Church, and to spread scriptural holiness throughout the land."[2] But, by 1789, two years before his death, he saw the irony that the English Church, especially Methodist promoters of holiness within it, had "done so little good in the world." Others might theologize about Original Sin or individual vices, but Wesley focused on the specific practical problem of "riches" as he saw it Biblically explained.[3] The virtue of spiritual discipline in Methodist small groups had become the vice of self sufficiency. Small-group solidarity in disciplined godliness was replaced by individualistic membership and discipline that no longer shared the fruits of diligence in Christian community. A movement that began by attracting many from the working class by solidarity with labor no longer seemed committed to such solidarity.[4]

By the late nineteenth century, the same irony Wesley had seen in late eighteenth century England was evident in American Methodism. The Methodist Episcopal Church the largest American Protestant denomination, had acquired vast wealth in church facilities, colleges, and seminaries and boasted a highly financed world missions program.[5] Yet, the same organization that had declared at the 1784 organizing Conference in Baltimore its sense of mission "to reform the continent and to spread scriptural holiness over these lands" had become an institution of wealth and power to be defended against a perceived threat by the American working class.

Interpreting the Lost Critique

The basic question explored in the following pages is: how may various Methodist responses to late nineteenth century labor unrest in the United States be interpreted as part of historic developments of the times? More specifically: what interpretation may be made of the shift in the perfectionist revival movement that had so much to say before the Civil War about freedom for American slaves, yet had so little to say after the Civil War about freedom from oppression for factory workers? Also, what interpretation may be made of the role of institutional Methodism, which saw itself as an agent of civic reform after the Civil War, yet did not speak up in behalf of the wage laborer?

The data for this research effort are selected on the basis of Henry May's focus on "three earthquakes" which challenged post-Civil War Protestantism's perspective on labor.[6] My research focuses on responses to three critical events: 1) the July 1877 National Labor Uprising; 2) the May 4, 1886 Haymarket Bombing and resulting trial and

execution of the Chicago anarchists; and 3) the May to July 1894 Pullman Strike in Chicago and related National Railway Union Boycott. Data comes from three influential Methodist publications: The Methodist Review, The Christian Advocate (New York), and Zion's Herald.[7] The scholarly bi-monthly Review and the more popularly written weekly Advocate were official national Methodist publications. The Herald, controlled by the Boston Wesleyan Association, spoke for new England Methodism. These three publications presented a variety of responses and not a single "party line," so they provide a wide-ranging source for the analysis of Methodist responses to late nineteenth century labor unrest.

Additional data comes from diaries, autobiographies, and other accounts of Methodist President Rutherford B. Hayes, Methodist national women's leader Frances Willard, and Methodist Pastor William Carwardine. Hayes sent troops to subdue the 1877 strikes. Willard took sides with labor after the events of May 1886. And, Pastor Carwardine wrote an extensive commentary on the 1894 Pullman Strike.

The basic philosophic framework for interpreting this segment of history will be the Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas, as expressed in his Theory of Communicative Action, especially the second volume, Lifeworld and System.[8] Habermas's Critical Theory involves both a theory of the modernization of society and a theory of the human rationality expressed in that modernization. It is both a social theory and a philosophic perspective.[9]

On the one hand, Habermas interprets the modernization process as an evolution from traditional society to a rationally ordered communicative social lifeworld to rationally

ordered political and economic subsystems. The social "lifeworld" includes culture, society, and personality, which are, respectively, reproduced, integrated, and socialized by communicative action.[10] Political and economic subsystems are developed to serve the more fundamental lifeworld, and they develop a rationality of their own.

On the other hand, Habermas observes the steering of the lifeworld by the money medium of the economic market and the power medium of political administration. He also notes the challenge to this steering by the more fundamental medium of language of the lifeworld.

Modernization, as Habermas interprets it, is a process of the rationalization of society, leading to conflict of lifeworld and subsystem rationalities--communicative actions conflicting with strategic actions--and eventually overcome by the more fundamental communicative action seeking lifeworld rationality. Social conversation leads to rational worldviews replacing traditional ones. Further conversation leads to rational economic and political plans for the benefit of the lifeworld. But, the media of money and power of the economic and political subsystems come to steer the lifeworld rather than the medium of language. Eventually, the lifeworld asserts itself to put economic and political rationality in their place, subservient to the rationality of the lifeworld that is determined by the medium of language.

Additional perspective for interpreting these events will come from theological insights of Wesley and Reinhold Niebuhr. Wesley saw rational economic discipline as a potential threat to the Biblical call to share resources with those in need. He also saw a problem in religious idealism that is "without God," a moral commitment to "justice,

mercy, and truth" that is not grounded in and dependent on a personal experience of God.[11] Niebuhr saw the irony of American religion that ignores the Christian doctrine of Original Sin, the irony of a nation whose pretentious claim to virtue is the seed of its greatest vice.[12]

What Wesley saw as the threat of "riches," and what Niebuhr saw as the irony of American virtue becoming the source of its vice, Habermas sees as the conflict, in the modernization process, between the rationality of human communicative society (the lifeworld) and the rationality of economic and political subsystems, with the media of the economic and political subsystems, money and power, replacing the language medium of the lifeworld. A rationality generated to serve the fundamental rationality of the lifeworld takes the place of the rationality it was generated to serve. Mixing the perspectives of Habermas and Niebuhr, it was the irony of rationality become irrational. From Wesley's Methodist perspective, it was the irrationality of spiritual discipline leading away from spirituality. Disciplined Pentecostal community was replaced by individual quest for Pentecostal experience.

Each of these thinkers in his own way expresses commitment to rationality that recognizes potential conflicts in the exercise of human reason, conflicts which, if unrecognized, lead to the use of reason to legitimate bondage and oppression rather than to empower human liberation. Their critical understanding of the conflicts of human reasoning helps interpret Methodist efforts to rationally respond to late nineteenth century labor unrest in the United States. Habermas's theory points to a more critical philosophic perspective, while Wesley and Niebuhr point to a more critical theological perspective.

Using Habermas's framework, three general responses to labor unrest may be observed among Methodists. First, institutional Methodism, married to an American system of Civil Religion, pursued strategies of defense of the American political system, including promotion of Pentecostal revival. The "Pentecostal Revival" promoted by Methodist leaders to save the nation and to save the church was not the glossalalia-employing ("speaking in tongues") phenomenon of the early twentieth century. Rather, it was a quest for a "deeper life" spiritual experience to empower for Christian living. Strategic promotion of such a revival sought to preserve the existing sense of political and administrative order in the nation and the church. The perfectionist revival movement made common cause with this Pentecostal Revival promotion, an individualistic Pentecostalism, in contrast to Wesley's communal Pentecostalism.

A second Methodist response sought to re-structure the marriage by a new Gospel of Wealth or Social Gospel. It was a strategy making the rational order of the economic or political subsystem primary. Whether the individualistic Gospel of Wealth or the socially compassionate Social Gospel, it placed the rationality of the political or economic subsystems ahead of a communicatively discovered lifeworld rationality.

A third Methodist response, motivated by human compassion, and sometimes connected with Wesleyan roots, challenged Americans to listen to labor so as to re-vitalize the union of Methodist religious concerns for liberation and American political concerns for liberation. This supports Habermas's optimistic view that modernizing human rationality contains the source of its own deliverance from the steering of the lifeworld by means of money and power. Although Wesley and Niebuhr's theological perspectives

agree with this emphasis on human communicative rationality as more fundamental than economic or political rationality, they both would see these hopes as unduly optimistic, Wesley because of "the deceitfulness of riches," and Niebuhr because of the problem classically identified by the Christian label of Original Sin. Wesley and Niebuhr were optimistic as to possible social improvement, but their critical and realistic sense of "the deceitfulness of riches" and the human quest for "power and glory" moderated that optimism.

On the one hand, Methodism expressed the irony of communal spiritual discipline destroying spirituality through individual and collective prosperity. In Habermas's sociological and philosophic perspective, it was the modernizing rationality of economic and political subsystems dominating the rationality of the more fundamental communicative lifeworld. It was the media of money and power steering the human lifeworld rather than the language of uncoerced communication seeking rationality. On the other hand, Methodism also displayed the humanity of those motivated by concern to practice the spirit of their Master in community with the working class. In Habermas's terms, it was the rationality of the human communicative lifeworld asserting itself, the "self-consciousness of modernity" in action.

Habermas's Interpretive Framework: Critical Theory

Habermas's Critical Theory continues the Frankfurt School's effort to update Marxian analysis to take into account twentieth century social and historical realities.[13] Max Horkheimer, a key early leader in the Frankfurt school, articulated the basics of

Critical Theory in a 1937 essay titled "Traditional and Critical Theory."[14] He sought philosophically to refine insights of Marx, an effort continued by Habermas, even as Reinhold Niebuhr sought theologically to refine Marxian insights.[15] Horkheimer wanted to avoid what he viewed as a Marxist error of reducing social explanation to economic factors.[16] Niebuhr wanted to avoid what he saw as a Marxian religious apocalyptic vision whose hope was in a proletariat uncontaminated by any interests to defend.[17]

Rather than follow the Traditional Theory of Descartes in organizing experiences in the light of questions randomly arising from everyday life, Critical Theory, Horkheimer explains, studies persons "as producers of their own historical way of life in its totality."[18] Critical Theory differs from Traditional Theory in exploring social sources of questions and the likely social uses of science. Rather than follow Traditional Theory's "adoration of facts and the social conformism this brings with it," Critical Theory seeks "the rational organization of human activity which it is its task to illumine and legitimate."[19] It seeks "to create a world which satisfies the needs and powers" of humankind, not aiming simply at an increase of knowledge, but, rather, at human "emancipation from slavery."[20] Horkheimer explains that it sees itself as holding to the ancient Greek notion of Plato and Aristotle "that the free development of individuals depends on the rational constitution of society," a belief that inspired Karl Marx to a critique of political economy."[21]

Critical Theory especially sought to unmask false consciousness so as to emancipate individuals and society.[22] On the one hand, Horkheimer explains, it unmasks the "popular materialism of the age...camouflaged by idealist slogans" which "has become the

real religion of the age."[23] Niebuhr's critical perspective similarly unmasked the "working creed" of materialism most Americans practiced while professing abhorrence of Communist materialism."[24] Similarly, Wesley's critical perspective unmasked pretensions to Christianity by those who violated Jesus' command in the Sermon on the Mount, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth."[25]

Habermas builds on Horkheimer's neo-Marxist critique of ideology as he integrates insights of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, G. Herbert Mead, and Emile Durkheim. His theory critically challenges domination of the fundamental human social lifeworld by the rationality of non-communicative economic and political subsystems of that lifeworld. He believes that humans are interested in knowledge for emancipatory reasons that go beyond quests for knowledge for technical control or for achieving temporary social consensus.[26] His practice of Critical Theory in the interest of emancipation is an expression of that knowledge interest. as well as of his optimism. His Critical Theory unmasks the ideological role of verbalized concerns for economic or political rationality by groups with interests to defend from the uncoerced participation of other groups in the quest for a lifeworld rationality. His Critical Theory helps in interpreting the ideological nature of some Methodist responses to labor unrest in late nineteenth century America. Those with interests to defend, interests resulting partly from religious discipline, placed the rationality of political and economic subsystems ahead of the rationality of the communicative lifeworld.

Habermas's Critical Theory relates especially to what has happened in the modernization of Western society. He notes Max Weber's explanation of the process of

the modernization of society as primarily a developing "rationalization" that "disenchants" worldviews from traditional bases to rational ones.[27] Thomas McCarthy explains that despite Enlightenment hopes to the contrary: "The triumph of reason brings with it not a reign of freedom but the dominion of impersonal economic forces and bureaucratically organized administrations."--what Weber termed an "iron cage."[28] The Critical Theory of Horkheimer and others became somewhat resigned to this "reification" of consciousness and the domination by a "means/end rationality" of "instrumental reason" that de-revolutionized the proletariat into submission to the demands of a consumer society.[29]

Habermas maintained the insights of Critical Theory and of Weber by "shifting paradigms" from "philosophy of consciousness" and "critique of rationalization as consciousness" to an analysis of communicative foundations of social action and the relationship of systems theory to social integration.[30] First, he added to the concept of "instrumental action" seeking a rational order (teleological) the concept of "communicative action" seeking a rational order. Second, he joined concepts of the human quest for "lifeworld rationality" to the concept of the modernizing quest for "system rationality" in the economy and politics. He did this by using the sociological theory of G. Herbert Mead to explain communicative foundations of human society, the sociological theory of Emile Durkheim to explain the material foundations of society preceding communicative foundations, and the systems theory of Talcott Parsons to explain the functional development of economic and political subystems of the more fundamental social lifeworld system.

Habermas analyzes society from the perspective of human language--"language-in-use" or speech rather than syntax or semantics.[31] he argues that the speech act implies solidarity, and that this solidarity calls for communication free of coercion. This is not a "foundationalist" appeal to an epistemological base that may not be questioned, but an analysis of the rationality of human communicative action. Building on Critical Theory's concept of persons as "producers of their own way of life in its totality," Habermas explains:

> If we assume that the human species maintains itself through the socially coordinated activities of its members and that this coordination is established through communication--and in certain spheres of life, through communication aimed at reaching agreement--then the reproduction of the species also requires satisfying the conditions of a rationality interest in communicative action.[32]

Habermas's foundation is not something the individual, autonomous thinker may discover, as with Descartes' "I think, therefore I am." Rather, it is the human communicative effort engaged in for social coordination needed to reproduce the species. This effort often involves communication seeking agreement. For the communication to seek uncoerced agreement, appeals must be made based on rational justification. In an introductory survey of Critical Theory in general and of Habermas's Critical Theory in particular, Paul Lakeland explains that the theory of truth presented by Habermas involves not only consensus, but a consensus with rational justification, "if and only if every other person who could enter in a dialogue...would" agree.[33] Lakeland continues to quote Habermas as stating: "The condition of the truth of statements is the potential agreement of all others." This communicative quest for potential agreement is implied by the speech

act.

As he closes the first volume of The Theory of Communicative Action, Habermas notes that, to avoid problems of seeing rationalization as the "reification" ("thingification") of consciousness, he will turn in his second volume to the theories of G. Herbert Mead and Emile Durkheim to be free of the assumptions of a philosophy of consciousness.[34] He sees Mead and Durkheim as explaining social reality without resorting to non-material emphasis on "consciousness."

Habermas uses Mead to explain the "communication-theoretic foundation of sociology."[35] This is a kind of "social behaviorism" in that it begins with observable reality and rejects a philosophy of consciousness whose fundamental data would be human consciousness that becomes objectified in social relations, but it does not involve behavioristic explanation of group behavior in terms of the conditioning of individuals by their environment.[36] Rather, it rejects "methodological individualism" and objectivism for "reconstruction of general structures of linguistically mediated interactions."

Mead viewed the self as an "internalized conversation" among a "me," a "generalized other," and an "I."[37] The sense of self or "me" is experienced from the standpoints of other persons in society by way of gestures that become univeralized in the symbols of language.[38] The self is not experienced in "consciousness," but in the gesture-mediated perspective of others. A similar process leads to a sense of the organized community and its expectations, which Mead terms the "generalized other."[39] Thinking takes place as the individual takes the attitude of the generalized other.[40] This

process of personality formation takes place essentially through language, "predominantly based on the vocal gesture by means of which co-operative activities in a community are carried out."[41] The "I" is the individual response to a situation, not calculable, but something that "just happens" and is experienced only after an act has been carried out.[42] The personality in social experience is thus a conversation among a "me" (what others define the self as by gestures), a "generalized other" (what gestures tell the self the social order is), and an "I" (individual responses to situations). Society is composed of selves interacting in this fashion, neither understandable primarily in terms of consciousness nor primarily in terms of external behavior.

Habermas uses Mead's sociology to understand the rationalization of society Weber observed. He does this to avoid problems of viewing society as a reification of the rationality of consciousness, such problems as a split between internal, subjective ideas and an external, objective world. Then he uses Durkheim's "theory of social solidarity" and of religion to explain the historic origins ("phylogenetic" foundations) of the authority of the generalized other, with its sacred symbols.[43]

Durkheim explained that the social order rested on a non-rational foundation determined by the density of social interactions and mediated by rituals energized by society. Rejecting utilitarian assumptions of isolated individuals preceding society and entering into contract for individual advantage, Durkheim contended that social unity must precede individual interests, since mere self-interest would serve only to divide individuals from one another.[44] A sense of social cohesion "essentially due to a community

of beliefs and sentiments" must precede any division of labor.[45] That pre-contractual social cohesion was grounded in rituals with "collective representations," shared social symbols of an agreed on social order that preceded rational discussion.[46] Those rituals were what Randall Collins explains as "a moment of extremely high social density"--high physical density with an added component Durkheim called moral density.[47]

The "collective conscience" of that society changed from a "concrete conscience" to a more "abstract conscience" as the society became "more voluminous."[48] The society itself became more "rational," since: "That alone is rational which is universal."[49] Also, because of increased "social density," the individual is "made more and more free of the yoke of the organism" (instinctually determined actions).[50] "The organism is spiritualized" (socialized), distinguishing humans from animals.[51] But, at the foundation of all this was the ritual, symbolic unity generated by shared experiences investing society with the authority of a god to its members.[52] That divine authority could be incarnate in flags or other formulae, or in persons, real or mythical.[53] The spiritual cohesion of societiy always rested in a non-rational social solidarity.

Habermas weaves together varied sociological insights into a Critical Theory of society. It seeks to unmask and emancipate from domination of the human lifeworld by the rationality of economic and political subsystems. Thomas McCarthy explains that Habermas sees society as engaged in communicative actions of understanding, coordination, and sociation by means of speech acts that are propositional, illocutionary, or expressive.[54] This affects the three basic elements of the "lifeworld," which are culture,

society, and personality. Culture is reproduced. Society is integrated. Personality is socialized. If the logic or rationality of the economic or political systems is subservient to these concerns, so much the better. But, when they dominate the more fundamental lifeworld, as they often do, they must be resisted.

Habermas acknowledges that the rationality of the economic market and the rationality of political administration came to dominate the more fundamental lifeworld with modernization, producing Weber's "iron cage." But, he sees Durkheim's and Mead's theories as pointing to natural and rational sources of resistance, Durkheim's to ritual social solidarity grounded in material reality, and Mead's to a socially defined self.

As rationalization has proceeded with modernization, political and economic subsystems have been differentiated from the more fundamental social lifeworld, with their own political and economic rationality. The strategic and instrumental actions taken in behalf of political and economic subsystems increasingly come to dominate the communicative rationality of the more fundamental lifeworld in a process Habermas terms "steering." The political and economic subsystems, governed by the impersonal media of money and power, "steer" the more fundamental "lifeworld," which, of itself, would seek to be governed by communicative consensus through the medium of language. The rationalization of purposive/strategic/instrumental action in work that seeks "extension of power of technical control" has come to dominate the more fundamental rationalization of lifeworld interaction, which seeks "extension of communication free of domination."[55]

Habermas uses insights of Marx to interpret this as a kind of "colonizing" which can be resisted and reversed by the activity of "communicative rationality." Weber and

others "could locate the spontaneity that was not yet in the grip of the reifying force of systemic rationalization only in irrational powers--in the charismatic power of the leader or the mimetic power of love."[56] In contrast to that perspective, Habermas argues that lifeworld rationality involved "rationalization of worldviews" before organized domains of action (political and economic subsystems) could develop. Then, he concludes: "It is only this communicative rationality, reflected in the self-understanding of modernity, that gives an inner logic--not merely the impotent rage of nature in revolt--to resistance against the colonization of the lifeworld by the inner dynamics of autonomous systems."[57]

Methodism and Modernization:
Gracious Ability to Rational Ability

Bernard Semmel has made the case that John Wesley's Methodism was much more liberal and optimistic than Calvinism in seeing possibilities of grace overcoming sin in human life and community. Thus, Wesley was a significant contributor to the transition to modern society.[58] While Semmel makes Wesley out to be more of a rational humanist than he was, his observation of Methodism's role in "modernization" links both Wesley and his spiritual descendants of the 1890s to Habermas's "communicative rationality, reflected in the self-understanding of modernity" that gave "inner logic" to resistance to colonization of the social and political lifeworld by media of money and power. For Wesley, it was a miracle of divine grace empowering Christians to responsibly resist the deceitfulness of money and power. For Habermas, it would be a manifestation of "the self-understanding of modernity."

Robert Chiles explains how Methodism moved from Wesley's emphasis on divine grace to late nineteenth and early twentieth century emphasis on human freedom and ability.[59] Methodist optimism in the face of threats of domination by money and power came to be grounded in a "self-understanding of modernity" rather than divine grace. In Chiles's terms, it was a move from a concept of "sinful man" to a concept of "moral man."[60]

But, this optimism was severely challenged by inescapable realities which Methodist Social Gospelers sometimes evaded in their challenge to fellow Christians to "rise up" and apply Christian faith to the social needs of the day.[61] Sidney Mead has argued that this optimism led to a substitution of sociology for theology, and by the early twentieth century it resulted in a "new theology" that was "secularized and innocuous."[62] But, such realities as unmerited suffering, death, and the twisted pride that divides humankind were not overcome by human activity in "rising up" in collective Christian action against them. These realities would eventually push many Methodist Social Gospelers back to the classic Christian proclamation stressing divine redemption from human sinfulness and resurrection after suffering and death.

Niebuhr's Critique of Democracy: Limitations of Communicative Action

Reinhold Niebuhr's analysis sought to relate the traditional Christian proclamation to the liberal modernization effort as that modernization has sought expression in democratic community. Concerning the American experience, he observed: "The conviction of the perfect compatibility of virtue and prosperity which we have inherited from both

our Calvinist and Jeffersonian ancestors is challenged by the cruel facts of history."[63] His critical perspective presents an ironic challenge to Habermas's confidence in the "inner logic" of human communicative rationality to resist the steering of the human life-world by the media of money and power. He used the concept of irony to describe the way the human communicative ideal, free of coercion, is often most severely undermined by the twisted pride of its most passionate advocates. Niebuhr explained:

> The religious vision of a final realm of perfect love in which life is related to life without the coercion of power is changed into the pretension that a community, governed by prudence, using covert rather than overt forms of power, and attaining a certain harmony of balanced competitive forces, has achieved an ideal social harmony.(64)

Seeking to provide a realistic justification for democracy, Niebuhr asserted:

> Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary.(65)

The lifeworld quest for rational order free of domination might inspire democratic ideals. But, the frequently masked human quest for "power and glory" inclines persons and groups to seek to dominate others "for their own good."[66] Habermas might envision a revolt against political or economic rationality in the name of a more human communal rationality. But, Niebuhr would force that vision toward the political realism of recognizing in all participants "some corruption of inordinate self-love."[67]

Habermas notes the deceptive domination of the lifeworld of human society by the rationality of economic and political subsystems of the lifeworld. He sees hope in the human drive for a rational lifeworld resisting domination by media of money and power. On the other hand, Niebuhr notes the deceptive domination of human social ideals for ful-

fillment in society by the human will to "power and glory." His hope is in "wisdom" by "the children of light" to "see the power of self-interest in human society"--including themselves--and to "beguile, deflect, harness, and restrain self-interest, individual and collective, for the sake of human community."[68]

Setting and Responses

In the chapters which follow, I will apply Habermas's analysis to interpret varied Methodist responses to labor unrest in late nineteenth century America. I will note those Methodists whose concerns for political and economic rationality "steered" their concerns for social order. I will note those Methodists whose concerns for the total human community, motivated by religious understandings of "love of neighbor" and New Testament community, as well as "the self-understanding of modernity," led them to resist the "colonization of the social lifeworld by the media of money and power." I will also note the theological forgetfulness that assumed that the human quest for rational order in the social lifeworld, even when seeing itself as empowered by divine grace, too easily forgot the motivations of self-interest in "power and glory."

In my first chapter, based largely on secondary literature and some of Wesley's works, I will sketch the way John Wesley's Methodism pursued solidarity with the oppressed of his day in England and sought their holistic liberation by means of a theologically grounded communicative rationality. At first, Wesley had done this to earn his own salvation. Later, it was a matter of "working out" the salvation he had experienced as a gift of God's Spirit.[69] A recent study of Wesley's thought by Theodore Jennings, Jr.

explains that, in Wesley's case, this was a "preferential option for the poor."[70] Jennings also observes and analyzes the failure of this "preferential option" to continue among Wesley's English and American spiritual descendants.

Wesley had sought to discover what it meant to "take sides with God" in the social life of his Oxford University "Holy Club," in the religious societies and class meetings he organized, and in the Annual Conferences of preachers he organized. Although he and his American representative Francis Asbury ruled the developing Methodist movement with an iron hand for strategic reasons, the foundation of their authority was an "appeal to mean of reason and religion," in Wesley's case, or an appeal to General Conference, in Asbury's case. But, by the end of the nineteenth century in the United States, social modernization had resulted, in Habermas's terms, in the "colonization" of the rationality of the fundamental social lifeworld by the rationality of monetary and bureaucratic systems. The informal communicative action of Wesley's religious societies and class meetings, as well as the greater informality of pre-Civil War American class meetings and small group quests for holiness, had been replaced by the strategic action and rationality of more formalized large group meetings, from more formalized worship services to National Camp Meetings for the Promotion of Holiness, to Methodist-supported city-wide evangelistic rallies.

In my second chapter, also based largely on secondary literature, I will sketch the way American Methodism became institutionalized and married to the developing American Civil Religion by the end of the Civil War. The Christmas Conference organizing the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States in 1784 had stated its purpose

to be "to reform the continent and to spread scriptural holiness over these lands." It was an application of John Wesley's similar vision for England. "Holiness" for Wesley involved eudemonistic concern for human happiness through wholehearted love for God and neighbor achieved through spiritual liberation that would in turn liberate from social and economic barriers to human community. It was sometimes expressed by Wesley with the somewhat misleading term "Christian perfection." The very term suggests an impossible ideal or a group of legalistic and pretentious persons professing to have achieved that ideal. However, Wesley viewed this as a promise of spiritual wholeness enabling joyful and loving lives of service to humankind by very imperfect persons in the midst of a very imperfect world. His concern for human happiness and wholeness is summarized by Wesley scholar Albert Outler in his Theology in the Wesleyan Spirit.[71]

Wesley's concerns for social and economic liberation are documented in Jennings's Good News to the Poor. Within the half century after American Methodism's founding, it decided that its vision "to reform the continent" no longer included the liberation of abolishing human slavery. As it moved from "sect" status to "denomination" status, to use the terminology of Richard Niebuhr's The Social Sources of Denominationalism, it became more concerned to preserve its political unity throughout the nation than it was to preserve its reforming mission.[72] However, the developing institutional Methodism (the Episcopacy and General Conference) was challenged by a perfectionist movement within Methodism, reinforced by Puritan visions of a "Christian America" and more in keeping with Methodism's original concern for human liberation, which challenged

institutional Methodism to return to the vision of human liberation from slavery. Some perfectionists refused to involve themselves in political issues, including Phoebe Palmer's widely influential Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness, begun in the 1830s, but many others, such as Gilbert Haven, Lucius Matlack, and Luther Lee, insisted that spiritual perfectionism demanded the abolition of slavery.

After the Civil War, the movement to revive Wesleyan perfectionism re-united with institutional Methodism, sharing a vision for "Christianizing America." By then, Methodism had become united with and a powerful advocate for the developing American Civil Religion.[73] However, in a somewhat puzzling turn of events, the perfectionist movement called for a return to early Methodist spiritual perfectionism, but it no longer challenged institutional Methodism, or the nation as a whole, to be reformed to the extent many of its members had called for the abolition of slavery before the Civil War. These new perfectionists included the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness, organized in 1867, Eastern in origin and essentially supportive of institutional Methodism, and regional associations, organized in the 1870s, Middle and Far Western in origin, and essentially critical of the authority of institutional Methodism. The national and regional associations were in historical continuity with the "Pentecostalism" that would develop by 1900, emphasizing speaking in tongues and other dramatic gifts of the Spirit. They were in many respects responding to the threat perceived from the industrialization of America, and to the urbanization and immigration that went together with that industrialization. At the same time, institutional Methodism was responding with the defense of American "free institutions" and others would eventually develop the "Gospel of

Wealth" and the "Social Gospel."

Following chapters on Wesley's Methodism and early nineteenth century American Methodism, I will summarize the three labor "earthquakes' of 1877, 1886, and 1894. Sources for this will include secondary literature and reports in selected Methodist publications. Chapters four through six will interpret basic Methodist responses to these earthquakes.

Chapter four will consider the first pair of Methodist responses to late nineteenth century labor unrest. They sought to maintain the marriage of Wesleyan liberation concerns to American Civil Religious liberation concerns by the strategic actions of defending free institutions and promoting Pentecostal revival. Institutional Methodism, seeking to defend free institutions, placed political rationality ahead of the lifeworld rationality of communicative action with labor. The perfectionist National Holiness Association placed a certain political rationality ahead of communicative rationality, believing that by seeking "deeper life spiritual experiences" and maintaining political unity the church and the nation would be changed for the better. Institutional leadership, represented by Methodist editors, promoted the same Pentecostal experiences, both for the spiritual benefit of individuals and to maintain the political order.

A second set of responses, which I shall discuss in my fifth chapter, sought to restructure the marriage of Wesleyan liberation concerns and American Civil Religion. Adherents of the developing "Gospel of Wealth" sought to de-emphasize efforts to directly "Christianize" America and to cultivate virtues in individual workers and individual owners of capital who would maintain and develop the economic order. They

placed the economic rationality of individual responsibility and philanthropy in the "free market" ahead of the lifeworld rationality requiring communicative action in relating to labor. Together with institutional Methodists and Pentecostal revivalists, advocates of the Gospel of Wealth adhered to what Eric Foner terms a middle classs "Free Labor Ideology"--"a stolid liberal orthodoxy, in which individualism, laissez-faire, the defense of property, and the rule of the 'Best Men' defined good government."[74]

On the other hand, proponents of what became the "Social Gospel" were inclined to turn to what Foner terms the working class version of the Free Labor Ideology, "an affirmation of the primacy of the producing classes and a critique of the emerging capitalist order."[75] However, these same Social Gospelers also wanted to restructure the marriage of Wesleyan perfectionist revivalism and American Civil Religion. They wanted more emphasis on social liberation and perfection and less on individual spiritual liberation and perfection. And, they wanted more emphasis on enacting the kingdom of God in America. They often placed the political rationality of dependence on an elite of the educated and morally mature ahead of the rationality of the lifeworld to be found in communicative solidarity with the working class. Many Social Gospelers pursued their strategy as an alternative to the perceived threat of "barbarism" to American institutions.[76]

A third kind of response, which I shall examine in my sixth chapter, sought to renew the marriage of Wesleyan liberation concerns with American Civil Religious liberation concerns by renewing communicative action seeking lifeworld rationality. In addition to several advocates of a Social Gospel who contributed to the Methodist press,

three other Methodists of this period exemplify the quest for a lifeworld rationality that would keep the subsystem rationality of politics and economics secondary to the rationality of the more fundamental social lifeworld. Rutherford B. Hayes, a layman active in the Methodist Episcopal Church (although he felt himself unworthy to be an official member), sent Federal troops to maintain order in 1877, but came to describe himself as a "nihilist" by the early 1890s. He was able, to a degree, to identify with the lack of power for working class persons, since he saw American political institutions becoming "government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich." Frances Willard, Methodist leader of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, although she once saw the solution of labor problems chiefly in temperance, came to make the risky step of taking sides with labor in 1886. And, Methodist Pastor William Carwardine of George Pullman's model factory town in Illinois went so far as to preach a sermon and write a book in 1894 supportive of the cause of the oppressed workers there.

Pastor Carwardine had originally endorsed neither the strike by Pullman employees nor the sympathy boycott by Eugene Debs's American Railway Union. But, as one who found himself in solidarity with Pullman employees, he felt he must speak up for them. As a Christian pastor, he saw it as a matter of "taking sides with God." He wrote:

> Napoleon said God was always on the side of the heaviest battalions, but God himself has said that He is on the side of righteousness and justice for the poor and needy, and that he will avenge their cause against the oppressor.(77)

In Habermas's terms, Carwardine was pursuing the lifeworld rationality of communicative action, a communicative action requiring dialogue among George Pullman, his em-

ployees, and the rest of society.[78] He was rejecting solutions to labor-capital problems which would make the primary concern in resolving the strike strategic and instrumental action aimed at rationality in political and economic subsystems of the total lifeworld. He advocated "National and State Courts of Arbitration" to settle such disputes.[79]

Concluding Reflections

In my final chapter, I will present some reflections on philosophical and theological issues raised by this study. On the one hand, Methodist responses raise the problems of religious legitimation of oppression. They also raise the problem of a quest for truth and justice that excludes dialogue with non-religious persons. On the other hand, Methodist responses and the Wesleyan heritage suggest promise of help. Although many Methodists sided with political and economic rationality against a more fundamental lifeworld rationality that would include strikers, other Methodists' religion drove them to take sides with labor. Also, the Wesleyan heritage in particular and the Christian hope in general is hope in the fact of incoherences in Habermas's solidarity perspective explicitly cited by Helmut Peukert and implied by Niebuhr.[80]

Habermas's Critical Theory unmasks the ideology of some Methodist responses to late nineteenth century labor unrest. A political or economic order in their self interest was more basic than an uncoerced communicative lifeworld. The conflict of rationalities (lifeworld vs. economic and political) helps interpret the irony Wesley observed in spiritually disciplined Methodists becoming unspiritual. Their strategic spiritual quest for economic and political rationality was steering the more fundamental need for lifeworld

rationality in an inclusive Pentecostal community.

Habermas's Critical Theory also helps in interpreting efforts at solidarity through communication by other Methodists. Persons such as Hayes, Willard, and Carwardine pursued a lifeworld rationality that was more holistic than that of those focusing on political or economic rationality. They were expressions of an "inner logic" of the modernization process that resisted colonization of the lifeworld by the logic of economic or political subsystems.

But, Hayes, Willard, and Carwardine eventually confronted three barriers to human communicative solidarity: 1) undeserved suffering; 2) death; and 3)n the twisted pride that prevents human communicative action. Helmut Peukert's analysis of Habermas deals with the first two issues and Reinhold Niebuhr's deals with the third. Peukert points to the challenge of undeserved suffering and death to the logic of solidarity implied by the human speech act. Niebuhr points to the conflict between expectation of a humanly discovered rational solution to social problems and the irrationalities of human experience.

Methodism has also always been, in its finer moments, hopeful of grace overcoming sin, not sin as private vice or metaphysical substance, but sin as pride and selfishness than resists Pentecostal community. There was irony in Methodist responses to late nineteenth century labor unrest, the irony of a disciplined working class movement becoming middle class and showing its loss of spiritual disicpline by forgetfulness of its Christian calling to join its Master on the side of the poor. But, along with the irony, there was the humanity of Methodists going beyond any particular ideology to express

love of their Master and love of neighbor because driven by a shared human concern to love neighbor, or because driven by the Pentecostal Spirit described in Acts 2 in the Christian New Testament. Habermas would interpret it as an "inner logic" of the modernization process overcoming subsystem colonization of the human communicative life-world. Wesley would interpret it as grace overcoming sin in Pentecostal community.

NOTES

[1]John Wesley's Sermons: An Anthology, Edited by Albert C. Outler and Richard P. Heitzenrater (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991), p. 556, in a sermon by Wesley which his historic editors have titled "Causes of the Inefficacy of Christianity" (pp. 550-557).

[2]"Minutes of Several Conversations Between the Rev. Mr. John Wesley and Others From the Year 1744 to the year 1789," by John Wesley in The Works of John Wesley, Volume VIII, Addresses, Essays, Letters (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, undated reprint of 1872 edition from the Wesleyan Conference Office in London), p.299.

[3]Albert Outler, Theology in the Wesleyan Spirit (Nashville: Tidings, 1975), has summarized Wesley's perspective on Original Sin in a chapter titled "Diagnosing the Human Flaw: Reflections on the Human Condition" (pp. 23-44). As with Wesley's sermons on the topic, though, the discussion focuses on the relation of Original Sin to the need for divine grace for salvation. It does not deal with the impact of Original Sin on human organizational life--in the church, in politics, and in other relationships. Wesley's sermons "On Sin in Believers" (1763), "The Repentance of Believers" (1767) and "The Duty of Constant Communion" (1787) , as reproduced in Outler and Heitzenrater, op. cit., call Methodists to humility and confession of sins, but they do not analyze the impact of Original Sin on Methodist accumulation of riches due to spiritual discipline going together with economic discipline. Outler

(pp. 40-41), attempting to express Wesley's theological spirit, one that included both Protestant emphasis on justification by faith and Roman Catholic emphasis on holy living, gives a generalized definition of sin that is missing in Wesley. Outler writes: "Sin is not our actual misdeeds, nor even the evil impulses that still lurk in the murky depths of the human heart. Sin it its essence is human overreach--the reckless abuse of our human outreachings and upreachings--those aspirations that make us human but whose corruptions make us less than truly human. Sin is the bitter fruit of pride. It springs from out intimations of the infinite and our desires to avoid or escape the actual terms of our finite existence. Sin is our unwillingness to be radically dependent upon God 'for life and breath and all things.'" Outler relates this to quests for liberation sliding into oppression of others, quests for learning becoming intellectual arrogance, quests for self-knowledge and self-control turning into narcissism and self-deception, and pursuit of joy getting stuck in nostalgia or depression.

Wesley would have agreed, but his approach was not so explicitly theological. Rather than relate to the theological concept of Original Sin, Wesley attacked "The Danger of Riches" in so many of his sermons that Outler and Heitzenrater (op. cit., p. 451) suggest the generalization that "surplus accumulation leads Wesley's inventory of sins in praxis." Rather than a theological analysis of the origin of the quest for excess accumulation, Wesley warns his fellow Methodists of this great danger to Christian living. Outler and Heitzenrater (loc. cit.) conclude: "What is interesting is that Wesley's economic radicalism on this point has been ignored, not only by most Methodists, but by the economic historians as well."

[4]Wesley challenged Methodists "who continually grieve the Holy Spirit of God." He declared: "Many of your brethren, beloved of God, have not food to eat; they have not raiment to put on; they have not a place to lay their head. And why are they thus distressed? Because you impiously, unjustly, and cruelly detain from them what your Master and theirs lodges in your hands on purpose to supply their wants!" (Outler and Heitzenrater, op. cit., p. 553)

Responding to those who might question whether all the poor could be supplied this way, Wesley referred to the model Pentecostal church in Jerusalem in Acts 2 in the Christian New Testament: "It was possible once to do this... In the first church at Jerusalem 'there was not any among them that lacked, but distribution was made to everyone as he had need.'" (p.554) Observing that Methodists were leaving large fortunes to their children rather than help the poor, Wesley proposed giving a small amount to the poor after he had given these biting reflections: "But I will not talk of giving to God, or leaving half your fortune. You might think this to be too high a price for heaven. I will come to lower terms." In further remarks in this sermon applying the Hebrew prophet Jeremiah's words ("Is there no balm in Gilead?") to his

day, Wesley explains concerning Methodists: "Although many of them are still deplorably poor ('Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in Askelon!'), yet many others, in the space of twenty, thirty, or forty years, are twenty, thirty, yea, a hundred times richer than they were when they first entered the society. And it is an observation which admits of few exceptions, that nine in ten of these decreased in grace in the same proportion as they increased in wealth. Indeed, according to the natural tendency of riches, we cannot expect it to be otherwise."(p.556) The Gath and Askelon where Jeremiah had urged to "tell it not" were enemy Philistine cities he did not want to hear of the ineffectiveness of faith in the Hebrew community. Wesley recognized how this ironic powerlessness undercut the appeal of the Christian Gospel.

Although welcoming any who would propose another solution to this problem, Wesley saw only one way "to hinder riches from destroying the religion of those who were diligent and frugal. The only route to "escape the damnation of hell" was to "give all you can" to persons in need.(p.556) Wesley's three rules of stewardship--"gain all you can, save all you can, and give all you can"--must go beyond gaining and saving to giving. Otherwise, Methodist discipline would spiritually destroy Methodists.

Wesley's classic statement of his three rules of stewardship, "The Use of Money," is found in Outler and Heitzenrater, op. cit., pp. 348-357. Outler and Heitzenrater observe: "The breach here with the economic wisdom of the day is drastic and deliberate. ... On no other single point, save only faith alone and holy living, is Wesley more insistent, consistent, and out of step with the bourgeois spirit of his age.

[5]Methodist statistical bragging is a common occurrence in the 1880s and 1890s in The Methodist Review (MR), The Christian Advocate--New York (NYCA), and Zion's Herald (ZH). The goal of a "Million for Missions" was advertised regularly in these papers, successes were reported, and the standard was raised to $1,200,000. The 1892 General Conference included pleas for greater spirituality, but such self-congratulatory statements as Bishop R.S. Foster's speech in behalf of all the Bishops arguing that "both the church and general society are advancing to a better future."(ZH, May 1, 1992, p.1) Foster cited a numerical increase of 442,000 in the previous four years (1888-1892) as compared with an increase of 264,000 the preceding four years (1884-1888). Also, speaking of less emotional excitement but greater stability, he praised the increase in Methodist seminary enrollment because, as he put it: "We must meet the demand for an educated pulpit." NYCA of May 19, 1992 included a supplement with the Bishops' report of increases in numbers, foreign missions, church publications, and revivals.

[6]Henry May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949). May's earthquakes are: 1) the July 1877 National Labor Uprising, which began with railroad strikes; 2) the May 4, 1886 Haymarket Bombing and related striking, including the hanging of the Chicago anarchists; 3) the 1893 depression and related 1892 lockout and management-labor violence at Carnegie Steel in Homestead, Pennsylvania, as well as the 1894 Pullman Strike in Chicago and related boycott by the American Railway Union. To simplify the research, I focused on the Pullman Strike for the third earthquake.

[7]The following abbreviations will be used to represent these three Methodist publications: NYCA--The Christian Advocate (New York); MR--The Methodist Review (The Methodist Quarterly Review before January 1885); ZH--Zion's Herald (Boston).

[8]Jurgen Habermas, The Theory of Communicative Action, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Volume One: Reason and the Rationalization of Society (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984 translation of 1981 original German text). Volume Two: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987 translation of 1981 German text, as edited in 1985).

Habermas uses insights of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, George Herbert Mead, and Emile Durkheim. He argues that, in Weber's terms, the modernization of society, with its "rationalization" that "disenchants" worldviews from traditional foundations to rational ones, has also involved a separation of political and economic subsystems, governed by the impersonal media of money and power, from the more fundamental social lifeworld, governed by communicative consensus, of which politics and the economy are a part. The "lifeworld" (fundamental social lifeworld) is grounded in basic social solidarity and rituals, as analyzed by Durkheim. This framework is developed and transmitted by communicative interaction of society and its members by symbolic interaction, as analyzed by Mead. But, as modernization has developed, the rationalization of the political and economic subsystems of the social lifeworld has developed to the point of their separation from the more fundamental social lifeworld. Using Marxian analysis, Habermas argues that whatever strategic or instrumental action is needed to maintain economic or political rationality comes to have a "steering" control over the rest of the social lifeworld.

[9]Habermas, Theory, Volume I, pp. 1-7, "Introduction: Approaches to the Problem of Rationality," discusses this inter-relationship between philosophy and sociology.

[10]Thomas McCarthy, "Translator's Introduction," Habermas, op. cit., p. xxvii.

[11]In a 1790 sermon "On Living Without God," Wesley challenged those "practical atheists" who did not have a personal experience of God.(Outler and Heitzenrater, op. cit., pp. 568-572) He asserted a "wide difference...between Christianity and morality."(p.571 True Christianity "cannot exist without the inward experience and outward practice of justice, mercy, and truth"--which is morality. But, "all morality, all justice, mercy, and truth which can possibly exist without Christianity, profiteth nothing." Wesley qualified this for those "not under the Christian dispensation." He explained: "I have no authority 'to judge those that are without.' Nor do I conceive that any man living has a right to sentence all the heathen and Mahometan world to damnation. It is far better to leave them to him that made them, and who is 'the Father of the spirits of all flesh'; who is the God of the heathens as well as the Christians, and who hateth nothing that he hath made." But, those who called themselves Christians should not be content with anything less than a transforming personal experience of God giving a sensitivity to God that was missing from "practical atheists' who called themselves Christians. This was not a matter of having "right ideas," though, for, as Wesley put it: "I believe the merciful God regards the lives and tempers of men more than their ideas. I believe he respects the goodness of the heart rather than the clearness of the head; and that if the heart of a man be filled (by the grace of God, and the power of his Spirit) with the humble, gentle, patient love of God and man, God will not cast him into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels because his ideas are not clear, or because his conceptions are confused. Without holiness, I own, no man shall see the Lord; but I dare not add, or clear ideas." (p. 572)

Regardless of the disclaimers and expressions of Christian charity, though, Wesley was distancing himself from any Enlightenment optimism that the human community could overcome its problems by unaided human reason in community. As Outler and Heitzenrater observe (op. cit., p. 567): "His obvious concern was the rising influence of Enlightenment ideas about human autonomy, which he had come to regard as a mortal danger to evangelical Christianity." Late nineteenth century Methodists seeking to practice love of neighbor tended not to have such fears.

[12]Niebuhr expresses this in The Irony of American History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952).

[13]Documents in this development are presented in Roger S. Gottlieb, Editor, An Anthology of Western Marxism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). Gottlieb introduces Max Horkheimer's essay "Traditional and Critical Theory" with a

note on his key role in developing the Institute for Social Research at Frankfurt in the 1930s for "nondogmatic Marxist theory"--"new paradigms of leftist theory opposed both to Stalinist totalitarianism and the 'one dimensionality' of modern bourgeois culture and political life."(p. 171) He introduces Habermas's essay "Technology and Science as 'Ideology'" with a note on his connections with the Frankfurt School.(p 248) Martin Jay, The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950 (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown, and Company, 1973) traces the beginnings of the movement back to the 1920s in a chapter on "The Genesis of Critical Theory." (pp. 41-85)

[14]The Postscript of this is found in Max Horkheimer, "Traditional and Critical Theory," from Critical Theory (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1972), as found in Gottlieb, op. cit., pp. 171-178. The original was in Zeitschrift fur Socialforschung, VI, 2 (1937). It is analyzed in Martin Jay, op. cit., pp.80 ff.

[15]Paul Merkley, Reinhold Niebuhr: A Political Account (Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975), biographically traces Niebuhr's use of Marx in the 1920s and 1930s, as well as his pragmatic decision to support the Cold War effort against the Soviet bloc after World War II.

[16]Horkheimer criticizes reduction of Critical Theory to "economism," which involves a "levelling-down ideology" making political dependence on the economy a programmatic requirement rather than an observation of how society is now working. (Gottlieb, op cit., pp. 175-177) Thus, Horkheimer joined Marx in a critique of economic and political liberalism while also critiquing the application of Marxism in effect in communist nations when he wrote. He also critiqued Marxist analysis practiced in capitalist nations because he saw it as incorrectly assuming economic determinism.

[17]Merkley, op. cit., p. 165, notes Niebuhr's 1932 Moral Man and Immoral Society as saying that Marx's "apocalyptic vision" provided a "useful illusion" for a critique of capitalism. But, by the time of his 1952 The Irony of American History, he would declare: "In the Marxist apocalypse one error is piled upon another with regard to the virtue of the poor. They are not only assumed to be completely disinterested or to have interests absolutely identical with the interests of the whole of mankind, but also no thought is given to the fact that if they become historically successful they will cease to be poor. Furthermore, the oligarchy, which presumes to speak for the poor claims to participate in their supposed sanctity."(p.165)

[18]Horkheimer in Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 172.

[19]Ibid., p. 173.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid. Paul Lakeland, Theology and Critical Theory: The Discourse of the Church (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), p. 15, notes "ideology critique" to be "one of the clearest distinguishing marks" of Critical Theory, as it seeks to emancipate individuals by exposing ideology, leading to greater rationality. Lakeland explains: "To the Critical Theorist, the critique of ideology leads to the unmasking of false consciousness and with it the emancipation of the individual from that false consciousness."

Martin Jay, op. cit., pp. 81 ff., observes three fundamental emphases of Horkheimer's essay in unmasking the ideological dimensions of Traditional Theory. First, Critical Theory views knowledge as neither separate from nor superior to action (the goal of which should be change). He speaks of it as a refusal to "fetishize knowledge" as "superior to action" as Traditional Theory would do.(p.81) Marx criticized such a detachment in the eleventh of his 'Theses on Feuerbach": "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it." (Robert Tucker, The Marx-Engels Reader, Second Edition, New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978, p. 145) Second, Critical Theory recognizes the social structuring of research categories. Traditional Theory falsely holds out the hope of value-free research, while Jay observes that Critical Theory "recognized that disinterested scientific research was impossible in a society in which men were not yet themselves autonomous."(Jay, loc. cit.) Third, Critical Theory analyzes society and history relationally rather than abstractly. Traditional Theory falsely abstracts from social and historical relationships. Jay (op cit., p.82) cites George Kline ("Some Critical Comments on Marx's Philosophy," in Marx and the Western World, Edited by Nicholas Lobkowicz, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1967, p.431) as noting Marx's Hegelian distinction of the "concrete" ("many-sided, adequatley related, complexly mediated") from the "abstract" ("one-sided, inadequately related, relatively unmediated"). In summary, Jay explains that Critical Theory unmasks Traditional Theory's isolation of knowledge from use, social interests, and relationships.

Jay also notes Horkheimer's rejection of Pragmatic notions of truth that led to conformism. As with Positivism, it lacked critical means to go beyond existing "facts." (op cit., p. 83) Jay reports Horkheimer's call to intellectuals to challenge proletarian conformism rather than idolize the working class as the instrument of liberation.

[23]Ibid., p. 274.

[24]Niebuhr observes this "creed" as part of the irony of the American critique of communist "materialism." On the one hand, he sees a Hegelian idealism mixed with communist materialism to see a "rational structure of meaning" running through the whole of reality. On the other hand, he states: "The crowning irony in this debate about materialism lies in the tremendous preoccupation of our own technical culture with the problem of gaining physical security against the hazards of nature. ...Our orators profess abhorrence of the communist creed of 'materialism' but we are rather more successful practitioners of materialism as a working creed than the communists, who have failed so dismally in raising the general standards of well-being." (The Irony of American History, pp. 6-7)

[25]Wesley's sermon on this text (Outler and Heitzenrater, op. cit., pp. 239-253) is typical of his identification of riches as the most deceptive threat to a living Christian faith.

[26]Lakeland, op. cit., pp. 43-46, discusses these interests as expressed in Habermas's 1968 Knowledge and Human Interests (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971). The first knowledge interest is a "cognitive interest in technical control over objectified processes" (p. 44, Lakeland quote of Habermas).The second interest is "practical cognitive interest" in "the attainment of possible consensus among actors in the framework of a self-understanding derived from a tradition" (Lakeland quote of Habermas, p. 310). The emancipatory interest is the interest in knowledge to emancipate from ideological constraints developing in the other two knowledge interests.

[27]Thomas McCarthy, "Translator's Introduction" to Habermas, The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume I, pp. xiv, xix ff.

[28]Ibid., p. xx.

[29]Ibid., p. xxi.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p. xi.

[32]McCarthy, in his Preface (Ibid.), cites Habermas's explanation from p. 397 of the same volume.

[33]Lakeland, op. cit., p. 52. The quote is from Thomas McCarthy, The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1978), p. 299.

[34]Habermas, Theory, Volume I, p. 399.

[35]Habermas, Theory, Volume II, p.1.

[36]Ibid., pp. 4 ff.

[37]George Herbert Mead, "Thought As Internalized Conversation," from Mind, Self, and Society, Edited by Charles W. Morris (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), as excerpted in Three Sociological Traditions: Selected Readings (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 268-281.

[38]Ibid., pp. 270-273, 280-281.

[39]Ibid., pp. 276 ff.

[40]Ibid., p. 277.

[41]Ibid., p. 279.

[42]Ibid., pp. 280-281.

[43]Habermas, Theory, Volume I, pp. 1, 46 ff.

[44]Emile Durkheim, "Precontractual Solidarity," from The Division of Labor in Society (New York: Free Press, 1964), as reproduced in Collins, op. cit., pp. 161-174.

[45]Ibid., p. 165. Durkheim believed that when division of labor occurred, it would further strengthen already existing social bonds.

[46]This is explained by Randall Collins in Three Sociological Traditions (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 128-129.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Durkheim, in Collins, Selected Readings, p. 167.

[49]Ibid., p. 169.

[50]Ibid., p. 170.

[51]Ibid., p. 171.

[52]Emile Durkheim, "Social Rituals and Sacred Objects," from The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (New York: Free Press, 1963), as excerpted in Collins, Selected Readings, pp. f174-186.

[53]Ibid., p. 186.

[54]Habermas, Theory, Volume I, p. xxvii.

[55]Jurgen Habermas, "Technology and Science as 'Ideology,'" from Toward a Rational Society, as excerpted in Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 251.

[56]Habermas, Theory, Volume II, p. 332.

[57]Ibid., p. 333.

[58]Bernard Semmel, The Methodist Revolution (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973), pp. 41-45.

[59]Robert E. Chiles, Theological Transition in American Methodism, 1790-1935 (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965).

[60]Ibid., p. 187. Chiles sums up three basic dimensions of this transition: 1) from faith as self-authenticated response to God to faith as the justified right to be-

lieve; 2) from the concept of the "sinful" human condition to the "morally responsible condition"; and 3) from the concept of "free grace" to that of "free will." In Chiles' words: "Thus scriptural revelation was compromised by reason's concern for evidence and logical implication; man was identified in terms of his moral capacity rather than his capitvity in sin; and the sovereignty of God's grace in salvation was qualified by man's intrinsic freedom."

[61]A favorite hymn of the day, "Rise Up, O Men of God," expressed the optimism of the day, an optimism later Christian critics, including Karl Barth, saw as a triumphalistic, humanistic salvation that did not reckon with the seriousness of human sinfulness and the necessity of divine grace for salvation, social or otherwise.

[62]Sidney Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 183, 186.

[63]Niebuhr, Irony, p. 7.

[64]Ibid., p. 12.

[65]Reinhold Niebuhr, The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), as excerpted in Free Government in the Making: Readings in American Political Thought, Edited by Alpheus Thomas Mason ((New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, Third Edition), p. 899.

[66]Niebuhr further explains that the very persons who seek justice in democratic community are often blind to their own self-interest. He explains: "The children of light are foolish not merely because they underestimate the power of self-interest among the children of darkness. They underestimate this power among themselves." (Ibid., p. 902) Noting the modern secular rejection of the classic Christian doctrine of Original Sin, Niebuhr observes: "No matter how wide the perspectives which the human imagination may conceive, how universal the community which human statecraft may organize, or how pure the aspirations of the saintliest idealist may be, there is no level of human moral social achievement in which there is not some corruption of inordinate self-love."(p. 903)

[67]Niebuhr maintains that the natural human survival impulse, which he sees as "at the core of all human ambitions," is"spiritualized" in one of two ways. First, it expresses itself in the desire to fulfill human potential, which humans eventually come to realize is only fulfilled in self-giving. (Ibid., pp. 903-904) Second, though, this survi-

val desire is "spiritualized" in the desire for "power and glory," and the result is that human conflicts are "never simple conflicts between competing survival impulses." (Ibid., p. 904) Niebuhr explains: "Since the very possession of power and prestige always involves some encroachment upon the prestige and power of others, this conflict is by its very nature a more stubborn and difficult one than the mere competition between various survival impulses in nature."(Ibid.)

Niebuhr argues that conflicts are "not as easily resolved by the expedient of dissolving the groups (i.e., those in conflict) as liberal democratic idealists assumed." (Ibid.) On the one hand, Niebuhr argues that bourgeois liberalism assumes a natural equilibrium of economic power which historic facts refute."(Ibid., p. 906) On the other hand, he argues that Marxist theories obscure the fact that "the destruction of private property does not...guarantee the equalization of economic power in community."(Ibid.)

[68]Ibid., p. 905.

[69]Leon Hynson, To Reform The Nation: Theological Foundations of Wesley's Ethics (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Francis Asbury Press of Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), p. 34.

[70]Theodore W. Jennings, Jr., Good News To The Poor: John Wesley's Evangelical Economics (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990).

[71]Outler, Theology.

[72]H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: World Publishing Company, 1957; Reprint of 1929 publication by Henry Holt and Company, Inc.). Niebuhr maintains (p. 71) that American Methodism changed from a religion of the disinherited to a church of the privileged. "Religion of the disinherited" is his description of Ernst Troeltsch's exclusive "sect" whose membership is formed by joining. "Church of the privileged" is his term for Troeltsch's inclusive "church" in which membership is established by birth. (He points to this as the basic distinction on p. 17.) Troeltsch's analytic types were developed for study in European nations with an established church and Niebuhr has applied these to the American scene so as to allow for the lack of a single established church and yet to observe the development of 'churches of the disinherited" (sects) which developed due to North-South, East-West, black-white, and other socioeconomic factors, and later became settled into church-like denominations. He is arguing that "denominationalism represents the moral failure of Christianity," because of the "fail-

ure of the churches to transcend social conditions which fashion them into caste organizations...to resist the temptation of making their own self-preservation and extension the primary object of their endeavor."(pp. 24-25) Having argued that European class factors were replaced in the United States by East-West, North-South, and black-white factors and that the Western denominations (Methodist, Baptist, Disciples of Christ, and others) "followed partly in the tradition of the European churches of the poor" (pp. 135-137), he argues that the Methodist Episcopal Church "above all others, became the frontier church of the nineteenth century."(p.170)

[73]The term "civil religion," used two centuries ago by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in The Social Contract, was revived by Robert Bellah in a 1967 Daedelus article to describe the American "collection of beliefs, symbols, and rituals with respect to sacred things" which have been institutionalized." The Daedelus article ("Civil Religion in America"), originally published in Winter 1967, has been reproduced in American Civil Religion, edited by Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), pp. 21-24. Jones and Richey (p. 26) note the presence of the phrase "civil religion" in chapter 8, book 4 of The Social Contract referring to these simple dogmas: the existence of God, the life to come, the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice, and the exclusion of religious intolerance. They observe that, for Rousseau, all other religious opinion was outside the concern of the State and to be freely held by its citizens.

Neither antithetical to Christianity nor sectarian nor a substitute for Christianity, civil religion is observed by Bellah to be present in John Kennedy's 1960 Presidential inaugural as well as in the American ritual calendar of Memorial Day, Thanksgiving, Independence Day, Veterans' Day, and the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln. Noting its potential for good and for ill, Bellah states: "It has its own prophets and martyrs, its own sacred events and places, its own solemn rituals and symbols." (pp. 40-41) In a followup essay in 1973, Bellah observes American Religion's "central tenet" to be "that the nation is not an ultimate end in itself but stands under transcendent judgment and has value only as it realizes, partially and fragmentarily at best, a 'higher law.'" (Bellah, "American Civil Religion in the 1970s," in Richey and Jones, op. cit., p. 225) However, the central argument of the 1973 essay is that the concept of "civil religion" is useful for discussing an existing social phenomenon in such a way that "the question of evaluation could for the moment be bracketed."(p.257) He cites Richard Nixon's second inaugural of 1972, which basically praises America in a way which contrasts with the 1960 Kennedy challenge, as evidence that Bellah's critics who deny the reality of "civil religion" are overlooking a basic social phenomenon.(pp. 259-264)

Jones and Richey distinguish five inter-related meanings of the concept "civil religion": 1) :"folk religion" (inevitably in idolatrous competition with particular religions); 2) "transcendent universal religion of the nation" (what Sidney Mead has termed the "essentially prophetic...religion of the republic" which judges its "folkways"; 3) "religious nationalism" (the religion of patriotism); 4) "democratic faith" (such as John Dewey's "humane values and ideals of equality, freedom, and justice" without a necessary transcendent deity); and 5) "Protestant civic piety" (the "Protestant nationalism" which Will Herberg has seen as a secularization of Puritanism and Revivalism).(pp. 15-18)

A simplified analysis of civil religion is presented by Martin Marty in "Two Kinds of Two Kinds" in Religion and Republic: The American Circumstance (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987). One general "kind" sees the nation as "under God," with concepts of God varying greatly. Another general "kind" stresses "national self-transcendence," with little or no reference to any deity. Each of these may function in either a "priestly" or a "prophetic" fashion. "The priestly will normally be celebrative, affirmative, culture-building. The prophetic will tend to be dialectical about civil religion, but with a predisposition toward the judgmental." (p.82) The result is four kinds of civil religion: 1) priestly "nation under God"; 2) prophetic "nation under God"; 3) priestly "nation as self-transcendent"; 4) prophetic "nation as self-transcendent."

[74]Eric Foner, Politics and Ideology In The Age Of The Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 126. This is part of his chapter titled "Reconstruction and the Crisis of Free Labor." Foner's earlier book, Free Soil, Free Labor and Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War (New York, 1970), developed the argument that two basic ideologies were predominant in the United States in the 1850s, one a pro-slavery Southern ideology and the other a "Free Labor" Republican ideology. The "Free Labor" ideology united various Republican factions in support of an equalitarian emphasis on the "self-made man," who needed to be enabled to succeed as a small entrepreneur against the threat of competition of the slave power, and who was a foundation for political democracy against the threat of the Southern aristocracy of slaveholders.

[75]Ibid.

[76]This point is made by Philip D. Jordan in "Immigrants, Methodists, and a 'Conservative Social Gospel,' 1865-1908," Methodist History, October 1978, Volume XVII, Number 1, p. 20.

[77]William Carwardine, The Pullman Strike (Chicago: The Charles H. Kerr Co., 1894), p. 121, written during the strike.

[78]Ibid. Habermas, Theory.

[79]Carwardine, op. cit., p. 123.

[80]Niebuhr, Irony. Helmut Peukert, Science, Action, And Fundamental Theology: Toward a Theology of Communicative Action (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1984 translation by James Bohman of 1976 German text).

Peukert, in studying the convergence of modern sociological theories and modern theology in Habermas's theory of communicative action, argues for "anamnestic solidarity" with all the living and all the dead as implied by human speech acts. For this solidarity to make sense, says Peukert, theological concepts of redemption and resurrection are necessary.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A. LIBERATION IN THE WESLEYAN TRADITION: ELEMENTS OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTION SEEKING LIFEWORLD RATIONALITY

John Wesley, as part of his own quest to be "more than half a Christian," initiated the Methodist movement in England. His perspective on human liberation arose from personal, pastoral, and polemical concerns. Personally, after reading Jeremy Taylor's Rules and Exercises of Holy Living and Dying in 1725, he declared he "instantly resolved to dedicate all my life to God, all my thoughts and words, and actions."[1] To carry out this resolve, he joined in communicative action pursuing a rational life of godliness through discussions, prayers, religious observances, and social service projects in what came to be called the "Holy Club." This quest for "holiness of heart and life," as Wesley termed it, would eventually lead to an experience of spiritual liberation and confidence at a small group meeting on Aldersgate Street in London in 1738 as someone was reading Martin Luther's explanation of the experience of living faith.[2]

Pastorally, Wesley sought to share his own experience with others and learn more of the way of faith by field preaching, small group societies of believers, conferences with preachers who submitted to his direction, and many publications, espcially his written sermons. Although this pastoral effort was driven by personal conviction as to what it meant "to reform the nation, particularly the church" and "to spread scriptural holiness over the land," Wesley continually expressed his concern

to "think and let think" as he and the Methodist movement developed a growing consensus as to the reform and holiness that the England of his time needed.[3]

Polemically, he wrote to challenge Moravian Lutherans, Anglican Calvinists, and Methodist extremists, as well as to rationally appeal to other Anglicans and Roman Catholics. The challenges and the appeals were in behalf of the liberating and inclusive gospel he had experienced and was concerned to lead others into. Although Wesley led in the development of a system intensely concerned for "strategic action" in the disciplined quest for holiness, his preaching, writing, groups, and method of pursuing truth all involved a concern for the "lifeworld rationality" to be discovered by persons sharing a common concern to be all out for God and humankind and sharing their experiences of seeking to practice wholehearted love for God and all of humankind.

Wesley's 1725 resolve to be a wholehearted Christian was reinforced by his reading of Thomas a Kempis's Imitation of Christ and it was even more clearly shaped by his reading the following year of William Law's Treatise on Christian Perfection and Serious Call to a Devout And Holy Life.[4] Wesley later recalled, "I then saw in a stronger light than ever before that only one thing is needful, even faith that worketh by the love of God and man, all inward and outward holiness."[5] This sequence of readings had commenced when a "new seriousness" entered his life as he prepared for his ordination as a deacon, an ordination performed September 19, 1725 by Bishop Potter of Oxford.[6] Having achieved his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1724, he had let his parents know in January of 1725 that he intended to seek

ordination, an intention his father recognized as related to a desire to secure a teaching fellowship.[7] The following March, he received an appointment as a fellow at Lincoln College, Oxford, which would not only provide financial support for further study, but was a part of a process common at the time for preparing persons for the pastorate.[8]

Whatever the motivations, Wesley began keeping a diary as part of his new sense of seriousness. In 1729, his brother Charles, partly influenced by John's example, began a similar methodical diary and sought to join with John and others for mutual support in the disciplined quest for holiness. In 1729, John and Charles Wesley began joining others at Oxford in what came to be called the "Holy Club," a group whose origin he would look back to as the origin of Methodism.[9] Having been ordained a deacon in 1725 and a priest in 1728, he had served two different times between 1726 and 1729 as his father's pastoral assistanat.[10] He visited the beginnings of the Holy Club at Oxford in the summer of 1729 and joined them that fall, with the group being essentially "an informal literary society."[11] Beginning in August of 1730, the group began visiting prisons as well as visiting and seeking to help the poor.[12] Although the group had originated as "a pious group meeting for mutual exhortation, reading the Scriptures, praying and singing hymns," group member William Morgan's suggestions to visit the prisons prevailed.[13] The visits went beyond sermonizing and delivering pious books to efforts to relieve prisoners' material needs, including fuel, food, and clothing, as well as collection of money to pay

for the release of those imprisoned for debt.[14] They also secured legal advice for the prisoners, went to court with them, and even provided schooling for prisoners and their children.[15]

Richard Heitzenrater has observed something basic about Wesley's personal quest for holiness at this stage of his life. Most of the activities which came to characterize the Oxford Methodists of the time ("visiting the prisons, helping the sick, teaching the poor, attending the sacrament") were not originated by Wesley himself.[16] Heitzenrater notes that for Wesley "his method was not a static, settled scheme, but rather an approach to life that grew and developed and changed as he confronted different crises, had further insights and med new friends."[17] This disciplined small group effort was helping John Wesley determine, in the context of a rational community of faith, what it meant for him to "do good," but it left him unfulfilled until his spiritually liberating experience at Aldersgate Street in London in 1738.[18]

The climax of Wesley's personal quest came after the disillusionment of his journey to Georgia to serve as a missionary to Native Americans. He had rejected his father's invitation in 1734 to succeed him in the pastorate at Epworth because, he said, "In the state wherein I am, I can most promote holiness in myself," and that involved "daily converse with true Christian friends" and opportunities "for doing good for our fellow creatures."[19] But, within a year he would accept appointment by the Societiy for the Promotion of the gospel to a chaplaincy in Georgia, and he

would do it as part of a continuing quest to achieve holiness.[20] His sense of failure in that mission is captured in his exclamation: "I went to convert others, who will convert me?"[21]

On his return to England, after a series of encounters with Moravian Lutherans, he went "very reluctantly" to a religious society meeting in Aldersgate Street in London on May 24, 1738. As someone was reading Martin Luther's preface to his comments on Romans, the part of the preface which defines faith as living and active rather than merely intellectual, Wesley experienced what he would later describe in his diary as his heart being "strangely warmed" with the awareness of his personal trust in Christ for salvation and the work of God's Spirit in his life.[22] Although he would later question his faith and acceptance with God, this marked a turning point from pursuing holiness as a means to personal acceptance with God to pursuit of holiness as an expression of gratitude for the new life he now experienced.[23]

Wesley expressed his goal of personal liberation so clearly in a sermon before the University at St. Mary's, Oxford, on January 1, 1733, that he later reproduced it in his "Standard Sermons" which became the guide for Methodist preaching. But, in 1733, the focus was on his personal liberation rather than liberation for others. He spoke of the need for "circumcision of the Heart," based on a passage in the Apostle Paul's letter to the Romans (2.29), and he concluded: "Let your soul be filled with so entire a love of Him that you may love nothing but for his sake."[24] This "circumcision of the heart involved "humility, faith, hope, and charity" and included for the person of faith "the testimony of

their own spirit with the Spirit which witnesses in their hearts that they are the children of God."[25] At the heart of all this was love. Wesley declared:

> In this is perfection and glory, and happiness. The royal law of heaven and earth is this, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.' ... Not that this forbids us to love anything besides God: it implies that we love our brother also. Nor yet does it forbid us (as some have strangely imagined) to take pleasure in anything but God. To suppose this, is to suppose that the Fountain of holiness is directly the author of sin; since He has inseparably annexed pleasure to the use of those creatures which are necessary to sustain the life He has given us.(26)

Eleven years later, after his May 24, 1738 Aldersgate experience, Wesley returned to St. Mary's Oxford with the same ultimate commitment to wholeheartedly love God, but it now revealed a greater concern for the liberation of the rest of humankind. Taking as his text a verse in Acts describing the first century church as "all filled with the Holy Ghost" (4.31), he preached on "Scriptural Christianity" so as to challenge his fellow Oxford Christians to go beyond the forms of religion to its substance.[27] After speaking of what it meant for earliest Christians to be "filled with the holy Ghost" and for that faith to spread, and after expressing optimism that "time will come when Christianity will prevail over all, and cover the earth," Wesley rhetorically asked for what he did not see in the England of his day:

> Where does this Christianity now exist? Where, I pray, do the Christians live? Which is the country the inhabitants whereof are all thus filled with the Holy Ghost?--are all of one heart and of one soul; cannot suffer one among them to lack anything, but continue to give to every man as he hath need; who, one and all, have the love of God filling their hearts, and constraining them to love their neighbor as themselves; who have all 'put on bowels of mercy, humbleness of mind, gentleness, long-suffering'--who offend not

> in any kind, either by word or deed, against justice, mercy, or truth; but in every point do unto all men, as they would these should do unto them? With what propriety can we term any a Christian country, which does not answer this description? Why then, let us confess we have never yet seen a Christian country upon earth...
> ...I entreat you to observe, that here are no peculiar notions now under consideration; that the question moved is not concerning doubtful opinions of one kind or another, but concerning the undoubted, fundamental branches (if there be any such) of our common Christianity. And for the decision thereof, I appeal to your own consciences, guided by the Word of God.(28)

Wesley's intervening religious experience at Aldersgate Street Chapel in London had changed his holiness concerns from a means of acceptance with God to a means of expressing gratitude for salvation. Wesley scholar Leon Hynson has observed: "Before Aldersgate his social ethics grew out of a deep concern to save his own soul. After Aldersgate, he was motivated by the power of a new affection and gave himself to others out of the love he came to know in Christ."[29] Methodist social ethics historian Richard Cameron notes that Wesley's motive had changed from "anxiety for self...to compassion for others and love for God."[30] The realization that love for God must involve loving deeds for humankind continued, as did the appeal to each individual's conscience, but the motivation for so doing had changed toward a greater spontaneity and confidence.

Inspired by his own experience, he sought both physical and spiritual liberation for his fellow human beings. After the Aldersgate experience in May 1738, he had been both inspired and disappointed by a journey to the Moravian home base at Herrnhut on the European continent in following months. Albert Outler notes three further experiences in 1738 that preceded his successful field preaching experiences and the related pastoral work with religious societies which began in 1739.[31] First, he was deeply impressed by

reading in October 1738 of Jonathan Edwards's report of "the truly surprising conversions in and about the town of North Hampton in New England." Second, the Fetter Lane religious society he participated in at London was split because the dominant Moravians advocated a "stillness doctrine" which minimized good works and the church's "means of grace." Third, in response to what he saw as Moravian antinomianism, Wesley began in November 1738 "more narrowly to inquire what the doctrine of the Church of England is concerning the much controverted point of justification by faith; and the sum of what I found in the Homilies I extracted and printed for the use of others."[32]

On November 30, George Whitefield, Methodist evangelist, returned from his successes in his first tour of America, seeking to enlist Wesley. After seeking support from his Fetter Lane Society and his brother Charles to resist Whitefield's invitation to preach in the fields at Bristol, Wesley finally reports how, on April 2 at Bristol, he finally yielded to what would be vital to Methodism:

> At four in the afternoon I submitted to be more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation, speaking from a little eminence in a ground adjoining to the city, to about three thousand people.(33)

Outler notes the impact of field preaching on Wesley's faith. He had been told by Moravian Peter Bohler to "preach faith until you have it"; he had experienced faith at Aldersgate in May 1738; he now experienced greater faith as he saw his message confirmed in the fruit of faith in the lives of the common people of England.[34] This was typical of Wesley's concern for empirical confirmation in the lives of others of whatever doctrine he preached. Regardless of whether a doctrine seemed to him to be scriptural,

it must be confirmed in the lives of living witnesses for him to be fully confident in it. To use Habermas's terminology, Wesley was convinced of the rationality of a doctrine when he sensed that it was experienced in the lifeworld of common people and that its explanation arose from some kind of communicative consensus.

By the end of 1739, Wesley saw a need to go beyond mere preaching and to commence the organization of converts for pastoral care. He reports that in late 1739, when several came to him seeking spiritual advice on how to "flee from the wrath to come," he organized them into the first of the Methodist "Societies," groups for mutual religious support and exhortation.[35] The "wrath to come" was the possibility of divine punishment in this life and the certainty of judgment after death. As the Societies grew in numbers, Wesley had them divided into smaller groups of about twelve each, one of whom would be the leader. Wellman Warner's study The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution argues that the essentially democratic process of selecting class leaders contributed to a democratizing of the Societies and a liberalizing of English society.[36]

Besides a basic "desire to flee from the wrath to come, to be saved from their sins," Wesley required of members of Methodist Societies mutual support and challenge to one another to follow three basic rules: doing no harm, doing good, and "attending upon all the ordinances of God" (worship, the Lord's Supper, prayer, Bible reading, fasting).[37] Specific kinds of harm to avoid were listed, including such expected prohibitions as "profaning the day of the Lord" and "drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity." But, also prohibited were

"the using many words in buying or selling" (deceptive advertising) and "giving or taking things on usury" (interest) and "laying up treasures on earth." In addition, "doing good" was to be "of every possible sort, and as far as is possible, to all men: to their bodies, of the ability which God giveth, by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by visiting or helping them that are sick, or in prison; to their souls by instructing, reproving, or exhorting all..." Clearly, Wesley saw "liberation" as affecting one's use of material wealth, and he felt compelled himself, and exhorted his followers, to work for physical as well as spiritual liberation.

Theodore Jennings, Jr., in a recent study of Wesley's social and economic ethics, has observed the similarities of Wesley's pastoral attitude toward wealth and liberation to the perspective of twentieth century "liberation theology." In Good News to the Poor: John Wesley's Evangelical Economics, Jennings observes Wesley's "demystification of wealth," "preferential option for the poor," and advocacy of "the redistribution of wealth," all grounded in deep theological concerns.[38] Jennings also notes some key statements of qualification by Wesley which were later used by Wesley's followers and help explain why they found a convenient way to depart from his program.

Jennings argues that Wesley's ethics opens to us more clearly if we focus on his economics rather than his politics.[39] Writing as one who has sought to teach Wesley's sermons in a "third world country" (Mexico), he notes that "for the majority of the earth's population, the most pressing questions are those of economic justice," not issues of politics.[40] Wesley may have been quite conservative politically, favoring monarchy over democracy, but he was extremely radical in his economic pronouncements. Also, Wes-

ley's economic pronouncements were more fundamental to his theology than his political ones. Wesley's seemingly legalistic demands on dress, jewelry, and tea drinking are explained by Jennings to be part of his method of dealing with concrete reality ("praxis") before theorizing, confronting the threat to his people's faith of spending excessive money on self when their neighbor had little or nothing.[41]

Wesley's "practical divinity," in common with twentieth century liberation theology, begins with commitment to the poor (a "preferential option for the poor") in what Jennings terms "evangelical economics."[42] Also in common with liberation theology, this makes the perspective of the poor normative when in conflict with the perspective of wealth and power.[43] This involves a "demystification of wealth and power" as threats to faith, solidarity with the poor in the spirit of gospel ministry, protest against injustice and oppression, and a call to a Pentecostal redistribution in communal economics.[44] However, Wesley's manner of presenting this perspective opened the door to misunderstanding and drawing back from his "evangelical economics" by his many qualificaitons.[45]

The communicative rationality Wesley sought required demystification of wealth, both to enable solidarity with the poor and to empower a Pentecostal community. That community would put into practice the standard of the Christians described in the New Testament books of Acts, where "no one said that any of the things he possessed was his own, but they had everything in common," and "distribution was made to each as any had need."[46] Wesley went so far as to comment in his Explanatory Notes on the New Testament concerning Acts 2.45 that community of property "was a natural fruit of that love

wherewith each member of the community loved every other as his own soul."[47] Then, Wesley added: "To affirm, therefore, that Christ did not design that this should continue, is neither more nor less than to affirm that Christ did not design this measure of love should continue. I see no proof of this."[48] Pentecostal community required a communicative rationality of love, a full gospel empowering shared property, which Wesley saw as more vital than any other supernatural signs. Extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, such as speaking in tongues, might have been intended only for first century Christians. But, in the mind of Wesley, the Pentecostal love which motivated first century Christians to practice community of goods was not confined to the first century.

A fear that grew increasingly stronger over the years for Wesley was that the Methodists would become a "dead sect." In 1786, at the age of 83, Wesley expressed this fear that the Methodists would only exist "having the form of religion without the power."[49] The chief threat to the power of religion, for Wesley, was financial prosperity. Increase in wealth would lead to "increase in pride, in anger, in the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life."[50] The only way to avoid "that our money may not sink us to the nethermost hell" was to give all one could beyond one's personal and family necessities, and to give it to the poor.[51] Wesley responded to the criticism that giving to the poor might either confirm them in their vices or not succeed in treating their true spiritual problem: "Whether they will finally be lost or saved, you are expressly commanded to feed the hungry, and clothe the naked. If you can, and do not, whatever becomes of them, you shall go away into everlasting fire."[52]

The problem Wesley saw was that the Christian faith would lead to diligence, which would lead to wealth, which would distract one from loving God and loving one's neighbor. Thus, the faith that was to empower one to love in practical ways might be deserted to focus on the increased financial prosperity that came from Christian discipline.[53] Wesley viewed this as one of the chief causes of the ineffectiveness of Christianity.[54] Wealth threatened humility and patience, encouraging contempt, resentment, and anger, thus destroying Christian community.[55] In a letter to a wealthy man dated May 16, 1759, Wesley issues this warning:

> The grand maxims which obtain in the world are, The more power, the more money, the more learning, and the more reputation a man has, the more good he will do. And whenever a Christian, pursuing the noblest ends, forms his behaviour by these maxims, he will infallibly (though perhaps by insensible degrees) decline into worldly prudence.(56)

Wesley sensed a need to break the mystic hold on the popular imagination of the quest for money, even for doing good, and to replace it with a quest for godliness to do good, to be "holy and happy," as Wesley would put it. He was aware of the irony Reinhold Niebuhr would point out a century and a half later of a religious vision of an uncoerced community of perfect love changing to the "pretension that a community, governed by prudence" would achieve "an ideal social harmony."[57]

Wesley challenged his people to have concern for the poor, not a mere sentimental concern, but solidarity with the poor in their struggle against poverty. He had sensed this need from the beginning of his quest to be "more than half a Christian," and now he challenged the members of his religious societies to such a life. He attributed his

own exclusion from Church of England pulpits to his attraction of the poor to hear his sermons. He wrote in A Short History of the People Called Methodists concerning why people objected to his preaching:

> The far more common (and indeed more plausible) objection was, 'the people crowd so, that they block up the church, and leave no room for the best of the parish.(58)

When Wesley sought to help his followers to avoid discouragement in their quest for Christian perfection, he explained in a sermon the "Heaviness Through Manifold Temptation" experienced by the most devoted of Christians, and he marvelled at the faithfulness of those poor persons who labored and did not receive the just reward for their labor. Expressing his sense of solidarity with the poor, Wesley wrote:

> But how many are there in this Christian country, that toil, and labour, and sweat, and have it not at last, but struggle with weariness and hunger together? Is it not worse for one, after a hard day's labour, to come back to a poor, cold, dirty, uncomfortable lodging, and to find there not even the food which is needful to repair his wasted strength? You that live at ease in the earth, that want nothing but eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts to understand how well God hath dealt with you,--is it not worse to seek bread day by day, and find none? perhaps to find the comfort of five or six children crying for what he has not to give! Were it not that he is restrained by an unseen hand, would he not soon "curse God and die?" O want of bread! want of bread! Who can tell what this means, unless he hath felt it himself? (59)

Wesley challenged the Methodists to express solidarity with the poor by visiting them, not merely to observe or to make the poor "better people," but so that the Methodists could become more godly. Carrying help to the poor was superior to sending it because it was "far more apt to soften our heart, and to make us naturally care for each other."[60] This would increase "all social affections" and was a kind of "means of grace,"

just as public and private prayer and the sacraments were "means of grace."[61] Besides improving the spirituality of the visitor, this would correct false stereotypes.

After one visit with the poor in their cold and hunger, Wesley remarked:

> But I found not one of them unemployed, who was able to crawl about the room. So wickedly, devilishly false is that common objection, "They are poor, only because they are idle." If you saw these things with your own eyes, you would not lay out money in ornaments and superfluities.(62)

With respect to the need of a "gentlewoman" to be transformed by visiting the poor, Wesley wrote:

> I want you to converse more, abundantly more, with the poorest of the people. ... Creep in among these, in spite of the dirt, and a hundred disgusting circumstances; and thus put off the gentlewoman.[63]

Wesley was seeking to develop a community of faith by means of these communicative actions.

Wesley's communicative actions of solidarity with the poor combined with a modification of classic Protestant theology to create a sense of optimism and equality for the poor. Rejecting classic concepts of total depravity preached by Martin Luther, John Calvin, and English Reformers, Wesley offered the possibility of deliverance from human selfishness for all. Wellman Warner explains that Wesley saw the human will as "diseased," saw perfection as a possibility for all, and thus inspired democratic feeling, because he "placed rich and poor, high and low, on a level in the equality of their need and worth."[64] Rather than presenting perfection as an achievement of a flawless ideal, a kind of intellectual and physical perfection, Wesley presented it as an integration of character in cooperation with grace. Warner maintains that the possibilities of such a faith

for a population "burdened with a sense of inferiority would be revolutionary."[65] It may have been overly optimistic, and Wesley's spiritual descendants departed from its equalitarian implications, but it provided theological underpinnings for a lifeworld rationality grounded in communicative action.

Wesley engaged in a wide variety of activities expressing solidarity with the poor--regularly begging for funds to relieve needs, starting a cotton spinning collective for the unemployed, creating a "lending stock" to help the poor acquire tools and materials for small businesses, and providing free health care for the poor.[66] Aid was given to the poor irrespective of whether they joined Methodist societies.[67]

Wesley sought to make available to the poor and uneducated the best reading of the day (in his estimation), including his own edition of a dictionary.[68] With respect to construction of Methodist preaching houses, he urged plainness, because he feared over reliance on wealthy contributors would make Methodists dependent on people of wealth. In Wesley's view, this would mean "farewell to the Methodist discipline, if not doctrine, too."[69] To make sure that the poor saw themselves as important, he even advised one of his preachers in 1783: "Put the most insignificant person in each class to be the Leader of it."[70] Also, to publicly take sides with the poor, Wesley published in 1773 his Thoughts on the Present Scarcity of Provisions. It was an indictment of national policies which allowed half the annual corn crop to go to distilleries, which some argued helped provide Royal revenue. Wesley responded in his typical style:

> O, tell it not in Constantinople that the English raise royal revenue
> by the flesh and blood of their countrymen!(71)

After further explanations of the plight of the poor, he prescribed prohibition of distilling (but not of beer and wine), luxury taxes on exported horses and gentry carriages, and reduction in the size of farms to prevent small farmers from being thrown off the land.[72] These were his efforts to produce a lifeworld rationality grounded in communicative action with and on behalf of the poor of eighteenth century England.

From his perspective of solidarity with the poor, Wesley not only condemned the injustice of distilleries, but he also condemned the oppression of the poor by merchants, doctors, and lawyers.[73] As one example, he spoke concerning the law: "Without money, you can have no more law; poverty alone shuts out justice."[74] Three specific national policies also stood condemned for oppressing the poor--war, colonialism, and slavery.[75] Jennings observes that Wesley viewed each of these from the perspective of the "poor" (oppressed) participants--soldiers who killed and died, natives of colonized lands, and African slaves bought and sold by Europeans.

One of Wesley's prime objections to the American revolution is expressed in biting sarcasm to one who would say that the colonists were throwing off the yoke of slavery to England:

> You and I, and the English in general, go where we will, and enjoy the fruits of our labours; This is liberty. The Negro does not; This is slavery.(76)

In what proved to be Wesley's final letter, he encouraged William Wilberforce to persist against "the opposition of men and devils" until "even American slavery (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish away before it" (that is, before the might of God).[77]

Wesley was so committed to solidarity with the poor that, in spite of his Tory support of public order, he supported some poor English people who waylaid a ship of grain to distribute among them "at the common price."[78] When some Irish people protested against the "legal" confiscation of their lands with insurrection, Wesley rhetorically observed:

> It is no wonder that, as their lives were now bitter to them, they should fly out as they did. It is rather a wonder that they did not go much further. And if they had, who would have been most at fault? Those who were without home without money, without food for themselves and families? Or those who drove them to this extremity? (79)

Clearly, Wesley pursued the rationality of a lifeworld which included all the poor, and he would not submit to the rationality of a public order that excluded the poor and their rightful protests for not being heard.

The foundation of Wesley's quest for lifeworld rationality was what he saw as the grace of God, grace invading all dimensions of human life, not merely a private "spiritual" dimension. He rejected such notions as the idea that the economy would benefit if the wealthy believed that "it was the duty of every man that would, to be 'clothed in purple and fine linen' and to 'fare sumptuously every day'" rather than "feeding the hungry and clothing the naked."[80] Alluding to Jesus' reference to wealthy Dives and poor Lazarus as recorded in the New Testament Gospel of Luke, Wesley responded that the suggestion that the best way to help the poor was to spend and consume to help the economy was an example of the possibility of a person believing nearly anything if they wanted to strongly enough. The remedy was the challenge of grace confronting these

expressions of human self deception on the Methodist societies and classes.

Theodore Jennings aptly expresses Wesley's holistic concern by observing "Wesley would be just as ready to leave economics to the free exchange of the market-place as he would be to turn over the care of souls to psychologists."[81] Part of committing one's soul to God, as Wesley saw it, was to view one's possessions as not private, but as a divinely given stewardship for the common good. Jennings notes that, in this respect, Wesley was rejecting an "economic Deism" or "economic atheism" for an "evangelical economics."[82]

Wesley's direction to his people was: "You should look upon yourself as one of a certain number of indigent persons, who are to be provided for out of that part of his [God's] goods wherewith you are entrusted."[83] Whatever one possessed beyond "the necessaries and conveniences of life for himself and his family" was "riches," and was to be given to God by giving it all to the poor.[84] In fact, any such wealth which one spent on luxuries while the poor went hungry and unclothed was theft in Wesley's eyes.[85] The remedy for rationalizing such theft was the grace of God producing a Pentecostal community in which: "None of them will say, that aught of the things which he possesses is his own; but they will have all things in common." This new Pentecostal community, with its community of goods, would be a part of the convincing power of the Gospel and lead to to the conversion of unbelievers around the world.[87]

But, from 1760 onward Wesley found it necessary to plead with the Methodists that their material prosperity was robbing them of the holiness of this Pentecostal commu-

nity. As they moved from the working class to the middle class, Wesley saw them falling from grace. One of these many expressions of fear comes in his Thoughts Upon Methodism in 1786:

> I fear, wherever riches have increased, (exceeding few are the exceptions,) the essence of religion, the mind that was in Christ, has decreased in the same proportion.(88)

The rationality of the lifeworld of solidarity with the poor was being replaced by the rationality of the economic subsystem, and money was driving Methodists rather than the Pentecostal Spirit of communicative action with the poor.

One further expression of Wesley's communicative action in connection with his pastoral concern for the Methodist societies was his meeting with Methodist preachers in Annual Conferences.[89] Beginning in 1744, Wesley invited several revivalist Church of England clergy, together with selected lay preachers, to discuss how best to continue their work. As Albert Outler explains, Methodist doctrine and organizational patterns were hammered out in these Conferences in a process of group interrogation and debate, with Wesley always pronouncing the final word, in the light of the discussions.[90] In spite of the authoritarian character of the decisions, the quest was for a rationality for the societies and the preachers that was grounded in the interests of all its members.

In Outler's reproduction of the notes on the first Conference session of June 25, 1744 in London, the spirit of the Conference is reported early in the session.. A statement was read declaring that they would "meet with a single eye as little children who have everything to learn, that every point may be examined from the foundation."[91] The first question then raised was: "How far does each of us agree to submit to the unanimous

judgment of the rest?" The agreed upon answer was: "In speculative things each can only submit so far as his judgment shall be convinced; in every practical point, so far as we can without wounding our consciences."[92] There would be full and free discussion without coercion, and there would be an effort to reach a rational consensus. The remainder of the conference discussed beliefs about justification and sanctification and relations with the rest of the Church of England and rules for societies and other groups and for Lay

Assistants and Stewards.

The Second Annual Conference, holding its first session August 1, 1745 in Bristol, took considerable time at the beginning to remember that they should "still consider ourselves as children, who have everything to learn."[93] Next, it was agreed to re-examine the work of the preceding Conference and to take care concerning each item "to speak freely and hear calmly." The procedure to be sure that "everyone may speak whatever is in his heart" was "by taking care to check no one either by word or look, even though he should say what was quite wrong."[94] In the rest of the Conference, the chief topics were again beliefs about justification and sanctification and church discipline. The tone continued to be one of encouraging a communicative quest for a rational approach to ordering the life of Methodists as they sought to "spread scriptural holiness."

The Third and Fourth Annual Conferences continued the communicative approach of the first two Conferences. The Third Annual Conference at Bristol May 12, 1746 did not raise the issue of open and free discussion, but began with a reading of Wesley's abridged version of two tracts by Jonathan Edwards: The New England Narration and the

Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God.[95] It was an example of Wesley's use of materials produced by persons whose theology he disagreed with, in this case benefitting from Edwards while disagreeing with his Calvinism. The remainder of the Conference discussed beliefs about the nature of righteousness and assurance, as well as issues of church discipline, including the issue of examining whether a person ought to be a lay preacher and, if they should, how they should study and prepare themselves.

The Fourth Annual Conference in London July 15, 1747, as with the First Conference, began with an extensive time of making it clear that there was to be free and full discussion of all items.[96] In a reminder that the First Conference agreed to "examine every point from the foundation," the question was raised: "Have we not been some way too fearful of doing this?"[97] This was seen to be a vain fear of rejecting first principles, since:

> If these are true, they will bear strict examination. If they are false, the sooner they are overturned, the better.(98)

Then, in reiterating the desire to "submit to the unanimous judgment of the rest" so far as conscience would allow, this statement was agreed on: "Every man must think for himself to God."[99] Once again, extensive time was given to discussing justification, sanctification, and church discipline, including issues such as field preaching and other work of preaching assistants.[100] The perspective in all these Conferences was one of seeking the lifeworld rationality that can only be achieved by open communicative action seeking consensus.

Wesley's polemical writings reveal a concern for the liberating and inclusive gospel

he had experienced and which he sought to impart to those joining the Methodist societies. Albert Outler presents some of these writings in the third and final major division of his volume on John Wesley in the Library of Protestant Thought.[101] Included are materials critical of Moravian Lutherans, Antinomian Methodists, and Calvinist Evangelicals, as well as an appeal to Anglicans concerning the reasonableness of Methodism and an appeal to Roman Catholics to recognize common Christian concerns.

Wesley's Journal from November 1, 1739 to September 3, 1741 presents his controversy with Moravian Lutherans.[102] Although these Moravians had helped him to his experience of faith May 24, 1738, Wesley gradually became disenchanted with them because of their "stillness doctrine," a belief which undercut Wesley's concern for holy living. At first, he thought he could join the Moravians in the Fetter Lane Society in London, but the appearance and teaching of Philip Molther made him realize he could not.[103] Wesley discovered that Molther had been telling many that their faith was mere "animal spirit," that the presence of any doubt or fear meant one did not have true faith, and, in what especially concerned Wesley, that one should not do any works before receiving faith.

Wesley parted company with the Moravians, because he was convinced that his people had experienced faith--not by "stillness" and waiting for Christ, but in using the "means of grace," which included attending the Lord's Supper, prayer, Bible reading, and doing "temporal good" for others.[104] Matters became worse when the Moravians said one was not even obligated after receiving faith to use the means of grace and to do good works.[105] This was what Wesley would term "the enthusiastic doctrine of devils" in

his Rules for the Methodist Societies. It was the belief that a Christian believer was free to do good or not to do good "according as he finds 'his heart free to do it.'"[106]

The conflict with the Moravians climaxed in a debate with the Moravian leader from Herrnhut, Count Ludwig von Zinzendorf.[107] Zinzendorf was defending the Lutheran belief that one does not "grow in holiness," and Wesley was contending for "growth in grace" to "Christian perfection." In writing a letter protesting to the Moravians in Herrnhut, in his next to final paragraph, Wesley condemned the substitution of "an uncertain, precarious inward motion in the place of the plain written word," a word which called to "means of grace," and "especially works of outward mercy."[108] Wesley was contending for the very kind of "perfection" that Wellman Warner would conclude in his 1930 study imparted a sense of worth and possibilities to many in England in the eighteenth century and contributed to a democratizing of the society.[109] Bernard Semmel made the same observation in his 1973 study, The Methodist Revolution.[110]

Wesley also found it necessary to confront the unrealistic enthusiasm of some of his own followers. In particular, two of his lay preachers were making extravagant claims, matched with contempt for "ordinary Christians." Thomas Maxfield and George Bell anticipated the end of the world February 28, 1763, and they provoked Wesley's tract A Blow at the Root or Christ Stabb'd in the House of His Friends.[111] The problem was an antinomianism similar to the Moravian problem in that it counselled that good works did not have to go with faith. And, Wesley protested concerning the experience of Christian faith: "You are really changed: you are not only accounted, but you are actually

made righteous."[112] That is, this was true if they were experiencing true Christian faith, according to Wesley. Those who professed great faith were warned elsewhere against pride, enthusiasm, antinomianism, sins of omission, an schism in a tract entitled "Cautions and Directions to the Greatest Professors in the Methodist Societies."[113] Wesley saw these warnings as necessary, since some believed that they would never die, others believed that they could not err or sin, and others believed that any Methodist preachers who didn't agree with them were "in the dark."[114] Yet, they were denying their need to practice holy living.

A third conflict Wesley faced was with the Calvinists, from the controversy with his fellow Methodist preacher, George Whitefield, to the controversy with the Anglican Evangelical leader of late eighteenth century England, the Countess of Huntingdon. Whitefield had come to believe in double predestination, the view of John Calvin that God has decided before humans make any choices who will be saved and who will be lost. Wesley saw this as undercutting his offer of salvation to "whosoever will," although Whitefield had never seen it as an obstacle to his field preaching in England or his evangelistic tours of the American colonies. Nonetheless, Wesley found it necessary in 1752 to systematically respond to various arguments for predestination in a tract titled "Predestination Calmly Considered."[115] Wellman Warner argues that Wesley's perspective helped overcome two bases of early eighteenth century class distinctions: 1) "a relic of Calvinism supported the idea of one's assigned place," and 2) a "political arithmetic" suggested there was need for significant numbers of the poor for the welfare of

the nation.[116] This may have been a popular distortion of the teachings of John Calvin, but Wesley clearly made an appeal that helped break down previous pessimistic perspectives on the poor.[117]

Bernard Semmel argues that Methodism was a spiritual revolution "of a progressive and liberal character" which increased optimism about human possibilities by stressing the possibility of salvation for all and by warning against "falling from grace," something Calvinists believed to be impossible.[118] Arguing that Methodism was much more liberal and progressive than Calvinism, he sees it as part of the move from a traditional to a modern society. Semmel makes Wesley more of a rational humanist than he was, but he correctly stresses Wesley's optimism concerning the possibilities of divine grace for everyone.[119] This optimism for the poor is part of the reason Methodism appealed to the poor, while the Calvinism of the Countess of Huntingdon appealed to persons of privilege.[120]

Two other appeals by Wesley illustrate his quest for a rational consensus from the lifeworld of as many people as possible. The first is his Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion.[121] It was the first of a series of efforts to communicate the rationality of Methodist religion to "men of reason" and to communicate Methodist conformity to the Anglican heritage to "men of religion." To "men of reason," Wesley argues: "Whenever ...you see an unreasonable man, you see one who perhaps calls himself by that name but is no more a 'Christian' than he is an angel."[122] He adds that the religion the Methodists preach is "a religion evidently founded on,and every way agreeable to, eternal reason, to

the essential nature of things," with a foundation that "stands on the very nature of God and the nature of man, together with their mutual relations."[123] To "men of religion," Wesley responds to charges that he is departing from the Church of England teaching and promoting separation by explaining how these charges are untrue.

In addition to his Appeals, Wesley addresses a rational appeal to Roman Catholics in Ireland in "A Letter to a Roman Catholic."[124] Acknowledging the bitterness existing among both Protestants and Roman Catholics, he presents what he terms beliefs of a "true Protestant," and the practice of love of neighbor, in such a manner that Roman Catholics would not disagree with his position. Then, as he closes his "Letter," he urges that they resolve "not to hurt one another," to speak nothing harsh or unkind of each other," "to harbour no unkind thought...towards each other," and "to help each other on in whatever we are agreed leads to the Kingdom."[125] "Above all," says Wesley, :"let us each take heed unto himself (since each must give an account of himself to God) that he fall not short of the religion of love..."[126] Clearly, Wesley's polemic efforts sought a lifeworld rationality grounded in communicative action.

Wesley grounded his communicative approach to lifeworld rationality in theological convictions. Theodore Jennings has identified five of those convictions which prompted Wesley's approach.[127] First, he believed in a "grace" that really transformed people and made them more actively loving. This led to effort for an inclusive community. Second, he believed that Christian "believers" were empowered, not merely enlightened, and enabled to live new lives, neither denying the necessity of divine empowerment nor

conceiving God in a Deist fashion of not intervening in human affairs.[128] They were empowered to deal with human differences. Third, he saw "holiness" as grace overpowering sin, not "perfecting nature."[129] It was power to get beyond "natural" divisions. Fourth, he saw "love" as essentially a rational ordering of human life.[130] That rational ordering came in Pentecostal community. Fifth, he saw "worldliness" as most threatening in the realm of economics.[131] Economic self-interest--"riches"--was the greatest threat to Pentecostal community.

In spite of Wesley's "evangelical economics" which pursued a lifeworld rationality that would communicate with and express solidarity with the poor, the generation after Wesley departed from this emphasis. The departure is studied in the works of Jennings, Semmel, and Warner. Jennings observes Wesley's "hedges and qualifications," making exceptions to his radical Pentecostal economics, especially his Standard Sermons and his unbiblical maxim urging Methodists to gain all they could, save all they could, and give all they could.[132] Warner cites for England the turn of the century (eighteenth to nineteenth) "rise of a new class," "revolution phobia," and association of radicals with irreligion.[133] As a result of successes of a mixed pietism and business action, Methodists moved away from a "divine-ownership theory" (stewardship) requiring the giving of whatever one earned beyond life's necessities.[134] Warner argues that Wesleyanism lost its "capacity for creative leadership" as it drifted away from its religious societies, changed its official pronouncements, and came to grant greater prestige to the economically successful.[135] Semmel observes with respect to England the role of a fear of

repression of itinerant preachers whom the government had tried to restrict for fear they were organizing the poor and working classes in ways that had potential for revolution.[136] Also, Methodists found an outlet for potentially revolutionary impulses in foreign missions and in the effort to abolish slavery in the Empire.[137] Yet, in spite of the rejection of much of Wesley's teaching by ;Methodists shortly after his death, his concern for the poor lived on in the Methodist heritage. Although moves were made to follow a rationality grounded in strategic action governed by the political needs of both the Methodist Church and the wider society, the concern for communicative action in solidarity with the lifeworld of all the oppressed did not die out completely.

NOTES

[1]Referred to in Wesley's A Plain Account of Christian Perfection as contained in Albert C. Outler, John Wesley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964) ("A Library of Protestant Thought" Series), p.7. Outler's source is Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M., Third Edition (1829-1831), Thomas Jackson, Editor, Volume XI, pp. 366-367. This also may be found in John Wesley, A Plain Account of Christian Perfection: As Believed and Taught by the Rev. Mr. John Wesley from the Year 1725 to 1777 (Boston: McDonald, Gill, and Co., undated reprint, p.1, second paragraph. This is referred to in the analysis in John L. Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1985, Second Edition of 1956 Edition by Pierce and Washabaugh of Nashville, Tennessee), p. 19. This is also referred to in the analysis in Albert C. Outler, Theology in the Wesleyan Spirit (Nashville, Tennessee: Tidings, 1975, p. 70.

[2]Passages in Wesley's Journal related to this are re-produced and analyzed in Outler, John Wesley, pp. 51-69.

[3]Wesley gives his sense of the purpose of the Methodists in what is sometimes called "The Large Minutes," a compilation of "Minutes of Several Conversations Between The Rev. Mr. Wesley and Others From the Year 1744, to the Year 1789," as found in The Works of John Wesley, Volume VIII, Addressed, Essays, Letters (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, undated with unidentified editor, from 1872 edition from the Wesleyan Conference Office in London), p. 299. Question 3 of these "Minutes" reads: "What may we reasonably believe to be God's design in raising up the Preachers called Methodists?" The answer provided is: "Not to form any new sect; but to reform the nation, particularly the Church; and to spread scriptural holiness over the land." In question 4, Wesley asks: "What was the rise of Methodism, so called?:" He answers: "In 1729, two young men, reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others so to do. In 1737 they saw holiness comes by faith. They saw likewise, that men are justified before they are sanctified; but holiness was still their point. God then thrust them; out, utterly against their will, to raise a holy people."

[4]Wesley, Plain Account, paragraphs 2 through 6; Outler, John Wesley, pp. 6-7; Peters, loc. cit.; Outler, Theology, loc. cit.

[5]Peters, op. cit., p. 20. Reference to The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, Edited by John Telford (London: The Epworth Press, 1931), Volume IV, p. 299.

[6]Vivian H. H. Green, John Wesley (London: Nelson, 1964), p. 15. Outler, in John Wesley, p. 7, argues that Wesley's "consequent decision to prepare for ordination" followed his "conversion" to a resolve to dedicate his entire life to God.

[7]Green, op. cit., p. 14. Richard P. Heitzenrater, "The Oxford Diaries and the First Rise of Methodism," in Methodist History, XII (July 1974), p. 114.

[8]Green, ibid.

[9]Heitzenrater, loc. cit., pp. 110-135. Green, op. cit., pp. 1-34. "The Large Minutes," The Works of John Wesley, loc. cit.

[10]Outler, John Wesley, p. 8.

[11]Heitzenrater, op. cit., p. 117.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Green, op. cit., p. 29.

[14]Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[15]Ibid., p. 30.

[16]Heitzenrater, op. cit., p. 118.

[17]Ibid.

[18]This thought is developed in Leon Hynson, To Reform The Nation: Theological Foundations of Wesley's Ethics (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Francis Asbury Press of Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), "Christian Faith and Social Ethics: The Significance of Aldersgate" (pp. 21-31).

[19]Green, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

[20]Ibid., pp. 34-37, says this was a chaplaincy under the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. Outler, John Wesley, p. 11, cites a record of the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel as having appointed Wesley to this mission.

[21]Quoted from the Jackson Edition of Wesley's Works, Volume I, p. 74, by Robert G. Tuttle, John Wesley: His Life and Theology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p. 176.

[22]Outler, John Wesley, p. 66.

[23]Ibid., p. 14, Outler discusses some spiritual uncertainties Wesley had after Aldersgate.

[24]Ibid., p. 197.

[25]Ibid., pp. 189, 191.

[26]Ibid., pp. 192-193.

[27]Ibid., pp. 53-73.

[28]Ibid., pp. 68-69.

[29]Hynson, op. cit., p. 34.

[30]Richard Cameron, Methodism and Society in Historical Perspective (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1961) (Volume I in four volume set), p.33.

[31]Outler, John Wesley, pp. 14-16.

[32]Ibid., p. 14.

[33]Ibid., p. 17, reference to Journal, eight volume standard edition edited by Nehemiah Curnock (1909-1916), Volume III, pp. 172-173.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Outler, John Wesley, pp. 177-180, reference to Jackson Edition of Works of Wesley, Volume VIII, pp. 269-271.

[36]Wellman J. Warner, The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1930), p. 274. Warner writes: "Religious experience served as the stimulant of that social mobility which is an invariable symptom of free initiative and liberal sentiment." He adds on p. 176: "Wesleyanism made vigorous contributions to the process which undermined the foundations of the old standards and made new values of spirit and personality supreme." But, he concludes on p. 179 that Methodism failed its great opportunity when leaders after Wesley decreased their stress on developing character for the good of society.

[37]Outler, John Wesley, loc. cit.

[38]Theodore W. Jennings, Jr., Good News to the Poor: John Wesley's Evangelical Economics (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990).

[39]Ibid., pp. 13-15.

[40]Ibid., p. 14.

[41]Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[42]Ibid., pp. 18-22.

[43]Ibid., p. 22.

[44]Ibid., pp. 24-25.

[45]Ibid., p. 26.

[46]Acts 4.32 and Acts 4.35. This "Pentecostal Community is described in Acts 2.43-47 and Acts 4.32-37.

[47]John Wesley, Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1958 reprinting), p. 402.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Jennings, op. cit., p. 136, reference to Thoughts Upon Methodism in Volume XIII, p. 258 of the Jackson Edition of Wesley's works.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid., p. 129. This warning is issued by Wesley in the fourth of his Standard Sermons on the Sermon on the Mount.

[53]Jennings (p. 135) notes that Wesley observed this thesis that Protestantism results in Middle Class prosperity long before it was developed by Max Weber in The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism and R.H. Tawney in Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.

[54]Ibid. Writing on "The Causes of the Inefficacy of Christianity," Wesley asked: "Does it not seem (and yet this cannot be) that Christianity, true scriptural Christianity, has a tendency, in process of time to undermine and destroy itself?" He explained: "For wherever true Christianity spreads, it must cause diligence and frugality, which, in the natural course of things, must beget riches! and riches naturally beget pride, love of the world, and every temper that is destructive of Christianity. Now, if there be no way to prevent this, Christianity is inconsistent with itself, and, of consequence, cannot stand, cannot continue long among any people; since, wherever it generally prevails, it saps its own foundation." (Jennings quotes this passage from Works, Vol. VII, p. 290.)

[55]Jennings (pp. 29-46), in a chapter titled "The Demystification of Wealth," cites many sermons and letters by Wesley warning against the threat of riches to motivate hostility toward those perceived to have fewer possessions. Jennings sees this de-mystification as a antidote to "the pseudo-gospel of wealth and power."

[56]Jennings, op. cit., p. 36, reference to a letter of May 16, 1759.

[57]Reinhold Niebuhr, The Irony of American History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 12.

[58]Ibid., p. 50, reference to Works, Volume XIII, p. 307.

[59]Ibid., p. 51.

[60]Ibid., p. 54, reference to Journal for November 24, 1760.

[61]Ibid., reference to "On Visiting the Sick," Works, Volume VII, p. 60.

[62]Ibid., p. 55, reference to Journal for February 9-10, 1763.

[63]Ibid., p. 57, reference to "Letter to a Member of the Society" of February 7, 1776. Jennings cites a similar letter of June 9, 1775 with this challenge: "Go and see the poor and sick in their own poor little hovels! Take up your cross, woman! Remember the faith! Jesus went before you, and will go with you. Put off the gentlewoman: You bear a higher character."

[64]Ibid., p. 64.

[65]Ibid., p. 71.

[66]Ibid., pp. 58-62.

[67]Jennings (p. 61) notes that Wesley wrote of how he gave medical attention in A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists (Works, Volume VIII, pp. 263-265): "I did not regard whether they were of the society or not." Jennings observes (p. 224) that Wesley criticized the Moravians in his Journal of November 28, 1750 this way: "I do not admire their confining beneficence to the narrow bounds of their own society."

[68]Ibid., pp. 62-64.

[69]Ibid., p. 65, reference to "The Large Minutes" of Wesley in Works, Volume VIII, p. 332.

[70]Ibid., reference to "Letter to Mr. John Cricket" of February 10, 1783.

[71]Ibid., p. 68, reference to Works, Volume XI, p. 55.

[72]Ibid., p. 69.

[73]Ibid., pp. 72-78.

[74]Ibid., p. 77, reference to Works, Volume VIII, p. 165.

[75]Ibid., pp. 78-88.

[76]Ibid., p. 93, reference to "A Calm Address to our American Colonies" in Works, Volume XI, p. 81.

[77]Ibid., p. 89, reference to letter of February 26, 1791.

[78]Ibid., p. 94.

[79]Ibid., p. 95.

[80]Ibid., p. 99, reference to Journal of January 21, 1767.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid., pp. 98-102.

[83]Ibid., p. 103, reference to "The More Excellent Way" in Works, Volume VII, p. 36.

[84]Ibid., pp. 106-108. Jennings contrasts Wesley's call to give all to God in the poor with that kind of "stewardship" appeal which calls church members to give a "Temple Tax" of a tithe for church buildings and programs.(p. 105)

[85]Ibid., pp. 108-111. Among other references, Jennings gives this Wesley direction on dress: "Therefore, every shilling which you needlessly spend on your apparel is, in effect, stolen from God and the poor!" (P. 109 reference to "On Dress" in Works, Volume VII, p. 20)

[86]Ibid., p. 113, reference to "The General Spread of the Gospel" found in Works, Volume VI, p. 284. Jennings expands on this with reference to Wesley's works on pp. 111-116.

[87]Ibid., pp. 113-114, 131.

[88]Ibid., p. 137, reference to Wesley's Works, Volume XIII, p. 259. Jennings summarizes Wesley's expressions of these concerns over the years on pp. 130-138, including a section titled "Wesley Against the Methodists."

[89]These are summarized by Albert Outler in John Wesley, pp. 134-196.

[90]Outler, op. cit., p. 135.

[91]Ibid., p. 136, reference to Publications of the Wesleyan Historical Society, No. 1 (1896).

[92]Ibid.

[93]Ibid., p. 147.

[94]Ibid., p. 148.

[95]Ibid., pp. 155-156. Outler notes that this source for these minutes is Wesley, as found in Works, Volume VIII, pp. 275-298.

[96]Ibid., pp. 163 ff. Outler (p. 135) observes that these minutes are once again those of lay preacher John Bennet

[97]Ibid., p. 164.

[98]Ibid.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Ibid., pp. 165-176.

[101]Ibid., pp. 345-499.

[102]Ibid., pp. 353-376.

[103]Ibid., p. 354.

[104]Ibid., pp. 357-358.

[105]Ibid., pp. 360-361.

[106]Ibid., p. 361.

[107]Ibid., pp. 367-372.

[108]Ibid., p. 376.

[109]Ibid., pp. 364-371.

[110]Ibid., pp. 35-40.

[111]Ibid., p. 377.

[112]Ibid., p. 381.

[113]Ibid., pp. 298-305.

[114]Ibid., p. 305.

[115]Ibid., pp. 427-472. Wesley also offered in 1774 another tract titled "Thoughts Upon Necessity" related to the same topic.

[116]Warner, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[117]Warner's thesis is that the Wesleyan movement provoked a more liberal and humanitarian perspective by breaking down social conditions preventing re-appraisal of community values and by fostering a situation making a new outlook

possible.(p. 274) He does not deal with differences between John Calvin's writings and popular Calvinism of eighteenth century England.

[118]Bernard Semmel, The Methodist Revolution (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1973), pp. 4-5, 41-45.

[119]Wesley was more "liberal," in the sense of optimistic about human possibilities, than Luther or Calvin. ; But, Semmel's quote (p. 19) of Wesley's definition of faith as "an assent upon rational grounds" is a definition that precedes the more characteristic definition of faith as "an assent to what God has revealed because he has revealed it and not because the truth of it can be evinced by reason." (Letters, Telford Edition, Volume I, p. 25, as cited in George Allen Turner, The Vision Which Transforms: Is Christian Perfection Scriptural (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1964), p. 197.) Also, with respect to "free will," Semmel incorrectly argues that Wesley departs from Lutheran and Calvinist emphases to stress "free will," thus becoming more consistent with a "modern" or "liberal" perspective.(pp. 41-45) However, Robert Chiles, in Theological Transitions in American Methodism: 1790-1935 (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), stresses that it was those who followed Wesley in America who made the transition to belief in "free will," while Wesley continually stressed gracious ability or "free grace."

[120]Ibid., p. 53.

[121]Outler, John Wesley, pp. 384-424.

[122]Ibid., p. 393.

[123]Ibid., p. 394.

[124]Ibid., pp. 492-499.

[125]Ibid., pp. 498-499.

[126]Ibid., p. 499.

[127]Jennings, op. cit., pp. 139-156.

[128]Ibid., pp. 145-148. Jennings observes (pp. 143, 144) that Wesley stressed the inner change of the believer as part of his concern for outward change, not as an expression of disinterest in outer human behavior. He writes that "a conversion that left

unchanged my manner of relating to my neighbor would be an imaginary conversion, an exercise in irreality." In a footnote (p. 229) Jennings sees this perception of Wesley as "relatively disinterested in outward transformation" as "the characteristic misinterpretation"
of E.P. Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class (New York: Random House, 1963).

[129]Ibid., pp. 148-149.

[130]Ibid., pp. 150-151. Jennings summarizes (p. 150): "Wesley regards this pure disinterested love for every human being as rational religion--rational because it corresponds to the true character of the created subject, rational because it corresponds, as that subject must, to the divine subject."

[131]Ibid., pp. 153-156.

[132]Ibid., pp. 157-179, a chapter titled "Why Did Wesley Fail?"

[133]Ibid., p. 123.

[134]Ibid., p. 196.

[135]Ibid., pp. 198-206.

[136]Ibid., pp. 124-136.

[137]Ibid., pp. 145-146, 168-169.

B. MARRIAGE TO AMERICAN CIVIL RELIGION DEVELOPING STRATEGIC ACTION SEEKING SUBSYSTEM RATIONALITY

Wesley's followers in North America asserted their adulthood and independence in the 1784 formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore. At the same time, the thirteen colonies were asserting their adulthood and independence in the 1776 Declaration and the 1787 Constitution in Philadelphia. As the years passed, both entities, the newly formed Methodist Episcopal Church and the newly formed United States of America, realized a commonness of interests, and Methodism became a vital component in the religious support of the nation. Wesleyan concerns for personal and social liberation were married to American concerns for liberty within republican institutions. Concerns for Christian maturity were blended with concerns for national unity in a civil religion which appealed to all American Protestants, uniting Evangelical heirs of the American Great Awakening with Deistic heirs of the Enlightenment. A community of concern and religious devotion to the survival of the new republican institutions was developing. When the developing civil religion came to be more concerned about political order in the church and in the nation than about the liberation of slaves, perfectionists from within Methodism challenged the institutional church to a more inclusive lifeworld rationality that would include the well-being of slaves. After these and other conflicts led to Civil War, institutional church Methodists and perfectionist Methodists re-united in a Civil Religion whose objective was the spread of spiritual and civil liberty throughout the nation and around the globe.

Bishop Francis Asbury and the General Conference communicated their best

wishes and prayers for success to newly inaugurated President George Washington in 1789.[1] This act symbolized the marriage of Methodist and American concerns for liberty. Bishop Asbury's visits with President Washington clearly expressed wholehearted Methodist support of independence from Great Britain. It also helped overcome doubts caused by Methodist founder John Wesley's opposition to the cause of the colonists.[2]

Methodists were among the Evangelical Revivalists whose rejection of cold formalism found common cause with Deist opposition to traditionalism to support religious freedom in a context of a voluntary civil religion in the new American nation.[3] Sidney Mead has described this "lively experiment" with religious freedom and voluntaryism as grounded in rationalist emphasis on the primacy of reason and revivalist (he speaks of it as "pietist") emphasis on the primacy of the heart.[4] Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and other Deists were convinced that the revivalist religious groups would each "inculcate in its own way the basic religious beliefs that are essential" to public order.[5] Jefferson opposed "whatever is prejudicial to the Commonwealth" and Franklin resented the remarks of a preacher he thought would "rather to make us Presbyterians than good citizens."[6]

Mead explains that this alliance of revivalists and rationalists required the revivalists to "inculcate the basic religious beliefs essential for the existence and well-being of the society" by persuasion and to accept the view that only what the churches held in common was relevant to the well-being of society and state.[7] Persuasion and voluntaryism would have to be the means of appeal, since the United States was already so diverse that no

group could dominate. This "religion of the nation" (which I am referring to as "Civil Religion") was imparted by the public schools as more important than the "religion of the denominations" taught by the churches.[8] Mead argues: "In this sense the public school system of the United States is its established church."[9] Henry May observes that by 1850 this civil religion had a clearly Protestant flavor, part of what he terms "Progressive Patriotic Protestantism."[10]

When the revivalist/rationalist marriage of the Revolutionary period divorced with the 1800 Presidential campaign of Thomas Jefferson, the Federalists evoked fears focusing on the threat of French political instability associated with Jefferson rather than on the theological differences of rationalist naturalistically revealed religion versus revivalist supernaturalistically revealed religion. Thus, the Civil Religion of beliefs promoting political rationality remained supreme, even as the Federalists aroused public fears of Jefferson by associating him with the excesses of the French Revolution. The civil religious unity of rationalists and revivalists remained, while debate focused on who could be trusted to maintain the political stability of American republican institutions.

Civil religion provided a connecting link between the concerns of Methodism to organize itself and concerns of the new nation to conquer the frontier and organize itself. Charles Ferguson has analyzed the parallel rationalization of American life in general and of Methodism in particular.[11] He argues that American Methodism bears a major responsibility "for the worship of methodology in America," and that it is both an example of and a major cause of the American combination of "exuberance and statistics..., idealism and bureaucracy, ...ponderous effort and quick wit, ...grandiose plans and

infinite detail."[12] Ferguson analyzes the role of organized circuit riders, class meetings, and camp meetings in presenting, in addition to religious instruction, "the claims of regulation and social control" and the related sense of order for new settlers on the American frontier.[13]

Strategic actions pursuing political order within Methodism, under the control of Bishops from Francis Asbury to Joshua Soule, came to be resisted over the years by those seeking communicative action to achieve a more inclusive lifeworld rationality. The eventual result was the 1844 split of the Methodist Episcopal Church into Northern and Southern branches largely due to the conflict over the power of the General Conference of the preachers to regulate the Bishops. Methodist preachers had withdrawn to form the Primitive Methodists in 1791, the Republican Methodists ("Christian Church") in 1798, the Methodist Protestant Church in 1830, and the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in 1843.[14] But, the Bishops control of the church was finally challenged successfully when the General Conference voted 110 to 68 on June 1, 1844 for Bishop James Andrew to cease functioning as Bishop so long as he owned slaves, slaves he had come to possess by marriage and had found no way to set free.[15] Even as the strategic action of the national political parties and the Congress to prevent communicative action on the slavery issues (so as to maintain a certain political rationality) was being overcome during these years, so the strategic action pursuing church political rationality by the Bishops and General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church avoiding the slavery issue was overcome. The result was the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844 and the division of the nation in 1861.

The founding Christmas Conference at Baltimore had demanded that those unwilling to free their slaves within one year (two years for Virginia) be expelled.[16] But, the rule was not enforced, because Methodist leaders Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke had suspended the requirement within six months as being impractical.[17] In 1785, Asbury had urged George Washington to support a petition making emancipation of slaves legal. Washington had refused to sign but said he would support such an action by the Virginia Assembly. The petition had come to nothing.[18] Asbury was undisturbed, because he preferred improvement of the slaves' condition rather than emancipation. A 1793 slave revolt on Hispaniola led by Toussaint L'Ouverture followed by 250 slave revolts in the United States in the next half century influenced Asbury to stress conversions and let converts change society rather than threaten church unity with such a social issue.[20] The concern for political order within the Methodist Episcopal Church developed to be so strong that the 1836 General Conference approved by a vote of 120 to 14 a censure of 2 delegates for attending an antislavery convention.[21] Bishop Joshua Soule, presiding at the 1844 General Conference, expressed the overriding concern for political rationality in confronting the slavery issue. He praised Methodist evangelistic efforts, especially toward blacks, and he added: "But to raise them up to equal civil rights and privileges is not within our power. Let us not labor in vain and spend our strength for nought.[22]

A growing movement within Methodism and American revivalism was not content to tolerate human slavery. Timothy Smith has analyzed the development of this movement in many denominations in his Revivalism and Social Reform.[23] Methodism had stressed

Christian perfection in love as an equipping experience and relationship from its beginnings in England and its early days in America. By the 1830s, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists shared similar concerns and beliefs. While some saw the quest for "entire sanctification" to be the pursuit of an experience so vital that concern for social issues would not be permitted to interfere, others viewed it is enabling confrontation with what was seen to be the key moral issue of the times, human slavery. In fact, Charles Finney, a non-Methodist who came to share many Methodist perspectives, in his emphasis on "new measures" to provoke the outbreak of revivals of religion, stressed that taking a wrong stand on such human rights issues as slavery was one of the key hindrances to revival.[24] These perfectionists were part of a movement for communicative action seeking a rational order by means beyond strategic or instrumental action that meely sought what seemed necessary for the political order of the nation, a church, or a movement.

"New measures" in American religious history are usually associated with the work of Charles Finney. In analyzing the impact of this change in American revivalism, William McLaughlin explains that his sermons "combined reason and emotion, faith in the Bible and faith in human intelligence, belief in the benevolence of God and belief in the perfectibility of man."[25] He points to Finney's 1835 Lectures on Revivals of Religion as "the definitive statement of techniques and criteria for modern revivalism."[26] Finney called for a raising of excitement as politicians would do to bring people to a decision, and he shared the post-millenial optimism of most revivalists of the time that society could be transformed.[27] From the pages of the Oberlin Evangelist he condemned the church for its "pernicious attitude..on the reforms of the age," and he challenged religious leaders to

speak out on issues of reform that would otherwise divide the church.[28] The "strategic action" of his "new measures" were seen as a means to reform individuals and society, but not something more vital than communicative action concerning the great social issues of the day.

McLaughlin contends that Finney harnessed frontier revivalism to the institutionalized church system and helped stabilize and unify American evangelical Protestantism and "transform it into a national religion."[29] He argues that the social outlook of Finney's theology was the "Christian counterpart of Jacksonian democracy," but that, as it came to be a "national religion," it went hand in hand with social conformity and political conservatism.[30] Perhaps the use of Finney's "new measures" without his reformist agenda went together with social conformity, but Finney's perspective was clearly not one of social conformity. His communicative efforts had such clear social implications, even when not explicitly stated, that Lyman Beecher feared Finney's "appealing dangerously to levelling and democratizing" by his speaking the same message to all classes, and Beecher saw this as a "sure presage of anarchy and total destruction."[31]

However, some people's use of "new measures" for strategic reasons not clearly related to reform did go hand in hand with social conformity. John Peters, Timothy Smith, and Charles Jones all document the developing "new measures" in America from the 1830s onward to encourage the quest for "Christian perfection" understood as being experienced in a crisis of "entire sanctification."[32] Methodists had always exhorted one another to "go on to perfection" (as Wesley had asked them to do), but the 1820s and

1830s saw a renewed emphasis on this. Methodists published books on the subject and wrote articles on it for their official publications. Even as they had taken the camp meeting and organized it, and used it to replace the more personal and communicative class meeting, so they used the "new measure" of direct confrontation for decision for conversion, as employed by Finney, and applied it to the call to confess entire sanctification.[33]

A key event in this developing concern was the beginning of a "Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness" in 1835., combining two Methodist women's prayer groups under the leadership of Phoebe Palmer. Men were eventually welcomed to the meetings and it became an interdenominational quest for an experience of entire sanctification. Timothy Smith relates this both to Finney's efforts and quest at the time and to "the temper of the time."[34] Smith sees it as related to the strivings of "a romantic and transcendentalist generation" that hungered for an experience that would "make Christianity work."[35]

About 1847, Palmer developed her controversial "altar theology," a strategy which advocated public testimony to entire sanctification before one felt assurance. This was seen as an expression of faith and as a means to advance the movement.[36] It was based on an emphasis of the Apostle Paul on presenting oneself as a "living sacrifice" (as in the twelfth chapter of the Letter to the Romans in the Christian New Testament) and an Old Testament declaration that "the altar sanctifies the gift."

Not all Methodists agreed with this exegesis. Nathan Bangs, a friend of Palmer, criticized the departure from Wesley's emphasis on "the witness of the Spirit." In spite of the controversy, though, by the 1850s Phoebe Palmer and her husband, Dr. Walter

Palmer, as well as numbers of other evangelists, were becoming quite successful in mass meetings, especially in using Methodist camp meetings as a vehicle for calling persons to an experience of entire sanctification using the "altar theology."[37] However, Timothy Smith has pointed out that Palmer and "her New York and Philadelphia coterie" (bishops, editors, and other Methodist leaders) were "laggards in whatever demanded stern attacks on persons and institutions."[38] The 1857-58 "Prayer Meeting Revival" ("Business Men's Revival"), which Smith presents as a high water mark of the pre-Civil War combination of revivalism, perfectionism, and millenialism, would not permit discussion of such controversial issues as slavery.

But, contrary to Phoebe Palmer's kind of strategic action, many other revivalists, especially many Methodists, combined revivalism, perfectionism, and millenialism into a movement to socially apply Christianity.[39] In fact, Timothy Smith's basic thesis is that American revivalism and perfectionism "helped prepare the way both in theory and in practice for what later became known as the social gospel."[40] Smith argues that "whatever may have been the role of other factors, the quest for perfection joined with compassion for poor and needy sinners and a rebirth of millenial expectations to make popular Protestantism a mighty social force long before the slavery conflict erupted into war.[41] The groundwork was laid by the attack upon slavery in the 1840s and 1850s. As revivalistic abolitionists had dealt with the issues of whether church or national unity should be jeopardized for their cause and whether the church in a democratic society should seek to impose Christian values on society, revivalistic perfectionists became

involved in "the rehabilitation of the Bible as an instrument of reform." This included rational and historical approaches to use against slavery a document allowing slavery in Old and new Testaments.[42]

Three unusual perfectionists who challenged institutional Methodism on the slavery issue before the war were Gilbert Haven, Luther Lee, and L.C. Matlack. Haven's biographer William Gravely documents his Puritan, revivalist, Methodist context and his abolitionism from within Methodism before the war. This included a Biblical case that all slavery is sin and that racial equality, not mere freedom, was the ultimate goal.[43] It also included a rational appeal to a "higher law" than the Constitutionally adopted Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850 (which he never regarded as a "Law.")[44]

Matlack and Lee both withdrew from New England Methodism in 1843 with Orange Scott and others to form the Wesleyan Methodist Connection.[45] Lee states in his autobiography what he saw as the three reasons for the secession: 1) slavery was known to be a sin; 2) the Methodist Episcopal Church endorsed slavery; and 3) the antislavery cause was crippled within the church.[46] But, Matlack, looking backward from 1881 to write a history of "The Anti-Slavery Struggle," maintains that there was a continuing anti-slavery position within the Methodist Episcopal Church through the Civil War. Both Matlack and Lee state that they returned to membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church at the end of the War, since the cause of their leaving had been removed.[47] The writings of all three of these social perfectionists are filled with optimism, and each represents the civil religion which both institutional Methodists and social perfectionists shared

after the Civil War.

Millenial optimism and civil religion were related to a changing perspective on "Providence" that developed during the 1850s and was very strong after the War. Before the War, and before the 1850s intensification of the slavery debate, Providence had tended to be a doctrine invoked by conservatives in favor of social and civil conservatism, as when Bishops Asbury and Soule stressed individual evangelism and avoidance of potentially divisive social issues. Methodist leaders saw the growth of Methodism as a sign of Providential mission. It was not something to be jeopardized by what seemed to them to be shortsighted attention to "issues of the day" such as abolition. Donald Jones has observed that after the War the doctrine of Providence motivated "a strong conviction of being mission-sent into the world; a logical outgrowth of a fervent religious nationalism; and a felt requirement of a providential Lord who was judging, renewing and calling ...to obedience.[48]

This changed view of Providence went hand in hand with a post-Civil War reunion of perfectionists with institutional Methodism in a renewed synthesis of civil religion which saw as its goal the spread of civil liberty throughout the nation and the world. Specific examples of this synthesis were Luther Lee and Lucius Matlack, founders of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in 1843, who returned to the Methodist Episcopal Church after the War and made common cause with Bishop Matthew Simpson, a perfectionist who spoke at the first meeting of the National Camp Meeting for the promotion of Holiness in 1867 and who was a strong exponent of American civil religion.[49] President Lincoln gratefully thanked his friend Bishop Simpson for his wartime support, especially his often repeated

"War Message," which was one of the clearest expressions of the American civil religion.[50] Arguing for the providential mission of America, Simpson declared: "I would say it with all reverence. God cannot do without America."[51] As Donald Jones describes it, Methodism after the Civil War combined both "the religion of the nation" and "the religion of evangelical Christianity."[52] This civil religion of American freedom was "a fervent nationalism rooted in traditional faith," says Jones, not the kind of thing brought to mind by twentieth century concepts of civil religion which are either a kind of "folk religion" replacing traditional faith or "a religion of politics."[53] Jones argues that this sense of mission to Christianize America (advance freedom and free institutions) may help to explain two other processes: 1) "how a revivalist-oriented denomination came to assume a social mission to the nation" and 2) "how northern Methodism could acquiesce, along with the nation, to the compromise of 1877 and gradually lose its concern for civil justice in both the North and the South."[54]

Referring to Methodist post-Civil War leaders, Jones argues that the greatness of such men "is seen in their capacity to affirm and work for humane causes without ignoring the biblical and historical origins of the human virtues."[55] He contends that post-Civil War Methodism, rather than being shaped primarily by the frontier, was in a mood for "turning eyes back to New England to gain perspective for the meaning of the conflict, of national destiny, of the meaning of the church."[56] In a time of national upheaval, the Puritan sense of calling to be a Christian nation was remembered, and at a time of celebration of the centennial of the first Methodist preachers sent by Wesley to America

in 1766, the sense of Methodist mission to "reform the continent" was remembered. Jones cites Bishop Jesse Peck's 1868 History of the Great Republic as seeing Methodism to be battling "the sins that threatened the Republic"--sins of slavery, intemperance, social inequality, rebellion, ignorance, and all the forces which endangered free institutions and civil liberty.[57] He also cites Methodist leader George Crooks' January 24, 1863 article in The Methodist which stated: "The manifest destiny of the nation is to be a Christian nation; our democracy will be a democracy of schoolhouses. And so long as church and schoolhouse, religion and education, are cherished, so long shall we be bound by indissoluble ties to the spirit of Puritanism."[58] He gives extensive space to Daniel Whedon's concept of "The Man-Republic" in an essay by that title in the Methodist Quarterly Review and his 1852 Public Addresses.[59] This concept was part of the developing Methodist supported civil religion which saw itself to be evangelizing the nation as an entity. In connection with this, Methodist historian Abel Stevens remarked concerning Gilbert Haven's book of sermons dealing with his struggle against slavery after the 1850 Fugitive Slave Bill that "the struggle not only emancipated our slaves, it emancipated our clergy.[60]

Philip Jordan and Leon Hynson have made the same point as Jones with respect to post-Civil War civil religion.[61] Jordan seeks to explain the rise of the Social Gospel as an essentially conservative movement, and initiates his discussion with a summary of what he terms the "evangelical Religion of the Republic" evident in public remarks by Bishop Matthew Simpson and Wesleyan University President C.D. Foss.[62] Simpson's "War Message" not only argued "God cannot afford to do without America," but it also

was very optimistic with respect to the positive future power for America of free immigration and social mobility in carrying out America's world mission of teaching the world republican government.[63] Foss argued that the United States was made by God "the grand repository and evangelist of civil liberty and of pure religious faith."[64]

Leon Hynson presents Bishop Jesse Peck's History of the Great Republic as representing the post-Civil War Methodist concern to "convert the nation"--not into a theocracy, but into an example of civil liberty. Peck spoke of "the progressive development of the new manhood" in a process by which "the social elevation...makes vice disgraceful, and instills virtue and piety as the dominant forces of reason."[65] He argued:

> The race is coming to feel the imperative for a divine regeneration of society, the grand model of which is found in every true Christian in whose heart, purposes, motives, and acts, old things have passed away, and all things become new.(66)

There was a strong feeling that the Civil War had led to such a "new birth of freedom," to use the Lincoln phrase.

Methodism had organized itself in 1784 in Baltimore "to reform the Continent and to spread scriptural holiness over these lands." Early on it committed itself to personal and social liberation, and it even went on record as seeking the abolition of slavery. But, as the years passed, Wesleyan social perfectionism, including commitment to the abolition of slavery, was deserted for strategic action to maintain the political stability of the American Republic and the Methodist Episcopal Church. At the same time, Wesleyan perfectionists, some concerned for individual perfection and others for both individual and social perfection, challenged institutional Methodism and the Nation to return to the more

inclusive vision of a lifeworld rationality which included slaves, rather than let the expediency of political rationality triumph. As conflict led to War, the civil religion preached by Methodists inspired Northern unity. President Abraham Lincoln expressed gratitude both for Methodist soldiers and for Methodist Bishop Matthew Simpson's "War Message" calling for devotion to the Union cause. By the end of the War, the previously antithetical elements of institutional Methodism and perfectionism had been synthesized in a renewal of civil religion which saw its mission to be the advance of "free institutions" around the world. The marriage of Methodism and American civil religion had been threatened by temporary separation, but it was now renewed in the covenant to spread social holiness over the globe.

NOTES

[1]Charles W. Ferguson, Organizing to Beat the Devil: Methodists and the Making of America (Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1971), "Hail to the Chief," pp. 13-21; Frederick A. Norwood, The Story of American Methodism (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), pp. 120, 121.

[2]Early American Methodist leader Thomas Rankin expressed the skepticism some Methodist preachers had felt concerning the war for independence. Part of his diary is reproduced in Sourcebook of American Methodism, Edited by Frederick A. Norwood (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982). On a day set apart by the Continental Congress for a fast (July 20, 1775), Rankin recorded in his diary this summary of sermon he gave at Gunpowder Falls (apparently in Maryland): "I endeavoured to open up and enforce the cause of all our misery. I told them that the sins of Great Britain and her colonies had long called for vengeance and in a peculiar manner the dreadful sin of buying and selling the souls and bodies of the poor Africans, the sons and daughters of Ham." (Norwood, Sourcebook, pp. 47-48)

In a diary entry for Wednesday, August 23, 1775, Rankin expressed his discomfort with actions of his fellow colonists: "I cannot I dare not, countenance the measures taken to oppose Great Britain; and yet at the same time, I would do nothing to hurt the inhabitants of America. How difficult to stand in such a situation; and not to be blamed by violent men on both sides? I had frequent opportunities from the first general congress that was held in Philadelphia, till now; to converse with several of its members; and also with many members of the Provincial Congress, where I travelled. I found liberty to speak my mind with freedom and so far as I could see they were not offended. I could not help telling many of them, what a farce it was for them; to contend for liberty, when they themselves, kept some hundreds of thousands of poor blacks in most cruel bondage? Many confessed it was true, but it was not now the time to set them at liberty. ...I endeavoured according to my little abilities to lead all those who heard me, (among whom were sometimes members of the Congress) to a proper improvement by turning with our whole hearts to the living God." (Norwood, Sourcebook, p. 49.)

[3]Sidney Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 35 and elsewhere. See Introduction above, note 72 on pp. 39-41 on use of the concept of "civil religion."

[4]Ibid., p. 61.

[5]Mead, op. cit., p. 63, gives his summary of Jefferson and Franklin's thought on this.

[6]Mead, op. cit., p. 64, refers to Jefferson and p.66 refers to Franklin.

[7]Ibid., p. 65.

[8]Ibid., pp. 66-71.

[9]Ibid., p. 68.

[10]Henry May, Ideas, Faiths and Feelings: Essays on American Intellectual and Religious History: 1952-1982 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 171. May's essay "The Religion of the Republic" (pp. 163-186) develops this thesis. He contends that the predominance of this civil religion ended in 1919 with the end of the Interchurch World Movement. Robert W Wuthnow deals with the history of recent expressions of American civil religion in The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II (Princeton, New Jersey: The Princeton University Press, 1988). Wuthnow argues that there are two current American versions of civil religion, one conservative and the other liberal. He also suggests that, due to the lack of agreement

between these two, yet a third "secular mythology" appears to be rising to dominance as American civil religion. His chapter "Two Cheers For America" (pp. 241-267) presents this perspective, including an explanation of the conservative and liberal varieties.

[11]Ferguson, op. cit.

[12]Ibid., pp. vii, viii.

[13]Ibid., p. 67.

[14]Ibid., chapters titled "The Mischief Begins" (175-184), "Reform With a Vengeance" (185-200), and "Half Slave and Half Free" (201-217).

[15]Ibid., p. 229. Harry Richardson speaks of Bishop Andrew as a "kindly, sincere man" who could not bring himself to sell his slaves and was not legally permitted to free them. He does this in Dark Salvation: The Story of American Methodism as it Developed Among Blacks in America (Garden City, New Jersey: Anchor-Press/Doubleday, 1976), p. 55. The conflict and decision are recounted in Norwood, The Story, pp. 197-199.

[16]Richardson, op. cit., p. 53.

[17]Ibid., pp. 53-54.

[18]Ferguson, op. cit., p. 17.

[19]Ibid., p. 205. IN contrast, James O'Kelly, a Virginia Methodist preacher, freed his slaves and responded to the assertion that slavery might be God-ordained by declaring: "If there be such a being in existence as may be called God, who was the author of this tragedy, it must be one of those gods that ascend from the bottomless pit. Such a god I defy in the name and strength of Jesus and declare eternal war against him!"

[20]Ibid., pp. 206-208. Ferguson sees this as a triumph of the "spirit of Asbury" over the "spirit of Coke."

[21]Ibid., pp. 208-209. This was in spite of the defense of the two delegates by Orange Scott, leader of the New England delegation. Scott, converted in a camp meeting, was known as a flaming evangelist whose services were described as "overwhelming pentecostal seasons." When the General Conference continued to refuse to deal with

slavery issue, he joined Luther Lee and Lucius Matlack in forming the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in 1843. Scott died before the Civil War began, but Lee and Matlack rejoined the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1867, after the War ended the slavery issue. Norwood, The Story, pp. 195-196; L.C. Matlack, The Anti-Slavery Struggle in the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 371; Luther Lee, Autobiography (New York: Garland Press, 1984, reprint of 1882 edition by Phillips & Hunt of New York), pp. 305-310.

[22]Ferguson, op. cit., pp. 219-220.

[23]Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War (New York: Harper Torchbooks, originally published by Abingdon Press in 1957).

[24]Charles Finney, Revivals of Religion (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, undated reprint of 1835 original, pp. 325-327, 337-343. Donald Dayton, Discovering an Evangelical Heritage (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), pp. 15-24.

[25]William McLaughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham (New York: The Ronald Press, 1959), p. 67.

[26]Ibid., p. 84.

[27]Ibid., pp. 87, 105-106.

[28]Dayton, loc. cit., discusses Finney's role in reform and reprints a Letter on Revival that other editions of Finney's works have edited so as to remove references to reform issues. On p. 19, Dayton refers to an edition of Revival Fire published several times in the twentieth century by Bethany Fellowship of Minneapolis which reprints Finney's words on "excitement" but does not give the full letter. The letter reproduced by Dayton includes these words: "Now the great business of the church is to reform the world--to put away every kind of sin. The church of Christ was originally organized to be a body of reformers. The very profession of Christianity implies the profession and virtually an oath to do all that can be done for the universal reformation of the world. The Christian church was designed to make aggressive movements in every direction--to lift up her voice and put forth her energies against iniquity in high and low places--to reform individuals, communities, and governments, and never rest until the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High God--until every form of iniquity shall be driven from the earth." Finney concludes: "Is it possible my dearly beloved brethren, that we can remain blind to the tendencies of things--to the causes that are operating to produce alienation, division,

distrust, to grieve away the Spirit, overthrow revivals, and cover the land with darkness and the shadow of death? Is it not time for us, brethren, to repent, to be candid and search out wherein we have been wrong and publicly and privately confess it, and pass public resolutions in our general ecclesiastical bodies, recanting and confessing what has been wrong--confessing in our pulpits, through the press, and in every proper way our sins as Christians and as ministers--our want of sympathy with Christ, our want of compassion for the slave, for the inebriate, for the wretched prostitute, and for all the miserable and ignorant of the earth." (pp. 21,24)

[29]McLaughlin, op. cit., p. 13.

[30]Ibid., pp. 13, 100.

[31]Ibid., p. 36.

[32]John L. Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (Nashville, Tennessee: Pierce and Washabaugh, 1956, Second Edition by Zondervan Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1985); Smith, op. cit.; Charles E. Jones, Perfectionist Persuasion: The Movement and American Methodism 1867-1936 (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1974).

[33]Ferguson, op. cit., pp. 141-150, explains Bishop Asbury's positive response to camp meetings because of their results. Methodists regularized the camp meeting and it became a very popular and dependable activity. At first, effort was made to keep both class meeting and camp meeting, but, when it was found impossible to keep both, the class meeting fell into disuse. Ferguson relates this to the emphasis on individuals and saving numbers as opposed to saving structures. He writes: 'On the primacy of the individual, Methodist doctrine and American temperament agreed." (p. 150) But, it was part of a process of stressing strategic action toward individuals to fit them into a political unit of the church rather than the communicative action of the class meeting seeking life-world rationality.

[34]Smith, op. cit., pp. 103-113.

[35]Ibid., pp. 142-145.

[36]Ibid., p. 125.

[37]Ibid., pp. 123, 1124.

[38]Ibid., p. 212.

[39]Ibid., p. 64.

[40]Ibid., p. 8. This is especially developed in Smith's chapters on the post-Civil War period.

[41]Ibid., p. 149.

[42]Ibid., pp. 188-203, 216-219

[43]This goal of equality is especially discussed in chapter two of William Gravely, Gilbert Haven, Methodist Abolitionist: A Study in Race, Religion and Reform, 1850-1880 (Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1973).

[44]Gravely, loc. cit., observes that Haven never regarded the Fugitive Slave "Law" as law.

[45]Matlack, loc. cit.; Lee, loc. cit.

[46]Lee, op. cit., pp. 241-246.

[47]Matlack, op. cit., p. 371; Lee, op. cit., p. 303.

[48]Donald G. Jones, The Sectional Crisis and Northern Methodism: A Study in Piety, Political Ethics and Civil Religion (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1979), pp. 63-71, 177-190.

[49]The story of the beginnings of the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness, Bishop Simpson's appearances, and sermons by Matlack are recounted by early participants in the following: A. McLean and J.W. Eaton (Editors), Penuel: or Face to Face With God (New York: W.C. Palmer, Jr., 1869); George Hughes, Days of Power in the Forest Temple: a Review of the Wonderful Work of God at Fourteen National Camp-meetings from 1867 to 1872 with an introduction by Bishop Haven (Boston: John Bent and Co., 1873); Adam Wallace, A Modern Pentecost: Embracing a Record of the Sixteenth National Campmeeting for the Promotion of Holiness Held at Landisville, Pa., from July 23 to August 1st, 1873 (Philadelphia: Methodist Home Journal Publishing House, 1873.)

[50]November 7, 1864 New York Herald Tribune as cited in Ferguson, op. cit., p. 243.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Donald Jones, op. cit., p. 145. Jones sees this "two religions theory" to be present in the thought of Alexis de Tocqueville (Democarcy in America, 1835), Ralph Gabriel (The Course of American Democratic Thought, 1956), Will Herberg (Protestant, Catholic, Jew, 1960), Sidney Mead (The Lively Experiment, 1963) and Martin Marty righteous Empire, 1970).

[53]Ibid., pp. 145, 146.

[54]Ibid., p. 147.

[55]Ibid., p. 127. Jones (p. 1) presents his conclusions concerning post-Civil War civil religion as a "dissent" from the "summit of complacency" view of Henry May (Protestant Churches and Industrial America, 1949), Robert Handy (The Quest for a a Christian America: 1830-1930, 1967), and Martin Marty (Righteous Empire, 1970, with its chapter on Reconstruction titled "The Complacent Era.") He also sees his conclusions to be a "polemic" against the "carpetbagger" interpretation of northern Methodism (Ralph Morrow's 1956 Northern Methodism and Reconstruction and Hodding Carter's The Angry Scar. He explains that his views have been shaped by the "revisionist" works of C. Vann Woodward (Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction, 1951), Kenneth Stampp (The Era of Reconstruction: 1861877, 1965), James McPherson (The Struggle for Equality: Abolition and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction, 1964), Timothy L. Smith (Revivalism and Social Reform, 1956), H. Shelton Smith (American Christianity, Vol. II, 1820-1960, with Robert Handy and Loefferts A. Loetscher, 1963) and William Gravely (Gilbert Haven: Methodist Abolitionist, 1973). It is also a "quarrel" with Gravely's biography of Haven because Jones argues: "Haven was not along by far in desiring to mix religion with politics in a prophetic and redemptive fashion." Jones names T.M. Eddy, Daniel Curry, Daniel Whedon, James McClintock, and Abel Stevens as examples of those who sought to mix religion and politics.

[56]Ibid., p. 128.

[57]Ibid., p. 136, reference to Jesse Peck's History of the Great Republic (New York: Broughton and Wyman, 1868), pp. 140-544.

[58]Ibid., p. 123.

[59]Ibid., pp. 153-158.

[60]Ibid., p. 198, reference to December 30, 1868 article by Stevens in the Christian Advocate (New York) titled "G. Haven's Sermons...Liberty of the Pulpit," p. 410.

[61]Philip D. Jordan, "Immigrants, Methodists and a 'Conservative' Social Gospel, 1865-1908," Methodist History, October 1978, Volume XVII, Number 1, pp. 16-43. Leon O. Hynson, "Reformation and Perfection: the Social Gospel of Bishop Peck," Methodist History, January 1978, Volume XVI, Number 2, pp. 82-92.

[62]Jordan, op. cit., p. 16, reference to the "War Message" as reported in the the New York Daily Tribune, November 7, 1864, p. 7.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid., p. 17, reference to "The Mission of Our Country" in Christian Advocate (New York), July 7, 1876, p. 210.

[65]Hynson, "Reformation and Perfection," pp. 88-89, reference to History of the Republic, pp. 479-482.

[66]Ibid., reference to Peck's History, p. 510.

C. CHALLENGES TO THE MARRIAGE: LABOR UPRISINGS OF 1877, 1886, AND 1894

Labor strife, symbolized by crucial events in 1877, 1886, and 1894, severely challenged both Methodism and American civil religion in their combined sense of mission. The 1877 railroad strikes and National Labor Uprising in July raised the spectre of the still freshly remembered Paris Commune of 1871. The 1886 Haymarket bombing symbolized fears of the new immigration, with its anarchists, socialists, and Roman Catholics who refused to be assimilated into America by way of the Protestant-dominated "common schools." The 1894 Pullman Strike, and especially the sympathy boycott of Pullman cars by Eugene Debs's American Railway Union, aroused fears of a society dominated by organized labor. Both Methodism and American civil religion felt themselves under attack.

During this same period, confronted by challenges of strikes, new immigration, and other dramatic social changes, various voices within Methodism moved from shocked outrage to increasing sympathy for the plight of the working class. The editors of the three most prominent Methodist publications--The Methodist Review. The Christian Advocate (New York), and Zion's Herald (Boston)--came to try to look at strikes from the point of view of the working class, publishing contributions of advocates of a developing Social Gospel as well as Gospel of Wealth advocates, yet maintaining a posture of defending the "free institutions" they still believed Methodism and America had a mission to spread to the rest of the world.

Dr. C.G. Truesdell of Chicago, writing in the Methodist Review in a September 1889 symposium on "The American Republic," expressed the sense in American

Methodism that the marriage of Wesleyan liberation concerns and American civil religious liberation concerns was threatened.[1] Having expressed his faith that the Declaration of Independence was "the religio-political creed of the American people," he praised "all nationalities and all religions" who had labored for "the defense and support of our American institutions and Christian civilization."[2] He praised them because:

> They love liberty and education... They hate anarchy and infidelity, and are mostly sober, industrious, law-abiding citizens who appreciate the blessings of Christian civilization.(3)

Then, Truesdell closed with this appeal:

> The institutions founded by our fathers or called forth by the exigency of the times, and which are ever to be maintained at any cost as the bulwark of our civil and religious liberties, are free church, free schools, free press, and free speech, manhood suffrage, an untrammeled ballot and an honest count. ...Any man who opposes or violates any one of these is a common enemy, and dangerous to the peace of the State and the Christian religion. ...Only those who stand by these are worthy to be accepted as citizens of a free republic. ...Protestant Christianity stands for these, and the American Republic guarantees these to every citizen. May both continue to increase and extend their influence and power as long as there are men on the earth who love truth and liberty and hate error and oppression. '<u>What God hath joined together let no man put asunder</u>.'"(4)

The three great "earthquakes" of 1877 to 1894--the National Labor Uprising of 1877, the 1886 Haymarket Bombing, and the 1894 Pullman Strike--were in the process of threatening both partners in the marriage as surely as they were threatening the marriage itself. Henry May's 1949 study of <u>Protestant Churches and Industrial America</u> explains that changes in the attitude of churches toward labor and economics resulted from the threat of these upheavals.[5] Rather than being a matter of theological innovation or response to world opinion, May argues that changed perspectives resulted from the

question of why such things could happen in the "home of Christian progress."[6]

May's perspective that only the Labor Uprisings could get Methodism to change its outlook had been voiced by the Rev. William Bull in reflecting on the Declaration of Independence on the Fourth of July in 1889. Comparing "chattel slavery" before the Civil War with the "wage slavery" of 1889, and asking whether there is no higher law for Christian employers than that of supply and demand, Bull observed concerning himself and his fellow Christians in their awareness of problems faced by the working class:

> ...we live our lives absorbed in money-getting and in pleasures of social life, until a rude shock such as was felt in Chicago in 1886, arouses us from our lethargy into some realization of its awfulness, and impresses us with the sense of our personal responsibility for it....(7)

The National Labor Uprising of 1877 not only raised the spectre of communism, but it also helped to shake Methodist confidence in the middle class version of Free Labor Ideology, with its "individualism, laissez faire, and the defense of private property.[8] Robert Bruce and Philip Foner offer two general interpretations of those events of the last two weeks of July 1877 which challenged other religious groups as surely as they did Methodism.[9] Bruce's thoroughly documented study argues that the ingredients of a great "bonfire" present in 1877 American society, plus a "fuse" of depressing events, were ignited by the "match" of wage cuts and increased work loads to produce a nationwide explosion of violence.[10] Foner's intensive analysis, building on Bruce's factual discoveries, argues that a "national labor consciousness" was developing which, rather than lead to "mindless riots," expressed itself in "crowds" (not "mobs") which reflected "the

economic, political, and social grievances, needs and aspirations" of each group of participants."[11]

Both Foner's and Bruce's interpretive studies, as well as secular and religious news reports of the times, observed the feelings of business, political, and religious leaders that these actions threatened free institutions. By September, though, Wendell Phillips argued that the conditions which led to the Uprising were the true culprits and the real threats to republican institutions.[12] As the Massachusetts Labor Party's candidate for Governor, he expressed what Eric Foner describes as the labor movement's Free Labor Ideology, a perspective to be distinguished from the middle class version of the same ideology. Henry George also began in September 1877 a serialized version of what would later become his influential Progress and Poverty, a work for which President Hayes would later express favorable impressions.[13]

Two series of uprisings may be distinguished in the events of late July 1877. The first were "explosions" related to union-planned strikes against wage cuts and more demanding working conditions at Martinsburg (West Virginia), Baltimore (Maryland), Reading (Pennsylvania), Hornellsville (New York), and several less influential locations. The second series were systematic efforts by the Workingmen's Party of the United States (WPUS) to coordinate strikes in New York City, Cincinnati, Louisville, Chicago, and St. Louis. The "explosions," in the minds of business, political, and religious leaders, posed a threat to "the right to work" and the right to property. The systematic efforts threatened the "free market" and accentuated the spectre of communism.

Four main trunk lines, the largest businesses of the day, had entered a pooling

agreement to cut trainmen's wages 10% beyond already severe cuts made in preceding months.[14] The "free market" might be a good idea when considering a worker's "right to work" without union interference. But, it was not helpful, from the perspective of these leaders, as a guide in overcoming rate wars or negotiating a common front for businesses on wages for railroad workers. To make matters worse, John Garrett, President of the Baltimore & Ohio, clumsily chose to report a 10% stock dividend and good business progress in the July 15 Baltimore Sun the day before he reported the "necessity" of a 10% wage reduction for trainmen.[15] That was too much for the trainmen, who had already been organized into a National Trainmen's Union by Robert Ammon during June.[16] They refused to operate trains at Camden Junction near Baltimore but were overcome by strike-breakers and police.[17]

Six hours west on the Baltimore & Ohio, at Martinsburg, West Virginia, with strong support from other local citizens and sympathy of local militia, striking trainmen were able to hold out several days until federal troops forced them to permit freight movement on trains. Governor H.M. Matthews of West Virginia and President Garrett of the Baltimore & Ohio had wired President Rutherford B. Hayes to send the troops, and Hayes only sent them when convinced that state militia were inadequate for the task. They seemed a strategic need of the time to maintain political order.[18] As in other strikes of July 1877, strikers sought to preserve property, prevent violence, and insure passage of mail and passengers while preventing freight movements.

Response to the challenge of the Baltimore & Ohio strikes varied. The New York

times editorialized over the foolishness of the strikers, describing their action as "nothing more than a rash and spiteful demonstration of resentment by men too ignorant or too reckless to understand their own interests."[19] Yet, the Times also acknowledged the strikers' moderation, the sympathy for them from a large part of their communities, and the fact that they had "leaders of no little degree of capacity. On Friday, July 20, their strike having been broken, the Martinsburg strikers posted a manifesto with these words:

> The merchants and community at large along the whole line of the road are on our side, and the working classes of every State in the Union are in our favor, and we feel confident that the God of the poor and the oppressed of the earth is with us.(20)

In contrast, Baltimore & Ohio Second Vice President William Keyser accused the strikers of having "aroused a spirit" that "strikes at the very life of the country."[21] The Martinsburg Statesman (West Virginia) saw a different threat in arguing that the strikes should teach "heartless and selfish railway corporations that there is a point in oppression beyond which it is not safe to go."[22]

The strike against the Pennsylvania Railroad and related rioting in Pittsburgh represented a far larger "explosion" and threat than incidents on the Baltimore & Ohio. Saturday night and Sunday, July 21 and 22, fires burned so as to be seen three miles from Pennsylvania Railroad property, and the strikers provided the only order in the city. The immediate cause for the strike was Pittsburgh Division Superintendent Robert Pitcairn's decision to order all freights travelling east from Pittsburgh to be "doubleheaders," halving the work labor force and doubling the work for already overburdened trainmen (especially brakemen).[23] More than being a drastic change, it was poorly timed, coming

on Thursday, July 19, at the height of the Martinsburg strike.[24]

When Pittsburgh militia proved sympathetic with the strikers, Philadelphia militia were sent on Saturday to settle the strike.[25] Ignoring advice to wait until some would go back to work on Monday, General Superintendent Pitcairn of the Pennsylvania Railroad and Allegheny County Sheriff Hugh Fife led 600 Philadelphia militia to seek to disperse a jeering crowd of 5,000 to 7,000.[26] The militia was ordered to charge with fixed bayonets, the crowd threw rocks, and the militia was ordered to fire. When the smoke had cleared, 20 were dead, including a member of the Pittsburgh militia and a woman and three small children.[27]

As news of the slaughter spread, "the whole city went mad," with looting and burning of railroad property. The Philadelphia militia escaped and returned to Philadelphia, and a citizens' mass meeting on Sunday afternoon appointed a committee of five which worked to restore order, together with the Mayor and 300 volunteers. When 50 federal troops arrived on Monday morning, they discovered that order had been restored.[28]

Although the public tended to sympathize with the strikers and be anti-monopoly and anti-corporation, the response of most newspapers, who accepted the views of Herbert Spencer, is summarized by a "composite editorial" suggested by Robert Bruce:

> Strikes, though legal, are foolish and mischievous, at odds with the law of supply and demand, doing the strikers themselves more harm than good and seldom gaining their objects. Theory aside, the railroads are essential to public welfare, and so there is a question as to whether work stoppage should be tolerated at all in the field. The pay cuts may or may not work some hardships, but hard times and

> fierce competition require them. The railroaders ought to accept them as cheerfully, or at least with manful resignation, as others have had to do and as widowed and orphaned stockholders have born dividend cuts. Thus far...we speak of policy. But from the moment that strikers trespassed on railroad property or kept a single strikebreaker off the job through force or intimidation, the issue became simply and wholly one of law. Only one question remains: how to crush the outbreak most effectively.(29)

Both instrumental action to maintain the rationality of the "free market" and strategic action to maintain the rationality of "republican institutions" were being advocated.

A second series of uprisings proved to be a more threatening challenge to middle class Free Labor Ideology. Going beyond the efforts of the Trainmen's Union to resist wage cuts, the Marxist Workingmen's Part of the United States (WPUS) sought a general strike and appealed for a drastic structural change in the American economic system. From the first Saturday of the strikes (July 21), The National Republican, published in Washington, D.C., raised the spectre of "the American Commune," although President Hayes said he did not consider the disorders to be a result of a spirit of communism, since the attacks were not primarily against property.[30] Foner reports that wherever the WPUS was influential, it never encouraged insurrection, and its influence always was a moderating one.[31] As Peter Clark, African American principal of Cincinnati's "Colored High School" and a Republican-turned-Socialist argued, railroad managers would be more likely to secure their property by employing sections of the WPUS than by having the help of the U.S. Army.[32]

Large rallies were held in New York City under WPUS sponsorship, with 20,000 turning out Wednesday, July 25, and 3,000 the next night, but no successful city-wide

strike. Wednesday's meeting was punctuated by a call by Party leaders for a socialist state, as well as by New York Sun editorialist John Swinton's speech describing the crowd as "as good-looking...as Henry Ward Beecher's church."[33] Brooklyn Congregationalist Pastor Beecher, then widely believed to be involved in an extra-marital affair and earning $20,000 to $30,000 annually, had preached the previous Sunday that a family with 5 children could live on $1 a day if they did not smoke or drink. Beecher contended that they could survive on bread and water.[34]

In both Chicago and St. Louis, the WPUS proved far more influential, and far more of a threat to middle class Free Labor Ideology, than in New York City. At a WPUS rally in Chicago Monday night, July 23, 6,000 to 15,000 came and supported resolutions to nationalize the railroads and telegraph and to encourage trade unionism.[35] Michigan Central Railroad switchmen began a strike that night, and the WPUS attempted to coordinate this with a strike by other industries on Tuesday.[36] But club-swinging police fired rubber bullets to disperse a WPUS rally of 1,000. And, on Wednesday, as the WPUS called for "peaceful though firm behavior," a crowd gathering that night was attacked by policemen, with three members of the crowd killed and 8 wounded.[37] The police invaded a Hall where the WPUS were meeting, killing one and wounding others.[38] The "Battle of Chicago" was over.

In St. Louis, the WPUS did not face police opposition, but was overcome by its own indecisiveness. It was the first General Strike to paralyze a major industrial city, but its leaders, fearing violence, curtailed demonstrations and lost touch with their suppor-

ters.[39] On Monday, July 23, Trainmen's Union workers from nine railroads voted to strike, and an open-air meeting the same night attended by 5,000, led by the WPUS, "established the party as the directing force of the strike in St. Louis."[40] The first speaker, Albert Kordell, expressed the labor movement's variety of Free Labor Ideology:

> I believe that our railroad monopolies today have no other object than to take the government in their possession and rule for the next fifty years to come, to the injury of our free institutions, and while we have some knowledge of their scheme, we purpose to prevent them.(41)

After the meeting, Sergeant F. Hinn, federal signal officer from St. Louis, wired Washington concerning this large meeting. He reported that it opposed violence, that it urged a General Strike for the eight-hour day, and that it called on the President to convene Congress to appropriate $200 to $300 million for benefits to the workers. He concluded: "No trouble apprehended tonight."[42]

Another giant rally of 10,000 on Tuesday night passed resolutions cautioning against violence and advocating various causes of the workers.[43] On Wednesday, the WPUS led a 3 hour parade through St. Louis, closing shop after shop on their way to another rally. WPUS control in St. Louis has been contrasted by Robert Bruce with "mob improvisation of the other cities," and Philip Foner summarizes the role of the WPUS at that point: "That night, the executive committee ruled the city."[44] But, when the Committee issued a proclamation on Thursday that, to avoid riot, no more large processions would be held until all was "completely organized," the crowds lost confidence in the Committee.[45] Then, on Friday afternoon, July 27, police cavalry and soldiers used clubs (but not guns) to disperse a crowd waiting outside WPUS headquarters and proceeded to

arrest the entire WPUS Committee.[46] The General Strike was over.

Amidst all the challenge to the middle class Free Labor Ideology, with its support of "the right to work" and the rights of property, and with its faith in the law of supply and demand, there was a continuing awareness of the human needs of the strikers and the threat to republican institutions posed by unregulated capital. Even the Pennsylvania Railroad's Tom Scott, through the New York World (which he controlled) labelled Henry Ward Beecher's simplistic solution to the labor protests "suicidal and the work of a lunatic."[47] At the heart of the National Labor Uprising, Beecher had followed up his "Bread and Water" sermon with a sermon declaring that God intended "the great to be great and the little to be little." Even the "great" Tom Scott was uncomfortable with that. If too many people heard such a claim, it would be bad for business.

Robert Bruce notes the"wide crack" the 1877 strikes put in "the foundation of Social Darwinism" as expressed in editorial reactions after the strike in The New York Times, The National Republican, The Philadelphia Inquirer and other publications.[48] The July 31 Cabinet Meeting of President Hayes suggested the possible need to regulate the railroads. Secretary Sherman suggested "national action." Secretary Evarts, responding to Secretary Thompson's suggestion of solution by "contract between railroads" said, "It is a case for Government, not contract."[49] Secretary Evarts also said the country was ready for "the execution of power" and Secretary McCrary noted wages to be a part of the problem. But, the subject was then dropped.[50]

Wendell Phillips, in a September 15 letter to the New York Herald, put it all in the

perspective of a desirable political economy to produce citizens with the virtue needed to maintain republican institutions.[51] First, he rejected excessive reliance on "supply and demand" by declaring: "That is a political economy which forgets God, abolishes hearts, stomachs and hot blood and builds its world as children do, out of tin soldiers and blocks of wood." Second, he argued that saying "capital will only pay what it pleases and labor must submit" is an argument for "slavery." then, Phillips concludes:

> If a day ever comes when, by any means, Americans are obliged to submit permanently to that, a republic here will be impossible. A class of such workmen will do well for the footstool of a despot; they can never serve as the sturdy bedplate for the heavy working of republican institutions. ...The necessities which underlie free institutions are their (workingmen's) strongest allies, and the conscience of mankind is on their side.(52)

The greater challenge to "free institutions" was not the organized working persons on strike, but it was the dictatorial economic power of unregulated capitalists. Concern for preservation of the rationality of the free market was being challenged by concern for strategic action to preserve the rationality of republican institutions. Phillips saw that as necessarily including the empowering of working class persons to participate in civic affairs.

Two prominent Methodist publications of the day saw a different threat to free institutions than Phillips did. The Rev. C.H. Fowler, writing the editorial for the Christian Advocate (New York) for Thursday, July 26, spoke for official American Methodism when he said the strikers were guilty of "crimes against society and against our free institutions, for which they must sooner or later be punished."[53] Expressing sympathy for workers "fighting up to the limit...to keep the wolf away from the door" and condemning

excessive railroad salaries, he, nonetheless, viewed the workers as "in the wrong" and needing to be righted on ideas of possession and liberty. The strikers were guilty and must be punished to avoid anarchy.[54] Fowler sketched the background of the French Commune of 1871 as having "originally embraced much of the best brain and heart of France." He saw it as motivated against a church that had been siding with a State to oppress and rob the workers. However, he made no comparison with a possible similar alliance in the United States. Rather, he warned of the need to move quickly against an "American Commune." Then, he offered this explanation:

> It is principally the importation and child of the trades-union. These are foreign to our institutions. They are chiefly composed of foreigners. They have brought with them their infidelity, and disregard for the sanctity of the Sabbath, and for the rights of others.(55)

Editor Bradford K. Peirce of Zion's Herald, voice of New England Methodism, had a perspective similar to that of C.H. Fowler. In a July 26 editorial, he spoke of "scenes never before witnessed in this country, and only paralleled by the Commune of Paris."[56] Referring to the strike leadership as "atheistical, brutal, reckless persons" who were both "imported and indigenous" and "only want occasion to break out into lawless robberies, indiscriminate rioting, burnings, and murders," Peirce called for a mission to the workers on a par with missions to China and India.[57] In an August editorial condemning "communistic riot" in Chicago, Peirce continued his evangelistic concern by way of disagreement with The Methodist:

> It is not enough to shoot down, as our peaceful confrere of The Methodist rather seems to advice (sic), these miserable wretches. It is poor use to make of any men to blow them into eternity with gunpowder.(58)

The strategic action of evangelizing workers would help to maintain the political rationality of the existing American political system. It would not involve the communicative action of listening to labor.

Other Methodists chose to remain silent concerning the strikes. The Methodist Quarterly Review had gone to press with its July issue before the Uprising, but it had revealed a defensive attitude toward criticism for not being more successful in the cities. The Rev. John Atkinson of Chicago, in an article titled "Methodism in the Cities of the United States, " had presented statistics to counter a series of articles that had appeared in the Congregationalist Independent in February of 1877 [59] Daniel Whedon, Editor of the Review, who had been outspoken on the slavery issue before the Civil War, chose not to deal with the National Labor Uprising in 1877.

Other Methodist sources reveal a similar silence. The renewed perfectionist movement, which many leading Methodists were actively involved in (including Bishop Matthew Simpson), published a summary of "Holiness Conferences" in Cincinnati on November 26, 1877 and in New York on December 17, 1877. Neither Conference dealt with the Labor Uprising. They would "defend free institutions" by promoting deeper life spiritual experiences and avoiding divisive political issues, even as the 1858 "Businessmen's Revival" and the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness had decided to do in previous years.[60]

A second major "earthquake" to shake Methodist confidence in the status quo was the Haymarket Bombing of May 4, 1886. From February 27, 1885 to March 16, 1885, the Knights of Labor had successfully struck Jay Gould's Southwestern Railroad holdings

to restore wages that had been cut.[61] But, Gould had played off skilled workers against unskilled to fight off strikes and fragment labor organizations from February to May of 1886.[62] At the same time as this great defeat for labor, there was a growing movement for an eight-hour day. It was represented by the beginning of Labor Day on September 5, 1882 (which became an official national holiday by President Grover Cleveland's signature June 28, 1894) and the setting of a deadline of May 1, 1886 for the eight-hour day limit by the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions (which became the American Federation of Labor in 1886) and Local Assemblies of the Knights of Labor.[63]

As early as the September 5, 1882 Labor Day Parade in New York City, a popular slogan was: "Eight hours for work--Eight hours for rest--Eight hours for what we will."[64] In spite of opposition from Grand Master Workman Terence Powderly of the Knights of Labor, about 350,000 workers in 11,562 establishments across the country went out on strike for the eight-hour day on May 1, 1886.[65] At McCormick Harvester factory in Chicago, 1400 members of Local Assembly 582 of the Knights of Labor were locked out because they had struck on May 1 for an eight-hour day, a $2 daily wage, an end to wage cuts, and an end to the piece work system.[66] On May 3, 300 "scab" " replacements of the strikers had been put to work at McCormick under the protection of 350-500 police. When the strikers demonstrated against the scabs, the police fired into the unarmed crowd without having given any warning. Four were killed and others were wounded.

A meeting was called for May 4 at Haymarket Square to protest the police bru-

tality. Mayor Carter Harrison approved the rally and attended to hear speeches by Anarchist organizers August Spies, Albert Parsons, and Samuel Fielden. Condemnations of the police were combined with warnings against violence and challenges to steadfastness in pursuing the eight-hour movement.

At about ten o'clock, with a rainstorm threatening and supposing the meeting to be nearly over, the Mayor left and stopped at a nearby police station to report that there was no trouble at the rally and that the police need no longer be on special alert. Fielden was winding up his speech when the Mayor left, and most of the crowd had gone home. Suddenly, 180 marching policemen appeared, commanding the crowd to disperse. As Fielden cried out that this was a peaceable meeting, a bomb was thrown from the crowd toward the police, killing one and mortally wounding five more. The police fired back into the crowd, killing several and wounding many others.[67]

The bombing touched off a "Red Scare" in which hundreds were arrested, the eight-hour day movement was condemned by association, and eight anarchists were arrested to be punished as public examples.[68] Though no evidence was found that any of them had thrown the bomb or directly encouraged anyone to do so, they were convicted of murder. Five were hanged on November 11, 1887, one had committed suicide, and three were pardoned in a politically very unpopular move by Illinois Governor John Altgeld on June 26, 1893.

In the year preceding the Haymarket Bombing, the Rev. Bradford K. Peirce, Editor of Zion's Herald, and the Rev. James M. Buckley, Editor of the Christian Advocate (New York), opened the columns of their official Methodist papers to discussion of the

problem of the growing tension between capitalists and labor. On February 25, 1885, Methodist layman and laborer Edward Rogers contributed to the Herald a page 2 article on "Communism and Socialism," calling for 'fair discussion" of "the needs of the time," and setting forth "The vision of a communal Church (the New Jerusalem), encircled by a socialist State."[69] Rogers followed this up with an October 7 exposition of "The Social Ideal of Prophecy," which was placed on the front page, and a February 3, 1886 call for "Arbitration" of labor capital disputes, which was published on page 2.[70] As one of the founders of the Christian Labor Union in Boston, Rogers would later command the respect of those hearing him address the Evangelical Alliance in December of 1886.[71]

Perhaps to present the opposite point of view, Editor Buckley published in the Advocate a series of six "Object Lessons in Social Economy" by an anonymous "Master Mechanic" between October 1, 1885 and February 4, 1886. The "Master Mechanic" saw "Providence urging us irresistibly toward a manifest destiny" of factory-related mutual dependence, specialization, labor-saving machinery, and workers pooling their capital to become capitalists whose success would be grounded in character.

Editor Bradford Peirce of the Herald had joined the chorus condemning "wage slavery" in August 1885, but he switched his stress to a response to the barbarism he saw threatening the country in April and May of 1886.[72] After the Haymarket Bombing, Peirce editorialized:

> We have been receiving fully in later years from Europe the flying anarchists, nihilists and communists, whose lives had become periled by their revolutionary and violent words and acts in their own countries.[73]

Noting the need for a changed approach to dealing with concerns of labor, and defending himself against charges of a lack of sympathy with workingmen, he stressed the contributions of "our thoughtful correspondent, himself a wage-laborer, Mr. Edward Rogers."[74] But, he displayed his concern for strategic action to maintain political order in the face of the threat symbolized by Haymarket when he explained that the religious press had to "change their tone of late" because "the principle has been widely held and acted upon that 'the end justifies the means.'" Writing one month after the McCormick Strike and the Haymarket Bombing, Peirce maintained that the "illegal and murderous acts" he blamed the strikers for justified a different approach by the press. Less emphasis was needed now on justifiable demands of labor and more stress needed to be put on maintaining order.

Similarly, Advocate Editor Buckley had called for Pastors to "mingle" with workers to get their point of view and bragged that he read even the Anarchist papers to see what the workers were concerned about.[76] But, after the Haymarket Bombing, Buckley declared: "All mobs should be ordered to disperse, and, if they resist, they should be shot down without parley and without delay."[77] He added that he wrote this so that "the authorities may know that in the maintenance of order they will have the sympathy of the Christian community for whatever measures may be necessary."

Buckley again enlisted the contributions of "A Master Workman" for a series of articles May 27, June 3, and June 10. Although he gave the typical condemnation of the Knights of Labor for "tyranny" of "dictating" wages, hours, and work conditions for a million members, he also raised an issue troubling all the Methodist editors of the time. After asking why workers could not share increases in wealth just as owners did, he said

his biggest concern was: "The majority of the laboring class are learning to hate Christianity because their hated employers are generally Church communicants or at least influential supporters of the church."[78]

Daniel Steele, a frequent contributor to Zion's Herald and a widely respected New England Methodist seminary professor and expositor of the traditional Methodist belief in perfection in love, expressed concerns similar to those of the editors when he addressed the Boston Preachers' Meeting in December 1885. Speaking on "How to Save the Masses," he declared: "A fearful heathenism and a volcanic socialism exists in the bosom of the wealthiest nominally Christian civilization on the globe."[79] His solution was workers prepared for preaching and visitation among the masses "before Rome has so triumphed over our great cities as to suppress our Protestant liberties." In a May 1886 contribution to the Methodist Review, he called for "Non-Classical Theological Seminaries" to prepare lay persons to go to the "thirsty multitudes through the spigot of street language."[80] It was an effort to be understood by the masses, partly to protect the church and the nation, mostly for the good of those same masses. But, it did not stress communication to find a shared solution to the problems besetting those who found it necessary to strike

Although they shared Steele's concern to evangelize the masses, the editors of all three major Methodist publications expressed great fear of the new immigrants, a fear symbolized by the Haymarket Anarchists. Bradford Peirce wrote in Zion's Herald, after the Anarchists were found guilty, that there was little doubt that there was "a conspiracy to bring about a social revolution."[81] Then, he pointed out that "these kinds" were not

confined to "our Western cities," but that there was "a weekly importation of the same atheistic, socialistic and lawless class."

Similarly, Editor James Buckley of the Christian Advocate made these comments just before the hanging of five of the Anarchists:

> If these men are not punished, all government is gone. ... This is the freest and best Government possessed by any populous country in the world. The foreigners who teach the doctrines of anarchy have fled from despotisms, but in many cases are themselves to blame for the particular oppression which they had to endure. They come here and concoct schemes which will overthrow the best experiment in self government that man has yet contrived. Whoever sympathizes with them is a foe to his country. ...To talk about pity, sympathy, or delay in connection with such demons, is to encourage their kind... ...Order is heaven's first law; 'surely anarchy is hell.'(82)

J.W. Mendenhall, Editor of the Methodist Review, expressed the same kind of concerns in a May 1890 editorial.[83] Fearing a turn to socialism because of immigrants, he recommended public schools and evangelism as the means to avoid this. He warned of a "foreign contagion" brought by "the degraded classes of Europe" who increasingly came to America, and "whatever is inimical to a pure democratic form of government is borne to us by every ship that anchors in our waters."

The Rev. Charles Parkhurst, who had replaced Bradford Peirce as Editor in 1888, continued the concern about foreigners matched with evangelistic challenge in an October 1892 editorial.[84] He argued that the immigrants then coming represented "the combined evils we have to contend with--socialism, communism, Romanism in its most bigoted form, ignorance, and the drink habit." He continued:

> It is this vast army disgorged here weekly which we are to make into self respecting men and women, not alone as a Christian duty, but also as a matter of self-defense. The work is imperative; we must Christianize these people, or we must in time be paganized by them.

Parkhurst was voicing the sense of challenge to American civil religion posed by the immigrants who had been so dramatically symbolized by those Anarchists who had been executed in connection with the Haymarket Bombing.

At the same time that fears of immigrants were challenging Methodist editors, those same editors were also publishing analyses that took sides with the workers. All three publications presented analyses and challenges by Methodist Pastor Frank Mason North of New York City.[85] The Christian Advocate published 13 articles by Professor Richard Ely.[86] Zion's Herald published two articles by Socialist W.D.P. Bliss.[87] And contributions by the Rev. Frederick Merrick to the Advocate, Dr. Abel Stevens to the Herald, and the Rev. C. M. Morse to the Review challenged Methodism to get beyond defending the status quo.[88] For example, Morse, in persistently arguing in the Review that "regeneration" of individuals was not enough to solve social problems, said the Christian "must place himself in touch with the poorest class, study all social questions from that point of view." It was a call for communicative action.

The third major "earthquake" to challenge Methodism and American civil religion in the late nineteenth century was the 1894 Pullman Strike and related boycott by Eugene Debs's American Railway Union. By the Spring of 1894, some of the worst results of the Panic of 1893 were making the lives of American workers miserable. A particularly dramatic example was the model factory town industrialist George Pullman had built south

of Chicago.[89] This supposedly caring capitalist was proving to be a feudal paternalist as he economically compelled his employees to live in over-crowded tenements, charging rent often 25% higher than rates in nearby communities. When the Panic of 1893 hit, many workers were dismissed, and those who remained saw their pay cut at east 25%. Pullman continued to pay 8% dividends on his stock, and he continued to charge his workers the same rent, even though their pay had been cut. Pay was withheld from paychecks to pay rent, with one worker receiving 2 cents as a paycheck after rent was withheld.

Pullman workers began organizing with the American Railway Union in April and May 1894,with membership reaching 4,000. When workers grievance committees approached Pullman executives, they were not only rebuffed, but some were dismissed. In response, at noon, May 11, 1894, the workers left their jobs.

When the first national convention of the American Railway Union met in Chicago June 12, Eugene Debs and other leaders listened to requests by workers from Pullman for help with a sympathy boycott, but they urged arbitration instead. For the next ten days, Union committees proposed arbitration to Pullman corporation leaders, only to be told: "We have nothing to arbitrate." At noon of June 26, a boycott of Pullman cars by the American Railway Union began across the country.

Nearly 150,000 workers answered the Union call for boycott, and rail traffic for Pullman cars was stopped. It was the first truly nationwide strike, and it impressed railroad owners with the awesome power of labor that was organized. John Egan, coordinator of the Railroad General Managers' Association, declared it to be "a fight between the

United States Government and the American Railway Union." The government decided not to detach mail cars from Pullman cars, so the charge could be brought that the Union was obstructing the mails. Richard Olney, U.S. Attorney General, who had been a railroad lawyer and member of the General Managers' Association, and who was a Director of the Burlington Railroad and a Co-director with George Pullman of the Boston & Maine Railroad, recommended an injunction against the Union, based on the 1890 Sherman Antitrust Act.

The Sherman Act had been passed to help curb the power of business monopolies, but Olney chose to use it instead to fight the power of organized labor. A petition was presented by railroad lawyers, guided by Olney, for an injunction by federal district court in Chicago prohibiting interference in railroad conduct of interstate commerce. The injunction that was issued in effect prohibited strikes and boycotts against railroads.

After careful deliberation, the American Railway Union decided to ignore the injunction. To enforce the injunction, Olney wired President Grover Cleveland, who sent federal troops, in spite of protests by Governor John Altgeld that the Illinois militia could handle the situation. Arriving July 4, the troops provoked violence and destruction of railroad property, with 25 strikers being killed and 60 badly injured. Since directing their members in the strike was considered contempt of court, Union leaders were arrested and the strike collapsed. A short-lived hope of a General Strike of all Chicago unions in support of the American Railway Union ended when a conference called by Samuel Gompers on July 12 decided the prospects for success were slim. Also, American Federation of Labor leaders (including Gompers) saw the Railway Union as a potential

threat to their craft unionism. When the General Managers' Association rejected his offer to call off the boycott if strikers could have their jobs back, Debs was arrested July 17 for contempt of court in renewing the boycott. He was jailed, tried in December, and sentenced to six months in jail.

The threat of an organized industrial union had been overcome by a combination of business and government. Conservative craft union leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the railroad brotherhoods saw this as vindication of their more conservative politics. The challenge of a powerful organized labor appeared to have passed for a while.

Methodist publications had been critical of the power of the Knights of Labor since the 1880s,and they were even more strongly challenged by the massive unity of the American Railway Union. Methodist Review Editor William Kelley expressed such resentment in a September 1894 editorial.[90] He argued that Governor Altgeld's two appeals to President Cleveland not to send troops "found no support except from strikers, labor demagogues, socialists, and other enemies of our constitutional system of liberty under law." Further, he declared: "There is quite as much distress, probably, among refined people, whose lives are one long service of humanity as there is among workers."

Editor Charles Parkhurst of Zion's Herald complained against the power of organized labor in August 1892 in the aftermath of the Carnegie Steel Lockout at Homestead, Pennsylvania. Parkhurst asserted: "Organized labor must cease to be the tyranny it has become."[91] In condemning the American Federation of Labor for supporting the Altgeld pardon of three of the Haymarket Anarchists, he declared: "An organization professedly representing the working classes which thus flaunts the red flag should be promptly be

repudiated and execrated."[92]

In the midst of the Pullman Strike, Parkhurst spoke of the "startling exhibition" of power by Eugene Debs's American Railway Union by contending: "He is mightier than the foremost millionaire."[93] When the U.S. Senate voted to support Cleveland's sending of troops to Chicago, Parkhurst supported that, stating that "the masses of the nation are not the anarchists or socialists," and urging workingmen to stop strikes and seek legislation instead. The following November, Parkhurst was forced to report that Strike Commission appointed by President Cleveland concluded against Pullman, and acknowledged:: "The Pullman Company is sharply arraigned; the Debs rebellion is practically justified."[94] But, by December Parkhurst was remarking concerning Debs's six months sentence to the county jail that it would remind Debs that "the public have also some rights, and that these rights are not to be rudely set aside in order that he and his followers may force redress for alleged private grievances."[95] Parkhurst's fear of organized labor was preventing him from hearing the just protests of the working class.

The 1877 Railroad Strike and National Labor Uprising challenged the assumption of progress by the marriage of Methodism to American civil religion. The 1886 Haymarket Bombing, symbolic of the strikes and unrest of that year, posed the threat to free institutions represented by foreign immigrants. The 1894 Pullman Strike, and the related sympathy boycott by the American Railway Union, represented the threat of the power of organized labor to potentially undermine free institutions. Each of these in its own way challenged the easy assumption that existing American institutions could be the unstoppable vehicle of progress and human liberation Methodist had thought they could be after

the Civil War was over.

Three Methodist periodicals of the day reflected varying ways of trying to respond to these challenges to the marriage. Editors and contributors increasingly addressed these challenges in the columns of the Methodist Review, the Christian Advocate (New York), and Zion's Herald (Boston). The editors in particular wrote to defend existing free institutions and to encourage political authorities to maintain "law and order" against strikers, and occasionally against monopolists. The strategic action of doing whatever was needed to maintain existing American free institutions seemed uppermost in their minds. These same editors and other contributors also looked to revivalism and the quest for a new spiritual Pentecost as a means to empower individual workers to avoid violence and individual employers to avoid exploitation. Although concern for spiritual cultivation of individuals was expressed, the frequently stated strategic objective of such efforts was the need to deal with the problem of city evangelization, particularly with respect to what was recognized to be the extremely difficult problem of seeking to evangelize the new immigrants if they were to be assimilated into American society.

A few contributors to these periodicals supported the older economics, including laissez faire, as the only means to prosperity. An instrumental rationality of maintaining and increasing economic growth seemed important to them. At the same time, an increasing number of writers challenged the church to the social application of the gospel to the labor problem. Sometimes this was promoted with a view to the strategic rationality of saving America from barbarism. At other times, the concern was for a rational community that would include working-class persons as agents of their own liberation. The chapters

which follow will attempt to analyze and interpret these varied responses.

NOTES

[1]Methodist Review, September-October, 1889, pp. 679-680. Following an introductory essay by Editor J.W. Mendenhall titled "The Constitutional Basis," and preceding a presentation on "The Mission of the Republic," Truesdell's contribution to this symposium was titled "The Religious Factor." Mendenhall had asserted in his essay the sacredness of the American Constitution as "the sheet-anchor of the nation's hopes and the guiding star to her destiny" and Truesdell argued a similar function for the Declaration of Independence.

Further references to Methodist publications in this chapter will be:

MR--for Methodist Review (Methodist Quarterly Review before January 1885)
NYCA--for The Christian Advocate (New York)
ZH--for Zion's Herald

[2]Ibid., pp. 678-680.

[3]Ibid., pp. 680-684.

[4]Ibid., p. 684. My emphasis.

[5]Henry May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949), p. 91.

[6]Ibid. May analyzes the impact of these Labor Uprisings on pp. 71-111. Sidney Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972) p. 847, echoes May's description of Protestantism's defense of the status quo of this period. He presents ideological precedents to the Social Gospel movement (787-793) and snapshot biographies of movement leaders (793-802) rather than an analysis of the impact of the labor uprisings on social thought. Winthrop Hudson has summarized the transition from defense of the status quo, to terrified response to the labor uprisings, to the development of the Social Gospel in Religion in America: An Historical Account of the Development of American Religious Life (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992, Fifth Edition, as revised by John Corrigan) ("The

Churches and the Economic Order," pp. 292-305). Frederick Norwood's The Story of American Methodism: A History of the United Methodists and their Relations (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974) briefly describes the transition from early Methodist opposition to workingmen's organizations to some support for labor, in many respects due to Pastor Carwardine's support of his parishioners in the 1894 Pullman Strike (pp. 341-344). Emory Stevens Bucke's The History of Methodism in Three Volumes (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), Volume II, contains a chapter by Walter W. Benjamin on "the Age of Methodist Affluence" (pp. 316-339), which includes a four-page summary of the transition from Methodist opposition to labor organizations to the time when "after much stumbling" Methodism did "respond creditably if slowly to the challenge of modern, urbanized, industrial America." (pp. 335-339).

[7]ZH, September 4, 1989, p. 1.

[8]Eric Foner, Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), "Reconstruction and the Crisis of Free Labor," pp. 97-127, argues that this is one of two perspectives from which the "Free Labor Ideology" which had united the Republican Party before the Civil War was coming to be viewed after the War. Foner maintains that before the War, "to men like Abraham Lincoln the salient quality of northern society was the ability of the laborer to escape the status of wage earner and rise to petty entrepreneurship and economic independence." (p.100) After the War, this was split into two perspectives. On the one hand, for the middle class, "Free Labor" became "a stolid liberal orthodoxy, in which individualism, laissez-faire, the defense of property, and the rule of the 'Best Men' defined good government" (p.126). On the other hand, for the labor movement after the 1873 financial Panic, "Free Labor" became "an affirmation of the primacy of the producing classes and a critique of the emerging capitalist order" (p.126).

[9]Robert V. Bruce, 1877: Year of Violence (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1959). Philip S. Foner, The Great Labor Uprising (New York: The Monad Press, 1977). Bruce acknowledges the planning, discouragement of violence, and protection of employers' property by labor leadership, while frequently referring to youth and "tramps" as encouraging violent encounters. Foner acknowledges the mixture of groups involved in the strikes and related violence while stressing the development of a national labor consciousness.

[10]Bruce, op. cit. The first two of three main parts are titled "Powder Keg" and "Explosion," and Part I is subdivided into "The Charge," "The Fuse," "The Match," and"Hangfire. His study was researched in more than one hundred libraries in thirty-nine cities and towns. His "Acknowledgements" (p. 373) describes the locations.

[11]Foner, op. cit., pp. 10-11. Foner acknowledges the influence on his analysis of the work of George Rude (The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848, New York, 1968); Eric Thompson (The Making of the English Working Class, New York, 1963); and Eric Hobsbawm (Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries, New York, 1959).

[12]Wendell Phillips, New York Herald, September 15, 1877.

[13]Bruce, op. cit., p. 312. Charles Richard Williams, The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes: Nineteenth President of the United States: With Portraits and Other Illustrations, Volume II (Columbus,Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1928 reprint of 1914 F.J. Heer Printing Company edition). Reference to Hayes diary entry for December 4, 1887.)

[14]Bruce, op. cit., pp. 40-41. The pooling railroads were: The Baltimore & Ohio, The Pennsylvania, The New York Central, and The Erie. They had begun the pooling arrangements for freight rates in March of the same year.

[15]Foner, op. cit., p. 34. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 63-65, notes that this involved a deliberate choice to lower wages rather than lower the 10% annual stockholder dividend, and that it was done in spite of the fact that June wages had not yet been paid and morale was very low.

[16]Bruce, op. cit., pp. 59-63. Foner, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

[17]Foner, op. cit., p. 75.

[18]Bruce, op. cit., pp. 85-92, presents this as part of his analysis of Hayes as one seeing himself as a "national" President needing to deal with issues of labor and industry which were "growing too big for the states to handle."

[19]The New York Times, July 18, 1877, p. 4

[20]Foner, op. cit., p. 45, citing Reading Daily Eagle (Pennsylvania) of July 21, 1877.

[21]Ibid., p. 53.

[22]Ibid., p. 54.

[23]Bruce, op. cit., p. 115. Foner, op. cit., p. 63.

[24]Foner, loc. cit.

[25]Ibid., pp. 57-60. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 138-140.

[26]Foner, op. cit., pp. 61-62. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 147-149.

[27]Bruce, op. cit., p. 147, cites the Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette as estimating 20 killed, with 10 deaths certain, and many wounded, including small children. Foner, op. cit., p. 63, reports from his sources that 20 were dead, 29 maimed or wounded, and that the dead included a woman and 3 small children.

[28]Bruce, op. cit., pp. 149 ff. and 180-183. Foner, op. cit., pp. 64 ff.

[29]Bruce, op. cit., pp. `62-`64.

[30]Ibid., p. 225, reference to an interview of President Hayes by The National Republican. Foner, op cit., p. 103, also refers to this issue. In connection with the Franco-Prussian War, beginning March 18, 1871, the working class of Paris had controlled the government for 72 days in the Paris Commune.

[31]Foner, op cit., p. 116.

[32]Ibid., p. 132.

[33]Ibid., pp. 120-121.

[34]Richard A. Bartlett, The Gilded Age: America, 1865-1900: Interpretive Articles and Documentary Sources (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 82-83, as reproduced from The New York Times, July 22 and 29, 1877. The Times noted that this was a reproduction of Beecher's lecture on "Hard Times," and paraphrased his July 22 remarks as: "It was true that $1 a day was not enough to support a man and five children, if a man insisted on smoking and drinking beer. Was not a dollar a day enough to buy bread? Water costs nothing. (Laughter) Man cannot live by bread, it is true; but the man who cannot live on bread and water is not fit to live.(Laughter)" Beecher's July 29 response to criticism of his July 22 sermon included these remarks, as paraphrased by the Times: "God has intended the great to be great and the little to be little. ... Persons have the right to work when and where they please, as long as they please, and for what they please..." He decried government efforts

to
at

(Pa

for

to "take care of the welfare of its subjects" as "un-American," preferring a "Hands off" attitude by government except for protection of "our rights and our individuality."

[35]Foner, loc. cit., says 15,000. Bruce, loc. cit., says 6,000

[36]Foner, op. cit., pp. 144-148. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 239-243.

[37]Foner, op. cit., p. 150. Bruce, op. cit., p. 246.

[38]Foner, loc. cit. Bruce, op. cit., p. 249.

[39]Foner, op cit., pp. 158, 180. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 273-276, 280-282.

[40]Foner, op. cit., pp. 163-166. Bruce, op. cit.. pp. 257-258.

[41]Foner, op. cit., p. 166.

[42]Presidential Papers of Rutherford B. Hayes, July 24, Midnight report. (Papers at Hayes Presidential Center, Fremont, Ohio.)

[43]Foner, op. cit., p. 174.

[44]Ibid., p. 179. Bruce, op. cit., p. 274.

[45]Foner, op. cit., p. 180. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 281-282.

[46]Foner, op. cit., pp. 185-186. Bruce, op. cit., p. 282.

[47]Bruce, op. cit., pp. 314-315.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Presidential Papers of Rutherford B. Hayes. Cabinet Meeting notes by Hayes for July 31, 1877.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Wendell Phillips, The New York Herald, September 9, 1877.

[52]Ibid.

[53]C.H. Fowler, "Labor and Capital Riots," NYCA, Thursday, July 16, 1877, p. 472.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Bradford K. Peirce, ZH, July 26, 1877, p. 4.

[57]Bradford K. Peirce, ZH, August 2, 1877, p. 4.

[58]Bradford K. Peirce, ZH, August 9, 1877, p. 4.

[59]John Atkinson, "Methodism in the Cities of the United States," MR, July-August 1877, pp. 481-505. Atkinson rejected arguments that Congregationalist settled pastorates were superior to Methodist itineracy and spoke of the "foreign-born" of the cities as an explanation of why Methodists were not as successful there. The fourteen largest cities were 35% foreign born, while the rest of the country, where Methodists were successful, was only "11 89/100 per cent" foreign born.

[60]Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), in a chapter complimenting the 1858 revival, observes that the prayer meetings forbid "controversial subjects like water baptism or slavery." (p.64) Later, he notes that Phoebe Palmer, respected as head of the perfectionist revival in Methodism, and "her New York and Philadelphia coterie" (Bishops Edmund Janes and Leonidas Hamline, then Methodist Quarterly Review Editor Nathan Bangs, and others) "were laggards in whatever demanded stern attacks on persons and institutions."(p.212) They chose to be silent on the issue of slavery, rather than divide the perfectionist movement. Similarly, the opening session of the National Camp Meeting Association For the Promotion of Holiness in 1867, as reported in Penuel: Face to Face With God and the first issue of the Advocate of Christian Holiness in 1870, edited by John Inskip, forbid the debate of "controversial items" that might interfere with the quest for a spiritual experience of entire sanctification. Strategic action to preserve the political wholeness of the movement was considered more important than communicative action to seek a fuller rationality that included discussion of major social issues until some sort of consensus could be reached.

Vol
of 5
mar
ker

sm

10

I
C

[61]Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States, Volume II: From the Founding of the American Federation of Labor to the Emergence of American Imperialism (New York: International Publishers, 1955), pp. 50-53. For many years, the basic study of this period was Henry David's The History of the Haymarket Affair (New York: Russell & Russell, 1936, 1958), often cited by Foner.

[62]Ibid., pp. 83-86.

[63]Ibid., pp. 93-101.

[64]Ibid., p. 96.

[65]Ibid., 103. Powderly preferred the legislative route to change rather than strikes.

[66]Ibid., p. 105. The account of this and the Haymarket Bombing are on pp. 105-106.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Ibid., pp. 107-114, recounts the events from the Red Scare to the three pardons.

[69]ZH, February 25, 1885, p. 2.

[70]ZH, October 7, 1885, p. 1, and February 3, 1886, p. 2.

[71]The Rev. R. Wheatley reports on this in ZH for January 4, 1888, p.2. He places Rogers on a par with his Pastor from Chelsea, Massachusetts Methodist Episcopal Church, Dr. Dorchester, who also addressed the gathering. Wheatley maintains that Rogers "commands universal respect," but many could not "endure his Scriptural hermeneutics." As Rogers argued that labor should not be regarded as a commodity, he maintained that the law of supply and demand meant single men were at an advantage in seeking employment over married men, and that this undermined the family. Bucke, op. cit., pp. 337, 338, observes that Rogers helped found the Christian Labor Union in Boston in 1872, and he notes this challenge from Rogers's 1876 book Like Unto Me: "So the church says that, to build a theological seminary is serving God; and she accepts half a million of money from a man, Daniel Drew, who got it by the most iniquitous service of mammon, and names the seminary after the man." (Ahlstrom, op. cit., p. 791, only names the congregationalist Rev. Jesse Henry Jones as founder of the Christian Labor Union.)

[72]In "Upheaval or Revolution," ZH, August 5,1885, p. 4, Peirce wrote: "It is a state of slavery as real as was the slavery of the black people. Then the means of subjection was the lash. Now it is starvation." In "Our Blood Lesson," ZH, April 28, 1886, p. 4, Peirce wrote: "We have raised an army of devils, the socialistic-anarchists, into power and given to their deadly embrace a large body of laborers who when these troubles began were peaceful citizens trying to accumulate some of that 'property' which is the horror of anarchism."

[73]ZH, May 12, 1886, p. 4.

[74]ZH, June 2, 1886, p. 4.

[75]Ibid.

[76]NYCA, April 1, 1886, p. 1, "The Crisis," and April 29 , 1886, p. 1, "Perilous Times."

[77]NYCA, May 13, 1886, p. 1, "The Mobs."

[78]NYCA, June 3, 1886, p. 3

[79]ZH, January 20, 1886, p. 2, reproduction of address given the previous December 31.

[80]MR, July-August, 1886, pp. 454-459.

[81]ZH, August 4, 1886, p. 5.

[82]NYCA, October 6, 1887, p. 1.

[83]"The Common People," by J.W. Mendenhall, MR, May-June,1890, pp. 427-435.

[84]Charles Parkhurst, "City Evangelization," ZH, October 6, 1892, p. 1.

[85]"Pews and Prejudice," NYCA, September 10, 1885. Four articles on "Christianity and Socialism" in ZH for January 14, 1891-February 4, 1891. "City Missions and Social Problems" in MR, March-April, 1893.

[86]Richard T. Ely, NYCA, February 12, 1891 to March 31, 1892.

[87]W.D.P. Bliss, "What Is Christian Socialism?" in NYCA, September 11, 1890, p.3. "Christian Socialism," in ZH, December 17 1890,p.1. (Includes this statement: "If Methodism be defined as 'Christianity in earnest,' Christian Socialism may be defined as METHODISM APPLIED TO THE SOCIAL ORDER." "The Growth of Christian Socialism," ZH, May 13, 1891, p. 1.

[88]"The Labor Question," by Professor F. Merrick, NYCA, April 8, 1886, p. 3. "The Great Problem" by Dr. Abel Stevens, ZH, May 28, 1890, p.1 "Regeneration as a Moral Force in Reform" by the Rev. C. M. Morse, MR, November-December, 1891, pp. 923-931, and November-December 1892, pp. 876-883.

[89]Foner, History of Labor, p. 261 ff., tells the story of the Pullman Strike and the sympathy boycott by the American Railway Union. I have used this source for the information above. Almont Lindsey's basic account, The Pullman Strike: The Story of a Unique Experiment And of a Great Labor Upheaval (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), as well as many other sources are used by Foner.

[90]MR, September-October, 1894, pp. 788-794.

[91]ZH, August 31, 1892, p.4, "The Aftermath of the Strikes."

[92]ZH, December 20, 1893, p. 1, "Organized Labor Siding With Anarchy."

[93]ZH, July 11, 1894, p. 1.

[94]ZH, October 28, 1894, p. 1, "The Strike Commission's Report.

[95]ZH, December 19, 1894, p. 1,"The Significance of the Debs Sentence."

II. METHODIST RESPONSES

A. MAINTAINING THE MARRIAGE: DEFENDING FREE INSTITUTIONS AND PROMOTING PENTECOSTAL REVIVAL --STRATEGIC ACTION SEEKING SUBSYSTEM RATIONALITY

Methodist editors of the Christian Advocate, the Methodist Review, and Zion's Herald responded to late nineteenth century labor unrest with a two-fold strategy of defense and promotion.[1] With the Advocate and the Review speaking officially for the entire Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Herald speaking for New England Methodism, they sought, on the one hand, to defend the free institutions they saw themselves as divinely ordained to evangelize the globe with. This was in keeping with the civil religion of the time. On the other hand, they urged their readers to work for revival, increasingly describing the envisioned spiritual renewal as a "Pentecostal" Revival. This was in keeping with Wesleyan concern for Christian perfection. Both strategies sought to maintain a political and religious order that seemed to be slipping away. Yet, even as these editors wrote to defend and to promote, and as they published contributions by others of the same perspective, they increasingly considered the claims of a developing Gospel of Wealth and Social Gospel, as well as challenges to try to see things from the striking laborers' point of view.

In 1877, Charles H. Fowler of the Advocate and Bradford K Peirce of the Herald advocated force by the government against the perceived threat of the strikers, even as they called for an evangelistic mission to them.[2] Daniel Whedon of the Review chose to remain silent. In 1886, after the Haymarket Bombing, Advocate editor James

Buckley, Review Editor Daniel Curry, and Herald Editor Charles Parkhurst united to defend free institutions and to promote Pentecostal Revival. The same was true of editors Buckley, William Kelley, and Parkhurst of the same publications in responding to the 1894 Pullman Strike and American Railway Union boycott.

Peirce had warned of "communist riot" threatening "public peace" in 1877, even as he called for an evangelistic mission to the "vicious masses."[3] In 1886, James Buckley let the authorities know he supported forceful suppression of Haymarket Anarchists, even as he perceived a solution to "the dangers of the times" in "a modern Pentecost."[4] In 1894, Buckley's Advocate praised "that pentecostal evangelist, the Rev. Dr. S.A. Keen," and hoped for a revival to follow the 1893 Panic comparable to revivals in the past which had followed the Panics of 1837, 1857, and 1873.[5] Such an event would preserve from the threat of a "Debs the Second" Buckley feared after American Railway Union President Eugene Debs's imprisonment.[6]

The "free institutions" these editors and contributors to their publications labored to defend included representative government, free churches, free schools, free press and speech, and a free market.[7] "Free schools" meant the "common" or public schools, against which Roman Catholic parochial schools were seen to be a direct threat. Repeatedly, the editors and their contributors expressed the added concern for the institution of the "Sabbath." This was not the Saturday day of worship and rest of the Hebrew Bible and Judaism, but a Christian institution applying Saturday Sabbath restrictions to a "Christian Sabbath" on Sunday. As a social issue, it usually ranked

alongside temperance and often ahead of labor-capital conflict. In fact, Sabbath observance was viewed by some as a cure for labor-capital conflict, if capitalists would only let their workers have Sunday free from work, perhaps with a "half-holiday" on Saturday.[8] Methodist editors strategically sought to preserve the Christian Sabbath institution alongside other American "free institutions" for the sake of the American religious and political order. Thus, the "free institutions" to be defended were: free government, free churches, free schools, a free press, a free market, and the Christian Sabbath.

The "Pentecostal" emphasis in revivalism by these editors was consistent with the perfectionist emphasis of the developing Holiness Movement within Methodism at the time, which was a movement to renew John Wesley's emphasis on Christian perfection as the pre-Civil War Methodist perfectionists had done. Within Methodism, there was an increasing questioning in the late nineteenth century concerning how "Pentecost" and Christian perfection were to be experienced in the lives of Christian disciples. But, the editors of the Advocate. the Review, and the Herald made special effort to make clear their full agreement with what was perceived to be John Wesley's perspective on the issue The National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness had been formed in 1867 by Methodist leaders concerned to maintain Wesley's teaching on the subject.[9] By the 1880's and early 1890's, members of this group and of various regional holiness associations came to insist on very specific formulation of the doctrine, stressing such expressions as "the second blessing." Eventually, many members of the National Association as well as other holiness associations would "come out" of Methodism, forming new denominations between the 1890's and 1920. Editors of the Advocate, the Review, and

the Herald objected to what they saw as the narrowness of such groups, but they declared themselves on the side of continued emphasis on Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection.

By the 1890s, the strategy was to pursue Pentecostal Revival as a vital means to preserve the church and the American political system. Editor Buckley expressed this in an editorial titled "Holiness to the Front" with these words in the May 24, 1894 edition of the Advocate:

> From the ...Scriptures it is as clear as vision that pentecost prayer brings pentecost fullness, and that pentecost fullness moves to pentecost speech that fulfills the great commission and saves the multitudes. Holiness, entire sanctification, perfect love, full salvation to the front; and with it revivals, evangelism, city evangelization, perpetual waves of soul-saving, soul-helping power. Let every church be a revival society! Let every member be a revivalist! (10)

For the preceding year, Buckley had been exhorting his fellow Methodists that revival, especially Pentecostal Revival, was the need of the hour, for the nation, for the church, and for the individuals Methodism was called to minister to.[11]

THE CIVIL RELIGIOUS MISSION

Before the July 1877 Labor Uprising, Advocate Editor Charles Fowler printed on his front page Luther Lee's "Our Great Law Book," which argued that the United States Constitution legalized only Christianity.[12] Lee argued that the singular in "no law respect-

respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" meant Christianity was the national religion, since Congress rightly restricted such religious prac-practices as Mormon polygamy. He concluded:

> Thus is Christianity our national religion, free and unrestrained, and the Bible is our great Law Book, from which the substance of our jurisprudence is drawn.

Apparently Lee had forgotten his pre-Civil War antagonism against the Constitution for not naming God and for legitimating slavery!

That Lee's perspective was not unique to him is revealed in front-page comments by Editor James Buckley of the Advocate for March 25, 1886.[13] After a glowing report of the work of Evangelist Samuel P. Jones in Chicago, Buckley presents the first of two promised editorials on "Church and State." He reports the results of Jones' efforts to be that "one thousand persons have pledged themselves to him to enter upon a new life." He observes: "It is cheering to know from such reports that at this time, when the relations of capital and labor are so much disturbed, and in a city where politics are so much debauched, the ancient power of Christianity to humanize and to harmonize men has not wholly failed." Relating this to an anticipated "trial of American institutions" to come due to labor-capital conflict, he notes: "It may be so; nothing can better prepare us to meet such a trial--if it must come--than the all-pervading influence of a living Christianity." Following this report and analysis, Buckley declares in his next article on "Church and State": "The American Commonwealth is historically Protestant Christian." He supports this, as did Lee, by explaining that this has been the basis of criticizing Mormon polygamy. Buckley sees America as a Christian Nation, and he sees Methodist evangelism, as represented by Methodist Samuel P. Jones, as a necessary strategy to maintain American institutions.

Several Review articles and comments by various Methodist editors further illus-

trate the strategy of some Methodists to seek to maintain the marriage of American civil religion to Methodist liberation concerns. In a Symposium on "The American Republic" in the September-October 1889 issue of the Review, Alexander Martin wrote of "The Mission of the Republic."

> The outward mission of the Republic is to liberalize the governments of other nations. To do this we need not enter on an armed crusade. ...It is true of the Republic, as of the Church, 'a city set on a hill cannot be hid.' ...In this direction our mission is to illustrate to the world the value of freedom and free institutions, and, as a beacon, guide the nations to realize the same for themselves. (14)

Martin later expounded on the threats to this mission:

> A powerful and unscrupulous hierarchy, losing ground in the old world, has fastened its eyes, and is largely concentrating effort, on this Republic. It would destroy our system of education and suppress freedom of inquiry, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. It holds that the magistrate should receive investiture from the priest, and the State be subject to the pope. Strikes and strife between capital and labor, between grasping and selfish monopoly, and honorable manly industry, too often occur. Intemperance, the prolific source of so much poverty, crime, and misery, still rears its hydra head, and the smoke of the distillery darkens our skies and poisons and pollutes our atmosphere.(15)

Martin closes with optimism that "the omnipotent reign of heaven's love for man" and individual heroism such as manifested in Revolutionary and Civil War days will overcome these obstacles to the mission of the Republic.

In the summer of 1890, editors of both the Advocate and Herald united in praise of Dr. James King, Methodist Pastor in New York City, for leaving his pastorate to become General Secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions.[16] Editor James Buckley wrote of the new league's efforts "to secure constitutional and legis-

ative safeguards for the protection of the common-school system and other American institutions."[17] Both Buckley and Charles Parkhurst of Zion's Herald reported positively King's efforts in leading the League in presenting legislation to the U.S. Senate to prevent tax money from being spent on schools that were not subject to "the same supervision and control as the Government schools."[18] Of course, this was an effort to make sure that future government appropriations were not used to support Roman Catholic parochial schools. Protestantism was unofficially in control of the public schools, and did not see the need for public funding of private church schools that many 1990s American Protestants seek. To tell the story fairly, it must noted that Methodist editors of the 1890s also urged the church to reject public funding of Methodist schools for Native Americans on reservations, because those schools were Methodist rather than public schools..

In another symposium in the Review in March 1891, this time on "The Christian Sabbath," The Rev. James Durrell argued that Christianity is the American national religion and that the Constitution recognizes this in honoring the Christian Sabbath.[19] Referring to the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution, and George Washington's Farewell Address, Durrell concludes:

> We have, then, by the fundamental law of the land, a national religion, and that religion is Christian. The observance of the Sabbath is a part of our religious system...

He argues that the exemption of Sundays from the ten days the President has to return bills to Congress is evidence for such recognition! The logic of his argument may be strained, but he expresses the sense of many late nineteenth century Methodists that

America was a Christian nation with a mission to the world, a mission that would be injured if the instituinstitution of the Christian Sabbath were not appropriately observed.

Editor William Kelley of the Review continues to express this sense of mission in March 1894 remarks on an address by Dr. George Smith of Scotland, who said Americans were the only people in the development of humankind ready to be "the apostle of liberty in its highest form--the freedom which is in Christ Jesus."[20] Kelley comments:

> America seeks no geographical extension. ...Missions from America have, therefore, the unmixed meaning of unselfish benevolence which none apprehended more quickly than the heathen themselves. Thus America not only represents the evangel of Christian liberty, but her missionaries have a 'clearance' for every spot on the globe. The opportunity involves the responsibility. ...It is for such a time we have come to the kingdom. (21)

Kelley was continuing to express a sense of mission that Professor O.B Super had stated in the November-December 1890 issue of the Review. Writing of "The Mission of the Anglo-Saxon," Dr. Super maintained that the Anglo-Saxons were "pre-eminently expo-exponents of spiritual Christianity" and that God was preparing the world for their mission as he had prepared it for his Son nineteen hundred years before.[22] Claiming "due reverence and humility," Super saw the Anglo-Saxons as:

> ...God's chief instruments in bringing about the time of which Tennyson sings, when
> 'The war drum throbs no longer, and the battle-flags are furled,
> In the parliament of nations, the federation of the world.'
> as well as that more glorious time when
> 'the kingdoms of this world are become
> the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ,
> and he shall reign for ever and ever.'"

Kelley and Super were two of many voices expressing the Methodist sense of mission, a

mission whose institutions were threatened by labor unrest.

DEFENDING FREE INSTITUTIONS

As the 1877 National Labor Uprising came to an end, both Editor Charles Fowler of the Advocate and Editor Bradford Peirce of the Herald expressed concern for the perceived threat of organized strikers. On July 26, Fowler accused the strikers of "crimes against society and our free institutions" and urged swift action to prevent the formation of "an American Commune" such as had taken place in Paris in 1871.[24] Relating "trades-union"and "foreigners" to the threat to "our institutions," he condemned their "infidelity and disregard for the sanctity of the Sabbath." On August 30, he condemned "Despotism in temporarily suspending the Republic and permanently disgracing free institutions in the eyes of the world."[24]

Peirce also expressed anxiety when he declared on August 2: "The one great need to be accomplished is to effectually break up these communistic alliances."[25] Yet, he added: "Men cannot be safely treated as machines." He recommended that corporations give their employees a sense of partnership. The following week, he condemned communistic riot" it Chicago, but he disagreed with his fellow editor of The Methodist who recommended that the authorities "shoot down" strikers.[26] "It is poor use to make of any men," said Peirce, "to blow them into eternity with gunpowder." Instead, Peirce challenged his fellow Christians to evangelize the strikers. Both Fowler and Peirce were defending free institutions and the American mission to spread them around the world. Peirce wanted to be sure that the mission extended to American strikers.

Even before the May 1886 Haymarket Bombing, terror was in the air over the strike intentions of the Eight-Hour-Day Movement. James Buckley of the Advocate, writing of "Perilous Times" for his March 11 edition, declared: "We regard the elements at work in the United States to-day as more fraught with peril to our institutions than all the merely political and personal discussions, conflicts, and agitations which culminated in the late war."[27] It's hard to know how Civil War issues could be considered "merely political and personal," but Buckley remembered "the country in 1877 trembled on the verge of anarchy." Now, he believed, "In every city there is a definite number of wild beasts in the guise of men who would rejoice in universal havoc and ruin."

Later in the year, Buckley published the Rev. E.D. McCreary's "Socialism in America." McCreary argued that Socialist organizations were Germans who came to America after the failed 1848 German revolutions, and he argued further that the International Workingmen's Association wanted to do away with all religion and believed "robbery, arson and murder" were necessary to advance their cause.[28] Herald Editor Peirce wrote of "Our Bloody Lesson" on his April 28 front page. Popular support of other strikers had encouraged a "march toward barbarism and away from the most precious principles of civilized society," as Peirce saw it.[29] He also saw this to be raising "an army of devils, the socialistic-anarchists" who wrapped otherwise "peaceful citizens" in the "deadly embrace" of opposition to private property.

After the Haymarket Bombing, Buckley, writing on the front page of the Advocate of "Rights of Knights and Rights of Men," spoke to defend "free government" and a "free market" involving the "right to work."[30] A member of the Knights of Labor had objected

to a Congressional Committee that a "scab" replacement worker had no "right" to replace a striking worker. Buckley declared concerning the Knights: "If this fatal error, born of its rapid growth and placing power in the hands of irresponsible and indiscreet Committees should not be checked, it would become a revolutionary tribunal which no free government could safely permit." Apparently, from Buckley's point of view, Labor Committees could not be trusted, but the "right to work" structure of individual employees negotiating with wealthy and powerful employers could be trusted.

Review editors perceived Henry George's "single-tax" scheme and Edward Bellamy's Nationalism to be threats to American free institutions. In the November-December 1887 issue, interim editor Daniel Wise published a critique of George's proposals written by "E.L.F."[31] He argued that the landowners who would bear the burden of George's tax on the "unearned increment" of land value used those profits from rising land values to help the poor. Then, he issued this warning and reminder:

> Consideration will arise touching the danger of the attempt to sweep away existing bulwarks of civilized society, and the opening of the door to communistic tendencies that may plunge our peaceful land into the horrors of socialism and anarchy. ...
> The constitution and laws of this land--in particular now assailed by the Communists--were established before such theorists came here.

Of course, George's proposals were viewed by one Methodist layperson, Rutherford B. Hayes, as helpful in finding a solution to the problem of labor-capital conflict.[32] Also, Methodist editors Buckley, Mendenhall, and Parkhurst would take pains in the 1890's to let people know that George was not a wild-eyed radical.[33]

Editor Mendenhall of the Review, whose major editorial concerns were against rationalism and higher criticism of the Bible, repudiated the program of Edward Bellamy as a threat to American institutions. In the March-April 1891 issue, he wrote of "Edward Bellamy's New Civilization."[34] Noting the popularity and literary appeal of Bellamy's Looking Backward, Mendenhall felt compelled to respond to this fast-selling book because of its "mischievous influence on American society." He stated:

> The palmary error of the author is his failure to recognize the moral integrity of the civilization of the nineteenth century. He starts wrong in assuming that our civilization is essentially an inherited depravity and, like the idolatry of Israel, must be annihilated.(35)

Apparently Mendenall could spot individual depravity, but not social depravity.

Mendenhall acknowledged some "disabilities" needing "reformation," but he also declared, "The competitive spirit belongs to human nature, and is the moving cause of its largest external activities; without it stagnation is inevitable." Then, he rose to his most vehement attack on what he labelled a "minority" movement of about one-fourth of the population--persons related to the Knights of Labor, the Trades-Union, the Federation of Railroad Employees, and the Farmers' Alliances, persons totaling about 15 million of the American population of 62 million. He declared:

> It is time to say the plain word that one man should not be allowed to dictate to three men, and that the laboring man, urging himself to the front and proposing to reform and reconstruct society, should take a back seat, and feel the pressure of reason, law, and religion. He is demanding too much; he is trespassing on the rights of the majority. The 'striker' should be branded a tyrant, and the 'reformer' should be reformed. It is time that the majority speak. It is time that culture, refinement, and the spirit of unity, order, and progress should combine against the ignorance, jealousy, hatred, and lust of the laboring classes; for the vices of the land inhere in those classes. It is time that the labor

> movement, so far as it contemplates legislation in its own interests and reconstruction for the minority, should be rebuked and forced into silence. Mr. Bellamy's scheme is in the interest of the minority.(36)

Continuing to state his case, he argued:

> It abolishes the republic, destroys individuality, reduces every man to a slave of the State, and by a system as inelastic as it is impracticable enforces uniformity of wages, prices, and conditions, and controls society by the ceaseless energy of its aggregated power, defiant alike of the rights of the individual and the obligations of religion.

Mendenhall's alternative to Bellamy is "gospel agency" operating through "the church, the schoolhouse, and the family institution." He concludes:

> The New Testament, once adopted as the text-book of the nation, obeyed by the individual citizen, its spirit incorporated in general legislation, and the new life it enjoins experienced by the people, will not only transform the republic into the kingdom of God, but do it so thoroughly, so easily, so permanently, as to obscure the inconsiderate idealism of the reconstructionists, who have nothing to offer for the ills of men except the impracticable visions of disordered intellects and the vagaries of fruitless speculation.

These same "visions" and "vagaries" of Edward Bellamy appealed to the popular Methodist women's leader of the day, Women's Christian Temperance Union President Frances Willard.[37] Various contributors to the Advocate, the Review, and the Herald agreed in supporting Bellamy's ideas or some other form of Christian Socialism. These perspectives will be considered in the next chapter. But, the views on Bellamy and socialism by the editors and most national Methodist leaders were expressed by Review Editor William Kelley when he charged in the September-October 1894 issue that socialism was "slavery all over again," interfering with the "liberty of contract" that was threatened by the 1894 American Railway Union Boycott of Pullman cars in support of the Pullman

Strike.[38] As far as Kelley was concerned, opposition to President Grover Cleveland's use of troops to end the strike was voiced by "strikers, labor demagogues, socialists, and other enemies of our constitutional system regulated by law." "Free institutions" of "representative" government and the "free market" were to be protected against the labor threat. Defending free institutions and the sense of an American mission to spread these institutions around the world was one major response by Methodists to labor unrest in the late nineteenth century.

PROMOTING PENTECOSTAL REVIVALISM

Even as Editor James Mendenhall of the Review saw the Gospel message to be the antidote to the poisoning of labor-capital relations, so the editors of the Advocate, the Review, and the Herald saw revival, especially the "Pentecostal" variety, as a fundamental strategy of response to the labor unrest. On the one hand, it was a means to defend free institutions and the mission of spreading those institutions throughout the earth. On the other hand, it was an effort to restore the sense of order provided by the content and experience of the Methodist faith as passed down from Wesley. But, it increasingly involved less of the small-group communicative element of Wesley's or America's class meeting context. The revival that was to be the means of a "Pentecostal" experience of perfecting holiness was a church-wide or city-wide effort more than an interpersonal and communicative development in faith.

In reading basic histories of the development of the Holiness Movement which resulted in the separating off of various denominations from Methodism during this period,

one would think that the Methodism of the 1890's rejected John Wesley's teaching that every Christian believer could expect and should seek a second crisis of evangelical faith called "entire sanctification." John Peters, Charles Jones, and Melvin Dieter all suggest that this was the case.[39] But, reading the Advocate, the Review, and the Herald for this period suggests something different. While the editors challenged precise use of terminology by contributors to the Christian Witness and by various "special measures" to cultivate holiness by holiness associations, the editors consistently praised books by holiness writers, challenged and disagreed with those writers who argued Christian experience was confined to what was experienced in conversion, supported such Wesleyan terminology as "entire sanctification" and "perfect love," and essentially recognized the Holiness Movement's classic theologian, Daniel Steele of Boston University, as a mediator between themselves and those holiness exponents insisting on precise formulations of the doctrine and evidences for the work of the Holy Spirit.

Editor James Buckley of the Advocate consistently supported the Wesleyan teaching of entire sanctification, even as he resisted criticisms wanting him to insist on narrow formulations of the doctrine and experience. He recommended Asbury Lowrey's Possibilities of Grace in the January 15 edition of the Advocate.[40] But he had to respond in the April 2 and April 23 issues to charges that he opposed "the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection."[41] He explained that he only opposed "holiness as a hobby," not "holiness itself." In a February 18, 1886 announcement, he praised holiness leader Phoebe Palmer on the fiftieth anniversary of her "Tuesday Meeting For the Promotion of Holiness" in New York City.[42]

In a front-page editorial November 4, 1886, Buckley clearly related his concerns to defend free institutions and to advance pentecostal revival. Writing under the title "Our Country's Need of a New Pentecost," he declared:

> Manifestly the need of the time is a modern Pentecost, a new Reformation, another time of refreshing kindred to that which gave birth to Methodism, a vast outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon whole communities... ...This, even this, is the great, the grand, the merciful, visitation from on high required to beat back the forces of darkness and to prevent the seeds of communism and proletarian demagogues from growing into the upas of mob violence and social revolution. (43)

Buckley and the Advocate consistently supported the work of Congregationalist revivalist Dwight Moody and his Methodist songleader Ira Sankey, as well as Methodist revivalists Samuel P. Jones and Samuel Small.[44] But the particular kind of revivalism Buckley desired for Methodism was more explicitly in keeping with Wesleyan traditions. He published an essay by New York City Pastor Frank Mason North early in 1887 titled "Indirect Rays Upon Church Methods."[45] It viewed the successes in the United States of an Anglican missioner Aitken as a reminder of the strengths of Methodism--revivals, popular singing, the prayer meeting, and personal assurance of salvation. Concerning revivals, North declared:

> ...Religion is more than conservative, it is absolutely radical. It not only educates, it revolutionizes.

He added concerning Methodism: "It has not only believed in revivals, but it is a revival." Condemning the drift away from congregational singing to professional performances and the conversion of the prayer meeting into a pastor's lecture, he called back to a Wesleyan emphasis on divine assurance of salvation and "the doctrine of a present and full salvation

consciously known by the subject of grace."[46] He concluded:

> This is a part of the mystery of grace the Wesleys preached nearly a century and a half ago.. It is certainly no time for us to become distrustful of our methods and less insistent upon our historic doctrines.

The following month, in response to criticism of the ambiguous term "Christian Perfection," Buckley presented a paragraph-long quotation from the Rev. John Fletcher, Wesley's chief theological helper in combatting Calvinism in evangelical circles in the eighteenth century Church of England.[47] After this explanation of and endorsement of the term, Buckley asks: "Why should the harmless phrase offend us?" He continues: "We give the name Christian perfection to that maturity of grace and holiness which established adult believers attain to under the Christian dispensation."

As Editor of the Advocate and elected spokesperson for Methodism, Buckley was continuing to voice support of Wesley's call of Christian disciples to an experience and life of entire sanctification. In late 1891 and early 1892, he opened the columns of the Advocate to the editors of three prominent holiness publications, Christian Witness Editor William McDonald, Guide to Holiness Editor George Hughes, and Christian Standard Editor E.I.D. Pepper.[48] Following the 1892 General Conference, Buckley published the books of the official course of study for both local pastors and those "travelling preachers" who were pursuing ordination.[49] Required books included such writings as Wesley's Plain Account of Christian Perfection and English Methodist William Arthur's The Tongue of Fire for first year travelling preachers (those who were beginning study leading to ordination). Fourth year local pastors were required to read Daniel Steele's Love Enthroned. All three of these gave very clear expression to Wesley's teaching on

entire sanctification. Arthur's book in particular stressed both the need for Pentecostal experience and for thorough reform of society. In urging readers to seek a Pentecostal touch of "The Tongue of Fire," Arthur declared this to be the primary way to "regenerate society."[50] But, he continued:

> On the other hand, have not those who see and feel the importance of first seeking the regeneration of individuals, too often insufficiently studied the application of Christianity to social ills?
> ... Fearful social evils may coexist with a state of society wherein many are holy, and all have a large amount of Christian light. Base usages fostering intemperance, alienation of class from class in feeling and interest, systematic frauds in commerce, neglect of workmen by masters, neglect of children by their own parents, whole classes living by sin; usages checking marriage and encouraging licentiousness; human dwellings which make the idea of home odious and the existence of modesty impossible, are but specimens of the evils which may be left age after age, cursing a people among whom Christianity is the recognized standard of society. ...
> ...Nothing short of the renewal of society ought to satisfy any soldier of Christ... ...Satan might be content to let Christianity turn over the subsoil, if he is in perpetuity to sow the surface with thorns and briers; but the gospel is come to renew the earth. (51)

But, Arthur's social reformist Pentecostalism was not stressed by Methodist editors or Holiness Movement leaders.

Buckley continued to express official Methodist support of traditional Wesleyan belief in entire sanctification as1894 began and he continued to see this as the means to deal with crises of the times. Revivalism, especially Pentecostal Revivalism, was on his mind from his call to pastors to renewed revival efforts in January to the challenge in late May to bring holiness "to the front."[52]

In August, Buckley published the Rev. Dr. William Reddy's "'Are They Right?'--Which?"[53] Explaining two theories then prominent in Methodism, Zinzendorfian, teach-

ing one was fully cleansed from sin at conversion, and Wesleyan, teaching one needed to pursue grace after conversion to cleanse "sin which remains," Reddy declared:

> Poor time and policy for the Methodists to go back on the distinctive feature of our inheritance, which has been the secret of our power.

Although the editors of the Methodist Review did not devote as much space to entire sanctification, they also continued to support what was perceived to be the traditional perspective of Wesley, even as the Advocate did. Their editor was also elected by the Methodist General Conference, and their words may be viewed as an official voice of Methodism. They urged continued loyalty to Wesley's proclamation of the possibility of this experience and life of grace, even as they opposed what official Methodism saw as extremes of various holiness associations with respect to terminology and required experience that would be evidence of entire sanctification.

In 1885, Editor Daniel Curry united with the Advocate in praising holiness exponent Asbury Lowrey's Possibilities of Grace, although he maintained that the book really presented "nothing new" and its publication was a good time to warn against those who would become "specialists" in religious experience.[54] He complimented the Rev. J. A. Wood, a Methodist holiness advocate, for his newly published Christian Perfection as Taught By John Wesley, and he eulogized National Holiness Association President the Rev. John Inskip upon his death.[55] In what amounted to an exposition of Wesleyan doctrine as much as a eulogy on Inskip, Curry praised Inskip as "not much given to theorizing on the subject" and challenged the contrasting emphasis of some on an "altar theology." This was a coded criticism of the Palmer Tuesday Meeting's favorite termino-

logy, an emphasis that advocated public testimony to entire sanctification before one felt assurance of the experience. Rather than opposing the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification, Curry was challenging what had come to be seen by many in the Holiness Movement as a practical necessity to express faith and to advance the holiness cause.[56]

Curry chose to present further criticism of this emphasis in Revivalism in general by printing an article by the Rev. W.R. Goodwin in July 1886 warning of the Revivalists who brought their own hymnbooks for sale, encouraged "mechanical clapping of hands," and substituted "the word of the revivalist for the witness of the Spirit."[57] Revivals were viewed as necessary, but the profession of a revivalist was viewed with skepticism, even as specializing in the experience of entire sanctification was frowned upon.

In the late 1880's, Review Editor James Mendenhall joined the Advocate and the Herald in praising the Rev. Dr. S.A. Keen's Faith Papers as well as The Guide to Holiness, a holiness publication observing its fiftieth anniversary.[58] But, Mendenhall, as well as the Advocate, went beyond praising holiness publications and leaders to criticizing their primary theological opponents. In a May 1889 book review, Mendenhall opposed Dr. J.M. Boland's The Problem of Methodism.[59] Mendenhall agreed that doctrine should not merely be based on what "Wesley said," and appreciated the fact that Boland's book might inspire new investigations. But, he saw a need to get beyond theorizing on the subject to living out the experience, and he called back to Wesley's teaching:

> We are constrained to write that, leaving Wesley out of the case, Dr. Boland's theory will paralyze the aspiration for holiness and ultimate in a suspension of all activity for the development of the spiritual life.

In the 1890's, Mendenhall saw it to be necessary to publish a challenge to his recommendation of Pentecostal Revival as the solution to the nation's ills. The Rev. C.M. Morse contributed "Regeneration as a Force in Moral Reform Movements" to the November-December 1891 edition of the Review and a similar essay responding to criticisms in the November-December 1892 edition. In words reminiscent of William Arthur's challenge in The Tongue of Fire (not explicitly referred to in the essay), Morse argued that a faith experience of regeneration was not enough to reform society, that careful thought, employing the discoveries of the developing science of sociology, was also required. Morse explained:

> ...The 'regenerated' rich man is no more liberal in relieving want and reforming social institutions than his unregenerated neighbor. ...I state it as a fact that if every individual in the United States should be 'regenerated' in an hour their wholesale conversion of the community--under present methods--would not result in a single reform in the industrial or social world. ... The only change would be that the present unjust methods in the distribution of wealth would be given the sanction of baptism and the authority of the church. (60)

Real practical change would require "Biblical sociological teachings," preachers would have to speak about "human conduct in the social realm," and this would require what twentieth century theologians have called a "preferential option for the poor." Morse explained: "In order to accomplish this, the 'man of God' must place himself in touch with the poorest class, study all social questions from that point of view, investigate without prejudice or fear the teachings of Jesus and the apostles."[61]

Mendenhall published challenges to Morse from the pen of R.F. Bishop and J.E. Learned favoring "spiritual methods" and arguing that "concerns of the soul" were to be

focused on by preachers, leaving "questions of politics" alone.[62] Mendenhall took pains to compliment Learned's warning to stay out of "questions of politics," meaning issues of political regulation of economics rather than political regulation of the common schools, immigration, the Sabbath, and alcoholic beverages. Morse's eventual response in late 1892 hearkened back to a Wesleyan pentecostal theme. Responding to challenges to his support for "the communism of the primitive church," Morse wrote:

> It was only when the world-spirit took possession of the Church, and when covetousness led men to sneer at the communism of the early brotherhood, that the gloom of the Dark Ages settled upon humanity. (63)

He reminded his readers that the descent of the Spirit at the first Christian Pentecost caused the disciples to sell their possessions and to put them into a fund for everyone in need. But, neither Editor Mendenhall nor the other Methodist editors advocated this kind of Pentecostal Revivalism.

Further evidence of official Methodist support of Pentecostal Revivalism may be seen in the eulogy for Mendenhall after his death June 18, 1892, and in glowing praise for the republication of Arthur's The Tongue of Fire in 1894.[64] Professor W.F. Whitlock gave basic biographical information of Mendenhall's ife and spiritual journey, eventually recounting his conversion as a college student. He followed this up with an account of Mendenhall's "quest for scriptural holiness" beginning in September 1870 and leading him to lay aside all books but the Bible and to prayerfully await the required experience. Whitlock continues:

> Soon the power and the witness came. He had perfect rest in God, his peace flowed like a river, his joy was unspeakably full.

The interim editorial staff was assuring readers of its appreciation of an example of its cherished Wesleyan doctrine.

The new Editor, the Rev. William Kelley, continued to express the Methodist leadership's view that Pentecostal Revivalism was the necessary strategy to deal with the multitude of problems facing the church and the country in the 1890's. In reviewing Arthur's classic, Kelley declared:

> The baptism of the Holy Ghost was the power of the early Church, is the need of nineteenth century Christianity, and will be the key to the success of the future church. Whoever has read Mr. Arthur's long-celebrated book has already consented to these truths. ... It is a great volume, by a great writer, on a great subject.

The marriage of Methodist spiritual liberation concerns and the American civil religion's political liberty concerns was to be maintained by a strategy of defending American institutions, especially through the means of Pentecostal Revivalism.

The Editors of Zion's Herald in Boston took the same basic position as the official national publications in New York, the Advocate and the Review. They seemed to have more conflicts with the Holiness Movement's publication The Christian Witness (also published in Boston) than the Advocate and the Review, but they also were careful to identify with Professor Daniel Steele of the Holiness Movement by publishing columns by him.

On July 12, 1877, Editor Bradford Peirce of the Herald placed first on his front page an editorial by Bishop Jesse Peck titled "Dangers to New England Methodism."[65] Warning Methodist preachers against putting logic ahead of feelings, Peck summed up the faith and religious experience Methodist leaders saw as the remedy for any threats that

might come:

> The utter depravity of man, a vicarious atonement, justification by faith, sanctification, entire, by the Holy Ghost, the resurrection of the body, the eternal happiness of the righteous and the punishment of the finally impenitent, are the fixed creed of the New England Methodists, as of all evangelical Christians; and so let us trust they will continue to be.

Editor Peirce placed a similar call to faithfulness to traditional Wesleyanism on the second page of his February 17, 1886 edition. This time, the editorial was by Bishop W.F Mallalieu on "Vital Orthodoxy":

> The present duty of all Methodist preachers in the present crisis is to stand by the old faith; preach the old doctrines; read up in Fletcher, and Watson, and Whedon; sing the old Methodist hymns; use the old Methodist methods; get the old experience of full salvation; make no compromise with the world, the flesh, or the devil; and especially cling to the assurance that God calls us to subdue this world to Christ. (66)

The strategy of promoting the "old faith" of "full salvation" (a synonym of "entire sanctification), by means of Pentecostal Revivalism, was the necessary means to "subdue this world to Christ."

Peirce personally wrote of the need to be faithful to this dimension of Wesleyanism in an editorial titled "Wesley's Advocacy of Perfectionism" in the Herald of June 30, 1886. Noting Wesley's 1744 acceptance of witnesses to this experience, he declares:

> It holds forth an unspeakable privilege. It presents an indispensable duty. Happy, therefore, is he in whose heart the pure love of God reigns without a rival! (67)

Charles Parkhurst's installation as Editor of the Herald in January 1888 did not change the publication's perspective on Wesley's teaching of entire sanctification. In a February 20, 1889 editorial, preceding Review Editor Daniel Curry's May analysis, he

challenged Dr. J.M. Boland's The Problem of Methodism as an "anti-Wesleyan" attack on this "crowning article of Methodistic faith."[68] Asserting that the "received doctrine" as preached by Wesley was of "salvation in two stages," he urged: "Let us abide by that, without any hairsplitting or newly-devised theories or methods." Although Parkhurst would be attacked by various holiness organizations, including the Rev. William McDonald, Editor of the Christian Witness, on various matters, he continued to support Wesley's views on entire sanctification in the years that followed. In an October 11, 1893 editorial titled "The Holiness We Believe In," he repeated his opposition to Dr. Boland's theory (now also associated with the work of J.T. Crane and S. Franklin) because they believed Christians were as pure as they ever would be at the time of conversion.[69] Instead, Parkhurst maintained that all believers "may, by deeper consecration and faith in the all-cleansing blood, have that impurity and weakness removed and live a life free from sin properly so-called." But, he was quick to add: "We stand for freedom in Methodism as to the great mass of non-essentials." He urged all to steer clear of "all formalism and fanaticism and Pharisaism." In a November 29, 1893 editorial on "The Mission of Methodism," he spoke of Methodism as a "continuous Pentecostal revival" and observed: "There was never more imminent need of a present and operating spiritual religion."

Parkhurst, as with Buckley in the Advocate and Mendenhall and Kelley in the Review, supported the strategy of Pentecostal Revival as part of their concern to defend American free institutions and spread them over the earth, even as they favored the same strategy for the well-being of individuals for whose spiritual care they felt responsibility. The Rev. James King had expressed this same view in a November 1890 contribution to

the Herald. Writing of "Methodism and the Social questions of the Day," King concluded with a plea for "the baptism of the Holy Ghost upon Methodist preachers and press" that would "furnish our quota of the solvent of all social issues of the day."[71]

As a potential split with the Holiness Movement developed, Daniel Steele sent a contribution to the Herald in late 1890 which helped Parkhurst to pursue two basic goals: 1) opposition to narrow formulations of holiness doctrine and experience; and 2) affirmation of a traditional Wesleyan perspective on doctrine and experience. William McDonald, President of the National Camp Meeting Association and Editor of its principal publication, The Christian Witness, apparently praised fasting as a sign of being Spirit-filled and criticized Henry Drummond's "The Greatest Thing in The World" as "salvation by works."[72] Parkhurst challenged both positions, asking:

> Are our people aware that the trend of the present holiness movement, as led by the Witness, is wholly divisive, a menace to peace of the churches, and directed towards schism in a large number of our societies in New England?(73)

In this context, Professor Daniel Steele of the Methodist Boston University and a theological leader of the Holiness Movement, submitted "Mandatory Fasting-Proof Texts Wanted."[74] Parkhurst maintained that he did not solicit Steele's contribution, but that Steele sent it to the Herald out of concern lest the church be misled on the issue of fasting.[75] In connection with the Witness assertion that fasting was mandatory for those who would be Spirit-filled, Steele responded:

> The new wine of the pentecostal dispensation would have been wasted if it had been poured into that bottle.(76)

Speaking from his experience of attending National Camp Meetings for the Promotion of

Holiness, as well as other Holiness Conventions, he declared that they had not promoted mandatory fasting. He followed this up in January 1891 by declaring that the Witness was advocating a return to the asceticism Christianity had been progressively escaping since the Dark Ages.[77]

But, the larger issue of entire sanctification was addressed by Parkhurst's reproduction of a paper Steele was asked by the Boston (Methodist) Preacher's Association to present on "Regeneration and Entire Sanctification" at their December meeting.[78] Parkhurst explained the response at the crowded Wesleyan Hall where Steele had read the paper in December:

> Not a dissident note or word of criticism was heard. This attests--what the writer believes is true--that there is not, and has not been, any opposition to the Wesleyan doctrine of 'perfect love.'

This overlooks Parkhurst's response to the challenge of J.M. Boland, but it does convey the sense of support for Wesley's teaching on entire sanctification by 1890's Methodist leadership.

Steele began with an emphasis on the great improvement in life through regeneration (conversion), something some holiness advocates had sought to maximize the imperfections of so as to stress the need of entire sanctification. Steele continued to stress the necessity of this second crisis of evangelical faith, but he concluded:

> In my conception it would be better for the church if all her preachers should preach the whole Gospel, and give the specialists a chance to rest.

The "full gospel" included both conversion and entire sanctification, and Steele refused to accept the strategy of minimizing the accomplishments of conversion or of bringing false

accusations against his fellow Methodists to advance that gospel.

In the following years, Parkhurst continued his balancing act of opposing what he saw as excesses of some members of the Holiness Movement and affirming what he saw as the Wesleyan teaching and experience. He reproduced parts of Bishop Randolph Foster's Philosophy of Christian Experience in May 1891.[79] He began publishing a column headed "Dr. Steele's Column" June 24, 1891, and presented new entries approximately every other week. The July 8, 1891 edition included a major section titled "Holiness: a Symposium."[80] This included a statement by the Rev. J.M. Durrell of the New Hampshire Conference declaring that "most believers" who enjoyed entire sanctification had as clear a witness to this as to their justification. However, in keeping with Parkhurst's and other Methodist leaders' perspective, Durrell added that it was possible that some had experienced this from the moment of justification.

Parkhurst reported positively the Pentecostal Meetings of the Rev. Dr. S.A. Keen at the General Conference of 1892.[81] In August 1894 he printed two essays by Bishop S.M. Merrill titled "Sanctification--Current Views and the Right View," citing favorably books by J.A. Wood, William McDonald, Asbury Lowrey, John Inskip, and Daniel Steele, all Holiness leaders of the time.

In 1891, Parkhurst challenged what he saw to be excesses of some in the Holiness Movement by publishing contributions by Bishop Foster and Professor Steele challenging the mechanistic nature of the "altar theology."[82] Parkhurst himself wrote questioning the uncharitableness of much of the Holiness Movement.[83]

Melvin Dieter has observed how the "altar theology," combined with increasing post-Civil War "new measures" camp meeting promotion of Pentecostal experience, contributed to the uncharitableness Parkhurst was concerned about.[84] Phoebe Palmer had developed her "altar theology" in 1847 to explain her own experience and to urge others to confidently seek the same experience.[85] She had joined the Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness initiated by her sister Sarah Lankford in 1835 and, together with her husband, physician Dr. Walter Palmer, had engaged in successful camp meeting evangelism promoting entire sanctification before the Civil War. Her "altar theology" urged persons seeking entire sanctification to express confidence by claiming the experience after making a complete consecration to God, and without waiting for what traditional Methodists called the "witness of the Spirit."

Dieter observes the consequences of the organization of camp meeting promotion of the altar theology under the National Camp Meeting Association, which was organized 1867. He notes that it resulted in an unwillingness to compromise to the degree that had been possible at the much smaller Tuesday Meeting and that, although the National Camp Meetings sought to keep alive many of the Tuesday Meeting's "small-group communicative and therapeutic values," its "more public nature" led, in Dieter's estimation, to "a more rigid formulation of the theology, practice, and standards by which the orthodoxy of true holiness faith and life were measured."[86] Dieter adds:

> ...the informal lay emphasis fostered by the Palmers as lay leaders was to be overshadowed by the more formally organized efforts of the ardent ministerial advocates who maintained

> a loosely structured, but tight control over the movement for thirty years.

While the earlier parlor meetings at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Palmer had invited personal testimony of persons of widely differing creedal views to dialogue on the "higher Christian life," camp meeting promotion tended toward being a "more polemical, definitively dogmatic proclamation of the doctrine in terms which tended to become stereotypes."[87] In the analytic terms of Jurgen Habermas, the lifeworld rationality pursued by communicative action within the Tuesday Meeting was replaced by strategic action pursuing the political rationality of the Holiness Movement. The result was a division between those promoting Wesley's doctrine and experience of entire sanctification in the 1890's, even among those seeking it by way of a "pentecostal revival." Some demanded a standard formulation and method, while Methodist leaders favored a more open communicative dialaogue that would share varying ways of experiencing entire sanctification.

Regardless of these differences, though, Editor Parkhurst foresaw "A Pentecostal Year" after General Conference in 1892, partly due to the "thoughtful, tender, tactful" work of Dr. Keen at the General Conference calling delegates attending the Pentecostal Meeting "to ask for the Holy Ghost."[88] As with Methodist Editors of the Advocate and the Review, Parkhurst spoke for Methodist leadership in pursuing a Pentecostal strategy seeking a Wesleyan experience of entire sanctification as a means to defend American institutions as well as a means to the spiritual well-being of those persons in their care. Defending American institutions

and promoting Pentecostal Revivalism went together for them, and these were their prime strategies of response to late nineteenth century American labor unrest. But, they also saw fit to publish responses recommended by persons of different persuasions. It is to those views that the next chapters are devoted.

NOTES

[1]The following abbreviations will be used to represent these three Methodist publications:

NYCA--The Christian Advocate (New York).
MR/MQR--The Methodist Review (The Methodist Quarterly Review before January 1885).
ZH--Zion's Herald (Boston).

[2]NYCA, July 26, 1877, p.8. NYCA, August 30, 1877, p.8. ZH, July 26, 1877, p.4. ZH, August 2, 1877, p.4. ZH, August 9, 1877, p.4. Fowler drama- tically expresses his fears and anger in the August 30 issue of NYCA: "We are in great peril through the sentimentality of public ninnies, and the pusilanimity of politicians, of excusing these great criminals without adequate punishment. ...We have had too much of the shoo-pussy business in our time to need any more of it."

[3]ZH, loc. cit.

[4]NYCA, October 4, 1886, p.1.

[5]NYCA, January 4, 1894 report of Round Lake, New York Camp Meeting by Joseph H. King included by Editor Buckley on p. 10. NYCA, January 18,1894. "The Crisis of the American Church," by Editor Buckley, pp. 1-2.

[6]NYCA, July 19, 1894, p. 2, "May There Be a Debs the Second?" Buckley notes the New York Sun statement: "The reign of DEBS the first has been one of the shortest

known to history. There will be no DEBS the second." Buckley says he's not so sure, and states: "If the principle of sympathetic strikes is not repudiated, those who favor it will learn by their mistakes." He concludes by calling for "'eternal vigilance'...to prevent the rise and triumph or longer reign of DEBS the second."

[7]C.G. Truesdell presents one of the clearest summaries of the "free institutions" many Methodists sought to defend in late nineteenth century America. He speaks of the "bulwark to our civil and religious liberties" as: "free church, free schools, and free speech, manhood suffrage, an untrammeled ballot and an honest count." (MR, September-October, 1889, p.684) Clearly, "free church" included neither those endorsing polygamy (Mormons) nor those considering church leader- ship more important than government leadership (Roman Catholicism). "Free schools" were the public ("common") schools, whose assignment was to inculcate American civil religion. (Sidney Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America, New York: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 68, argues, "...The public school system of the United States is its established church.") The institution of the "free market" (really, private ownership of the means of production) is the key institution defended against striking laborers by all the Methodist editors surveyed in this study. Free speech and free press were basic to the activities of these and other editors. Truesdell's "manhood suffrage" suggests the institution of limited, representative government, a government whose limitations are suggested by his use of the term "manhood."

[8]George May Powell, in "The Chief Cause of Labor Trouble," NYCA, July 29, 1886, p. 3, argues this case. Powell declares, "Sunday is the 'red-flag day' of the communistic operation." Then, he declares: "The quiet Sabbath of the fathers who founded the great republic is the keystone of the arch now crumbling in the blood and the fires of these anarchic, purse-proud, and purse-corrupting times." The Rev. James Thames presented a series of second-page essays on "The Half-Holiday Movement" to ZH in 1887 (May 25, June 1, June 15, and July 6). It was a call to limit the Saturday work day to a half day so that workers could do things they would otherwise do on Sunday and miss out on worship opportunities.

[9]The story of this is told in the following: A. McLean and J.W. Eaton (Editors), Penuel: or Face to Face With God (New York: W.C. Palmer, Jr., 1869, Reprinted by Garland Publishing, Inc.: New York and London, 1984); George Hughes, Days of Power in the Forest Temple: A Review of Fourteen National Camp Meetings From 1867 To 1872 (Boston: John Bend and Co., 1873); John L. Peters, Christian Perfection And American Methodism (Nashville, Tennessee: Pierce and Washabaugh, 1956; Second Edition by Zondervan Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1985), pp. 133-135; Melvin Dieter, Revivalism and Holiness (Temple University Doctoral Dissertation, Submitted November 1, 1972; Copyright 1973), pp. 112-117.

[10]NYCA, May 24, 1894, p. 7.

[11]On January 26, 1893, Buckley praises revivals and calls the churches to work for and expect more revivals. His opening front-page editorial, typical of earlier editions, is titled "Awake, O Zion!" A September 28, 1893 front-page editorial titled "Is It True?", presented in slightly larger type than the rest of the page, declares: "The most urgent need of the Church is ministers who will give themselves to the promotion of a revival that involves reconstruction of wholly or chiefly worldly lives, and of laymen who will assist them in the work." A front-page editorial of October 5, 1893 titled "The Need of the Times," again in slightly larger type than the rest of the page, urges pastors to "enter upon earnest revival efforts." A front-page editorial of October 19, 1893, also in larger type, titled "Missing the Vital Point," observes: "When a ship is sinking routine work is sus- pended till safety is assured. Many a church is like such a vessel, but the people are preparing for fairs, concerts or lectures. Only a genuine revival will save such a church, and to accomplish that the energy of all is essential." Talk must go beyond minor things and show interest in sons, daughters, and friends so as to testify that they must be born again to see the kingdom of God.

[12]NYCA, March 15, 1877, p. 1.

[13]NYCA, March 25, 1886, p. 8. The second article on the subject does not appear in later editions of NYCA.

[14]MR, September-October, 1889, p. 686. Other contributors are: Editor Mendenhall, "The Constitutional Basis"; Dr. C. G. Truesdell of Chicago, "The Re- ligious Factor." Martin is listed as a D.D. from Greencastle, Indiana.

[15]Ibid., pp. 688-689.

[16]NYCA, June 12, 1890, p.1. NYCA, July 24, 1890, p.1. ZH, July 21, 1890.

[17]NYCA, June 12, 1890, p.1, "The New Work of Dr. King." Buckley praises King for leaving 25 years of pastoral work to be General Secretary of "a National League to secure constitutional and legislative safeguards for the pro- tection of the common-school system and other American institutions, and to pre- vent all sectarian or denominational appropriation of public funds."

[18]ZH, July 21, 1890, p. 1, Editor Parkhurst supports Rev. James King's effort with the National League for the Protection of American Institutions to se- cure an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to prevent tax money from being used for sectarian

programs (i.e., Roman Catholic parochial schools!). NYCA, July 24, 1890, p. 1, Editor Buckley praises the same effort for not allowing money to be given to schools not subject to "the same supervision as the Government schools."

[19]MR, March-April, 1891, pp. 218-219. Other contributors to the Symposium are: Rev. L.R. Fiske, D.D., President of Albion College; Rev. J.C.W. Coxe, D.D., Agent Sunday-School Union, Washington, Iowa. Rev. Durrell is described as a D.D. from Manchester, New Hampshire.

[20]MR, March-April, 1894, p. 308.

[21]Ibid.

[22]MR, November-December, 1890, "The Mission of the Anglo-Saxon," pp. 865, 867.

[23]NYCA, July 26, 1877, p.8.

[24]NYCA, August 30, 1877, p.8.

[25]ZH, August 2, 1877, p.4.

[26]ZH, August 9, 1877.

[27]NYCA, March 11, 1886, p.2.

[28]NYCA, April 15, 1886, p.3.

[29]ZH, April 28, 1886, p.4.

[30]NYCA, June 24, 1886, p.1.

[31]MR, October-November 1887, p. 133.

[32]Hayes' views of Henry George are summarized in Charles Richard Williams, The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes: Nineteenth President of the United States, Volume II (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, F.J. Heer Printing Company, 1928; from copyrighted edition of Charles Williams, 1914), pp. 381-385. Hayes agreed with George's portrayal

of "the rottenness of the present system," but believed "We are ... not yet ready for his remedy." Hayes felt that more was needed than a "single tax." The educational system needed improvement and laws needed to provide better regulation of corporations and inheritance. Hayes was surprised at the Fall 1887 meeting of the Peabody Fund in New York (of which he was a trustee) to discover support for George by such persons as New England conservative Robert Winthrop and Chief Justice Waite of the United States Supreme Court.

[33]Writing in the April 12, 1894 Advocate on the front page concerning "Single Tax and Other Taxes," Buckley objected to being listed as a "single taxer," but he expressed admiration for George's Progress and Poverty as "exceedingly difficult to answer." However, he contended George's plan was "impracticable." For the January-February 1891 edition of the Review, Editor Mendenhall had presented Professor George Steele's "The Industrial Reconstruction" (pp. 27-43), which, although very critical of both George and Edward Bellamy, declared that neither of them was "a mere sensationalist, nor a senseless agitator, nor altogether a demagogue." (p.30) Editor Parkhurst of the Herald does little more than name Henry George without analysis, other than a front-page essay in his August 20, 1890 edition by George Howard Fall, Lecturer at Boston University, titled "The Modern Altruist." Parkhurst wrote of the article: "Some of the modern schemes for reforming society are clearly stated and ably refuted..." In the article itself, Fall merely criticizes George for only recommending a tax on land values and not on other properties.

[34]MR, March-April, 1891, pp. 280-286.

[35]Ibid., p. 282.

[36]Ibid., p.286.

[37]Willard biographer Ruth Bordin explains Willard's perspective in Frances Willard: A Biography (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986). Willard preferred Bellamy's "total control of the economy by an egalitarian state" as that which would remedy the evil by which "the working classes were cruelly exploited," in Bordin's description (pp. 145, 146). She corresponded with Bellamy about a "manifesto" of Nationalism to be published in the Union Signal of her Women's Christian Temperance Union. Bellamy's support of peaceful change was in keeping with Willard's opposition to violence.

[38]MR, September-October, 1894, pp. 788-794. Kelley observed concerning the needs of various groups of the time: "There is quite as much distress, probably, among refined people, whose lives are one long service to humanity,

as there is among workmen."

[39]Peters describes the transition in "The Doctrine Modified: 1865-1900," pp. 133-180, in Christian Perfection and American Methodism. Dieter explains the same period in "A Tradition in Dilemma" (pp. 224-261) and "In Search of Order" (pp. 262-330) in Revivalism and Holiness. Charles E. Jones relates this to the use of the Camp Meeting by various holiness associations in Perfectionist Persuasion: The Movement and American Methodism (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1974).

[40]NYCA, January 14, 1885, p.18.

[41]NYCA, April 2, 1885, p. 1 and April 23, 1886, p. 4.

[42]NYCA, February 18, 1886, p. 8.

[43]NYCA, November 4, 1886, p. 1. Buckley employs here the rare word "upas" for the poison of the threatened "mob violence and social revolution."

[44]An example of strong praise for Jones is a page 1 editorial of the NYCA for March 25, 1886. An example of equal praise for Moody is found on page 1 of NYCA for September 23, 1886.

[45]NYCA, January 6, 1887, p. 3. This is the same Frank Mason North prominent in leading the development of the Social Gospel in the 1890's and early 1900's. He is well-known to many as the author of the hymn "Where Cross The Crowded Ways of Life."

[46]North's emphasis. Concerning music, he declared: "Undoubtedly the Methodist Church is slighting an element of great power in its drift concerning church music. In many places criticism is supplanting devotions. Some churches are giving more to maintain the quartets than they do to convert the heathen. Instead of aping richer and, it ;may be, more aesthetic Denominations in the produc-tion of music unsuited to religious worship, why do we not give full opportunity for the use of grand choral and congregational singing?:" Concerning prayer meeting, he states: "To Methodism it has been from the beginning the center of power, both conservative and aggressive. ... It is perilous to convert it into the pastor's lecture hour, or into the arena where a few chosen spirits may display their spiritual exercises."

[47]NYCA, February 24, 1887, p.4.

[48]NYCA, December 24, 1891, p. 3 for Hughes; December 31, 1891, p.4 for Pepper; January 21, 1892, p.4 for McDonald.

[49]NYCA, November10, 1892 , p.12. The February 9, 1893 edition (p.4) of the Advocate contains an explanation of "The New Course of Study" by the Rev. Dr. W.C. Wilbur. He reported that the Episcopal Committee placed this set of books in the 1892 Discipline, and he saw it as a useful improvement over previous books in the course of study, since authors had been chosen "as men of the highest ability in their several fields" rather than for "denominational relations they may hold."

[50]William Arthur, The Tongue of Fire: Or, The True Power of Christianity (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1857), p. 91.

[51]Ibid., pp. 91-93.

[52]NYCA, January 18, 1894, p. 1, "The Crisis of the Church." NYCA, May 24, 1894, p.4, "Holiness to the Front," in which Buckley very deliberately listed synonyms for what he was calling for: "Holiness, entire sanctification, perfect love, full salvation to the front."

[53]NYCA, August 16, 1894, p. 3.

[54]MR, January-February 1885, p. 151.

[55]MR, September-October 1885, p.802, has the review of Wood's book. MR, May-June 1885, pp. 406-422, has the eulogy of Inskip.

[56]Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestant-ism on the Eve of the Civil War (New York: Harper Torchbooks, originally pub- lished by Abingdon Press in 1957, p. 125, describes the origins of this terminology, and he also notes that many holiness leaders opposed it. Dieter, op. cit., pp. 30-37, presents the same basic story.

[57]MR, July-August 1886, p. 605 of a four-page essay.

[58]MR, September-October 1988, pp. 801-802 favorably reviews Keen, who was a popular leader of "pentecostal meetings" at General Conference in 1892 and at other Annual Conference meetings in the 1890's. MR, March-April 1889, devotes its final two pages to positive references to the Guide, a publication begun by the Rev.

Timothy Merritt as The Guide to Christian Perfection in 1839. Editors Sarah Langford Palmer (Phoebe Palmer's sister) and the Rev. George Hughes are praised for the publication's "catholicity and non-controversial character."

[59]MR, May-June 1889, pp. 475-476. The subtitle summarizes Boland's concerns: "Being a Review of the Residue Theory of Regeneration and the Second Change Theory of Sanctification and the Philosophy of Christian Perfection." Peters, op. cit., summarizes two views present in Methodism at the time and presents a table of the two perspectives on pp. 175-176, essentially distinguishing those Methodists who viewed sanctification as effected by one experience of divine grace from those who viewed sanctification as requiring two experiences of divine grace.

[60]MR, November-December 1891, p. 927.

[61]Ibid., p. 930.

[62]MR, March-April 1892, pp. 303-304 essay by Bishop favored "spiritual methods." MR, May-June 1892, pp. 434-437 essay by Learned is annotated by Mendenhall to express agreement that preachers should disregard "questions of politics."

[63]MR, November-December, p. 882.

[64]MR, September-October, pp. 876-883, eulogizes Mendenhall. MR, May-June 1893, p. 511, praises Arthur's book.

[65]ZH, July 12, 1877, p.1. Bishop Peck seeks to distinguish Methodism by explaining: "Logic reasons and enjoys. Methodism gets happy and then reasons."

[66]ZH, February 17, 1886, p.2.

[67]ZH, June 30, 1886, p. 4.

[68]ZH, February 20, 1889, p.4.

[69]ZH, October 11, 1893, p.4.

[70]ZH, November 29, 1893, p.4.

[71]ZH, October 12, 1890, p.2.

[72] Parkhurst responded to these challenges in ZH, October 10, 1890, p.4, objecting to McDonald for being "censorious" and "divisive" over fasting, and in ZH, October 15, 1890, p.4, to McDonald's opposition to Drummond's exhorta- tion to Christians to live according to Paul's call to steadfast love in 1 Corinthians 13.

[73]ZH, October 15, 1890, p.4.

[74]ZH, November 19, 1890, p.2.

[75]ZH, November 19, 1890, p.4.

[76]ZH, November 19, 1890, p. 2.

[77]ZH, January 24, 1891, p.1.

[78]ZH, January 7, 1891, p.2.

[79]ZH, May 13, 1891, p.2. This was an excerpt from Philosophy of Christian Experience (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890), which the title page explains is "Eight Lectures Delivered Before the Ohio Wesleyan University On The Merrick Foundation." In avoiding excesses on all sides, Foster declared: "The truth to be preserved is that there is a higher experience possible to Christians than that which is attained in and at the time of regeneration; and this must be so taught as not to reflect discredit on regeneration on the one hand or to excite fanaticism on the other, and so as to inspire aspiration after it as a duty and a privilege." Foster maintained that the route to attaining this was "by the proper action of the soul itself and the co-working of God with it. It will not be forced; it will not come unsought; it will not come improperly sought. Mere desires or mere prayers or mere faith will not secure it; external reforms or mere legal morality will not bring it. There are no artificial means or magical appliances that will help to it; it is not the necessary outcome of lapse of time; it is not a reserved grace to be realized only in the dying hour." To those who did not profess this experience he spoke the encouraging reminder that professing to be a Christian was a "great profession." Then, he warned them that they should not be hostile to those who professed entire sanctification. To those who professed to having attained to this experience, he declared: "Remember that there is no difference between you and your brethren that marks an essential distinction." Although he acknowledges that it is impossible to be "too holy," he warns: "Do not make the mistake of imagining that the profession of holiness is holiness, or is a means to its attainment or a means to its continuance. Above all, avoid extravagance in the manner and terms of profession."

[80]ZH, July 8, 1891, p.2.

[81]ZH, May 18, 1892, p.1.

[82]The above cited article by Bishop Foster from ZH of May 13, 1891, p.3, used such expressions as "Profession does not aid it" to challenge the altar theology. Professor Steele, in ZH for September 30, 1891, p.4., specifically named the "altar theology" as inconsistent with such Methodist theologians as Miner Raymond, William Pope, and Richard Watson. He pointed out what he saw to be "the stu-pendous fallacy involved in the so-called 'altar theology' or 'shorter way of faith'--lay yourself on the altar and believe that God accepts you on your own estimate of your fulfillment of the conditions." He declared that it was the role of the human to put self on the altar, but then one must wait for the work of entire sanctification to be done by God alone and to be witnessed to by God.

[83]ZH, June 14, 1893, p. 4, "Is It Perfect Love?" He viewed as "uncharitable" actions which did not "acknowledge a legitimate difference of ways to describe the Christian life."

[84]Dieter, op. cit., pp. 70, 108-112.

[85]Smith, op. cit., p. 125, and Dieter, op. cit., pp. 30-37, describe these developments.

[86]Dieter, op. cit., p. 70.

[87]Ibid., pp. 109-110. Dieter also observes that "the theological tolerance which the more intimate atmosphere of the smaller group meetings could practice without diversion from the main issue also suffered in the midst of larger meetings and the later institutionalization of the revival."

[88]ZH for May 18, 1892, p.1, gives the report of the May 11, 1892 meeting led by Keen. ZH for June 8, 1892, p.4, gives Parkhurst's expectations of a Pentecostal Year.

B. RESTRUCTURING THE MARRIAGE THE GOSPEL OF WEALTH AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL --STRATEGIC ACTION SEEKING SUBSYSTEM RATIONALITY

A second Methodist response to late nineteenth century American labor unrest was to seek to re-structure the marriage of Wesleyan concerns for spiritual liberation and American civil religious concerns to advance human liberty. Two basic strategies were advocated to save perceived benefits of late nineteenth century American society.[1] On the one hand, some favored greater concentration on applying the Gospel to individuals and less religious interference in economic structures, believing that virtuous laborers and virtuous capitalists would automatically resolve their conflicts without interference by religious leaders. Although the editors of the Christian Advocate (New York), the Methodist Review, and Zion's Herald rejected the Gospel of Wealth views of both Andrew Carnegie and Herbert Spencer, they frequently proclaimed the solution to the labor-capital conflict to be greater diligence by individual laborers and greater philanthropy by individual capitalists. The appeal was to cultivate character that lived by the Golden Rule and not to interfere with matters of economics.

On the other hand, these same editors would sometimes suggest, and their contributors would sometimes advocate, the application of the Gospel to the social order. This Social Gospel approach sought a re-structuring of the marriage that would place the regeneration of society on a par with the regeneration of individuals. This kind of concern had been suggested at a general level by the popular Methodist book The Tongue of Fire in the 1850's, and writers in the late nineteenth century began relating that vision

of social regeneration to various kinds of socialism. Even as such practitioners of the Social Gospel as Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch challenged Christians to apply the Gospel to the social and economic order, Methodists also, motivated by pastoral experiences and concerns, came to believe that the Gospel called them to seek the re-structuring of society.

Both Gospel of Wealth advocates and Social Gospelers sought a new structure for the Methodist marriage of concerns for personal spiritual liberation to concerns for liberation through American civil religion. The Gospel of Wealth stressed equipping individuals to work out economic and social issues within the non-religious economic requirements of the larger society, downplaying the old concern for a "Christian America." The rationality of the economic subsystem required a laissez faire approach that was seen as more important than a democratic quest for a rationality expressed by political controls challenging domination by concentrated economic power. The Social Gospel stressed application of Christian principles, such as those in Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, to the economic and social order, increasing the emphasis on a "Christian America" while stressing the inadequacies of individual spiritual liberation in dealing with labor-capital conflict. The rationality of the political subsystem required a forceful effort to put into effect the kingdom of God, which was also seen as more important than a democratic quest for a rationality grounded in popularly determined controls over society and the economy. Both "Gospels" placed great faith in elite leadership to do for the masses what was "best" for them, Gospel of Wealth advocates trusting the leadership of the wealthy and Social Gospelers trusting religious and intellectual leadership.

THE GOSPEL OF WEALTH

Pittsburgh steel tycoon Andrew Carnegie succinctly stated the basics of the Gospel of Wealth in a June 1889 essay in The North American Review. Comparing the cost of following "the law of competition" with the advantages to be gained, he concluded that "while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department."[2] Matching Carnegie's laissez faire call not to restrict competition was his challenge to the possessor of wealth to "modestly" provide for self and dependents while "becoming the mere agent and trustee of his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they could do for themselves."[3] This trusteeship especially involved provision of "ladders upon which the aspiring can rise," cultivation of virtue rather than provisionof "indiscriminate charity."[4] Thus, the Carnegie "Gospel" included: laissez faire, patronizing trusteeship, and individual virtue cultivation.[5] Both post-Civil War national economic prosperity and the developing Social Darwinism espoused by former New Jersey Episcopal priest William Graham Sumner at Yale strengthened support for this perspective.[6] Many Americans agreed with Carnegie's conclusion: "Such, in my opinion, is the true Gospel concerning Wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the Rich and the Poor, and to bring 'Peace on Earth, among men of Good-Will.'"[7]

Although Methodist leaders quibbled over Carnegie's terminology, many of them operated from the same perspectives of laissez faire, patronizing trusteeship, and individual virtue cultivation. Editors of The Methodist Review, The Christian Advocate (New York), and Zion's Herald consistently urged support for the existing economic system while challenging Methodism to preach and practice the Golden Rule for both workers and capitalists. Editor Bradford K. Peirce of Zion's Herald exemplifies this practice. In a February 10, 1886 editorial, he declared: "However unwise charity may be, the Christian is brave who refuses to help a pauper--brave enough to the point of denying his Master." [8] But, in a May 5, 1886 editorial on "the let alone principle," he objected to interference with "freedom of contract" and argued that "the laborer, like everyone else, must work out his own salvation."[9] He may have recoiled from some implications of the "let-alone" perspective on the economy, but he essentially supported this key element of the Gospel of Wealth perspective.

Editors Daniel Curry and James Mendenhall of the Methodist Review expressed similar support for laissez faire. In reviewing Henry Sidgwick's "Economic Socialism," Curry agreed that socialism was "flowing in with a full tide."[10] But, he stated his agreement with Herbert Spencer that this meant "a new form of slavery," and he cited approvingly Spencer's assertion: "Political economy attempts to show that wealth tends to be produced most amply in a society where government confines itself to the protection of personal property and the enforcement of contracts not obtained by force or fraud." Curry noted that workers must be protected from bad working conditions and provided

with public services such as education, water and light, sanitation, and communication. But, none of this could be permitted to conflict with "motives of self-help" and "regard for self interest" in regulating supply and demand.

In one of his first editorials as newly installed Editor of the Review in 1888, James W. Mendenhall declared: "Many of the gradations in the human sphere are necessary, having been benevolently designed, and rebellion against them would imperil the foundations of life."[11] Condemning "unlicensed freedom of criticism of the social order" and "clamorous, if not barbarous, proposals for an immediate and perilous change in the social structure," he believed their source to be "the science of Darwin" and a "revolt against God," since "The socialist is an atheist." In later issues, Mendenhall would prescribe several solutions--education, philanthropy, evangelism, and cultivation of individual virtue. His major worry as editor was to respond to what he saw as the threat of rationalism and higher criticism of the Bible, but he wrote a number of editorials responding to labor unrest from a Gospel of Wealth perspective. And, to his credit, he printed contributions of many who did not share his perspective--from Rev. C.M. Morse's argument that individual conversions were not enough to Rev. C.H. Zimmerman's call for "an ethical political economy" to Rev. Frank Mason North's call for intelligent city missions and condemnation of laissez faire.[12]

Editorializing in the May-June 1890 issue of the Review, Mendenhall feared the "virus" of the "degraded classes of Europe" coming to America who could only be overcome by the public schools and by "benevolent, patriotic, and philanthropic" action by

the wealthy.[13] Condemning the vast "spoils system" and "enlargement of the power of the state" if socialism were attempted, he recommended in the January-February 1891 issue "to press the claims of the Gospel with renewed vigor on the understandings, the consciences, and the affections of all classes of men."[14] This would cause the working classes to "lay aside the vices which cause at least one half of the misery of which they complain." And, employers would pay better and share profits. The same year, Mendenhall praised the current system for "working through philanthropic and educational forces" and stressing "gospel agency for the improvement of men" by focusing on "the Church, the schoolhouse, and the family institution" as agents of change.[15] As individuals adopted the New Testament as a guide, the result would be to "transform the republic into the kingdom of God." Of course, Mendenhall would write in the May-June issue that this would require "laws...for the promotion of the observance of the Sabbath, in favor of temperance, frugality, honesty, and fraternity."[16] The "let alone" principle did not apply to these items.

After the untimely death of James Mendenhall at age 48, the Rev. William Kelley was elected Editor of the Review and continued Mendenhall's Gospel of Wealth perspective. In his first editorial work, he positively reviewed Charles Roads' Christ Enthroned in the Industrial World because it emphasized applying the law of love, with the chief difficulty being "the unregenerate, selfish human heart."[17] Two months later he expressed his conviction that it was "the individual, not the society, which the Church directly seeks to

reach and improve."[18] Later the same year, he responded to the Rev. F.M. Sprague's Socialism from Genesis to Revelation by declaring that self-interest is not unChristian and that socialism, rather than having a "higher morality" as Sprague asserted, "in fact...rests on a principle of covetousness" and it was time to expose "the wolf in the hearts of the mass of socialists."[19] As 1894 began; he was condemning "fantastic reformers" of whom he said:

> It is a helpless, hopeless, and ignorant movement away from plain morals, away from the truths that character is essential to the success of the poor and degraded and that we must lift them into heroic abstinence from such things as saloons into heroic self-help or fail to lift them at all. (20)

Although Kelley was continuing Mendenhall's practice of publishing other views, including praise of Professor Richard T. Ely's Outlines of Economics ("more advanced and socialistic than might have been expected a few years ago"), he appeared to be intensifying his commitment to making an official voice of Methodism supportive of a version of the Gospel of Wealth.[21]

Although Editor James Buckley of the weekly official Methodist Christian Advocate and Editor Charles Parkhurst of Zion's Herald (voice of New England Methodism) continued to support Gospel of Wealth emphases into the 1890's, they were not as negative toward socialism as Editor Kelley of the Review was. The Advocate published two series of articles by an anonymous "Master Mechanic" advocating Gospel of Wealth emphases.[22] But, it also published fourteen contributions by Professor Richard Ely challenging Gospel of Wealth ideology, as well as an essay on Christianity and Socialism

by the

Popul

Georg

H. R.

Fran

Som

opm

the

the

fo

M

l

by the Christian Socialist Rev. W.D.P. Bliss.[23] The Herald published eight essays of Popular Fallacies Concerning Labor and Wealth" by the Gospel of Wealth advocate Rev. George W. Steele.[24] But it also published a rebuttal by Methodist workingman Edward H. Rogers as well as four essays on Christianity and Socialism by Methodist Pastor Frank Mason North and two more on the same topic by the Rev. W.D.P. Bliss.[25] Some elements of Gospel of Wealth ideology were intensified, especially stress on development of virtue in workers and employers, but opposition to government interference in the economy moderated, partly due to the threat of the labor uprisings and partly due to the pastoral experiences and advice of contributors to the publications.

In the mid 1880s, Editor James Buckley of the Advocate focused on the need for worker virtue. He exhorted to diligence in hard times and reproduced a sermon by Methodist Evangelist Sam Jones calling for prohibition as a solution to the problems of labor.[26] He published a series of six essays by an anonymous "Master Mechanic," who, while arguing that God was using self-interest and selfishness to lead to Christian brotherhood, also prescribed that workingmen needed to overcome their "character flaw."[27] The extreme point in this line of analysis came, though, with the January 21, 1886 edition of the Advocate, when he used the entire front page of this official voice of Methodism to reproduce Benjamin Franklin's "The Way of Wealth."[28] In an editorial on the fifth page of the same edition, he went so far as to say that this document "did more to lay the foundation for the prosperity of the common people than any other document...in human

history." Jesus' Sermon on the Mount was not spoken of.

To be fair to Buckley, though, it must be noted that he exhorted Methodist pastors to mingle more with the working class.[29] He practiced this himself, reading works of socialists and anarchists as well as speaking with members of Trades Unions.[30] He also attempted a series of balanced criticisms of both working class persons and capitalists, which actually ended in a condemnation of "union despotism" and support of what a capitalist would love to hear, "the right to work."[31] But, his presentation of a second series by his anonymous "Master Mechanic" revealed a greater awareness of workers' perception of the hypocrisy of many capitalists.[32] Although the basic appeal was the old appeal to the cultivation of virtue that would practice the Golden Rule, whether by capitalist or worker, the presentation of "A Capitalist-Hater's Soliloquy" revealed a new sensitivity.[33] The speaker in the soliloquy had gone to work in a nut and bolt factory at age 14, had been told not to talk with other workers, and viewed his boss as desiring "to grind as much work out of us as possible, and all that we cared for him was his money." The worker continued:

> I hate that old sniveling, praying hypocrite to this day. If we hadn't had a Sunday one day in seven to get out of doors, and smell the fresh air, and have a ball game in summer, or skate on the ice in winter, we would have died of old age before we were twenty; but that old hypocrite told us we would go to hell if we didn't stop breaking the Sabbath. If he was so anxious that we should keep the Sabbath, why didn't he offer us a half holiday once a week, if we would go to church on Sunday. It is my opinion that very few poor people would ever get to heaven if it depended on on rich men's money. I have long since made up my mind that I am as good as any of these church-going folks and they will have to sing a very different song before they will catch me.

Later contributions in the series turned back to typical Gospel of Wealth themes, defending the right of capitalists to accumulate wealth, attacking the "tyranny" of the Knights of Labor, urging mutual yielding of rights by labor and capital, and charging labor as being as wrong as capital.[34]

For the next several years, Buckley would make occasional remarks on labor unrest and publish contributions of others, but his chief concerns became "the woman question" (opposing the seating of female delegates at General Conference), prohibition, and Methodist rules against playing cards, dancing, and theater attendance. In 1893 he published four contributions by Professor David Kinley of the University of Illinois, which advised gradualism and avoidance of anything that would prevent "self-reliance" and "rugged character which comes from experimentation and struggle with adverse circumstances."[35] Socialism would be a terrible mistake, since it ignored the basic selfishness of human nature, and "The ultimate reform must be in human nature."[36] Although his opening essay argued that material change must precede moral change, he concluded, "We should seek to develop the moral and religious character, and industrial and other ills will then largely settle themselves on the basis of greater existing justice and brotherly love."

Perhaps this series by Professor Kinley was Buckley's way of keeping a promise after presenting a series of fourteen essays by Professor Richard Ely that others of "equal or greater eminence" could present a decidedly different view.[37] Professor Ely's 1890 to

1892 series, which challenged the economic underpinnings of the Gospel of Wealth, had been initiated by a request by Buckley to respond to a contribution to the Advocate by Henry George, author of Progress and Poverty and advocate of the single tax on the unearned increase in land values.[38] Because of his respect for the work of George, even though he did not fully agree, Buckley found himself accused by Judge William Lawrence of Ohio of supporting socialism "under the pale of the teachings of a professed religious newspaper" and thus encouraging "alien sentiments" which were "rife in the land, destructive of property, good government, and social order."[39] Buckley explained again that he respected George but did not agree with his panacea, and he added:

> Furthermore, because there are communistic ideas abroad, is no reason why men should refuse to consider the inequalities and evils that exist, and endeavor to correct them. It is an amusing variety in our experience to be practically charged with radical or socialistic notions by our esteemed friend, whom we hope will take the time to read with care the editorial referred to.

Buckley was moderating his Gospel of Wealth perspective, and he even published without negative criticism an essary advocating compulsory arbitration just before the 1894 Pullman Strike began.[40]

Zion's Herald Editors Bradford Peirce and Charles Parkhurst also continued to support elements of the Gospel of Wealth while moderating on others during this period. After the 1877 National Labor Uprising, Peirce had recommended evangelizing rather

than shooting strikers, to rely on "the power of God unto salvation" for "these abandoned masses of men."[41] Charles Parkhurst recommended the same virtue-cultivating strategy in the aftermath of 1892 strikes, especially the one at Homestead, Pennsylvania. After several reports blaming incidents on the workers, Parkhurst asked why Christian missionaries had not gone among the strikers "preaching forbearance and gentleness under wrongs" and among employers confronting them with the reminder that they were "dealing with brother-men."[42] Although the stress on virtue-creation as a solution continued, the laissez faire emphasis stressed by the Rev. George M. Steele in an 1887 series in the Herald, by the Rev. Reuen Thomas in an 1889 series, and by Boston University Lecturer George Fall in an 1890 series was being rejected by Parkhurst in the aftermath of the American Railway Boycott in connection with the 1894 Pullman Strike.[43] After the typical anti-mob response to strikes, Parkhurst urged workingmen to seek legislation and concluded: "Compulsory arbitration is the panacea." He was moving away from laissez faire.

Editor Peirce saw the solution to the labor problem in changed human wills. In an 1886 editorial, he referred to the "let alone principle" as a basis for objecting to the kind of compulsory arbitration Parkhurst would support in 1894.[44] But, the year before he had recognized the "cruel injustice by men who stand well with the church and the world" and pay the lowest wages the market will bear, arguing workers are free to go elsewhere if they desire higher wages. Peirce declared:

> The man with reduced wages, in many cases, cannot go elsewhere. He must provide for wife and children, and has neither time, money, nor knowledge to take himself elsewhere.(45)

He then quoted a professor he had been speaking with on this topic:

> It is a state of slavery as real as was the slavery of the black people. Then the means of subjection was the lash. Now it is starvation.

The following month, Peirce felt he had spotted an example of a virtuous capitalist who demonstrated the road to the solution of the problem of labor unrest.[46] This capitalist could evict tenants at ten days' notice, and could thus rid the community of saloons and "objectionable houses." His model factory situation was, said Peirce, exactly what he had been speaking of in his August editorial. Peirce explained:

> It is an industrious, sober population like this which is the best safeguard against communistic uprisings, and the most efficient protection against riots. ... All this comes from 'the broad Christian inspiration' of the founder, and it shows the practical consequences of the spirit of Christianity when its flame burns brightly in the hearts of capable business men of the world.

Slightly over nine years later, Editor Charles Parkhurst would have a different perspective on this model industrial leader when he reported the findings of the United States Strike Commission: "The Commission finds that the ideal features of the town of Pullman were adopted from business rather than philanthropic motives."[47] Although the Gospel of Wealth emphases on individual virtue cultivation and patronizing trusteeship continued, reliance on laissez faire was being severely questioned.

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

While there is no single document defining the Social Gospel comparable to Carnegie's "Wealth" for defining the Gospel of Wealth, certain key elements may be identified. First is the movement beyond concern for individual regeneration to concern for social regeneration. William Arthur's The Tongue of Fire, required reading for Methodist pastors in the 1890's,called beyond individual regeneration to social regeneration.[48] Timothy Smith, in explaining "The Evangelical Origins of Social Christianity," cites the quest for perfection, compassion for sinners, and a rebirth of millenial expectation as ingredients which made "popular Protestantism a mighty social force" before the Civil War began.[49] A resolution of the newly formed Christian Labor Union in Boston in 1875 stressed a second element, the challenge "to establish in the earth that divine order and conduct in human society which Jesus Christ called the kingdom of God."[50] For revivalists, this was combined with an optimism concerning what divine grace could do to perfect American society working through human agency, an optimism Henry May observes came to others through a rationalistic and humanistic religious perspective on human abilities.[51] In comparison with the Gospel of Wealth, laissez faire was replaced by a drive to establish the kingdom of God, a drive combined with an optimism as to what divine grace could accomplish. Cultivation of individual virtue, often defined in economic terms,

was replaced by cultivation of a social activist virtue seeking social regeneration. And the patronizing trusteeship of wealth was replaced by a trusteeship of spiritual and intellectual leadership that could also become patronizing.

Congregationalist Pastor Washington Gladden, Episcopal Professor Richard T. Ely, and Baptist Pastor and later Professor Walter Rauschenbusch are usually cited as key figures in the development of the Social Gospel. Gladden illustrates the long-term development of the position as well as development of a theology in the context of pastoral practice.[52] Ely academically challenged the reigning economic orthodoxy.[53] Rauschenbusch wrote the Social Gospel manifesto, Christianity and the Social Crisis (1907) and the standard Social Gospel theology, A Theology For the Social Gospel (1917).[54] Several other influential early leaders are also often mentioned--Charles Sheldon, William Dwight Porter Bliss, George Herron, and others--but Methodists are rarely spoken of.[55]

The role of Frances Willard, Frank Mason North, William Carwardine, and the Methodist press is generally overlooked in accounts of the development of the Social Gospel. Sidney Ahlstrom acknowledges Willard's conflict with previous Women's Christian Temperance Union President Annie Wittenmeyer who wanted to focus on prohibition while Willard preferred her "Do Everything" program and by 1896 began demanding "Gospel Socialism" rather than merely "Gospel Politics."[56] Yet he confines his discussion of Willard to a section on prohibition as a Protestant crusade, separated by 70

pages from his extensive discussion of all possible contributors to Social Gospel development. Henry May notes that Willard in 1874 supported Labor's demands for a living wage and later supported their 8-hour day demands, and that she recognized in an 1894 statement that poverty needed to be wiped out before drink did.[57] Yet, he, too, separates this by many pages from his discussion of Social Gospel origins. Frank Mason North is ignored by May in his account of the formation of the Federal Council of Churches in 1908 and is confined by Ahlstrom to a footnote citing a former delegate remembering 60 years later how tears came to his eyes after a report to the organizing Federal Council session on the Social Creed and singing North's hymn "Where Cross the Crowded Ways of Life."[58] Even Methodist historian Frederick Norwood states that "During the labor troubles and recurrent panics, the Advocates frequently urged relief for the unemployed, but had little to say about the causes of labor unrest or the policies of employers."[59] While it is true that Methodist leadership, as represented by Editors of major Methodist publications, advocated a variety of the Gospel of Wealth approach to issues of labor unrest, a reading of the Methodist Review, the Christian Advocate (New York), and Zion's Herald for 1885 to 1894 not only reveals a concern for the causes of labor unrest, but also presents a developing Social Gospel perspective that worked together with what Gladden, Rauschenbusch, and others were doing to lead to the formation of the Federal Council of Churches in 1908. Perhaps the overlooking of Methodist contributions to the origins of the Social Gospel results from the same thing that happens

when histories of revivalism dwell on Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists and their special efforts which seem more dramatic than the way revivalism was built into the Methodist heritage.

Four persons provide a basic outline of Social Gospel developments between 1885 and 1894 in key Methodist publications. Layman Edward H. Rogers sought to apply the Bible to society from a workingman's perspective. Professor Richard T. Ely, whose books were required reading for Methodist pastors, called Methodists to a new economics and a more positive view of the role of the State. The Rev. C.M. Morse focused criticism of conversion, as popularly understood, not only as not improving society, but also for potentially making society worse. And, the Rev. Frank Mason North identified commonalities of Christianity and socialism as he called for social regeneration.

"Dr." Edward H. Rogers: A Workingman's Perspective on the Bible

The Rev. R. Wheatley reported for Zion's Herald that "Drs. Dorchester, Baldwin, and Rogers" spoke concerning labor issues at the General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance in Washington, D.C. in December 1887.[60] Then he noted that only Rev. Baldwin and Rev. Dorchester had been awarded Doctorates, but he quickly added that "many less worthy" than Rogers wore the title. Rogers, a member of Methodist Dr. Daniel Dorchester's Chelsea, Massachusetts congregation, was described by Wheatley as "a practical workingman" who "revealed a breadth of thought and force of reason that

commanded universal respect." Wheatley said "many" could not endorse "his Scriptural hermeneutics," but that Rogers was "singularly eloquent and able, theocratic, and withal somewhat mystical," and "certainly right in looking for the solution of all difficulties in the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly in the Sermon on the Mount."

Something of a Victorian Eric Hoffer, Rogers had been one of the founders of the Christian Labor Union in Boston in 1872.[60] In addition to the report of his address to the Evangelical Alliance in December 1887, Rogers had three contributions published in Zion's Herald In the speech in December 1887, he had challenged the "law of supply and demand" as placing single men at an advantage over married men, thus undermining the family. In 1885, he had contributed an analysis of "Communism and Socialism" as well as an application of "The Social Ideal of Prophecy."[62] In 1886, he presented a Biblical perspective on labor arbitration.[63] After the Haymarket Bombing, when Editor Bradford Peirce of Zion's Herald was challenged for lacking sympathy for labor because he supported forceful suppression of strikers, Peirce pointed to contributions by Rogers as evidence of his even-handedness.[64] Rogers was viewed as one who spoke from the perspective of wage laborers.

Rogers' essay on "Arbitration" explained the efforts of labor negotiating with capital in terms of Matthew 18.15-18 in the Christian New Testament.[65] Admittedly, this was using the Bible to provide justification to what was already in practice. But it demonstrated use of the Bible for something beyond personal regeneration and church discipline.

The procedure of the passage was: 1) go to the offending "brother" (employer); go with another (organized labor) if the first effort were refused; 3) resort to "action of an extraordinary character" (such as a strike) if the first two failed, "for the Christian churches cannot deny the just claims of the poor."

Writing of "Communism and Socialism," Rogers noted socialist practices of the American government of the time--road construction, public schools, and weapons of war.[66] Although he acknowledged that his rejection of "individualistic theories" was no justification for a too powerful state, he saw the "grand hope before the American people" to be "the vision of a communal Church (the New Jerusalem) encircled by a socialistic State." This, he declared, would be the fulfillment of "the institutes of Moses, the predictions of the Hebrew prophets, ...the New Testament promises of the final and now proximate revelation which the Lord Jesus Christ will make of himself."

Continuing to pursue this prophetic perspective, he agreed with the Rev. Heber Newton's relating of Christian socialism to the Puritan "commonwealth of free and brotherly citizens," although Rogers regretted Newton's "doctrinal deficiencies" related to "naturalistic theories."[67] He saw the hope of the poor lying in adoption by the Church of both the principles of the Ten Commandments and "the true prophetic ideal of Scripture." He saw the Church's mission to be:

> To develop the whole prophetic question in such a comprehensive manner as to include a momentous crisis--now imminent--involving the second coming of Christ

> in a spiritual mystery; the sudden overthrow of Babylon-commercialism--and the expansion of the field of labor of the American churches by care for the bodies as well as the souls of men.

Clearly, Rogers challenged Methodism to look at the Bible from the perspective of the working class.

Professor Richard T. Ely: New Economics and New Confidence in the State

Richard Ely is generally recognized as one of the key figures in the development of the Social Gospel. Although his personal religious affiliation was with the Episcopal Church, he was especially influential in Methodism by way of his writings. On the one hand, Methodist Pastors were required to read his Social Aspects of Christianity in the Trial Year to become "Travelling Preachers" (persons assigned by the Bishop to pastoral circuits) and Ely's Introduction to Political Economy in their Third Year of preparation for full ordination.[68] On the other hand, Editor James Buckley of the Christian Advocate (New York), official weekly voice of Methodism, published fourteen contributions on economics between December 25, 1890 and March 31, 1892. They were both a challenge to the economics of laissez faire and a magnification of the desirable role of the State.

Ely was originally invited to contribute to the Advocate a response to Henry George's Single Tax ideas. He declared George to be too simplistic, not realizing that "all production is social...and society as a participant in production is entitled to share the

product," not merely a tax on unearned increases in land value, as George recommended, but a tax on all production.[69] When Buckley asked Ely to contribute a series on labor and economics, Ely began it with an analysis of "Social Classes," challenging the accepted notion that all could "rise in life" if they only worked at it.[70] The principle of laissez faire did not provide equal opportunity for all to advance. Ely's critique called for what the Rev. C.H. Zimmerman wrote of in the Methodist Review was "an ethical political economy."[71] Zimmerman blamed reigning economic theory for sending forth "an army of graduates...from college every year to prey upon their fellow men."[72] He saw hope in the economic perspective of teachers such as Ely helping to "substitute altruistic for egoistic aims, to displace the purely selfish 'economic man' by one governed by the Golden Rule."[73]

In his next four contributions, Ely magnified the role of the State in achieving divine purposes. As a preface to an essay condemning the placing of property rights ahead of the rights of persons, he declared: "The State is religious in its essence, and its mission is religious."[74] He declared that too much credit was being given to philanthropists, who could not do what only the "strong arm of the law" could.[75] In response to the challenge that legislation could not make persons good, he quoted the English Methodist leader, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes: "I never heard anybody say that except when he was trying in some way to hinder the kingdom of God."[76] When he analyzed the role of the State, he condemned a skeptical view of the State in declaring,"The truly contemptible

doctrine that the State is a necessary evil was as far from Aristotle as it has been from all great political thinkers."[77] As he continued his advocacy of an Aristotelian perspective on the State, he declared: "God works through the State in carrying out his purposes more than through any other institution." He believed that the Protestant Reformers had exalted the role of theState, liberating it from Church control, and concluded:

> The true unity of Christians...is found in the State. Men of all Denominations act together in the administrative, legislative, and judicial branches of government for the establishment of righteousness.(78)

this fit the American sense of Civil Religion, and was not contradicted by Editor Buckley or any other contributors to Zion's Herald.

In further contributions, Ely challenged the economic basis of inequality before the law, criticized the Church for focusing on the future life at the expense of the present, blamed the economics of self-interest on a materialistic age, defended labor unions against unfair criticism, and objected to charity organizations becoming "detective agencies" in deciding how to aid the poor.[79] Then, in responding to the question of whether social reform were going too fast, he declared:

> Impatience is disastrous; wise and careful consideration of all proposed measures is important; but we cannot go too fast in social reform provided we are moving in the right direction for the accomplishment of desirable ends, and all apprehension of going too far is groundless until when we look about us we can see the existence of that kingdom of righteousness for which all Christians have been taught by their Lord and Master to offer daily prayer.(80)

Episcopal social and economic theorist Richard T. Ely influenced Methodism to a greater application of Christian principles to society, both a rejection of laissez faire economics and political theory and a greater emphasis on the power of the State. Although this was expressed in Christian terms, it did not speak of a vital role for personal spiritual liberation. It was an important element in the developing Social Gospel reconstruction of the marriage of Wesleyan spiritual liberation concerns to American civil liberty concerns.

The Rev. C.M. Morse: The Problem of Conversion

The Rev. C.M. Morse initiated a dialogue in the Methodist Review concerning the role of conversion in social reform. Not only did he question the positive value of conversion for accomplishing social reform, but he went so far as to say that conversion, as it was then being experienced in America, often only led to a blessing of American culture rather than a prophetic challenge to it.

Six years before Morse challenged the popular notion that social problems would work themselves out if only workingmen and capitalists experienced conversion, Editor Bradford Peirce had raised the issue in Zion's Herald:

> It is not enough for us to convert men to God. We must also convert men to men. ...Men may be eminently pious, and yet be vastly injurious in their action and influence on the social and industrial life. ... Save the future world by all means, but save, also, this world to the utmost. (81)

The Rev. D.H. Ela, in two essays on "Christianity's Next Social Problem," had observed in the Review that Christian over-stress on individual religion had gone together with over-stress on individual property rights and a wrongful tendency to make accumulation a virtue, a proof of piety.[82] Zion's Herald had published the challenge of The Rev. Josiah Strong, General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, to "get beyond getting persons in right relation to God to the second commandment," the command to "love your neighbor as yourself."[83]

Editor James Mendenhall of the Review prefaced Pastor Morse's essay with a disclaimer asserting that Morse's criticism of the Church for "inattention to social and industrial questions" was "not wholly justified," since "such questions are new."[84] Morse expressed his loyalty to the church, but noted that "regeneration, or faith in Jesus alone," as experienced in 1891, did not fit a person to "act intelligently and righteously upon questions of grave public importance" since "our present religious system nowhere enters a protest against present economic conditions, nor insists upon a return to the precepts of the Bible along these lines."[85] On three key examples, slavery, war, and possession of riches, "modern regeneration" seemed to make no difference, so, Morse concluded:

> I state it as a fact that if every individual in the United States should be 'regenerated' in an hour this wholesale conversion of the community--under present methods--would not result in a single reform in the industrial or social world. ... The only change that would follow would be that the present unjust methods in the distribution of wealth would be given the sanction of baptism and the authority of the Church.(86)

Morse offered both a solution for the problem and an explanation for the cause.

The solution was:

> ...The 'man of God' must place himself in touch with the poorest class, study all social questions from that point of view, investigate without prejudice or fear the teachings of Jesus and the apostles.(87)

The explanation of the current predicament was:

> ...The great adversary constantly brings up other and less important questions to occupy the minds of religious thinkers. If the same earnest discussion and investigation were applied to the Bible doctrines concerning land-tenure or usury that are given by the Presbyterian Church to the opinions of an errant professor, or the Baptist Churches to the question of immersion, or the United Presbyterian Church to the matter of psalmody and the use of instruments in divine worship, or the 'woman question' in our own denomination, Christianity would soon forge to the front as a social factor.(88)

Morse added that if Christians did not take up this mission soon, some other organization would and would receive credit for the achievement.

The Rev. R.F. Bishop of Marietta, Ohio, and The Rev. J.E. Learned responded to Morse the following year. Bishop challenged Morse for using a Unitarian cyclopedia as a source for a definition of "regeneration" and accused Morse of condemning the church's "spiritual methods," those of Paul, Wesley, and Moody, as inferior to those of social critics Spencer, Bellamy, and Tolstoi.[89] Learned charged Morse with confusion as to the purpose of the church, and declared:

> The great question in this, as in old times, is of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, and not of bimetallism, tariff, single-tax, and trusts. These are matters of state, of police merely, of material and temporal character, which the Church has no more to do than with the fire department or the public works.(90)

Editor Mendenhall was careful to footnote Learned's essay with an affirmation of his agreement with Learned.

Morse responded the same year, declaring concerning those who "sneered" at talk of the church's early communism: "It was only when the world-spirit took possession of the Church, and when covetousness led men to sneer at the communism of the early brotherhood, that the gloom of the Dark Ages settled upon humanity."[91] He declared that the United States consisted of two classes, "the robbers and the despoiled," because land and money were held by the few and methods of unjust gain were regarded as "legal."[92] A church supporting these unjust practices would only "convert" persons to acceptance of these unjust principles.[93] The solution lay in following Mosaic principles of Sabbatical release of debts and Jubilee return of alienated lands, as well as paying attention to Jesus' teachings against "laying up treasures," and following the example of the disciples at Pentecost, who, when the Holy Spirit descended upon them, "sold their landed possessions and put their money into a fund for the benefit of all who were in need."[94] Referring to divine laws of justice and their relation to 1890's practices, he declared:

> ...The Church is becoming more of a fashionable organization than a living power for righteousness. Every reform movement...is opposed by the Church.(95)

Thus, everyone could be "regenerated" in the United States, without a single reform resulting. Morse was exhorting to a Social Gospel that would change American society

to be more in conformity with Biblical teachings, a regeneration that took a person beyond virtue empowering for economic success to a virtue empowering for personal and social reform.

The Rev. Frank Mason North: A Pastoral Perspective on Socialism

Frank Mason North, New York City Methodist Pastor, frequently contributed to the Methodist Review, The Christian Advocate (New York) and Zion's Herald in the 1880's and1890's. In The Advocate he condemned the "pew system," and called for a renewed Methodist revivalism.[96] In The Review he called for a new kind of Urban Mission.[97] And, in Zion's Herald he called for a new kind of City Evangelization in 1893 after he had challenged Methodists in 1891 to consider the relationship between Christianity and Socialism.[98] With respect to the marriage of Wesleyan spiritual liberation concerns to American civil liberty concerns, North gave practical application to William Arthur's call to seek social regeneration, even as he challenged his fellow Methodists to greater effort for solidarity with working class persons. His call for "men and women of culture and godliness" to enter a new kind of mission to the cities could easily become the "patronizing trusteeship" of intellect the Social Gospel and its related political movement of progressivism often substituted for the "patronizing trusteeship" of wealth characterizing the Gospel of Wealth. But, for North, listening, in pastoral solidarity with the working class was essential to that effort.

In 1885, North wrote in The Advocate condemning a "pew system" of financing new church construction, since it made the poor feel unwelcome.[99] The poor had reason to feel suspicious, said North, because the resulting "spirit of caste" conveyed "the impression...that many of the churches are...private religious clubs." The following year, in writing of the success of a Church of England Missioner Aitken in the United States, North considered it to be confirmation of Methodist stress on revivalism, popular music, prayer meetings, and personal assurance of salvation.[100] Challenging those who feared such methods might cause undue "nervous shock" to persons attending Methodist services, North declared:

> ...Religion is more than conservative, it is absolutely radical.
> It not only educates, it revolutionizes.

Six years later, North issued a challenge in The Methodist Review for caring missionaries to the cities who would not function chiefly in tract distribution, small prayer meetings, street corner meetings, or annual reports "in the wealthy districts to tell the benevolent 'better class' what they are doing 'to reach the masses.'"[101] Rather, they were to battle "rum traffic," "poverty everywhere" in overcrowding, sanitation abuses, and injustices to workers reducing them to machines and buying and selling them as commodities.[102] It was impossible for him to walk through the community he served "without coming to conclusions touching laissez faire and the new political economy." Such a journey readjusted his views of "the sacred rights of property," and led him to

conclude: "God cares as much for the personal rights of each man in the million who have not a bank account as he does for those of each man of the hundred who have."[103] He added concerning a person such as himself:

> The possibilities of the applied Gospel in curing social iniquities seem to him less distant and the socialism of Christ more reasonable than the many who are following the Master and studying his teachings where the crowds cannot jostle thought or disturb complacence.(104)

Moved by his experience of urban need, North continued his challenge to his fellow Methodists:

> The first need of this decade is that men and women of culture and godliness, disciplined equally in mind and heart, who can be indifferent to nothing that concerns human welfare, shall with profound devotion to Christ consecrate themselves to the life of contact with the multitudes in our cities over whom the master weeps.(105)

Later in 1893, North wrote in the columns of Zion's Herald his sense of the Church's responsibility to the people of the cities;

> It must concern itself with what concerns them, place itself in the very centres of community life, and by a warmer fellowship, a deeper human sympathy, a wiser tolerance of inherited prejudices, a manner less self-protective and a spirit which is not afraid to be called humane, come into touch with the people, the touch which can convey the magnetic thrill of the divine longing for the well-being of men. (106)

North's most lengthy contribution to the discussion of how to respond to labor issues came in a series of four essays published in Zion's Herald in 1891 relating

Socialism and Christian faith. The Rev. G.E. Hiller had declared in 1888 that all human possessions partook of unrighteousness and that Christ would have looked upon "the present method of adjusting property in the same way as he looked upon divorce; it is permitted on account 'of the hardness of our hearts, but in the beginning it was not so."[107] William Bull had suggested in 1889 Fourth of July reflections that "much that we have hitherto called property...may...become a form of robbery deserving condemnation."[108] Editor Charles Parkhurst of Zion's Herald had been the first in the Herald, The Methodist Review, or the Christian Advocate (New York) to use the term "social gospel" as he described the London Dock Workers' Strike of 1889 and declared the first need of the time was justice rather than charity or mercy.[109] The Congregationalist Rev. W.D.P. Bliss, Editor of the Socialist publication Dawn, had written for The Christian Advocate (New York) and Zion's Herald that "If Methodism be defined as 'Christianity in earnest,' Christian Socialism may be defined as METHODISM APPLIED TO THE SOCIAL ORDER."[110] Citing as "contemporary socialists" Richard Ely, Frances Willard, and others, he had concluded, "It is not a matter of following any of these, but of following Jesus Christ."[111]

In keeping with the developing socialist movement in America and the continuing contributions to the Methodist press of challenges to consider socialism as a way to live out the Christian Gospel, North presented his four essays in 1891. First, he dealt very deliberately with five reasons the church had been hesitant to involve itself in matters of

social reform.[112] Some misconceived the Gospel as redeeming persons from this world rather than in it and had substituted charity for justice. The Church had become an "endowed institution," willing, in the words of Karl Marx, to accept attacks upon its Creed ("thirty-eight of the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England") before accepting attacks on the established economic order. Many socialists were anti-Christian and many Christian attempts at socialism were contemptible for their foolishness. And, Americans were very reluctant to accept State interference in issues of private rights.

In his next essay,North turned from reasons for reluctance of the Church to deal with social reform to the declaration that the late nineteenth century had not discovered social reform. "It was a Christian conviction," North reminded his readers, "which commanded the liberation of the slave, the relief of the prisoner, and justice to the poor."[113] However, North observed that British Christian Socialist F.D. Maurice's theology of man's essential sonship to God, of which even sin could not rob him, and its companion truth that brotherhood is not an accident of society," had influenced the social thought of Washington Gladden, Phillips Brooks, Lyman Abbott, and others. Returning to matters of heritage, though, North observed concerning Methodism:

> It inherited from its founder a mission to the poor and oppressed. Methodism was a social as well as a spiritual reformation.

Referring to the "General Rules" Wesley had prescribed as required of Methodists to practice as evidence of their sincerity, North spoke of them as "packed with the seed principles of a new social order." He concluded:

> In a word, Methodism has long been conscious of its mission to regenerate souls. Let us now realize, also, that God calls it to regenerate society.

At the hardest time of the Panic of 1893, while others were looking back to the Panic of 1857 and the Christian revival that followed, in hopes of a similar occurrence in 1893, North raised the challenge: "Is it impossible that the answer may come in such a social regeneration as the world has never known?"[114]

In the remaining two articles, North pointed up "The Christianity of Socialism" and "The Socialism of Christianity."[115] Besides the fact that the Bible attacked "the despotism of money," North observed another similarity. The charge that socialism is charged with not living up to its ideals is comparable to Christianity being charged with not living up to its ideals. He acknowledged that Christianity seeks better conditions by seeking better character and that socialism seeks better character by seeking better conditions, thus recognizing a difference. And, he charged that many reformers "need introduction to a problem more imperative than reconstruction of society, and that is the transformation of man." Having said that, though, he declared that "the Gospel has acted not only on the hearts of men, but also upon the social order which expresses and controls their relationships." He listed challenges to more urgently apply Christ's teachings, to illustrate those teachings in the life of the Church, and to better human conditions. As part of these challenges, he declared:

> The Gospel stands for brotherhood, simplicity, humility, helpfulness, self-sacrifice. The church belies it when it encourages caste, extravagance, pride, exclusiveness, selfishness. ...'Present idols--the

> golden beasts of a false worship--must be replaced by a simpler, purer, more spiritual culture. The pride that despises labor must go. The selfishness which seeks men simply to use them must die.

North was optimistic as to what the Church could do in the presence of these challenges if it would only realize its opportunity. North's concern was for personal spiritual liberation and for social liberation. He sought a restructuring of the marriage of Methodist personal spiritual liberation concerns to American civil religious concerns. His stress on personal spiritual liberation was continuous with early Wesleyanism. His concern to Christianize the social and economic order helped lay the groundwork for stress on political rationality that in the progressive movement and much of the Social Gospel would become more important than concern for communicative action pursuing a more democratic ordering of society. Together with Edward Rogers, Professor Richard Ely, the Rev. C.M. Morse, and others, the Rev. Frank Mason North responded to late nineteenth century labor unrest with a call for applying the Gospel to the Economic Order.

These and others lay the groundwork for the Methodist Social Gospel Movement which produced the Social Creed. Richard Cameron, in Methodism and Society in Historical Perspective, describes the role of five persons in leading the Methodist Federation for Social Service which contributed the Social Creed to the Federal Council of Churches in 1908.[116] New York Pastor Herbert Welch, Western Christian Advocate (Cincinnati) Assistant Editor Elbert Zaring, and Cleveland Pastor Worth Tippy, joined Frank Mason North, and Chicago Pastor Harry Ward, principal author of the Creed,

in leading the Methodist Social Gospel movement. Tippy said that Walter Rauschenbusch was the prophet of the movement and North was the leader.[117] In December 1907 they formed the voluntary Methodist Federation for Social Service, which received official sanction by the Methodist General Conference of 1908, which adopted a report containing the Methodist Social Creed.[118] Several months after the Methodist General Conference, the organizing session of the Federal Council of Churches adopted a Social Creed modeled after the Methodist one. The Federal Council, the prime institutional expression of the Social Gospel, was uniting in declaring the faith the Methodists had affirmed in these words:

> The Methodist Episcopal Church stands--
> For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.
> For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in Industrial dissensions.
> For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational diseases, injuries, and mortality.
> For the abolition of child labor.
> For such regulations of the conditions of labor for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.
>
> For the suppression of the "sweating system."
> For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practical point, with work for all: and for that degree of leisure for all which is the condition of the highest human life.
> For a release from employment one day in seven.
> For a living wage in every industry.
> For the highest wage that each industry can afford, and for the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be devised.
> For the recognition of the Golden Rule and the mind of Christ as the supreme law of society and the sure remedy for all social ills.(119)

NOTES

[1]Winthrop Hudson observes that by the turn of the century two antithetical gospels, "the gospel of wealth" and "the social gospel," struggled for predominance in American Protestant religion. Winthrop S. Hudson and John Corrigan, Religion in America: An Historical Account of the Development of American Religious Life (New York: Macmillan, 1992 revision of book first authored by Hudson and copyrighted in 1965), p.292.

[2]Andrew Carnegie, "Wealth," North American Review, June 1889, pp. 653-664. This article is also reproduced in The Gilded Age: America, 1865-1900: Interpretive Articles and Documentary Sources, Edited by Richard A. Bartlett (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 44-53.

[3]Ibid., pp. 661-662.

[4]Ibid., pp. 663-664.

[5]ZH Editor Charles Parkhurst, in a June 19, 1889 editorial, responded: "Andrew Carnegie, in a somewhat too patronizing style, furnishes an article on 'Wealth.'" (p.3) John A. Garraty, in The New Commonwealth: 1877-1890 (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), p. 27, suggests that, while the Carnegie doctrine "seems insufferably patronizing to modern readers," it was "not a selfish doctrine." If Parkhurst's view was shared, Carnegie was "insufferably patronizing" to 1890's readers as well as "modern" ones.

[6]Sydney Ahlstrom makes these points in A Religious History of the American People (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), p.790. Hudson, op. cit., p. 293, observes the same connection. Paul A. Carter, in The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971), pp. viii, 136, 137, relates support for Social Darwinism to the strange way in which the age became "more religious and more secular at the same time," with "the gospel of Christ...felt to be in full harmony with the Gospel of Wealth," while "science-minded members of the comfortable classes" could discount Biblical challenges to wealth.

[7]Ibid. Carnegie followed up his June essay on "Wealth" with a December contribution to The North American Review titled "The Best Fields For Philanthropy." (pp. 682-698) Attempting to justify this departure from previous explanations of Biblical teachings, he declared: "The 'Gospel of Wealth' but echoes the words of Christ. It calls upon the millionaire to sell all he hath and give it in the highest and best form to the poor, by administering his estate for the good of his fellows, before he is called upon to lie down upon the bosom of Mother earth." If this were done, Carnegie felt assured that "against such riches as these no bar will be found at the Gates of Paradise." (p.698)

[8]ZH, February 10, 1886, p.4. Peirce noted that emancipation of the slaves had countered Herbert Spencer's "let-them-alone" principle. He added: "The weak have not pulled us down; they have lifted us up."

[9]ZH, May 5, 1886, p. 4. Peirce saw hope for the laborer in cultivating personal virtue, which would lead to greater popular support.

[10]MR, March-April, 1887, pp. 318-320.

[11]MR, November-December, 1888, "The Chronic Disease," pp. 921-923.

[12]MR, November-December, 1891, "Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements," by Rev. C.M. Morse of New Wilmington, Pa., pp. 923-932. This initiated a dialogue among several contributors to MR. MR, September-October 1892, "Wanted, An Ethical Political Economy," by Rev. C.H. Zimmerman of Evanston, Ill., pp. 737-744. MR, March-April 1893, "City Missions and Social Problems," by Rev. Frank Mason North of New York City, pp. 228-239.

[13]MR, May-June 1890, "The Common People," pp. 427-435.

[14]MR, January-February 1891, "The Demand of Socialism for the Reconstruction of Society," pp. 120-126. This followed Mendenhall's more primary editorial concern: "Is The New Testament Safe?"

[15]MR, March-April 1891, "Edward Bellamy's New Civilization," pp. 280-286.

[16]MR, May-June 1891, "Sociological Christianity a Necessity," pp. 449-456.

[17]MR, May-June 1893, pp. 503-504.

[18]MR, July-August 1893, "What Are the Functions of the Church?" pp. 628-633.

[19]MR, September-October 1893, pp. 838-839.

[20]MR, January-February 1894, "Fantastic Reformers," pp. 107-109.

[21]MR, March-April 1894, p. 333. Kelley noted Ely's praise of socialists for "calling attention to social problems," but he appreciated Ely's support for private property and his opposition to radical change.

[22]NYCA, December 31, 1885 to February 4, 1886 and May 27 to June 17, 1886.

[23]NYCA, December 25, 1890 to March 31, 1892 for Ely and September 11, 1890 for Bliss.

[24]ZH, January 26 to May 25, 1887.

[25]ZH, July 20, 1887 for Rogers, December 17, 1890 and May 13, 1891 for Bliss, and January 14 to February 4, 1891 for North.

[26]NYCA, May 7, 1885, "Christian Workingmen In Hard Times," p.1, has Buckley's call to diligence. NYCA, November 19, 1885, p.2, has the reprint of the Sam Jones sermon.

[27]NYCA, December 31, 1885, "Object -Lessons in Social Economy: I. Drifting Whither?" p.3, article said self-interest was leading to Christian brotherhood. (This was an exact reproduction of an essay first printed in NYCA October 1, 1885.) The series continued in issues for January 7, 1886 (p.3, "II. Every Man a Specialist"), January 14 (p.3, "III. Labor Saving Machinery"), January 21 (p.3, "IV. Co-Operation"), January 28 (p.3, "V. Over-Production"), and February 4 (p.3," VI. Starting Aright"). The January 21 and February 4 essays challenged workers to remedy a "character flaw" and develop "steadfastness."

[28]NYCA, January 21, 1886, pp. 1 and 5.

[29]NYCA, April 1, 1886, p. 1, "The Crisis." Buckley wrote: "Let, then, the ministry, wherever they are throughout the land, mingle more freely than ever with all classes, especially with workingmen, that there may be no ground for the charge, often made, that they care nothing for the workingman so long as they can fatten upon the dinners and ride in the carriages of the rich--a charge often without foundation, but occasionally, we regret to have to say, borne out by the facts. .... Almost every difference can be adjusted where both sides are anxious to compromise. ... Let the Golden Rule and its spirit pervade all Christian capitalists and workingmen, and a way of adjustment will be found."

[30]NYCA, July 8, 1886, p. 1, "The True Sphere of Labor Organizations."

[31]NYCA, April 29, 1886, p.1, "I. Rights of Workingmen." NYCA, May 6, 1886, p.1, "II. Rights of Employers and Capital." NYCA, May 13, 1886, p. 1, "III. Employers and Employees." NYCA, May 20, 1886, p.1, "IV. Collisions Between Employers and Employees." NYCA, May 27, 1886, p.1, "V. Collisions of Labor and Capital.

[32]NYCA, May 27 and June 3, 10, and 17, 1886, p.3 essays on "Labor-Capital Agitation."

[33]Ibid., June 3 essay.

[34]Ibid. June 10 essay justifies right to accumulate and attacks Knights "tyranny," June 17 essay calls for "a mutual yielding of rights," and June 24 essay says labor is as wrong as capital.

[35]NYCA, August 17, 1893, p.3, "The Law of Social Progress." NYCA, August 24, 1893, p.3, "The Relation of Social Reform to Social Evolution." NYCA, August 31, 1893, p.3, "Some Tendencies in Social Reform." NYCA, September 7, 1893, p.3, "The Relation of the Church to Social Reform."

[37]NYCA, April 14, 1893, p.1, "Professor Ely's Letters."

[38]Buckley kept a promise issued in an earlier Advocate by publishing on the first page of the July 24, 1890 edition George's "The Single Tax--What It Is, And Why We Urge It." George argued that since the society had added value to land the state could rightfully tax it. Buckley wrote on the first page of the August 7, 1890 edition that publishing George's article was in keeping with Advocate policy of presenting "the best

articles on both sides of important debated questions." Then, he promised, "A writer of equal force with Mr. GEORGE will present the other side" and complimented, "As an illustration of the high art of putting things, Mr. GEORGE'S article is a model." (Buckley's editorial on George's name) The one chosen to respond in December and for the next two years was Professor Richard Ely. But, after Ely's presentation, Buckley was compelled to deny Advocate responsibility for Ely's "reasoning, facts, or conclusions," although he expressed admiration for Ely's "respect for Christianity." (NYCA, April 14, 1892, p.1) He then suggested that others of "equal or even greater eminence" could present a view decidedly different from Ely's.

[39]NYCA, May 10, 1894, p.5.

[40]He presented "Compulsory Arbitration" by H.L. Wayland in the May 10, 1894 edition of the Advocate (p.3). Wayland had commented on the remark of "a gentleman of property" after the Homestead Strike who had said concerning arbitration, "There is nothing to arbitrate. It is simply matter of whether a man shall control and manage his own property." Wayland had commented: "That a man has a right to use his own property as he will is an assertion so monstrous that it cannot be held by any sensible person who has for a moment reflected upon the situation. ... The State is bound in the end to interpose; and if the State is to come in at the finish with the bayonet, it may as well come in at the start with the balance." The doctrine of laissez faire was being abandoned.

[41]NYCA, August 9, 1877, p.4.

[42]ZH, page one reports for July 6, 13, 20, and 27 had blamed the workers. Parkhurst's editorial "The Aftermath of the Strikes was in ZH, August 31, 1892, p.4.

[43]ZH, "Popular Fallacies Concerning Labor and Wealth," by the Rev. George M. Steele, p.1 of January 26, 1887; February 2, 9, and 16 1887; March 2, 1887; May 4 and 25, 1887. This included the February 9 assertion: "Anything which tends to check the increase of capital is a damage to the interests of labor." ZH, "Christian Socialism," by the Rev. Reuen Thomas, p. 1 of January 16 and 23, 1889; February 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1889; March 6, 1889. This included no explicit reference to the laissez faire principle in economics, although it included a February 13 favorable citation of Englishman George Dawson's request with respect to the New Jerusalem to "wipe my name out of its citizenship if the stout and lazy vagabond and all who have no talent for work" be welcomed. ZH, "The Modern Altruist," by George Howard Fall, "Lecturer on Roman Law in Boston University, p.1 of August 20 and 27, 1890. In the August 27 essay, Fall declared: "Natural selection and the survival of the fittest is the only law." Parkhurst's remarks were in ZH, July 18, 1894, "Liberty--but Law," p.1.

[44]ZH, May 5, 1886, "Law and Labor," p.1. Peirce declared: "To make it law would interfere with the freedom of contract." He saw it as a reversal of the way of progress by increasing individual rights. He then added his typical virtue plea: "The hope for labor lies not in law, but in another direction altogether. To begin with, it must become sober and self-respecting. It must boycott rum, tobacco, and laziness, and sensuality and dishonesty. It must cultivate the homely virtues of industry and thrift." This would help it cultivate popular support.

[45]ZH, August 5, 1885, "Upheaval or Peaceful Revolution," p.4.

[46]ZH, September 2, 1885, "Pullman," p.4.

[47]ZH, November 28, 1894, "The Strike Commission's Report," p.1.

[48]William Arthur, The Tongue of Fire: Or, The True Power of Christianity (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1857). Arthur raised the question of whether "those who see and feel the importance of first seeking the regeneration of individuals, too often insufficiently studied the application of Christianity to social ills?" (p.91) For the many Methodist pastors who sought ordination while pastoring, the General Conference prescribed a disciplined reading program. Those "On Trial" had certain books to read, and those who had moved to "First Year" status were required to read The Tongue of Fire (even as "On Trial" persons were required to read the first volume of Wesley's sermons and "First Year" students were required to read the second volume of Wesley's sermons). These are listed in NYCA, October 10, 1892, p.12 and NYCA, March 23, 1892, p.12. The Rev. W.C. Wilbur reports in the February 9, 1893 issue of NYCA (p.4) that the Episcopal Committee chose the books and authors on the Disciplinary requirements in the Course of Study "more with reference to their prominence as leaders of thought...than for any particular denominational relations that they may chance to hold." He also noted that "the new course of study corresponds more fully with the curricula of the theological seminaries and colleges than ever before." On this basis, it would seem that Arthur's work was very influential in 1890's Methodism..

[49]Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War (New York: Harper Torchbooks, originally published by Abingdon Press, 1957), pp. 148-162.

[50]Cited in Smith, op. cit., p. 236, as cited in Aaron I. Abell, The Urban Impact on American Protestantism (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Historical Studies, 1943), p.24. Smith compares this to similar discussions in Charles Hopkins' The Rise

of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism (New Haven, 1940), pp. 42-49, and Edward H. Rogers; National Life in the Spirit World (Chelsea, Massachusetts, 1891), pp. 2, 9-11, 64. Rogers, a Methodist layman, contributed several challenging essays to Zion's Herald during this period.

[51]Smith, loc. cit., chapter on "The Evangelical Origins of Social Christianity" explains the role of this optimism of grace in motivating social reform as distinct from an optimism of unaided human ability. May, op. cit., notes such things as "Unitarians helped alter Protestant ideas of the possibilities of mankind." (p.35), and "humanistic religion" was helping Protestants turn their eyes toward the world and making it easier to emphasize social change (p.87). May does not deal with the motivations Smith describes. Both of them are describing varied motivations going into the Social Gospel that developed by the early 1900's, a perspective that especially revealed after World War I the two great deficiencies May cites: 1) a shallow theological and emotional content which could not provide "spiritual sustenance" needed by "the great mass of Christians" (something the revivalist Social Gospel had provided) and 2) "The simplicity and optimism of its social analysis did not fit it to lead the way through the deep jungles and morasses of the twentieth century. The second criticism applied to most revivalist Social Gospel as surely as it did to the more humanistic variety May refers to.

[52]Gladden (1836-1918) began his pastoral work in the 1860's in North Adams, Massachusetts, where he took sides with strikers. In 1875, he began a seven-year pastorate at Springfield, Massachusetts, where he also expressed sympathy for unemployed workers. While there, he wrote Workingmen and their Employers (1876). From 1882 to 1914 he served as pastor of First Congregationalist Church, Columbus, Ohio, where mine owners were members of his congregation, but he took sides with striking mine workers in the Hocking Valley Coal Strike southeast of Columbus in 1884. (Ahlstrom, op. cit., p. 794 and Hudson, op. cit., pp. 298-299) His 1886 Applied Christianity illustrates his essentially conservative perspective as he condemns unrestricted competition as "poisoning the very sources of the national life" even as he also acknowledges that "private enterprise has filled the world with blessings." (Quoted by John Garraty, op. cit., pp. 321-322) Henry May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 171-176, in presenting Gladden as the most representative and influential exponent of the Social Gospel, describes the Social Gospel as "a middle class creed," even as he quotes Gladden as saying in Applied Christianity: "The doctrine which bases all the relations of employer and employed upon self-interest is a doctrine of the pit; it has been bringing hell to earth in large installments for many years."

[53]Ely (1854-1943) studied economics in Germany under professors who repudiated "alleged laws of classical economics" and emphasized "the prior importance of

differing cultural contexts, historical developments, national needs,and political realities." (Ahlstrom, op. cit., p. 796) Ahlstrom observes the influence of Ely's The Social Aspect of Christianity (1889), in which Ely declared he belonged to "the ethical school of economists" and of which Ahlstrom says, "With this book he became one of the most widely read of all American economists." (Ibid., p. 797) Garraty, op. cit., pp. 322-323, cites Ely as an example of the kind of social scientist of whom Gladden could say, "Social science is the child of Christianity," despite the fact that some social scientists' stress on objectivity kept them from involvement in reform efforts. Garraty cites B.G. Rader, The Academic Mind and Reform: The Influence of Richard T. Ely in American Life (Lexington, 1966) as presenting Ely as critical of capitalism but opposing drastic social changes. May, op. cit., pp. 138-142, notes the 1885 origins of the American Economic Association, in which Gladden and 22 other clergy opposed the dominant classical economics, with Richard T. Ely being the most important leader.

[54]Rauschenbusch (1861-1918) pastored a German Baptist congregation near New York City's Hell's Kitchen from 1887 to 1897 in a decisive period in his life. (Ahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 800-802) He labored for playgrounds and better housing. While serving as Church History professor at Rochester Seminary, he took a study leave in Europe and published Christianity and the Social Crisis. His 1917 Theology for the Social Gospel formulated a more realistic doctrine of "the Kingdom of evil" than other Social Gospelers taught.

[55]Sheldon's In His Steps (1896) popularized the movement and Bliss and Herron became outspoken socialists. (Hudson, op. cit., p. 300 and Ahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 799-800) Josiah Strong is described by Ahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 798-799, as "the dynamo, the revivalist, the organizer, and altogether the most irrepressible spirit of the Social Gospel movement." May, op. cit., lists other influential figures.

[56]Ahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 868-870. Ahlstrom speaks of her as "the single most impressive reformer to have worked within the context of the evangelical churches" and adds a description of her as "the chief exception to the rule of evangelical social complacency during the 'halcyon years.'" But, he includes this in a discussion of prohibition as a crusading Protestant effort, clearly separate from his discussion 70 pages earlier of the Social Gospel.

[57]May, op. cit., pp. 127-128.

[58]Ibid., p. 203. Ahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 802-803.

[59]Frederick A. Norwood, The Story of American Methodism: A History of the United Methodists and their Relations (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), p.343.

[60]ZH, January 4, 1888, p.2.

[61]He is comparable to the San Francisco longshoreman, who did not have a college degree, but contributed the perceptive social analysis The True Believer. Rogers is reported as helping found the Christian Labor Union in Emory Stevens Bucke, The History of Methodism in Three Volumes (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), Volume II, pp. 337, 338. The possibility exists that he was influenced by the Rev. D.H. Ela, who served as pastor of Mt Bellingham Church in Chelsea from 1878 to 1881, as reported in ZH, October 22, 1890, p.4. Ela contributed two essays to the Methodist Review in 1886 supportive of labor, and titled "Christianity's Next Social Problem." The first, in the May-June 1886 issue (pp. 597-603) saw the "social financial problem" as "the next step in the work of making modern civilization Christian." Otherwise, "the bloody path of anarchy and barbarism" lay ahead. Christians, said Ela, had overly stressed the individual and property rights, and they had tended to make accumulation a virtue, a "proof of piety." Ela's second essay, in the September-October 1886 issue (768-773) warned that employees had become mere machines to be thrown aside when worn out and that the marketability of the ballot threatened liberty. Property would have to be widely distributed, and Christian principles, which dethrone wealth, had not changed since Pentecost, as Ela saw it. "Surplus profits" beyond what was consumed in support of the worker should not be accumulated by the employer. Perhaps these views by a fellow Methodist pastoring in Chelsea encouraged Rogers in his convictions.

[62]ZH, February 14, 1885, p.2, "Communism and Socialism." ZH, October 7, 1885, p.1, "The Social Ideal of Prophecy."

[63]ZH, February 3, 1886, p. 2, "Arbitration."

[64]ZHY, June 2, 1886, p.4, "Not Lack of Sympathy."

[65]ZH, February 3, 1886, p.2, "Arbitration."

[66]ZH, February 14, 1885, p.2, "Communism and Socialism."

[67]ZH, October 7, 1885, p.1, "The Social Ideal of Prophecy."

[68]NYCA, November 10, 1892, p.12, and NYCA, March 23, 1893, p.12, list these requirements. The Rev. W.C. Wilbur, in NYCA, February 9, 1893, explains that the Episcopal Committee placed these requirements in the 1892 Methodist Discipline as part of an effort to include the best writers on a given subject, regardless of their denominational affiliation. He also noted that these requirements were in conformity "with the curricula of the theological seminaries and colleges" of Methodism.

[69]NYCA, December 25, 1890 p.4, "The Single Tax."

[70]NYCA, February 12, 1891, p.3, "Social Classes." Ely observed the two main classes of modern society, employers and employed, viewed events and wrote newspapers from different points of view. Economic forces made it impossible for persons to move about freely, even though there was no legal prohibition. "The law does not directly and immediately prevent the man who is sweeping the street in front of my house from taking a pleasure trip to Egypt this winter, but is he free to do so?" "It is absurd to hold out to the masses of men the prospect of 'rising in life' as the saying is. A few may rise as the few may draw prizes in the lottery..." "If we are going to improve society, we must in some way bring it about that the carpenter as carpenter, the blacksmith as blacksmith, the farmer as a farmer, and even the most ordinary drawers of water and hewers of wood as such, shall be able to lead happier and more wholesome lives."

[71]MR, September-October 1892, pp. 737-744, "Wanted, An Ethical Political Economy."

[72]Ibid., p. 740.

[73]Ibid., pp. 742, 744.

[74]NYCA, March 19, 1891, p. 4, "Person and Property." Ely declared that "the spirit of our law is pagan and not Christian, because it tends to put property ahead of person. ...It is idolatry." He asked: "What protection have we in this country for the right of the laborer to the labor power residing in his own person?" He concluded: "The Christian State must antagonize the worship of wealth."

[75]NYCA, April 16, 1891, p. 3, "Inadequacy of Private Philanthropy for Social Reform."

[76]NYCA, May 14, 1891, p. 3, "Making Men Good By Statute."

[77]NYCA, June 11, 1891, p. 4, "The State.

[78]Ibid. he explains: "Factory acts, educational laws, laws for the establishment of parks and playgrounds for children, laws securing honest administration of justice, laws rendering the Courts accessible to the poor as well as the rich--all these are religious laws in the truest sense of the word."

[79]NYCA, July 16, 1891, p. 3, "Legal Inequality." NYCA, July 30, 1891, p.7, "The Church and the World." Ely states: "Christianity is primarily concerned with this world, and it is the mission of Christianity to bring to pass here a kingdom of righteousness and to rescue from the evil one and redeem all our social relations." NYCA, August 13, 1891, p.4, "The Widening and Deepening Range of Ethical Obligations." Ely writes: "It was an unbelieving age of materialism which asserted the all-sufficiency and even beneficence of self-interest, and attempted to restrict economic inquiries to this one question: 'How produce the greatest wealth?'" NYCA, September 10, 1891, p. 4, "Labor Organizations." NYCA, November 12, 1891, p.2, "Some Remarks on the Eight-Hour Day." NYCA, December 3, 1891, p.2, "Wages and Salaries." NYCA, February 11, 1892, p. 4, "The Difficulties."

[80]NYCA, March 31, 1892, p.6, "Are We Going Too Fast?"

[81]ZH, October 28, 1885, p.4, "Necessity of a Christian Sociology."

[82]MR, May-June 1886, pp. 597-603, and MR, September-October 1886, pp. 768-763. The reference to the problems of individualistic religion is in the May-June issue, pp. 601-602.

[83]ZH, January 14, 1891, p.2, "The Outlook For Practical Religion In The Decade," as reprinted from The Independent.

[84]MR, November-December 1891, p.923, preface to Morse's "Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements," pp. 923-932.

[85]MR, November-December 1891, p.926, Morse, "Regeneration..."

[86]Ibid., p.929.

[87]Ibid., p.930.

[88]Ibid., p. 931. The "errant professor" of the Presbyterian was Dr. Charles Briggs, then on trial for heresy. The "woman question" in Morse's own Methodist denomination was the question of permitting female delegates to be elected to General Conference.

[88]MR, March-April 1892, pp. 303-304, "Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements."

[90]MR, May-June 1892, pp. 434-437, "The Church and The World."

[91]MR, November-December 1892, "Regeneration As A Force In Reform Movements. Second Paper," pp. 876-883. The reference to the "Dark Ages" is on p. 881.

[92]Ibid., pp. 876-877.

[93]Ibid., p. 878.

[94]Ibid., pp. 880-882.

[95]Ibid., p. 882.

[96]NYCA, September 10, 1885, p.3, "Pews and Prejudice." NYCA, January 6, 1887, p. 3, "Indirect Rays Upon Church Methods."

[97]MR, March-April 1893, pp. 228-239, "City Missions and Social Problems."

[98]ZH, October 18, 1893, p.4, "City Evangelization." ZH, January 14, 1891, January 21, 1891, January 28, 1891, and February 4, 1891.

[99]NYCA, September 10, 1885, p.3, "Pews and Prejudice."

[100]NYCA, January 6, 1887, p.3, "Indirect Rays Upon Church Methods."

[101]MR, March-April 1893, pp. 228-239, "City Missions and Social Problems."

[102]Ibid., pp. 230-234.

[103]Ibid., pp. 234, 236-237.

[104]Ibid., p.237.

[105]Ibid., p. 239. The final line is reminiscent of a stanza of North's hymn:

"In haunts of wretchedness and need,
on shadowed thresholds dark with fears,
from paths where hide the lures of greed,
we catch the vision of Thy tears."

[106]ZH, October 18, 1893, p.4, "City Evangelization." English Methodist Editor Hugh Price Hughes of The Methodist Times had written in ZH, August 19, 1891, p.1, an article titled "Jesus and the Masses." In it, he said: "If you are at the standpoint of some doctrinaire political economist or of some thoughtless writer who has never known what hunger means, you may pour forth column after column of heartless folly, but if you know the suffering of the poor as Christ knows it, you will pity them. ...We--society at large--must take a big share of the blame for the sin and folly of those who break the law. There was a good old Saxon rule in England many years ago: when anybody did something wrong in a parish, every parishioner was fined for it--a most excellent rule founded upon profound reasons."

[107]NYCA, April 26, 1888, p.1, Supplemental Edition, "What Is the Duty of the Christian Church in Regard to the Socialistic Movements of OurTime?" Hiller pointed out that the early church in Jerusalem "had all things common," and that he ws not in favor of legislating this, but favored pursuing this ideal. Comparing the current relation of many Christians to labor to the refusal of many Christians to liberate their slaves before the Civil War, he said: "We, as Christian citizens, would appear in the very same light now if, while we are willing to give laboring men the Gospel, that they may go to heaven, we would at the same time refuse to better their condition in this world by introducing suitable political and economical reforms." Calling for a Christian socialistic movement, he closed with this alternative: "But if this is neglected a great lava-stream of bitter discontent will gather in the bosom of society,and this will some day burst forth and cause fearful destruction."

[108]ZH, September 4, 1889, p.1 "The Social Problem. Fourth of July Reflections," by Rev. Wm. L. Bull.

[109]ZH, October 9, 1889, p.4, "The Social Gospel," by Charles Parkhurst. Parkhurst wrote of the unity of Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists in support of London Dock Workers on strike and the statement by a Baptist Dr. Clifford rejoicing in this union of religious forces for "the first fruits of the social gospel."

[110]NYCA, September 11, 1890, p.3, "What is Christian Socialism?" ZH, December 17, 1890, p.1, "Christian Socialism" (source of this quote, with Bliss's emphasis). ZH, May 13, 1891, p.1, "The Growth of Christian Socialism."

[111]In the May 13, 1891 article, he quoted British Methodist Rev. Peter Thompson speaking at the centennary of John Wesley's death declaring: "Methodism must do for the masses what our founder did." Bliss believed the Church's involvement in social questions would "make the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." Professor George Herron contributed similar convictions in writing on "The Kingdom of God" for ZH for February 7, 1894 (p.1). Speaking of the earliest preachers of the Christian Gospel, he declared: "No blasphemy would have seemed to them so terrible as the partitioning of life into the secular and the sacred, the economic and the spiritual; as the division of any part of life from the sphere of Christ's authority. ...The theory that the whole actual life of the world must be lived out under the dominion of selfishness is the science of treason to the kingdom of God." Mere conscientiousness was not enough, since "Conscience is a safe guide only when God is the guide of conscience. Conscience will compel us to righteousness when conscience is educated by righteousness."

[112]ZH, January 14, 1891, p.1, "Socialism and the Christian Church." Editor Parkhurst praised this as a "very thoughtful" essay.

[113]ZH, January 21, 1891, p.1, "The Christian Church and Socialism."

[114]ZH, January 28, 1894, p.1, "The Unemployed Poor in New York." North's main concern in this essay was to call for public support for the unemployed rather than mere reliance upon private charity to help through the severe winter.

[115]ZH, January 28, 1891, p.1. ZH, February 4, 1891, p.2.

[116] Richard Cameron, Methodism and Society in Historical Perspective (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1961), pp. 315-325.

[117] Ibid., p.319.

[118] Georgia Harkness, The Methodist Church in Social Thought and Action (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), p. 46.

[119] Ibid., p.47.

C. RENEWING THE MARRIAGE: LISTENING TO LABOR IN SOLIDARITY --COMMUNICATIVE ACTION SEEKING LIFEWORLD RATIONALITY

A third Methodist response to late nineteenth century labor upheavals was a quest to renew the marriage of Wesleyan revivalism and civil religion. Sometimes the editors of the Christian Advocate, the Methodist Review, and Zion's Herald, sometimes their chosen contributors, and sometimes persons involved in specific labor upheavals sought to bring laborers into the conversation over what to do about the labor-capital conflict. Communicative action pursued a rational ordering of the life of late nineteenth century America that would benefit all. A fundamental feature of that communicative action involved taking sides with strikers and advocating their cause. The columns of the Methodist press included calls by a wide variety of Methodists to take sides with wage laborers. Methodist layman Edward Rogers, historian Abel Stevens, editor Hugh Price Hughes of England, Professor Frederick Merrick, and Pastor Frank Mason North all challenged their fellow Methodists to see issues from the perspective of the working class.[1] Pastor C.M. Morse warned that, even if all Americans were to become "Christian," rather than solving the labor-capital conflict, if it were the Methodist Christianity of late nineteenth century America, it would only seek to justify existing oppressive relationships.[2] He, too, called his fellow Methodists to view labor-capital conflict issues from the perspective of solidarity with labor.

In addition to the Methodist press, persons in close touch with strikers in late nineteenth century labor uprisings came to take sides with the workers. Methodist lay-

man and President Rutherford B. Hayes sent troops in 1877 to end strikes. By 1887, he responded positively to Henry George's proposals in Progress and Poverty for remedying inequalities. Methodist Women's leader Frances Willard identified with the Knights of Labor after the 1886 Haymarket Bombing and came to favor Edward Bellamy's variety of socialism as a way to respond to labor's pleas. William Carwardine, Pastor at the Methodist Episcopal Church in Pullman, Illinois, in 1894 spoke out in favor of the strikers and their sympathetic boycotters, including support of President Eugene V. Debs of the American Railway Union. Each of these Methodist figures was saying that the marriage of individual spiritual needs for liberation to social needs for liberation needed the freshness of a two-way communication with the strikers.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE METHODIST PRESS

In the April 1, 1886 issue of the Christian Advocate (New York), Editor James Buckley challenged Methodist pastors to "mingle" with workingmen so as to defuse workers' resentment over pastors who catered to the rich.[3] Buckley's "communication" seemed designed to get worker support for his version of Gospel of Wealth ideology. But, one week later Buckley chose to publish a contribution by Professor Frederick Merrick calling the Christian community to more clearly communicative activity.[4]

Professor Merrick, one of the founders of Ohio Wesleyan University in 1842, and a Professor there before serving as President for thirteen years, exhorted Methodists

to take sides with labor. He called on them to follow the examples of both Christ and John Wesley and "give more especial attention to the poor."[5] Merrick's rationale for the church to "be in favor of the laborer rather than of the capitalist" was three-fold: 1) laborers outnumbered capitalists; 2) "Capital is more likely to oppress Labor than Labor Capital"; 3) laborers were "more susceptible to religious influences than the wealthy."[6] Care should be taken, said Merrick, to construct sanctuaries in such simplicity that they would be places where "the rich and poor meet together." The week following this challenge, Merrick credited great numerical increases in the Midwest to stress on entire consecration and baptism with the Holy Ghost as "the world's only hope."[7] He was praising historical Wesleyan emphasis on entire sanctification for a personal spiritual liberation that would bear the fruit of communicative relationships with the working class.

Zion's Herald Editor Bradford Peirce cited Methodist layman Edward Rogers as one who spoke from a working class perspective.[8] Peirce published a Rogers response to Gospel of Wealth Advocate George Steele's eight-part series critical of "Popular Fallacies" questioning the wealth and power of capitalists.[9] After stressing that he was "thoroughly conversant with the opinions and feelings of his fellow-laborers," Rogers offered a possible explanation of "the brother whose views I have called in question." The problem, argued Rogers, was one of relating to workers as isolated individuals for limited periods of time and not noting "the altered conditions of associated labor under competition." From his perspective as a member of the working class, Rogers viewed this as "in direct antagonism to the Divine will."

In "An Open Letter" to the Christian Advocate (New York), the Rev. C.M. Morse, Methodist pastor in New Castle, Pennsylvania, declared that loyalty to Jesus required him to speak out against church sanctioning of an economic system enriching the few and forcing many into poverty.[10] After making sure that his readers knew he was presently enjoying the experience of justification and that he loved the Methodist Episcopal Church, he explained that social questions are moral questions, and that, as moral questions, they must be dealt with by the word of God. Then, he proposed this communicative solution:

> Let any minister...disguise himself and mingle with working-men, and he will soon discover their feelings in the matter. ...And the situation is more clearly defined against a background of history which shows that the cause of the captive, the slave, the oppressed and downtrodden, has always been the cause of God. ...Moses and Isaiah, Jesus and Paul, Wesley and Lincoln, were the champions of the common people.

Morse envisioned renewal of vital Christian faith, as well as renewal of the marriage of personal spiritual liberation and civil religious liberation, as coming from this communicative interaction with the working class. Memories of Wesley and Lincoln were invoked in behalf of a renewed marriage of revivalism and civil religion as Morse sought a more fundamental spiritual renewal of his fellow Methodists.

Methodist historian Abel Stevens contributed a three-part series to Zion's Herald in 1890 challenging the church not only to confront Labor-Capital issues on behalf of workers in general, but also to face the prime threat of war-making that drained national budgets. First, speaking of Jesus' humble birth and choice of lowly apostles, Stevens declared:

> His name is the most democratic word in the universal speech of men, his 'kingdom' means the reclamation, the elevation, and the divine reorganization of universal humanity. Christianity must become disloyal to its Founder, and contradictory to its very self, before it can fail to take sides with the masses in the great problems of the day.(11)

In the two articles which followed, Stevens denounced "The Problem of War" as burdening "the laboring masses," with "the 'ruling classes' ...infected with a species of demoniacal infatuation."[12] Stevens declared the time had come for legislation "for the 'masses,' and not for the classes."[13] He concluded:

> War is the greatest drain on the resources of the people; hence the Socialistic and workingmen's conventions in Europe have denounced it as the chief of their oppressors, and the chief calamity of the industrial masses.

The following year, the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, Editor of English Methodism's Methodist Times, contributed to Zion's Herald a front-page challenge on "Jesus and the Masses."[14] Hughes called "Christians of the privileged class" to return from the suburbs "in the Spirit of Christ" to live among the masses. Many feared the masses, said Hughes, because they did not know them. These fears could be overcome by taking "Christ's Standpoint." This could be found by living among the working class. Hughes explained:

> If you are at the standpoint of some doctrinaire political economist, or of some thoughtless writer who has never know what hunger means, you may pour forth column after column of heartless folly. But if you know the suffering of the poor as Christ knows it, you will pity them.

Then, he added his sense of the social causes of what some found fault with in the behavior of the working class:

> We--society at large--must take a big share of the blame for

> the sin and folly of those who break the law. There was a good old Saxon rule in England many years ago: when anybody did something wrong in a parish, every parishioner was fined for it--a most excellent rule, founded upon very profound reasons.

In the years that followed, the columns of the Methodist press reported other calls to take sides with the working class. A report of an 1892 General Conference session noted a resolution by the New Jersey delegation for Methodism to pledge "to the toiling masses our sympathies in this unhappy strife."[15] After a Dr. Hanlon spoke in favor of it, the Rev George Mains dispensed with the motion by having it referred to a committee, avoiding the need for Methodism to take an official position. Words on "City Evangelization" by Pastor Frank Mason North in 1893 called Methodists to get in closer touch with working class people.[16] But especially strong challenges came in the lives of three persons associated with three major late nineteenth century American labor uprisings--Rutherford Hayes, Frances Willard, and William Carwardine.

Editor James Buckley, speaking for the official voice of Methodism, the New York Christian Advocate, presented a positive perspective on each of these persons. At the death of Hayes, Buckley stressed Hayes strong Christian commitment, which he argued should not be challenged, in spite of the fact that he never officially joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. Buckley wrote:

> Nevertheless, it cannot be said of him that he did not confess CHRIST; for everywhere he spoke of Him, and of the principles of Christianity, not in the manner of one considering a social force or a philosophical system but of one who felt himself identified with the Saviour of the world and his kingdom.(17)

In addition to the positive reports by Buckley and other Methodist editors of

Frances Willard's work with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Buckley defended Willard in 1894 against gossip that she had deserted the Prohibition Party and drunk wine.[18] After extensive criticism of gossip in general and the observation that Willard had only drunk unfermented grape juice, Buckley noted her acceptance of the Labor Party's nomination as its 1892 Vice-Presidential Candidate, and quoted her: "The Prohibition and Labor Parties have almost everything in common, and ought to try to cooperate."

Buckley was less favorable toward Pastor Carwardine, although he did not denounce him. Reviewing Carwardine's The Pullman Strike, he observed that Carwardine endorsed neither strike nor sympathy boycott, and he found Carwardine's book "very interesting."[19] But, he rejected Carwardine's solution of compulsory arbitration, and he particularly objected to Carwardine designating "whoever refuses to arbitrate, whether corporation or union" as "traitors to their country's best interests, violators of the laws, instigators to riot, and enemies to every principle that is good and pure and holy and peaceable." Buckley saw such conclusions to be "extreme," as "arbitrary" as anything that could be suggested by the Czar of Russia, and, if compulsory, as "unqualified despotism."

Hayes, Willard, and Carwardine were each respected by the Methodist press. And, each in their own way, as a result of personal experiences, came to advocate communicative activity with the working class to resolve Labor-Capital conflicts, rather than mere strategic or instrumental action to defend American political or economic institutions.

RUTHERFORD B. HAYES: THE PRESIDENT WHO SENT TROOPS IN 1877

Over the years after he left the Presidency in 1881, Rutherford Hayes' perspective on labor-capital relationships moved from a stress on the "right to work" for labor to a concern for the assault on civic virtue caused by an existing system that involved the accumulation of large holdings by the few while most workers were unable to purchase property for themselves.[20] Hayes' transition was not so much a matter of deserting one set of values for another as it was a matter of seeking to apply continuing values to a more clearly comprehended social world. His fundamental theological and ethical perspective had become fairly well established by the 1840's. It took the remainder of his life to apply and clarify that perspective. Theologically, he rejected his Presbyterian mother's belief that every event of life was an expression of God's favor or judgment, and related beliefs in the realities of Hell and Original Sin, for a faith centering in a Christ who empowered for living by the Golden Rule.[21] Ethically, he was concerned to do that which would best facilitate his own growth in virtue and a similar development in others. As expressed in his Presidential leadership and in his labors as a trustee with various educational and philanthropic institutions after his Presidency, his theology and ethics motivated him to seek a rationality grounded in the give and take of communication rather than one dictated by concerns for money or power.[22] He steadfastly pursued a set of ideals--national unity, civil rights for former slaves, civil service reform, education for all,

prison reform, and others. But the achievement of those ideals depended on the power of rational dialogue rather than mere political or economic strategy.

Although he never formally joined the church, Hayes attended faithfully with his wife Lucy from the time of their marriage.[23] It was an expression of his commitment since youth to what he saw to be fundamental Biblical principles.[24] Beyond mere attendance, he was actively involved, as is indicated by diary entries for January 1, 1889.[25] At 4:30 in the afternoon, he and Lucy and others took their pastor to a "home mission meeting" ten miles out in the country. They shared supper with a local family, promised gifts of books to the family's children, and then drove to a nearby small town Methodist Episcopal Church. After recitations, songs, and a 30 or 40 minute sermon by their pastor to a full house, Hayes reports: "I spoke with good emphasis a few minutes. Altogether a good meeting." They reached home at 11:00 P.M., where their son Scott's dancing party was "still on and merry."

Hayes' diary includes frequent references to his thoughts about sermons he heard. For Sunday, December 25, 1877, he expressed appreciation for the sermon of his Pastor, Parker B. Pope:

> Quiet; no dancing around the pulpit, no low, whispered tones, no straining of the voice, no elaborate gestures; a natural, straight forward delivery of weighty matter. In the morning, Christ's love for men; in the evening, all things changing but a longing for stability and rest, which can only be satisfied and supplied by the Future of the Bible.(26)

Apparently "the Future of the Bible" was a reference to the future promised by the message of the Bible. In later years, after Lucy's death, he would develop a fondness for the

writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson, a fondness cultivated by a shared reading program with Mrs. John Herron, whose husband had died. A letter to Mrs. Herron reveals both his admiration for Emerson and his awareness of Emerson's limitations:

> He will not change our faith; he will not lead us to any faith. But I insist that we shall be more comfortable with God, with the future, with this whole bow-wow. We shall have more charity for others' errors. We shall have fewer errors of our own. Therefore, let us read him.(27)

Hayes' opposition to emotionalism and favorable response to Emerson was in no way a negative remark about Methodist revivalism, though. Harry Barnard has noted that Hayes supported the holding of revivals in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Fremont, Ohio, "even against ardent church members who opposed them."[28]

Another response to a sermon and a eulogy by Washington Gladden point to the heart of Hayes' faith. A diary entry for December 29, 1891 records a reaction to a sermon in the Congregationalist Church the preceding Sunday:

> Heard in the Congregationalist church a good and wholesome sermon... on the text, 'and the second is like unto it, love thy neighbor as thyself.' All churches neglect this second 'like'--equal in duty, importance, etc., etc. All creeds give their chief attention to the first, and almost totally neglect the 'like' duty and work.(29)

Gladden reported similar remarks by Hayes in response to a similar sermon, stressing love for neighbor as "like unto" love for God. Gladden then cited words of the Apostle John to the effect that every one who loves knows God and concluded: "The unselfish ministry of the last ten years...prove that the first great commandment ["Love God'] was also the law of his life."[30]

In a January 8, 1893 diary entry, Hayes declared: "I am a Christian according

to my conscience in belief, not of course in character and conduct, but in purpose and wish;--not of course by the orthodox standard. But I am content, and have a feeling of trust and safety." On the death of his beloved wife Lucy, he wrote a letter summarizing her faith, which was the same as his, other than his "lack of orthodoxy":

> She loved Christ and all good Christians. She cared very little for the formalities of religion. Believed in all the orthodox doctrines; but was liberal and all-embracing in her charitable views as Christ himself. She would never dream ever of forcing others in matters of opinion or conduct, unless the conduct was greatly criminal.(31)

Hayes' theology, though not systematic, sought to be, as Lucy was, "liberal and all-embracing...as Christ himself." This was not a mere agreeableness with his wife's preferences, but a flowering of convictions from the 1840's. It was a perspective that would seek rational order in society through communication rather than through strategies of any single group to impose a rational order on society.

Hayes' ethical concern for virtue is revealed in his concerns about his own development as well as his objectives in serving others. Frequently, he would reflect on his life on the occasion of his birthday, October 4. In 1877, after expressing satisfaction with his Presidency and the affairs of his family, he resolved to do better in the future in seeking "lasting benefit" for the country. "Let me be kind and considerate in treatment of the unfortunate who crowd my doorway, and firm and conscientious in dealing with the tempters."[32] In 1878, his resolution was: "To make others happy and make men and women better to the extent of my power--this is my aim."[33] On his seventieth and last birthday (1892), he reflected on overcoming his naturally nervous disposition and a number of his father's and mother's relatives "having become insane" and related this to

everyone's ability to change.[34] He had steadily labored throughout his life to provide resources for the similar development of virtue in others, the Freedmen, other uneducated persons, and prisoners.[35] There was no reliance on laissez-faire or "the survival of the fittest" for Hayes, but, rather, a public-spirited effort to help others have the resources to grow in personal and civic virtue if they chose to.[36]

In another sermon response, Hayes expressed admiration for a Mr. Wilson's sermon at the Fremont, Ohio Methodist Episcopal Church. The preacher had not only "in sweet tones and words portrayed the consolations of the Christian in times of affliction," but he had also given "a comparison of the Church to a palm-tree and the cedar of Lebanon."[37] The palm tree and cedar of Lebanon symbolized for Hayes what was the all-important virtue of strength of character that related rationally and responsibly to life in human society. Ten years later, in mourning the loss of his fellow Civil War General, George Crook, he stressed these "cedar of Lebanon" qualities:

> Faithful in his friendship; appreciating the volunteer soldier; with an Indian's patience, endurance, and sagacity.(38)

In his diary entry for New Year's Day 1886, Hayes reports seeing the same "cedar of Lebanon" qualities when he visited with a spiritualist, Thomas Clapp, whose virtuous life impressed Hayes:

> Is called a spiritualist. Is not a believer in orthodoxy... He meets poverty and disability so uncomplainingly and with a spirit which in a church member we would call that of an exemplary Christian. His wife, afflicted with a cataract--almost blind--is another meek and sweet-tempered person--like her husband a Christian in the best sense, and yet both are regarded as infidels! They are never in a church, but have all the virtues except the devotional, which the church seeks to inculcate and extol.(39)

With respect to social ethical issues, Hayes believed in the power of virtuous living and example rather than enforced virtue. Harry Barnard's biography details Hayes' struggle while a student at Harvard in 1843 to decide for the conservative constitutionalism of ex-Justice Story, whom he greatly admired, or for the support of fugitive slaves by John Quincy Adams, whom he also admired.[40] He would be compelled by historical developments to choose for Adams, but he would always prefer the power of persuasion and a life of virtue that chose a middle way between extremes. He was compelled to support the use of force in the Civil War and he was compelled to resort to force in the 1877 National Labor Uprising. But he preferred the powers of example and persuasion through rational communication.

With respect to the temperance issue, which illustrates Hayes' perspective on social ethical issues, he reports in a diary entry of July 1891 that he had personally chosen total abstinence, but he opposed the use of political power in behalf of temperance.[41] He preferred the methods of "education, example, argument, and friendly and sympathetic persuasion."[42] The only laws on the subject should focus on preventing nuisance, and then they would not be, strictly speaking, "temperance" legislation. Rather, they would be "in the interest of good order, for the suppression of crime and violence, and such legislation may well be left to the sense of duty and self-interest of the community at large."[43]

This social ethical perspective matches well Hayes' reluctant use of force to sustain order in the National Labor Uprising of 1877. His August 5, 1877 diary entry notes

that the strikes had been put down by force, but now they needed a "real remedy."[44] The remedy was to be "by education of the strikers, by judicious control of the capitalists, and by wise general policy." After noting the three problems of preventing workers from working, seizing the property of employers, and encouraging criminal disorders, Hayes closes his remarks by stressing "the right to work." By the late 1880's, he would be developing his perspective on Labor in the context of his larger perspective on social ethics in general.

Harry Barnard observes the seeds of Hayes' critique of capitalism in the July 1877 Cabinet meeting in which he raised the point that if railroad workers were to be subjected to governmental force, then perhaps the railroads should be subjected to governmental supervision of their labor policies.[45] By 1886, this had led to a shift of focus from that of Middle Class Free Labor Ideology to Working Class Free Labor Ideology, from stress on the "right to work" to stress on the rights of "the working, productive many" and the "dangerous power in the hands of the few."[46] Harry Barnard observes that this transition by Hayes was shared by several others who had been founders of the Republican Party who "saw a disturbing likeness between the intensity of the emotional hatred for anarchists and socialists and the hatred in the 1850s for the Abolitionist."[47]

In a St. Patrick's Day speech in Toledo, Ohio in 1886, Hayes expressed concerns about defending free institutions from a new perspective:

> The ideal community for a free government is one in which all are educated,in which all are or have been workingmen, and in which all are or can be owners of homes. In America, as we approach this ideal condition the foundation of our institutions grow stronger. As we drift away from it they are more and more imperilled.(48)

In a diary entry for November 6, 1887, he describes his perception of the problem: "A few get more than their share; the working, productive many get less than their share."[49] On December 4 of the same year, he observes that "in church it occurred to me" that it was time for the public to be fully informed of "the giant evil and danger in this country--the danger which transcends all others--is the vast wealth owned or controlled by a few persons."[50] The consequence of this "giant evil" was an assault on the virtue essential for a free republic. "Excessive wealth in the hands of a few means extreme poverty, ignorance, vice, and wretchedness as the lot of the many."[51] Hayes does not record what it was in church that day that impressed this concern upon his mind, but he does express admiration for Henry George for portraying "the rottenness of the present system," although Hayes maintains: "We are ... not yet ready for his remedy."[52] Instead of George's "single tax" on the "unearned increment" in land values caused by market changes in land values, Hayes prescribed both education and "changes in the laws regulating corporations, descent of property, wills, trusts, taxation, and a host of other important interests, not omitting lands and other property."[53] Hayes apparently favored a more wholistic restructuring of the system than George's "single tax." He would record in his diary for March 11, 1888: "Hundreds of laws of Congress [and of] all the State legislatures are in the interest of those men and against the interests of workingmen. These need to be exposed and repealed."[54]

Hayes' admiration for Henry George's critique of the existing relationship of Capital and Labor was shared by fellow members of the Peabody Fund. While visiting

New York for their annual Fall Meeting in 1887, Hayes spoke with a friend, William Henry Smith, about Henry George's mayoralty campaign, which was then in full swing.[55] Hayes was surprised by fellow Trustees' sympathies for George. Robert Winthrop, a Puritan New England conservative, saw George as "a protest against the wrongs that ... [are] now threatening the Republic."[56] U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Waite commended George' campaign because, "The dollar is too much regarded; character and humanity too little." A Bishop Whipple said he lay awake nights worrying over the evils the George campaign was fighting. "There are great inequalities in society; suffering and deprivation on the one side, and luxury and unjust, dangerous power in the hands of the few.:"[57] Hayes told his friend William Henry Smith that "justice and education" were the only instruments adequate to prevent concentration of ownership in the hands of the few. He added:

> The governmental policy should be to prevent the accumulation of vast fortunes; and monopolies, so dangerous in control, should be held firmly in the grip of the people. ... Monopoly is offensive; it destroys individual enterprise; it antagonizes the principle of personal liberty which is the very corner-stone of republican government; it is a menace to the people.(58)

After acknowledging Standard Oil's liberality in paying its employees better than other employers, Hayes observes: "The Roman people were fed and entertained while being robbed of their liberties."[59] He then points out Standard Oil's attempt to seize political power by electing Governor Hoadly and Senator Payne and attempting to defeat Senator Sherman, a development requiring government power to supervise such combinations.[60]

Whatever the sermon when Hayes attended church the Sunday before Decem-

ber 4, 1887, something brought to mind his strong feelings on what was really threatening free institutions in the United States. In a diary entry two years later (March 18, 1890), he would support the "nihilism" he saw in the novels of Dudley Warner. Explaining his understanding of nihilism, he wrote:

> I use it to mean all opinions tending to show the wrong and evils of the money-piling tendency of our country, which is changing laws, government, and morals, and giving all power to the rich and bringing pauperism and its attendant crimes and wretchedness like a flood. Lincoln was for a government of the people. The new tendency is "a government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich." The man who sees this and is opposed to it I call a "Nihilist."(61)

Recognizing the negative impact of calling his position "nihilism," he pondered a response to William Dean Howells' novel Annie Kilburn in a January 13, 1889 diary entry:

> It opens the democratic side of the coming questions. I do not find a ready word for the doctrine of true equality of rights. Its foes call it nihilism, communism, socialism, and the like. Howells would perhaps call it justice. It is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, and of the Sermon on the Mount. But what is a proper and favorable word or phrase to designate it?(62)

Whatever name would come to be attached to his perspective, Hayes sought a renewed application both the spiritual power of the Sermon on the Mount and the political ideals of the Declaration of Independence. It would be a renewal of the marriage of Methodist revivalism and American civil religion.

In relating Hayes' changing perspective on Labor and Capital to similar changes in other Republicans who had been Abolitionists, Harry Barnard notes several places where Hayes cautiously incorporated nihilist elements into speeches to the National Pri-

son Congress and to the veterans group called the Loyal Legion.[63] Recording his struggle "hammering out a speech" for the National Prison Congress on July 4 and 5, 1888, he concludes: "A little 'communistic' in its tendency, the 'privileged class' will say. But I quote largely on this topic from such high authorities as Webster and Horatio Seymour."[64] On ship for Bermuda April 18, 1890, he recorded reading in the Philadelphia Inquirer "a good editorial quoting and commending my nihilistic paragraphs in the Loyal Legion speech of the 16th."[65]

A November 27, 1890 diary entry stresses the duty of 'simple justice" which the "rich and the so-called fortunate" owed "the poor and unfortunate."[66] A December 10, 1890 entry raises a series of questions about whether "wealth,education, opportunity, [and] power," which "go together," were to be controlled by a few or "wisely, equitably, that is, widely distributed."[67] In a diary entry of January 29, 1891, Hayes noted completion of preparations for a talk at Western Reserve University for February 4 in which: "One idea in the line of my nihilism I get in, viz., that property is a trust for the welfare of the public."[68] On returning from giving the address in Cleveland, he recorded in his diary for February 6 something of his hopes for educational empowerment of laborers to help in a communicative resolution of the Labor-Capital conflict:

> Let men both intelligent and true to the interests of the laborer take up the problem. All fair-minded men admit that labor does not now get its fair share of the wealth it creates. All see that wealth is not justly distributed. Let education send into our society a body of laborers educated and intelligent--able to deal with this grave question.(69)

Hayes' perspective on Labor-Capital relations had changed from what Eric

Foner has termed a Middle Class Free Labor Ideology, with its stress on "individualism, laissez faire, the defense of property" and "the right to work" to a Working Class Free Labor Ideology, "an affirmation of the primacy of the producing classes and a critique of the emerging capitalist order."[70] Yet, in another sense, this was the flowering of basic life commitments he had made in the 1840s, commitments which life experience had revealed the meaning of, commitment to the theology of an inclusive God and to an ethical concern for virtue within a society rationally ordered by communication among educated members from all segments of society.

FRANCES WILLARD: THE METHODIST NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEADER WHO SIDED WITH LABOR IN 1886

Frances Willard's changed perspective on labor issues is similar to that of Hayes. Labor issues were thrust upon her while she was absorbed with other issues, beginning with "the woman movement and the education of women," continuing with temperance and evangelism, and moving to labor issues and total national social reform.[71] She was more clearly committed to orthodox Wesleyanism than Hayes, having settled some matters of religious doubts in an experience of entire sanctification in a Winter 1866 series of meetings by Holiness Movement leaders Walter and Phoebe Palmer at Evanston, Illinois.[72] From January 1860, she was an official member of the Methodist Epis-

copal Church, a step Hayes had never chosen to make, in spite of his loyalty to the ministry of that Church.[73] However, she shared Hayes' inclusive concept of God, and wrote in her diary shortly after joining the Methodist Episcopal Church:

> Before I ever declared myself determined to live, being helped by God, a Christian life, I resolved to educate myself in an unsectarian spirit. I honestly believe that I regard all churches, the branches rather of the one Church, with feelings of equal kindness and fellowship."(74)

Whatever rationality she would seek in life would involve respectful communication with those of differing opinions and beliefs.

Her "nonsectarian spirit" and reform concerns led her to break ties with Dwight Moody's revival crusades in 1877 when Moody challenged her appearances on the same platform with those who denied the divinity of Christ.[75] Moody rejected her argument that she was doing so to advance the cause of the WCTU. She had served for three months in Boston, conducting daytime "women's meetings" while appearing at night in area rallies for temperance. She had seen large numbers of conversions in response to her preaching. But, in response to Moody's objections, Willard saw the need to write to Moody's wife to let Moody know she was convinced that if all were invited to the communion table, as they were, "then surely in the sacred communion of work for poor hu-humanity," all were invited to join, with the only requirements being "earnest purpose, devout soul, and irreproachable moral character."[76] In spite of Moody's otherwise generous attitude "upon the woman's question," Willard wrote, "Brother Moody's Scripture interpretations concerning religious toleration were too literal for me; the jacket was too straight--I could not wear it."[77] Strategies to secure conversions to a particular theology

would have to take second place to the communion of serving poor humanity.

While on her knees in prayer preceding a temperance address in Columbus, Ohio in the Spring of 1876, she became convinced God was calling her to advocate women's suffrage together with her WCTU efforts for temperance.[78] It was the beginning of a public means of expressing an expanding agenda of reform. By 1878, she was challenging Annie Wittenmyer's more conservative presidency, and in 1879 she won election as President of the WCTU.[79] By 1881, she had convinced the national WCTU to accept her linking of women's suffrage with temperance under the rationale of "Home Protection," with women needing the vote to secure prohibition.[80] At the same time, she was leading the WCTU to eventual endorsement of the Prohibition Party in 1885, with the party not only supporting a prohibition amendment to the U.S. constitution, but also such other social reforms as direct election of senators, the income tax, and the vote for women.[81] Biographer Ruth Bordin observes that this linkage with the primary issue of prohibition explains why this most popular American at her death in 1898 came to be ignored as an embarrassment by social reformers and as a voice of a dying way of life by historians.[82]

Willard become a member of the Prohibition Party central committee in 1882, when she influenced a change of name to the "Prohibition Home Protection Party."[83] It was in the midst of these reform activities in an expanding agenda that Willard reached out to labor at a time when it was unpopular to do so. Her 1881 WCTU Presidential Address slogan "Do Everything" was expanding beyond "use all available means to ad-

vance temperance and women's rights" to "be involved in all that needs to be dealt with to make society more just."[84]

In May 1886, after Knights of Labor demands for an eight-hour day and related strikes resulted in the Haymarket Bombing and the blaming of labor for the incident, Willard chose to send a WCTU delegation to the May 1886 Knights convention.[85] Grand Master Workman Terence Powderly, leader of the Knights, stated in his Thirty Years of Labor that it was the first time that a representative of another organization had been admitted to a Knights of Labor convention.[86] Bordin analyzes possible reasons for this move that was not being demanded by the WCTU constituency and could have undermined her leadership and concludes that, beyond the Knights' support of temperance and "equal pay for equal work regardless of sex," Willard's concern over economic distress and injustice was primary.[87] Bordin writes of Willard:

> She had not forgotten her center city experience of the mid-seventies [i.e., in Chicago] and seems to have been further radicalized by the combination of unemployment, economic distress, and labor unrest that characterized the 1880s. To urge temperance and philanthropic aid no longer seemed enough to solve the economic and social problems she saw all around her.(88)

When Elizabeth Rodgers was elected in August 1886 as Master Workman of District Assembly 24 , the central organization of the Knights of Labor in Chicago, Willard sought a meeting with her, wrote a supportive article about her for the WCTU Union Signal, and later cooperated with her in the Chicago Woman's League and the Illinois Woman's Alliance.[89] In her Presidential address to the WCTU for1886, Willard suggested the WCTU could "do much to ameliorate the deepening battle between capital

and labor."[90] Arguing for support of "all lawful efforts of the toiling millions to better their condition," she declared: "We will stand by them. Their triumph is our own."[91] Anti-labor persons might agree with her later assertion: "The central question of labor reform is not so much how to get wages, as how to turn present wages to better account."[92] But, she knew that temperance was only part of a more holistic solution. The WCTU membership authorized her to seek cooperation with labor and she published a December 1886 address to labor which Powderly published in the Knights' official newspaper, including these words:

> We rejoice in your broad platform of mutual help, which recognizes neither sex, race nor creed. Especially do we appreciate the tendency of your great movement to elevate women industrially to their rightful place, by claiming that they have equal pay for equal work; recognizing them as officers and members of your societies, and adlocating the ballot in their hands as their rightful weapon of self help in our representative government.(93).

Willard was invited to address the Knights in February 1887, and she became an official member of the Knights.[94] As part of her expanding agenda seeking a rational ordering of all of society, she labored to the end of her life to make sure that the working class was a part of the national dialogue.

Willard had not dealt with the labor issue during the 1877 National Labor Uprising, being absorbed in issues of temperance and women's rights.[95] However, by the late 1880's, she was so inclusive in her concern to transform society to enable virtue in individuals that some regard her as the "Social Gospel theologian of the age"--preceding Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Charles Sheldon in her impact.[96]

After Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward was published in 1887, she corresponded with Bellamy about publishing a "manifesto" of Nationalism in the WCTU's Union Signal in 1888.[97] Although she admired Henry George, she preferred Bellamy's confidence in what the government could do to provide a rationally ordered society over George's suspicions over too much power in the hands of the government.[98] She maintained her involvements with the WCTU and the Knights of Labor while encouraging WCTU members to join Bellamy's Nationalist clubs throughout the country.[99] Her 1889 WCTU Presidential address exhorting to Christian socialism marked her transition from 1880 focus on issues of temperance and women's rights to 1889 cooperative efforts with the labor movement and advocacy of Christian socialism.[100]

When the WCTU voted to send fraternal delegates to national meetings of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Presbyterian General Assembly, they were refused admission to speak at either body, and Willard reluctantly conceded defeat, only to be elected delegate to the 1888 Methodist General Conference and provoke discussion that would lead to women as delegates, after her death, to the 1904 General Conference.[101] Her effort at inclusiveness supported involvement of persons of Jewish and Roman Catholic persuasion in combined temperance efforts, an inclusiveness that even feminist Mary Livermore opposed because of implied support of Catholic political organization.[102]

Although it could be argued that Willard's ideas stressing government as an instrument for change rather than mere individual moral change or philanthropic effort was the

result of the Social Gospel developing in the late nineteenth century, Willard biographer Ruth Bordin argues that she was in many ways in the forefront in the development of the Social Gospel. Gladden's Applied Christianity appeared in 1886, Sheldon's In His Steps in 1896, and Rauschenbusch's Christianity and the Social Crisis in 1907, while Willard was expanding to a Christian socialist agenda in the 1880s.[103] Bordin maintains that Willard did for the Social Gospel, by her use of the rhetoric of orthodox Protestantism in her radical causes, something comparable to what Herbert Gutman observes to have happened by trade unionists' use of Christian rhetoric in expressing their concerns.[104]

Willard's greatest communicative effort, which eventually failed, was her 1890s attempt to bring together the forces of the Prohibition Party, on whose central committee she was a member, the Knights of Labor, and the Populist or "People's Party."[105] By 1892, the farmers' alliances, the heart of what became the Populist Party, had replaced the Prohibitionists as the largest source of third-party strength in American party politics. After a May 1891 meeting of reform groups in Cincinnati, including farmers' alliance members, Prohibitionists, Bellamy Nationalists, and Henry George single taxers failed to achieve unity, Willard invited leaders of all the major reform movements to a private conference at Chicago's Sherman House for January 1892 to try to arrive at an agreed upon platform. Those who accepted her invitation included: James B. Weaver, first People's Party candidate for President; Minnesota Populist Ignatius Donnelly; Herbert Taubneck, who had been elected temporary chairman of the party organized in the Cincinnati meeting; Nationalist George Washburn; Henry Demarest Lloyd; Prohibition Party Chairman Samuel Dickie; and Edward Wheeler, editor of ;the Prohibitionist party

paper.[106]

Twenty-two men and six women responded to this invitation, initiated solely by Willard's desire to unify reform movements. In the "address" developed to express areas of agreement, Willard supported two compromises. The first would not advocate national prohibition, but would only condemn the saloon. The second would only advocate municipal suffrage for women who were educationally qualified.[107] These compromises would satisfy Populists who opposed Prohibition and southerners who opposed woman suffrage.

There was complete agreement on planks "advocating cheap money, condemning land speculation, and asking for limitations on the amount of land that could be owned by any corporation or individual." There was also agreement on government control rather than ownership of public transportation and communication. Willard and fellow Prohibitionists signed the address, as did Populists Donnelly and Weaver. But, the lack of unanimity in getting all signatures indicated troubles ahead.

The same organizations which had met in Cincinnati in May 1891 met again at the St. Louis Industrial Conference in February 1892. Willard had called her conference a month in advance to prepare for the February Conference. But, the Prohibition Party withdrew from the Conference because they sensed the new party would not have a prohibition plank. Willard stayed on, designated by the Conference a representative of the WCTU and chosen as a member of the platform committee which brought planks for a platform before the entire Conference. In spite of much opposition, she brought two minority planks before the Conference, supporting what she had worked out as a

compromise at the Sherman House conference in Chicago. Her universal suffrage and antisaloon planks were voted down by the Conference 352 to 238, with Populists fearing loss of support from the antisaloon plank and southern alliance members fearing lost support from the suffrage plank. Willard was bitter over the political maneuvering, but she was hopeful as late as June 1892 that the Populist Party ("People's Party") would nominate a Presidential candidate who supported prohibition and suffrage and the Prohibitionists could support the same candidate and thus "mass" the reform vote.

At the Cincinnati Convention of the Prohibition Party that summer, she prepared a resolution supporting "total suppression of the liquor traffic" and "the enfranchisement of women" as a condition of union of the Prohibition with the People's/Populist Party, hoping the change of wording would advance success. She also hoped for nomination of a Presidential Candidate who would withdraw when the People's Party named its candidate if that candidate favored these two positions. An obscure Prohibitionist, John Bidwell of California, was nominated and refused to withdraw. Willard was even unable to offer her resolution on the two key issues to the Prohibition Party Convention.

At the WCTU convention in the Fall, Willard was able to have a resolution adopted stating that "because we are positive rather than negative...we express hope that the Prohibition Party will, in the near future, adopt a name that is as broad as its purpose toward humanity." As late as November, being interviewed in New York, she expressed optimism, stating:

> There must be a new party continuing the reform elements for the interest of humanity. The Democrats and Republicans are like boulders in the path; the Prohibition and People's parties must combine.

But, she had essentially abandoned the fight the previous August as she went to the bedside of her dying mother and grieved the loss. She would continue to labor for union of reform parties until 1896, but she would never again exert the influence she did in January and February of 1892. After travelling to England to work together with close friends for temperance and reform there, she became ill in the spring with the illness that would lead to her death five years later at age 59.[108] The diagnosis was "pernicious anemia," and she developed a bad cold that became pleurisy in June. In spite of these difficulties, she returned to the United States for the Fall convention of the WCTU.

Her speech, which had to be read by her English friend Lady Henry Somerset, provided a challenged WCTU members to be "Christian socialists."[109] Entitled "The Do Everything Policy," it included a section on "Gospel Socialism." Opposing single-issue reforms saying "virtues, like hounds, hunt in packs," her plea was for a "corporate" conscience by the country which would "conceive of society as a unity which has such relations to every faction thereof that there could be no rest while any lacked food, clothing or shelter or while any were shackled by the grim circumstances of life that they were unable to develop the best that was in them in body and mind."[110]

By 1896, Willard was barely able to prevent the WCTU from endorsing the Prohibitionist Party, which had become a single-issue party by then.[111] Speaking positively of both William Jennings Bryan and William McKinley, she advocated non-endorsement, and was able to have that position supported at the final WCTU convention she presided over in 1897.[112]

Willard responded to labor-capital conflict, as well as other issues of the day, with a concern to get beyond strategies to advance a particular agenda to the give and take of compromise that did not ignore the conditions of the powerless. She was bitterly disappointed by the rejection of her efforts in 1892. But, her efforts were widely recognized at her death. Memorial tributes included the praise of Holiness Movement leader Hannah Whitall Smith as well as British Socialist Sidney Webb.[113] Smith described her as "the greatest democrat I knew," an intimate friend of 25 years with whom she sometimes disagreed, but who saw persons through the eyes of Christ. "She looked at everything and everybody through His eyes, and saw the good, not the evil, in all.[114]

Frances Willard may have seen "the good, not the evil, in all," but she was not as reserved in the use of force as Hayes was. She preferred Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward, with its prescription of 'total control of the economy by an egalitarian state" which would remedy the evil that "the working classes were cruelly exploited" by, in the words of Willard biographer Ruth Bordin.[115] Bellamy favored peaceful change, which was in keeping with Willard's opposition to violence. She was moving from the Middle Class Free Labor Ideology that stressed thrift by the individual workers with the wages they earned to the Working Class Free Labor Ideology that stressed the claims of the workers to a greater share of economic profits and stressed a critique of the existing capitalist system. Even as she favored political force on the temperance issue over Hayes' stress on example and persuasion, so she favored a more wholistic overhaul of the system, represented by Bellamy's Nationalism, over Hayes' prescription of education and legal efforts for justice. Yet, as with Hayes, Willard represents a changed perspective on

labor issues which represents not so much a radical shift of values as a new awareness of what would be required in the economic, social, and political system for there to be freedom and wholeness for all persons in the American Republic. That would involve a quest for a communicative rationality that did not overlook the needs of the least powerful.

WILLIAM CARWARDINE: THE METHODIST PASTOR AT PULLMAN WHO TOOK SIDES WITH STRIKERS IN 1894

As with Hayes and Willard, Pastor William Carwardine of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Pullman, Illinois, urged communication among all parties to resolve the conflict between capital and labor brought so dramatically to national attention by the Pullman Strike and sympathetic boycott of all Pullman cars by the American Railway Union in 1894. When George Pullman refused to negotiate, Carwardine saw his Christian calling to be to take sides with the Pullman workers. He would have preferred that there had been no resort to strike or boycott, but George Pullman's autocratic rejection of negotiations angered Carwardine. Rational ordering of capital-labor relations by open and uncoerced communication was more important to him than a national economic and political order unresponsive to the interests of labor.

At age six, Carwardine had determined some day to dramatically take sides with workers. Born in Brooklyn February 22, 1858, his parents died when he was very

young. He found work in the composing room of the New York Post, where an abusive foreman focused his anger.[116] Carwardine wrote in his history of the Pullman Strike:

> In those days there was engendered in my soul a hatred against tyrannical foremen and abusive treatment of men which has never left me, and which during the past months [i.e., leading up to the 1894 Pullman Strike] of our long and sad winter, made my very blood boil with indignation at what I have seen and heard.(117)

Carwardine continued:

> Then it was I declared that if ever the opportunity presented itself to defend the true rights of laboring men, and smite those who unmercifully oppressed them, I would lift up my voice and cry aloud, in the name of the God of Israel.

Carwardine's dedication of his book on the Pullman Strike suggests that his future father-in-law may have encouraged and helped direct that indignation. Carwardine states that his book is:

> Affectionately dedicated to my beloved Father-in-law, Rev. John Williams, Pastor of the First M.E. Church, Creston, Ill., who was for thirty years in his early life connected with the daily press of New York City, and who did loyal service at that time in arousing public sentiment to the needs of the toiling masses.

Carwardine's response to the Pullman Strike was rooted in the values he had learned in his earlier years.[118]

Married in 1880, Carwardine was ordained in the South Kansas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, serving in that conference from 1882 to 1887.[119] Stephen Cobb, in his history of Carwardine and the Pullman Strike, notes the impact of Populism on these formative years, with Kansas papers filled with Populist rhetoric advocating "industrial democracy," and with Populist Governor Lorenzo Lewelling challenging

the Gilded Age for putting property rights ahead of individual liberties.[120] Lewelling declared that it was the duty of the government to protect the weak. The powerful could take care of themselves. Reformers of the age were coming to look to government power to defend the weak, and Carwardine was coming to agree with this perspective in the 1880's.[121]

When the Pullman Strike began May 11, 1894, Carwardine had pastored there for two years and was "familiar with almost every face and fireside in the town" of Pullman and knew both George Pullman and Eugene Debs and their lieutenants.[122] On Sunday evening, May 20, Carwardine preached from the text of Luke 10.7, "The laborer is worthy of his hire," condemning the "hollow mockery" of Pullman's pretense as a "model factory town" and concluding to the strikers:

> I am with you to the end. I hope you will get your just demands. I shall always in the future count it as the proudest moment of my life that I could say a word of comfort at this crisis, and take my stand beside you in this great and apparently unequal contest.(123)

Newspapers throughout the country carried reports of this sermon.[124] The courage required to deliver it is suggested by a Chicago Times editorial of the previous day declaring that it was common knowledge Carwardine had been warned, if not threatened, of possible disaster to himself and his church.[125] The editorialist continued: "But if Mr. Carwardine has the courage of his convictions and is a true follower of the gospel he professes he will speak the truth that is in him and thereby gain a reward which no Pullman bulldozing can destroy." Carwardine's response to any such fears was:

> Better a thousand times that our church be disorganized by the company than that we truckle to them, forego the God-given and American right to free speech, smother our convictions, muzzle our mouths, fawn beneath the smiles of any rich man or corporation. Better to die for the truth than be surfeited by a lie.(126)

He spoke from convictions grounded in both Wesleyan revivalism and American civil religion. He took a decidedly different perspective from that of the pastor whose congregation used Pullman's one church building in the town, and who had counselled the workers that "half a loaf is better than none at all," but who disappeared on "vacation" during the difficult times of the strike, never to return.[127]

Carwardine had tried from the beginning to be impartial, respecting the business genius of Pullman, but refusing to agree that he could be considered a "benefactor" when he cut wages in half, required the same rents of the workers who had to rent his homes, and yet reaped a profit of $4,000,000 after paying expenses and stockholder dividends for 1893.[128] In taking sides with the workers, whose pleas he thought would not otherwise be heard, union leadership acknowledged his support. In one of his most prized possessions, the Central Strike Committee sent him a note dated July 23, 1894, affirming him to be a "man of sterling character" and declaring:

> The Rev. is noted for his veracity and fearless devotion to justice at all times. ... He is respected by all and loved by many. We heartily endorse all that he writes about the present strike and the town of Pullman.(129)

As a result of publicity attending his May 20 sermon, Carwardine began a lecturing program that extended for many years after the Pullman Strike. The goal was to let the public know that the strikers were "not simply illiterate troublemakers," but

responsible and skilled Americans subjected to intolerable conditions," as Cobb paraphrases Carwardine's mission.[130] However, Carwardine himself had to counter the charge that he was an "anarchist."

Carwardine published his story of the Pullman Strike in July 1894, essentially amplifying upon his concerns and challenges from the May 20 sermon, ending with an appeal to arbitration. Arguing that the society was dividing into two classes, oppressor and oppressed, he declared that the nation faced two threats--lack of military support in wartime from workers as soldiers and divine judgment against oppression.[131] Observing that the nation had drifted from equal rights intended by the founders and that the current conflict could be solved by "federal bayonets and bullets," he proposed this arbitration as a solution in these words:

> The strong arm of the law should compel the autocratic millionaire as well as the dependent mechanic to submit his case and abide by the decision. And where, as in this strike, there is an obstinate refusal to arbitrate, then the federal and state governments should take possession of the railroads, the telegraph, the coal mines, or the manufacturing plants, and run them in the interest of the whole people. and not in the interest of the obstinate corporations. The public peace of the country demand this.(132)

Carwardine charged those who resisted to be traitors, riot-inspirers, and enemies of the good.[133] He was placing the "anarchy" charge that was often brought against him and the unions against corporate interests refusing to arbitrate. These were the recommendations New York Christian Advocate editor James Buckley regarded as leading to a government like that of Czarist Russia, a kind of government Carwardine saw to be already in operation in Pullman.[134]

When called to testify before the United States Strike Commission investigating the Pullman Strike, Carwardine considered the charge that he was an "anarchist" both "contemptible and false," although he could be fairly considered a Christian socialist.[135] For "settlement of these difficulties," Carwardine told the Commission: "There will have to be more justice, more of the spirit of co-operation, more of the spirit of recognition."

In speaking of the need for "recognition," he was pointing to the reality Pullman bragged to exist but did not practice--"mutual recognition." A company propaganda piece advertised: "It has illustrated the helpful combination of capital and labor without strife or stultification upon lines of mutual recognition."[136] At the beginning of his book on the Strike, Carwardine had declared:

> I contend now that in the discussing of this theme I am preaching the gospel of applied Christianity--applied to humanity--the gospel of mutual recognition, of co-operation, of the "'brotherhood of humanity.'"[137]

At the close of his book, he had appealed to the working class to use the democratic vehicle of the ballot, which he said was:

> ...a ballot that represents a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, free homes, free schools, free press, a united people, the right of every man unmolested to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; the greatest gift given by God to man outside of his blessed Son, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and one that can give us, if we use it right, the grandest type of government under the sun.(138)

Carwardine was appealing to the traditional values of American civil religion against what he saw to be the distortion of those values by laissez faire capitalism. It was a distortion which Stephen Cobb's book on the Pullman Strike views as early nineteenth century values of nature organically unfolding, divine providence, and will leading to individual

success into "the success myth [Horatio Alger], laissez faire capitalism, and Social Darwinism."[139] It was the transition from pre-Civil War Free Labor ideology to Middle Class Free Labor ideology that Eric Foner speaks of.[140]

In opening his book on the Strike, Carwardine had sought to renew the relationship of Wesleyan revivalism and American civil religion by an appeal to both heritages which also responded to the charge he should "stick to preaching the Gospel":

> He who denies the right of the clergy to discuss these maters of great public concern has either been brought up in a government totally foreign to the free atmosphere of American institutions, or else he has failed utterly to comprehend the spirit of the age in which he lives. ...I am preaching the gospel of applied Christianity... The relation existing between a man's body and his soul are such that you can make very little headway appealing to the soul of a thoroughly live and healthy man if he be starving for food. Christ not only preached to the multitude, but he gave them to eat.(141)

It was an appeal to live by the rule Wesley had long ago instructed Methodists in, to show evidence of salvation by concern for the well-being of person's bodies as well as their souls.

The monthly Chicago Methodist preacher's meeting finally expressed publicly their support of "Our Methodist Pastor in Pullman."[142] The meeting passed and had published this statement:

> Whereas, the Rev. W. H. Carwardine, pastor of the Pullman Methodist Episcopal Church, has been accused of anarchy in the Christian sympathy which he has extended to the working people in recent distresses; therefore, resolved, that we, the members of the Methodist preachers' meeting of Chicago, express our utmost confidence in the Rev. Carwardine's loyalty to Americanism, Methodism, and Christianity in the manly sympathy which he has manifested in word and deed for the law-abiding working people of Pullman, and believe

> that the accusations of anarchism made against him have been unjust and untrue, if not malicious.(143)

The Chicago Times report of the meeting that passed this resolution indicated that many clergy persons, previously opposed to the cause of strikers, were caused to re-think their position because of the work of William Carwardine.

Stephen Cobb tells the story of Carwardine's continuing labors as a pastor and advocate for the working class until his death August 25, 1929. In addition to continuing to give public lectures on the relationship between Christian faith and the cause of labor, he unsuccessfully ran for the Illinois state legislature and contributed editorials as religion editor of the Chicago Herald and Examiner. Although he had the support of Samuel Gompers, the American Federation of Labor, the Legislative Voters' League, and many others, he lost the contest for a gerrymandered district in 1904.[144] As an editorialist, he had written against evils ranging from the opium traffic to bad housing to the imprisonment of Eugene Debs during World War I as "unpatriotic," a charge Carwardine saw to be a smokescreen for punishment for Debs's labor activities.[145]

At his death in 1929, several editors had special praise for his Christian spirit.[146] The Herald and Examiner declared that he had, for so many years, "walked with God" as a "spiritual comrade" that for young men and women who had worked with him, "the glory of religion will always be defined as having the Carwardine spirit." Theater Editor Ashton Stevens, after acknowledging Carwardine enjoyed a good play better than Ashton enjoyed a good sermon, remarked: "He was a godly man who didn't know how to be miserable about it, and I miss his gusty, spontaneous laughter." The Daily News

complimented him as a pastor at Pullman who sought to find out why his parishioners were on strike, sought to help others to understand the workers' concerns as he understood them, and as one "beloved by his own people" and "acclaimed by the labor unions as one minister who dared stand for social justice."

As with Rutherford Hayes and Frances Willard, William Carwardine was one who chose to respond to the labor-capital conflict with "no theory," but with Christian concern related to the Methodist heritage extending back to John Wesley. It was a heritage that often had been waylaid by concerns for strategies to secure political or economic order, but also a heritage unsatisfied with an order that chose domination by elitist strategy rather than dialogue seeking a communicatively grounded order. All three of these persons espoused views which were part of the developing "Social Gospel" movement in America, and all three were susceptible to the elitism and middle-class bias characterizing so much of the Social Gospel and the related progressive movement in American life. All three of them were also susceptible to an unrealistic faith in the powers of reason and human progress that would later go together with a de-emphasis on the Christian heritage of confronting the false pride Christians have always called sin. They were also susceptible to a faith in human ability for change that would later discard the Christian heritage of dependence on divine grace for individual and social tranformation, ultimately in resurrection and a divinely completed kingdom. Yet, their very openness to uncoerced communication in dealing with the labor-capital conflict was not only a means to renewal in their day of the marriage of Wesleyan revivalism and American

civil religion, but also a means of renewal of a Wesleyanism that had become a Middle Class Church in the twentieth century that working class persons often rejected as not ministering to their spiritual hungers.

NOTES

[1]Editor Bradford K. Peirce cites Rogers as calling for such a dialogue in "Not Lack of Sympathy" in ZH, June 2, 1886, p.4. He published contributions by Rogers making such a call February 14, 1885 ("Communism and Socialism," p.2), October 7, 1885 ("The Social Ideal of Prophecy," p.1), February 3, 1886 ("Arbitration," p.2), and July 20, 1887 ("Some Unpopular Truths Concerning Laborers and Employers," p. 2). Editor Charles Parkhurst of ZH published Stevens' concerns in ZH for May 28, 1890 ("The Great Problem," p.1), June 4, 1890 ("The Problem of War," p.1), and June 11, 1890 ("The Problem of War," p.1). Parkhurst published Hughes' challenge in ZH. for August 19, 1891 ("Jesus and the Masses," p.1). Editor James Buckley published Merrick's plea in "The Labor Question.--The Proper Attitude of the Church" in NYCA, April 8, 1886, p.3. Editor Parkhurst printed North's concerns in "City Missions and Poverty" in "City Evangelization: a Symposium" in ZH for February 1, 1893, p.1, and "City Evangelization" in ZH for October 18, 1893, p.4.

[2]"Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements," in MR, November-December, 1891, pp. 923-932; "Regeneration as a Force In Reform Movements: Second Paper," in MR, November-December 1892, pp. 876-883.

[3]"The Crisis," NYCA, April 1, 1886, p.1.

[4]Frederick Merrick, "The Labor Question--The Proper Attitude of the Church," NYCA, April 8, 1886, p. 3.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]"Letters on Revival by Rev. F. Merrick," NYCA, April 15, 1886, p. 4.

[8]ZH, June 2, 1886, loc. cit.

[9]ZH, July 20, 1886, loc. cit.

[10]NYCA, April 11, 1889, p. 4.

[11]"The Great Problem," ZH, May 28, 1890, p. 1.

[12]"The Problem of War" in ZH for both June 4, 1890, p. 1, and June 11, 1890, p.1.

[13]ZH, June 11, 1890, loc. cit.

[14]"Jesus and the Masses," ZH, August 19, 1891, p. 1.

[15]NYCA, May 26, 1892, p. 9, report of session of May 13, 1892.

[16]"City Evangelization," ZH, October 18, 1893, p. 4, where North pleaded for the development of relationships with working class people. Earlier the same year, the February f1, 1893 issue of ZH gave front-page space to "City Evangelization: A Symposium." Both North and Mains contributed. North had the first contribution, "City Missions and Poverty." Arguing that poverty is no incentive to faith, he declared: "Many a sleek church member who shows annoyance at 'the discontent of the poor' would lose what he calls his religion in less than a week if he should find himself reduced to a two-room tenement on the East Side of New York City with no work by which to earn bread for his family or money for his rent." The fourth contribution to the Symposium was Mains' "Importance of Right Location of Churches." One sentence expresses his concern: "A first-class location will double the membership and the revenues as compared with a poor location in the same general community." North represented a communicative Methodism. Mains represented a strategic and instrumental Methodism, concerned for political and economic rationality.

[17]"Ex-President Hayes," NYCA, January 26, 1893, p.2. Buckley also noted Hayes' trusteeship in the John F. Slater Educational Fund, the Peabody Educational Fund, the National Prison Reform Association, and Ohio Wesleyan University, as well as his interest in the well-being of Native Americans and African Americans.

[18]"Needless Denials," NYCA, October 4, 1894, p. 1.

[19]NYCA, October 4, 1894, p. 12 ("Literature" section).

[20]Charles Richard Williams, The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes (Columbus: F.J. Heer Printing Company, 1928 reprint of 1914 original), Volume II, pp. 382-384, presents this changed perspective. The "right to work" emphasis is evident in Hayes' August 5, 1877 diary entry as published in Charles Richard Williams, Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes (Columbus: F.J. Heer Printing Company, 1924), Volume V, pp. 440-441. The concern for civic virtue to sustain the republic is evident in Hayes' diary entry for March 18, 1886, after a St. Patrick's Day speech in Toledo, Ohio on "America the land of the free and the home of the brave." He wrote: "My point is that free government cannot long endure if property is largely in a few hands and large masses of the people are unable to earn homes, education, and a support in old age." (Williams, Diary, Volume VI, p.277)

[21]Williams, Life of Hayes, Volume II, p. 435.

[22]Kenneth E. Davison and Ari Hoogenboom have published recent studies of Hayes' Presidency which describe this style of leadership. Davison, The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1972, stresses Hayes' "prudence and care" in relationship to the 1877 National Labor Uprising (p.149). (Davison's work is the third of six in a series titled "Contributions In American Studies" edited by Robert H. Walker.) Hoogenboom, The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1988) notes Hayes' concern for law and order mixed with sympathy for workers against "plutocrats" and against any more than eight hours of labor in a day (p.81). (Hoogenboom's work is part of the "American Presidency Series" edited by Donald McCoy, Clifford Griffin, and Homer Socolofsky.) In his concluding chapter, he sums up Hayes' style: "Hayes was both a good man and an able president. His administration of that office contradicts the widely held view that he was an inept politician. ... In dealing with...problems, Hayes was principled but practical, cautious yet courageous, open to the advice of cabinet members and friends but decisive."(pp.223-224) In a "Bibliographic Essay" (pp. 257-262), Hoogenboom cites Williams' biography (1914) as "though laudatory in spirit,...crammed with information," Barnard's (1954) as "more concerned with Hayes the man than with Hayes the president," and Davison's (1972) as "useful."

[23]Williams, Life of Hayes, Volume II, p.435.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Williams, Diary, Volume IV, pp. 432, 433.

[26]Ibid., p. 359.

[27]Williams, Life of Hayes, Volume II, p.434.

[28]Harry Barnard, Rutherford B. Hayes and his America (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1954), p.504. Hayes was so loyal to his local pastor that he appealed to Bishop Randolph Foster in Cleveland in 1883 against the "cruel injustice" of removing Pastor M.M. Mather on false charges (gossip) of "improper interest in women parishioners." (pp.504-505) Hayes succeeded in having his pastor re-appointed to the Fremont church.

[29]Williams, Diary, Volume V, p.27.

[30]Williams, Life, Volume II, p. 436. Gladden was speaking at Hayes' funeral January 20, 1893, of Hayes years of service after leaving the presidency in 1881.

[31]Williams, Diary, Volume IV, p.483. Hayes' last recorded words were: "I know that I am going where Lucy is." (Diary, Volume V, p. 145)

[32]Williams, Diary, Volume III, p.444.

[33]Ibid., p. 501.

[34]Ibid., Volume V, pp. 110-112.

[35]An October 4, 1882 Diary entry concerning his work with the Slater Fund for Freedmen's education reported: "Help none but those who help themselves. Educate only at those schools which provide in some form for industrial education. These two should be insisted on. ... This is the gospel of salvation for the colored man." (Ibid., Volume IV, p. 88)

Harry Barnard (op. cit., p.506) reports that Hayes used his influence, even against existing rules, to get a fellowship from the Slater Fund to pay for the education of W.E.B. DuBois, one of the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Although Hayes has been condemned by many for his role in the ending of Reconstruction after his 1876-77 election as President, Williams, Barnard, Davison, and Hoogenboom all recount Hayes' efforts to advance both educational and civil and voting rights for African Americans. Davison (op. cit., p.12) observes that in the 1867 Governor's race in Ohio, incumbent Republican Governor Jacob Cox opposed black voting

rights as did the Democratic candidate, Ohio Supreme Court Justice Allen Thurman. There was also a proposed constitutional amendment on the ballot guaranteeing blacks the right to vote. Hayes, as the Republican candidate, conscientiously supported the amendment. He won the election by fewer than 3,000 of the nearly 500,000 votes cast. The proposed amendment lost by 38,000 votes. Later, Hayes lent his support as Governor to the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, even as he had, as a member of Congress, supported the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments.

[36]Williams, Diary, Volume IV, p.343, gives Hayes' report of a meeting with his fellow trustees of the Peabody Education Fund. Volume IV, p.126 gives his diary entry concerning the reorganization of the National Prison Association September 7, 1883, with Hayes as President, William Round as Vice President, and Theodore Roosevelt as Treasurer. Williams notes this reorganization in a footnote to Hayes' October 4, 1883 entry: "Called at Bible House on Mr. Round. Favorably impressed with the National Prison Association."

Barnard (op. cit., pp. 506-507) describes Hayes involvement in the Peabody Fund for education in the South and the Slater fund for education for blacks in the South. He also describes Hayes' belief that "manual training" should be part of the education of all persons, regardless of status or educational goals, so as to keep touch with physical labor.

Hayes especially thought the "manual labor" part of his educational prescription would be useful in the rehabilitation of criminals. His work in the National Prison Association was a continuation of a life-long concern for those accused of or convicted of crimes. He had first gained fame as a lawyer in Cincinnati defending three persons who had been convicted of murder and were sentenced to hang. The first, on Hayes' appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court, rather than being hanged was sent to an asylum for the insane, based on Hayes' moving plea to understand an insanity defense. The second, although Hayes' appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court was turned down, had their sentence commuted by the Governor. The third was hanged, with Hayes present on the sad occasion. Davison, op. cit., pp. 6-8, recounts these events of the 1850's.

[37]Williams, Diary, Volume III, p.624, entry for August 30, 1880.

[38]Ibid., Volume V, p. 557.

[39]Ibid., Volume IV, p. 259.

[40]Barnard, op. cit., pp. 135-136.

[41]Williams, Life, Volume II, pp. 379-381.

[42]Diary entry of October 12, 1881, cited by Williams, Life, Volume II, p.380.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Williams, Diary, Volume III, p. 441.

[45]Barnard, op. cit., p. 446.

[46]Williams, Life, Volume II, pp. 381-385, summarizes Hayes' later views on this.

[47]Barnard, op. cit., pp. 515-516. Barnard notes that former Illinois Governor Richard Oglesby said that if the same "guilt by association" brought against the Chicago Anarchists of 1886 in connection with the Haymarket Bombing had been applied in connection with John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry Arsenal, all American Abolitionists and most Republican Party leaders, including Lincoln and Hayes, might have been hanged!

[48]Williams, Life, Volume II, p. 382.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid. Henry George's Progress and Poverty was one of the fundamental protests in the 1880's against the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of "Big Business."

[54]Ibid., pp. 382-383.

[55]Ibid., p. 383.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Ibid., pp. 383-384.

[58]Ibid., p. 384.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Ibid. Williams, Diary, Volume IV, p. 556.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Ibid., Volume IV, pp. 434-435.

[63]Barnard, loc. cit.

[64]Williams, Diary, Volume IV, p. 397.

[65]Ibid., p. 565.

[66]Williams, Life, Volume II, p. 384. Williams, Diary, Volume IV, p. 616.

[67]Williams, Life, pp. 384-385. Williams, Diary, Volume IV, p. 621.

[68]Ibid., p. 635.

[69]Ibid., p. 637.

[70]Eric Foner, Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p.100.

[71]Ruth Bordin, Frances Willard: A Biography (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986), p. 53 speaks of her Winter 1871 commitment to the "woman's movement" after early teaching experiences and the death of her sister Mary at age 19. Bordin's chapter "Commitment" (pp. 54-71) speaks of Willard's term as first president of Northwestern Woman's College and her choice to leave her enjoyable educational efforts in 1874 and reliance on Divine provision and guidance in becoming involved with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) in 1874. Her preaching skills developed as she sought the down and out in Chicago's Loop area and she remarked concerning one preaching occasion: "This little Gospel meeting, where wicked men have wept and prayed and said they would see Jesus--it thrills me through

and through."(p.76) She was elected Corresponding Secretary for the crucial first year of the WCTU, with the more conservative Methodist Annie Wittenmyer serving as the WCTU's first president.(p.79). She maintained her influential Corresponding Secretary's position when she resigned her position as President of the Illinois WCTU to join Dwight Moody in his January 1877 evangelistic campaign in Boston, with 6,000 hearing her speak at the Boston Tabernacle on a Sunday afternoon on "What Think Ye of Christ?" and several hundred converted (pp. 87-88). Conflicts with Moody over her work with Unitarians in WCTU rallies led to her withdrawal from the Moody effort, a short-term effort as editor of a Chicago newspaper, and return to full-time WCTU work in 1878 (p.89). Bordin explains Willard's involvement in labor and other national reform issues in chapters titled "Reformer" (pp. 129-154), "Christian" (155-174), and "Politician" (pp. 175-189). Bordin's biography is the primary source for this section on Willard, together with: Frances E. Willard, Glimpses of Fifty Years: The Autobiography of an American Woman (Chicago: H.J. Smith & Company,1889) and Anna A. Gordon, Frances E. Willard: A Memorial Volume (Chicago: The Woman's Christian Temperance Publishing Association, 1898).

[72]Bordin, op. cit., p. 156.

[73]Bordin, op. cit., p. 29.

[74]Ibid. Footnote on p. 246 refers this to Willard's diary entry for January 20, 1860. Bordin, pp. 24-37 traces the related romantic idealism that led her to accept an engagement ring from Charles H. Fowler in 1862, only to return it the next February because she rejected the thought of any "emotionally trimmed, functional marriage" that would be a "marriage of convenience" in keeping with nineteenth-century norms. Interestingly, this was the same Charles H. Fowler who would be the editor of the New York Christian Advocate during the National Labor Uprising of 1877.

[75]Willard, op. cit., pp. 358-359.

[76]Ibid., p. 359.

[77]Ibid., p. 361.

[78]Bordin, op. cit., p. 97.

[79]Ibid., pp. 105-106.

[80]Ibid., p. 111.

[81]Ibid., pp. 134-137.

[82]Ibid., pp. 3-12. Flags were at half staff in both Chicago and Washington, D.C. at her death on February 17, 1898.(p.3) Bordin writes: Willard's devotion to home and womanliness was paired with radical social ideas. ... Willard used conservative values to promote radical ends. ... Nevertheless, Willard's triple emphasis--womanliness, the pivotal role of temperance in her reform program, and her complete faith in progress--doomed her to obscurity by the mid-twentieth century."(pp. 10-12) Bordin contends that by the 1980's people were ready to re-examine Willard's concerns about alcoholism and Willard's belief in the unique contributions she believed only women could make.

[83]Ibid., p. 136.

[84]Ibid., p.130. Bordin sees this process taking about 8 or 9 years for Willard after the1881 address.

[85]Ibid., p. 135. Philip Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States: Volume II: From the Founding of the American Federation of Labor to the Emergence of American Imperialism (New York: International Publishers, 1955) does not mention this, Willard or the WCTU in his discussion of the role of women in the Knights of Labor (pp. 61-66). He only mentions (p.64)the 16 women delegates out of 660 at the 1886 Knights Convention. Also mentioned by Foner is Mrs. Elizabeth Rodgers, who served for several months as Master Workman of District Assembly 24 in Chicago, who presided over 40,000 members and whom Bordin notes to have become good friends with Frances Willard.

[86]Ibid.,140, footnote, p. 261 to Thirty Years of Labor, 1859-1889 (Columbus: Excelsior Publishing House, 1890), p. 601.

[87]Ibid., pp. 140-144.

[88]Ibid., p. 144.

[89]Ibid., p. 140.

[90]Ibid., p. 141.

[91]Ibid., p. 142.

[92]Willard, op. cit., p. 413. Willard's emphasis.

[93]Bordin, loc. cit.

[94]Ibid., pp. 142-143.

[95]Bordin, op. cit., p. 129.

[96]Ibid., p. 174. Bordin cites Mari Jo Buhle, Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981), p. 64 as arguing that this was the case.

[97]Ibid., p. 146.

[98]Ibid., pp. 146-147.

[99]Ibid., pp. 147-148.

[100]Ibid., pp. 148, 154.

[101]Ibid., pp. 160-168. Bordin cites Zion's Herald, which she mistakenly calls "A Chicago publication representing the progressive West" (really, it was a Boston publication), as supporting election of female delegates to the Methodist General Conference while James Buckley and the New York Christian Advocate led the opposition (164ff.).

[102]Ibid., pp. 168-170. Ironically, Livermore was a Unitarian, and Willard's ecumenicism of ministry to human need that included Unitarianism had been what caused her split from Dwight Moody's Boston Crusade.

[103]Ibid., p. 174.

[104]Ibid., reference to Herbert Gutman, Work Culture and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History (New York: Vintage Press, 1976) chapter 2. Ken Fones-Wolf has applied a modified Gutman perspective to Philadelphia in Trade Union Gospel: Christianity and Labor in Industrial Philadelphia, 1865-1915 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), in which he contends that religious rhetoric was used by trade unionists into the twentieth century to challenge the oppressiveness of capitalism.

[105]Ibid., chapter XI, "Politician," pp. 175-189, is the source of the information in this paragraph.

[106]Ibid., p.179. Bordin notes (p.267) that "the two most comprehensive studies of Populism pay no attention to the attempt to organize a reform coalition that included women, Prohibitionism, and Populism." The two studies she has in mind are: Lawrence Goodwyn, Democratic Promise: The Populist Movement in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) and John D. Hicks, The Populist Revolt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931). She does note that the effort to arrange a union between the Prohibitionists and the new Populist Party is described in detail in Jack S. Blocker, Jr., Retreat from Reform: The Prohibition Movement in the United States, 1890-1913 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976).

[107]Ibid., p. 180.

[108]Ibid., p. 206.

[109]Ibid., p. 210.

[110]Ibid.

[111]Ibid., pp. 232-233.

[112]Ibid., p.234.

[113]Gordon, op. cit., pp. 401 ff.

[114]Ibid., p. 401.

[115]Bordin, op. cit., pp. 145-146.

[116]Stephen G. Cobb, Reverend William Carwardine and the Pullman Strike of 1894: The Christian Gospel and Social Justice (Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), p. 191. William H. Carwardine, The Pullman Strike (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1894; re-published for the Illinois Historical Society in 1971), p. 111. Cobb's book is apparently a re-writing of a 1970 doctoral dissertation for Frederick Norwood through Northwestern University, as suggested by a footnote on page 344 of Norwood's The Story of American Methodism (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974).

[117]Carwardine, op. cit.

[118]Winthrop Hudson (with editor John Corrigan), Religion in America: An Historical Account of the Development of American Religious Life (New York: Macmillan, 1992, revision of book first by authored by Hudson and copyrighted in 1965), pp.289-290, contrasts Carwardine and Gladden in his account of the origins of the Social Gospel. Hudson views Carwardine as typical of clergy whose consciences were disturbed by personal acquaintance with the workers' circumstances and thus became supportive. He says of Carwardine: "He had no theory to support his opinions." His "immediate and first-hand experience" of workers' conditions at Pullman convinced him of "the justice of the strikers' demands." In contrast, he states that, although Gladden's exposure to workers' plight first occurred in his Springfield, Massachusetts pastorate, "The conversion was not quite so sudden and dramatic [i.e., as Carwardine's to the justice of the workers' demands]. ... His views did not mature until the Hocking Valley Coal Strike of 1884 when he was minister of the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio."

Carwardine had "matured" through pastoral experiences, perhaps in terms of coming to some conclusion as to the need for governmental action to defend the workers' cause, perhaps in terms of how the church ought best to relate to the issue. There had been no "sudden conversion" to support of the justice of workers' demands. His commitment to the cause of justice for workers dated from experiences as early as childhood. His "theory" on which he based that commitment may not have been grounded in sociological analysis, but it was grounded in long-lasting theological commitments, commitments suggested in the troubling question raised by Charles Sheldon's 1896 Social Gospel classic In His Steps: "What would Jesus do?"

[119]Cobb, op. cit., p. 191.

[120]Ibid., pp. 58-59.

[121]Ibid., pp. 65-92. Cobb presents a chapter on "Sources of Carwardine's Value Orientations," focusing on "Labor" (pp. 35-42, speaking of the writings of Henry George, Lester Frank Ward, Richard T. Ely, Edward Bellamy, Jacob Riis, Henry Demarest Lloyd, and Thorstein Veblen), "Social Gospel" (pp. 42-44, with very general references to Walter Rauschenbusch, Shailer Mathews, Josiah Strong, and Washington Gladden), "Populism" (pp. 44-65, with references to Lloyd, Lewelling, and Carwardine speeches), and "Christian Socialism" (pp. 65-92, with references to beginnings of English and American Christian Socialism and to Ely, Lloyd, and George Herron and W.D.P. Bliss. Cobb suggests that Carwardine was especially influenced by those who viewed government power as the proper means to deal with injustices.

[122]Carwardine, op. cit., p.7. This is the account of John Merritte Driver in the Introduction. Driver was Pastor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church in Marion, Indiana, as cited in Cobb, op. cit., p. 129.

[123]Cobb, op. cit., pp. 125-126. Quote is from "Preacher to Strikers; Pullman Minister's Plain Words" in the Chicago Herald of May 21, 1894.

[124]Ibid., p. 120.

[125]Ibid., pp. 119-120.

[126]Ibid., p. 121.

[127]Cobb, op. cit., pp. 116-117, reports the sermon of the Rev. E.C. Oggel of the Greenstone Memorial Church who had preached a sermon in Spring 1894 eulogizing Pullman's "Horatio Alger" story of "rags to riches" success, condemning union agitators and declaring "half a loaf is better than none." Other pastors tended to speak in generalities or counsel against violence, as summarized by Cobb, pp. 117-118. Cobb, pp. 118-128 summarizes Carwardine's sermon and responses to it.

[128]Carwardine, op. cit., pp. 27-30 praises Pullman's business genius, but charges: "Determination and resolution have turned to arrogance and obstinacy." Carwardine reproduces a report of the Springfield, Illinois Republican for July 11, 1894 listing the 1893 $4,000,000 surplus. Carwardine specifies wage cuts, rents in comparison with the surrounding towns, and shop abuses that contradict any claim that Pullman was a "benefactor" (pp. 68-117).

[129]Cobb, op. cit., pp. 201-202. This was signed by President T.W. Heathcote, Vice President R.W. Brown, and Acting Secretary J. W. Jacobs.

[130]Ibid., p. 99.

[131]Carwardine, op. cit., p. 121.

[132]Ibid., pp. 122-123.

[133]Ibid., p. 124.

[134]Editor Buckley's comments were in the October 4, 1894 edition of NYCA, p.12, the "Literature" review section. Carwardine's comparison of Pullman to the Czar is in op. cit., p. 49.

[135]Cobb, op. cit., pp. 153-154.

[136]Carwardine, op. cit., p. 15. My emphasis on "mutual recognition."

[137]Ibid, p. 14. Again, my emphasis on "mutual recognition."

[138]Ibid., p. 125, with the appeal extending from pp. 124-126.

[139]Cobb, op. cit., p. 3, presents these as early nineteenth century core values, as described in John William Wood's Andrew Jackson--Symbol For An Age (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962). Cobb gives further application to late nineteenth century laissez faire and Gospel of Wealth on pp. 10 and 59.

[140]Foner, loc. cit.

[141]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[142]The Northwestern Christian Advocate (Chicago), edited by the Rev. Arthur Edwards, had remarked in its June 13, 1894 edition that "Mr. Pullman has a Universalist brother and is said to favor that faith." Then, Edwards had declared: "Our Methodist Pastor in Pullman, Rev. W.H. Carwardine, who advised against the strike, now advocates the cause of his people as against the company." Edwards also published excerpts from Carwardine's history of the strike. The September 19 issue reports that Carwardine and his wife were given gold watches in special recognition at the September meeting of the Chicago Methodist preachers.

[143]Cobb, op. cit., pp. 157-158.

[144]Ibid., pp. 180-186.

[145]Ibid., pp. 187-190.

[146]Ibid., pp. 195-198.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Late nineteenth century labor uprisings threatened the Methodist sense of rational order that had married Wesleyan perfectionist revivalism to American Civil Religion. The irony was that a movement that originated in a quest for spiritual liberation that would share in Pentecostal community became a movement to defend an old order or to advance a new one that did not ground itself in Pentecostal community. The prime concerns of most Methodists were human liberation by quality religious experiences, by the smooth functioning of American "free institutions," by the cultivation of economic virtue, or by the enforcement of "the kingdom of God." "Liberation," though, was usually to be achieved by strategies that denied the liberty of participation by working class persons in the process of socially deciding what the fundamental social order would be. The continued "rational order" of a "free market" or of American "free institutions" of government or of Methodist institutions of "spiritual freedom" were more important than the free participation of the working class.

Methodist responses to late nineteenth century labor unrest in the United States may be critically interpreted from historical, philosophical, and theological perspectives. Historically, the responses were part of the modernization of society and they also included rational social sources of resistance to domination of the communicative social life-world by economic and political systems. Methodist pastors and lay people, when they sought a reasonable solution to the challenges of the day in conversation with one another found resources to refuse to be squeezed into the mold of the money of the marketplace or the power of political and religious institutions.

Philosophically, the responses reveal both the partial rationality of strategic actions

and the more holistic rationality of communicative actions. Human communities, including religious ones, find a sense of purpose in communicative interaction. They seek strategies of political and economic activity to implement that purpose. But, the moral foundations crumble when those strategies become more important than the shared sense of the group's purpose.

Theologically, the responses expressed ultimate concerns that were often distracted and distorted by transitory material and self-glorifying interests. Ultimate concern for the nation or the church or Pentecostal Revival became a religious commitment of greater importance than commitment to the one who said "Blessed are the poor in spirit."

Methodist responses to threats posed by strikes in 1877, 1886, and 1894 moved in three directions, each of which fits social theorist Jurgen Habermas's understanding of the quest for rationality by modernizing societies.[1] Some Methodists sought to steer the late nineteenth century American social and political lifeworld with the medium of power to maintain the existing marriage of Methodism and American civil religion by strategic action to "defend free institutions," including the strategic action of promoting mass Pentecostal revival to save the nation and to save the church from the perceived threat of striking laborers. Others sought to re-structure the marriage by steering the same lifeworld by the medium of money legitimated by an emerging Gospel of Wealth or the medium of power legitimated by an emerging Social Gospel. Gospel of Wealth advocates would let the medium of money steer the lifeworld by way of the "free market" and some Social Gospel advocates would let the medium of power steer the lifeworld by way of a State-imposed "kingdom of God." The objective was human liberation by private virtue in a

minimally-regulated economy according to the "Gospel of Wealth." Or, it was human liberation in a religiously-regulated economy and politics for many adherents of the "Social Gospel.". A movement originating in small-group dynamics of communication, trusting divine grace to work through this structure, was turning to faith in divine grace to work through strategic action for economic or political order. The Pentecostal "gift of tongues" for "all flesh" was being replaced by a gift of strategic leadership for the preservation of "free institutions."

Another alternative, stressed by other Social Gospel advocates, contributors to the Methodist press, and Rutherford Hayes, Frances Willard, and William Carwardine, was the quest for what Habermas terms "communicative action" that sought to employ the medium of language to find a renewed marriage of Wesleyan perfectionist revivalism and American Civil Religion. These leaders did not often use the language of Pentecost, and they did not regularly refer to the Wesleyan heritage. But they sought a "gift of ears" to hear the working class that would match a "gift of tongues" to communicate in the quest for a community rationally ordered by the Divine Spirit through the medium of language rather than the media of money or power. They were pursuing, in Habermas's terms, an "extension of communication free of domination" by the media of money and political power.[2] Their "communicative rationality," rather than the mere "impotent rage of nature in revolt," gave, as Habermas describes it, an "inner logic...to resistance against the colonization of the lifeworld by the inner dynamics of autonomous systems" of economics and politics.[3] It was a communicative rationality their spiritual ancestor, John Wesley, saw to be inspired by the Spirit of Pentecost, resisting worldly reliance on money

and power and instead seeking Pentecostal community.[4] So long as it was an "appeal to reason," such as Wesley made in his Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion, it was one source of the "rational hope" Jurgen Habermas speaks of for breaking free from the "iron cage" of modernization Max Weber spoke of.[5] It was a source of communicative action that would resist domination by the strategic and instrumental actions of the economic and political subsystems.

This segment of Methodist history reveals religion as a force that can either contribute toward enslaving or emancipating the human spirit. It can be a source of "false consciousness" that seeks to legitimate orders dominated by money and power. In that case, it is false consciousness because it supports the human rationality of the marketplace or the political system while ignoring the more fundamental human rationality of the uncoerced and inclusive human lifeworld Or, religion can be a source of protest for the loosing of the tongues of the oppressed and opening the ears of potential oppressors to participate in the creation of a democratic civic order. It can be, in the words of sociologist Peter Berger, "alienating" or "de-alienating."[6]

As contributors to the Methodist press in the late nineteenth century, Abel Stevens, Hugh Price Hughes, Frank Mason North, Frederick Merrick, and C.M. Morse all challenged their fellow Methodists to seek a new order grounded in what all members of society had to say, including those who were striking. As leaders intensely related to Labor Uprisings of 1877, 1886, and 1894, Rutherford Hayes, Frances Willard, and William Carwardine also called their fellow Methodists in particular and Americans in general to listen to and empower the working class. Although many other Methodists

were steered on the labor issue by the media of money or power, these Methodist resisters called for empowering the tongues of the working class to join the quest for a just social order. They sought a rational order grounded in uncoerced communicative involvement by all citizens. These Methodists reveal that, alongside the irony of disciplined Methodist spirituality seeking Pentecost without Pentecostal community, there was the humanity of persons motivated by religious commitments to swim against the stream of popular antagonism against striking laborers and support the rationality of holistic human community as superior to economic or political rationalities.

Methodist responses to labor unrest in late nineteenth century America raise further issues beyond the role of religion in either submitting to or helping to overcome the steering of the lifeworld by the media of money and power. Methodist responses suggest the question of how to determine justice for a given society as well as the question of the limits of a philosophic theory of rationality such as that proposed by Habermas.[7] These issues are suggested by Paul Lakeland and Helmut Peukert in their efforts to employ Habermas's perspective in both Roman Catholic and Protestant theological and ethical thought.[8] They are also raised by Reinhold Niebuhr in his critique of rational optimism. They are not questions this study was designed to answer, but they are issues arising out of the study that invite further reflection.

Lakeland contends for a public ethic of emancipation implicit in Habermas's starting point of the communicative speech act. Habermas argues that the speech act rationally implies solidarity, and that this solidarity calls for communication free of coercion. This is not a "foundationalist" appeal to an epistemological base that may not

be questioned, but an analysis of the rationality of human communicative actions.[9] The "foundation" is not something the individual, autonomous thinker may discover, as with Descartes' "I think, therefore I am." Rather, it is that which the human community discovers in uncoerced communication and has a rational justification for. In an introductory survey of critical theory in general and of Habermas's critical theory in particular, Lakeland explains that the theory of truth presented by Habermas involves not only consensus, but a consensus with rational justification, "if and only if every other person who could enter in a dialogue ...would" agree.[10] The agreement would be grounded in consent to the most convincing argument. Lakeland continues to quote Habermas as stating: "The condition of the truth of statements is the potential agreement of all others." An acceptable public ethic, justice for a given society, is determined in the collective human quest for truth for social and political relationships.

Lakeland notes Habermas's explanation of modernization as the development of rationalization by which "the sacred has been progressively diminished and replaced by communicative reason." Economic and political systems of money and power have developed a rationality originally designed to serve the lifeworld but eventually separating and "colonizing" the more fundamental communicative lifeworld.[12] Then, Lakeland states what he sees to be the hope for overcoming this loss of human rational control:

> We can only look to the exercise of human rationality in and through the communication community to fight back against human loss of control over the system. ... Habermas's argument would suggest that a first step is to begin to resist mightily the forces that privatize art, philosophy, ethics, and even religion, and to promote a vigorous communication community dedicated to a public ethic that will win back control for the lifeworld of the system that is, inevitably, a good

servant but a very bad ruler.(12)

Although Lakeland acknowledges that Habermas has been criticized for an emphasis on "procedural rationality and procedural ethics" that has nothing to offer substantively, Lakeland notes that Habermas has stressed a social structure with "lifeworld" controlling subsystems of the economy and politics, thus going beyond an individualistic procedural justice.[13] Lakeland uses the remainder of his book to apply this perspective on method to arrive at ethical decisions in general and public ethics in particular as the Roman Catholic community participates in the wider human community .

Communicative Methodists of the late nineteenth century were supporting a similar method for arriving at social justice. They tended to lack any single scheme for a just society, but, rather, advocated rational conversation among strikers, employers, and other members of the public in seeking industrial justice. Consensus grounded in the results of that rational conversation would be the foundation of any justice. The motivation, though, was religious commitment to love of neighbor rather than a philosophical analysis of human rationality. As with the ancient prophets of Israel, the source of their rational objection was a religious sense of Divine judgment of humanly created institutions.[14] But, their approach agrees with a philosophical quest for justice that goes beyond just individual procedures or distributions or the following of any specific ideal to a substantive justice grounded in control by the communicative lifeworld over economic and political

subsystems.

Peukert's analysis finds Habermas's work helpful in underlining the human

solidarity required to make rational sense of human communicative activities. But, he observes two basic discontinuities in human communicative solidarity--undeserved suffering and death. Following a lengthy introductory analysis of developments in scientific theories of society leading to a theory of society understood primarily in terms of communicative action, Peukert suggests that without traditional theological concepts of redemption and resurrection, there is a fundamental incoherence in the human sense of solidarity.[15] If solidarity is not to involve forgetfulness of those who have suffered unjustly in the past, as well as not involve forgetfulness of all who have died, Peukert argues that there must be concepts of redemption of that past suffering and resurrection of the dead. He does so with a lengthy analysis of sections of both the Old and New Testaments.

Habermas has responded to Peukert's challenge by saying that, although the "ethics of compassion and solidarity" are limit problems for communicative ethics, he thinks that, in the words of Peukert translator James Bohman, "Peukert does not sufficiently take into account the counterfactual and discursive nature of universalist ethical claims."[16] Habermas is trying to make rational sense of the speech act, but he is not concluding that life rationally agrees with all inferences. The ideal human speech community implied by the speech act does not exist. Peukert acknowledges Habermas's response to issues he has raised. In a footnote, Peukert quotes Habermas's recognition of problems Peukert has raised and Habermas's resolution of these problems:

> Considering the risks to individual life that exist, a theory that could interpret away the facticities of loneliness and guilt, sickness and death is, to be sure, not even <u>conceivable</u>. Contingencies that are irrevocably

> attached to the bodily and moral constitution of the individual can be raised to consciousness only as contingency. We must live disconsolately with them.(17)

Habermas has responded to Peukert's challenge and chosen what Peukert sees as the incoherence of living disconsolately rather than the acceptance of theological concepts.

In connection with Methodist responses to labor uprisings in the late nineteenth century, both Rutherford Hayes and Frances Willard, with all their confidence in human rationality, longed for reunion with departed loved ones, Hayes with his beloved wife Lucy and Willard with her sister and father and mother.[18] As the Social Gospel developed in the twentieth century, rational theologies de-emphasizing resurrection and redemption were found unacceptable in the lifeworld of everyday members of the Christian community. There seemed to be something unreasonable about a permanent separation at death. Peukert would ground hope in the rationality of the communicative speech act.

Reinhold Niebuhr's critique of rational optimism suggests a further problem for Habermas's theory of rationality. Walter Rauschenbush had argued, and Niebuhr would later emphasize, that the traditional Christian conviction was that mere human rational communication was inedequate to overcome human selfishness dividing the lifeworld. Rauschenbusch's 1917 A Theology for the Social Gospel warned of the "Kingdom of Evil" that could deceitfully overcome the Kingdom of God and Niebuhr's 1932 Moral Man and Immoral Society warned of the hidden self-interests involved in social crusades.[19] Although Niebuhr's critique was aimed at an overly optimistic religious community, one that overlooked its own "corruption of inordinate self-love," it would apply to any vision

of a "final realm" in which "life is related to life without the coercion of power."[20] For Niebuhr, a concept of rationality would have to include the "irrational" obstacles to the rationality implied in the human speech act.

With respect to the Methodist attraction to rational optimism during this time, Robert Chiles has explained the Methodist theological transition from John Wesley's focus on Divine grace to later Methodist emphasis on human freedom and ability.[21] As Chiles describes it, the "new theology of the early twentieth century "seemed relevant and appealing to the optimism, and scientific age which gave it birth."[22] Chiles contends that John Wesley's perspective had held together tensions "every generation" in the Christian community is tempted to resolve at the expense of truth--tensions between God and man, between reason and revelation, and sin and grace. Chiles could have added that every generation also tends to resolve too simply the tension Wesley held between optimism concerning human possibilities through grace mixed with a critical perspective on obstacles to that achievement. For Niebuhr, those obstacles to rational human community included "inordinate self-love."

Historians seek an interpretive pattern for past events, and they also seek to relate that to a better understanding of contemporary realities. On the one hand, historians seek past sources of contemporary events. On the other hand, they attempt to see the present more clearly in the light of the social dynamics of past events.[23] The pattern of Methodist responses to the strikes of 1877, 1886, and 1894 fits Habermas's interpretation of the modernization of society. That modernization leads to colonization of the lifeworld by media of money and power, as is exemplifed in some Methodist economic and political

strategies of responding to the strikes. But, it also includes the source of rational protest against that colonization, as exemplified by Hayes, Willard, Carwardine, and other Methodists of this period. The pattern of these responses reveals the irony of Methodist spiritual discipline and quest for a modern Pentecost leading away from the spiritual discipline in Pentecostal community Wesley had envisioned. These responses also reveal the irony of Methodists loyal to Wesley's concern for love of neighbor ignoring Wesley's emphasis on the need for divine grace to overcome what Reinhold Niebuhr in the twentieth century would speak of as the "corruption of inordinate self-love" in the most idealistic of social planners.

Philosophy seeks a critical and constructive perspective on human experience so as to live it.[24] Habermas defines it in terms of the human effort to understand rationalaity.[25] Methodist responses to the late nineteenth century strikes in the United States provide examples of the social conflict between lifeworld rationality and the rationality of economic and political subsystems. They also suggest the imperative to keep the economic and political subsystems and their rationalities servants and never masters of the more rationally basic rationality of the social lifeworld.

Theologically, each of the Methodist responses displays an ultimate concern, a religious commitment, and each reveals a potential for distortion.[26] Paul Tillich labels as "religion" the "dimension of depth in the human spirit," the Ultimate Concern he argues that all humans have in some fashion. Defenders of free institutions and promoters of Pentecostal Revival were ultimately concerned to practice the will of God through free institutions and through liberating spiritual experiences. But, the less than ultimate means,

defending free institutions and promoting Pentecostal revival, became an ultimate end, more ultimate than a possible divine calling to develop better institutions or to have a fresher perspective on Christian experience. In particular, they made secondary the communicative work of the Divine Spirit in Pentecostal community.

Similarly, promoters of a Gospel of Wealth or a Social Gospel were convinced that this was the divinely prescribed route to the will of God on earth. But, they, too, often made less than ultimate means, individual virtue cultivation or enforcement of the kingdom of God for justice in society, more important than a divine calling to a social activist virtue or a kingdom of God by consent. They, too, made the activity of the Divine Spirit in communicative action secondary to strategic and instrumental action.

Although other Methodists listened for the Divine Spirit in solidarity with labor, they, too, found confusion on ultimate issues. Rational concerns for love of neighbor confronted obstacles to expressing that love in undeserved suffering and death. Also, the classic dependence on the grace of God was departed from, leading to undue optimism without the needed blend of critical realism.

Hayes, Willard and Carwardine all sensed their own weaknesses. But, they were optimistic about possible human achievements. The irony was that they were placing hope for a just society in human rational and democratic sources. Reinhold Niebuhr would later remind Americans that the classic Christian faith puts such ultimate hope only in God.

Habermas, Niebuhr, and Wesley, each in their own way, lend critical perspective to Methodist responses to the strikes. Habermas points to the power of concern

for subsystem rationality, and also to the power of concern for lifeworld rationality to overcome domination of the lifeworld by subsystems of political and economic concerns. Niebuhr points to the irony of Christian communication being replaced by unaided human communication that ignores the traditional Christian understanding of Original Sin. Wesley points to the threat of riches to disciplined godliness in Christian community.

In an ironic way, Wesley's Pentecostalism of Christian community of material goods in the service of godliness was replaced in the late nineteenth century by a Pentecostalism of spirit or consciousness. Wesley's Pentecostalism of material community shares Habermas's concern for uncoerced rational community. Habermas speaks of communicative rationality "connected with ancient concepts of logos."[26] He contends that participants in communicative action "assure themselves of both the unity of the objective world and the intersubjectivity of their lifeworld." They do this by "unconstrained, unifying, consensus-bringing force of argumentative speech, in which different participants overcome merely subjective views."

For Wesley, the grace to listen to what Habermas terms "unconstrained...speech" was the gift of the Pentecostal Spirit.. He also believed, together with the author of the Gospel of John, that the "Logos" foundation for communicative speech was made known when "The Logos became flesh and dwelt among us" in the person of Jesus. He frequently stressed a verse from the same passage about "the true light that enlightens everyone who comes into the world" as stressing a universal offer of salvation as opposed to other views of an offer to only a select few. The "Logos" or "Divine Reason" was a source of potential enlightenment for all, by grace, and this was to be shared in Pentecostal

community, not a community of disemdisembodied spiritual experience, but in a community of shared material goods. The irony was that many who spoke of Pentecost or rational order did not seek Pentecostal community or a rational order that included the working class in determining the social and political future. But, matching this irony was the humanity of those Methodists who, for religious or non-religious reasons, listened to labor in solidarity.

NOTES

[1]As in the Introduction above, and the body of this paper, this analysis is based on Jurgen Habermas, The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume Two, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason, translated by Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), especially pp. 256 ff. and 332 ff. This is also the perspective presented by Habermas in "Technology and Science as 'Ideology,'" reproduced from Toward a Rational Society (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970) in Roger S. Gottlieb (editor) An Anthology of Western Marxism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 248-275.

[2]Habermas, in "Technology and Science," p. 251.

[3]Habermas in Lifeworld, pp. 332-333.

[4]John Wesley, Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1958 reprinting), p. 402, comments on Acts 2 and 4. Theodore Jennings, Jr., Good News to the Poor: John Wesley's Evangelical Economics (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), "The Demystification of Wealth" (pp. 29-46), cites many references by Wesley warning against the threat of riches to break Christian bonds of solidarity with the poor, and Jennings sees this as an antidote to"the pseudo-gospel of wealth and power." For Wesley, the steering media of wealth and power were enemies of the Divine medium of language.

[5]Habermas, loc. cit.

[6]Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, 1967), discusses this in his chapter "Religion and Alienation," pp. 81-101. "Alienation" is defined there as a process by which the individual forgets that the social world is a human creation, and Berger notes the role of religion in legitimating this. He also notes the potential role of religion to relativize human social constructions in the presence of belief in divine judgments and thus to "de-alienate."

[7]Jurgen Habermas, The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume I, Reason and the Rationalization of Society , translated by Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), pp. 1 ff.

[8]Paul Lakeland, Theology and Critical Theory: The Discourse of the Church (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990). Helmut Peukert, Science, Action, and Fundamental Theology (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1984), translated by James Bohman from 1976 German edition.

[9]Translator Thomas McCarthy analyzes this in his introduction to Habermas, Reason and the Rationalization of Society.

[10]Lakeland, op. cit., p. 52. The quote is from Thomas McCarthy, The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas (Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1978), p.299.

[11]Ibid., pp. 54, 64-65.

[12]Ibid., p. 69.

[13]Ibid., pp. 65-69, gives substantive applications made by Habermas.

[14]Peukert, op. cit., p. 218, noting the normative value for the prophets of the Hebrew experience of liberation from Egyptian slavery, explains: "The cultic attempt to approach God the redeemer from slavery becomes a perversion and cries out for condemnation so long as others are enslaved." The source of rational criticism is the experience of the God of the Exodus. Further, Peukert adds: "The claim of this basic relationship, in which the recognition of the unconditional equality of the other is the condition of access to and acceptance of God, loses its former merely national limitations in prophetic proclamation. ... It becomes universal. From Amos to the book of Jonah, an ethnocentric conception of divine election, insofar as it is supposed to legitimate the refusal to extend solidarity beyond one's own people and does not make obligatory the commitment to this unlimited solidarity, is attacked."

Peter Berger, op. cit., pp. 98-101, notes the prophetic "debunking" of the supposed sacred character of humanly developed institutions, focusing on kingship and the prophet Nathan's condemnation of King David's adultery and murder (2 Samuel 12.10-17) as violations of the demands of a transcendent God. Berger sees three motifs of Israelite religion in general and the preaching of the prophets in particular as providing a source of challenge to versions of order advanced by other civilizations of the day. Those three motifs are: "transcendentalization, historization, and the rationalization of ethics." (p.115) A God distinct from the cosmos revealed himself in human history, calling his servants to impose a rational order of service to God and fellow humans. (pp. 115-121) The source of rational criticism is the historic experience of the transcendent God..

[15]Peukert, op. cit., pp. 208 ff.

[16]Ibid, p. 277. Reference to "A Reply to my Critics," in Habermas: Critical Debates, edited by J.B. Thompson and D. Held (Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1982), pp. 246-247.

[17]Ibid., p. 311. Reference is to Habermas's Legitimation Crisis (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), p. 120.

[18]Harry Barnard, Rutherford B. Hayes and his America (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 510-511. Ruth Bordin, Frances Willard: A Biography (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986), p. 207.

[19]Sidney Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), pp. 801-802, notes this realism in Rauschenbusch's A Theology for the Social Gospel. Ahlstrom also notes the "religio-ethical bombshell" effect of Niebuhr's 1932 Moral Man and Immoral Society (p.941). The biographical and theological foundations of Niebuhr's thought, including his transition from Social Gospel optimism to Neo-orthodox re-emphasis on the traditional Christian concept of Original Sin coloring with self-interest the most idealistic of human efforts, is presented in Paul Merkley, Reinhold Niebuhr: A Political Account (Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975).

[20]Reinhold Niebuhr, The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness, p. 899, as discussed above in the Introduction, pp. 17-18 and notes on p. 38.

[21]Robert E. Chiles, Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790-1935 (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965).

[22]Ibid., p. 187. Sidney Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), describes the new theology of the early twentieth century as substituting sociology for theology (p.183) and as eventually becoming "secularized and innocuous."(p.186). Mead thus describes a liberal theology that was a contrast to a fundamentalist theology he describes as "archaic and anachronistic." He closes his book with hopes that a post-1930's critique of "liberalism" and "modernism" would lead to a more imaginative theological effort to combine "traditional Christian formulations" and "contemporary culture." (p.187) His "contemporary culture" is the social and intellectual demands of today's culture. Mead's vision of a better theology is the kind of theology Helmut Peukert sees developing from the convergence of sociological and theological reflection on a theory of communicative action, a theory Peukert argues requires concepts of redemption and resurrection.

[23]Gerald N. Grob and George A. Billias, Interpretation of American History: Patterns and Perspectives, Volume I: To 1877 (New York: The Free Press, 1976), p.1, quote Benedetto Croce: "Every true history is contemporary history." Then, they comment on past history writing: "History--as distinguished from chronicle--was meaningful only to the degree that it struck a sympathetic chord in the minds of contemporaries who saw in the past the problems and issues of their own day."

[24]Twentieth century philosophers have given a variety of definitions of their work and priorities. An introductory text by Robert C. Solomon, Introducing Philosophy (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1986) sees philosophy as "a critical approach to all subjects" (p.11) and "an attitude of critical and systematic thoughtfulness." (p.13) Mortimer Adler sees it as concerned about "first-order questions" about "that which is and happens" and "what men should do and seek" and "second-order questions" about "the content of our thinking when we try to answer first-order questions." (Quoted from The Conditions of Philosophy, 1965, by Atheneum Press, as reproduced in The Range of Philosophy, New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1975, edited by Harold H. Titus, Maylon H. Hepp, and Marilyn S. Smith, pp. 6-7) Adler argues that philosophy must go beyond "critical" and "analytic" second-order questions to "constructive" and "synthetic" first-order questions. On the other hand, C.D. Broad argues that the main task of philosophy is "Critical Philosophy," the analysis and definition of concepts and the critical analysis of fundamental beliefs. A secondary task, says Broad, is "Speculative Philo-Philosophy," which seeks "to reflect upon the whole" of human experience. (Quoted from Scientific Thought, 1952, by Humanities Press, Inc., as reproduced in Titus, Hepp, and Smith, op. cit., p.10)

[25]Habermas, Theory, Volume I, pp. 1 ff.

[26]Paul Tillich, "Religion as a Dimension in Man's Spiritual Life," in Theology of Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 3-9. He maintains that

religion is manifest in "all the creative functions of the human spirit," including moral, cognitive, and aesthetic, and especially "ultimate seriousness," because "ultimate concern, or the state of being ultimately concerned, is itself religion." (p.8)

[27]Habermas, Theory, Volume I, p. 10).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Rutherford B. Hayes, Presidential Papers, July 16 to August 5, 1877. Hayes Center, Fremont, Ohio.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

The Boston Globe, July 30, 1877.

The Chicago Tribune, May 1-15, 1886.

The Christian Advocate (New York), January 4, 1877 to December 27, 1877 and January 1, 1885 to December 27, 1894.

The Methodist Protestant (Baltimore), July 14 to August 18, 1877, May 1 to 22, 1886.

The Methodist Recorder (Pittsburgh), July 14 to August 18, 1877., May 8 and 15, 1886.

The Methodist Review (The Methodist Quarterly Review before January 1885), January 1877 to April 1878 and January-February 1882 to November-December 1894.

The New York Times. July 17 to August 6, 1877.

The North American Review, June 1889 and December 1889.

The Northwestern Christian Advocate (Chicago), May 18 to July 13, 1894.

Zion's Herald, January 7, 1877 to December 13, 1877 and February 25, 1885 to December 26, 1894.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Arthur, William. The Tongue of Fire: Or, The True Power of Christianity. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1857.

Bartlett, Richard A., Editor. The Gilded Age: America, 1865-1900: Interpretive Articles and Documentary Sources. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Carwardine, William. The Pullman Strike. Chicago: The Charles H. Kerr Company, 1894.

Finney, Charles. Revivals of Religion. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, no date. Reprint of 1835 original.

Hamilton, J.W., Editor.The People's Church Pulpit. Boston: The People's Church, 1885.

Harkness, Georgia. The Methodist Church in Social Thought and Action. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964.

Hughes, George. Days of Power in the Forest Temple: A Review of the Wonderful Work of God at Fourteen National Camp-meetings from 1867 to 1872. Boston: John Bent and Company, 1873.

Lee, Luther. Autobiography. New York: Garland Press, 1984. Reprint of 1882 Edition by Phillips & Hunt of New York.

McLean, A. and Eaton, J.W., Editors. Penuel: or Face to Face With God. New York: W.C. Palmer, Jr., 1869.

Manual of the Methodist Social Union of Boston and Vicinity. Boston: Rand, Avery & Company, 1885.

Matlack, L.C. The Anti-Slavery Struggle in the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969.

Norwood, Frederick A., Editor. Sourcebook of American Methodism. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982.

Outler, Albert C. and Heitzenrater, Richard P. John Wesley's Sermons: An Anthology. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991.

Outler, Albert C., Editor. John Wesley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964. A Library of Protestant Thought series.

Wallace, Adam. A Modern Pentecost: Embracing a Record of the Sixteenth National Campmeeting for the Promotion of Holiness Held at Landisville, Pa., from July 23 to August 1st, 1873. Philadelphia: Methodist Home Journal Publishing House, 1873.

Wesley, John. Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1958 reprinting.

Willard, Frances E. Glimpses of Fifty Years: The Autobiography of an American Woman. Chicago: H.J. Smith, 1889.

Williams, Charles Richard. Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes. Columbus, Ohio: F.J. Heer Printing Company, 1924. Volumes I through V.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ahlstrom, Sidney. A Religious History of the American People. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.

Barnard, Harry A. Rutherford B. Hayes and his America. Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Incorporated, 1954.

Berger, Peter. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, 1967.

Bordin, Ruth. Frances Willard: A Biography. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Bruce, Robert V. 1877: Year of Violence. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Incorporated, 1959.

Bucke, Emory Stevens. The History of American Methodism in Three Volumes. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964.

Cameron, Richard. Methodism and Society in Historical Perspective. New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1961.

Carter, Paul A. The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971.

Chiles, Robert E. Theological Transition in American Methodism. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Cobb, Stephen G. Reverend William Carwardine and the Pullman Strike of 1894: The Christian Gospel and Social Justice. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

Collins, Randall. Three Sociological Traditions. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

_____. Three Sociological Traditions: Selected Readings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Davison, Kenneth E. The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1972.

Dayton, Donald. Discovering an Evangelical Heritage. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Dieter, Melvin. Revivalism and Holiness. Temple University Doctoral Dissertation, Copyright 1973.

Ferguson, Charles W. Organizing to Beat the Devil: Methodists and the Making of America. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday & Company, Incorporated, 1971.

Foner, Eric. Free Soil, Free Labor and Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War. New York, 1970.

_____. Politics and Ideology In The Age Of The Civil War. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Foner, Philip S. The Great Labor Uprising. New York: The Monad Press, 1977.

_____. History of the Labor Movement in the United States. Volume II: From the Founding of the American Federation of Labor to the Emergence of American Imperialism. New York: International Publishers, 1955.

Fones-Wolf, Ken. Trade Union Gospel: Christianity and Labor in Industrial Philadelphia, 1865-1915. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.

Garraty, John A. The New Commonwealth: 1877-1890. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.

Gordon, Anna A. Frances E. Willard: A Memorial Volume. Chicago: The Woman's Christian Temperance Publishing Association, 1898.

Gottlieb, Roger S., Editor. An Anthology of Western Marxism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Gravely, William. Gilbert Haven, Methodist Abolitionist: A Study in Race, Religion, and Reform, 1850-1880. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1973.

Green, Vivian H. H. John Wesley. London: Nelson, 1964.

Habermas, Jurgen. The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume II, A Critique of Functionalist Reason. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987. Translation by Thomas McCarthy of 1981 original German text.

_____. The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume I, Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984. Translation by Thomas McCarthy of 1981 original German text.

Heitzenrater, Richard P. "The Oxford Diaries and the First Rise of Methodism." Methodist History. July 1974, Volume XII.

Hoogenboom, Ari. The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1988.

Hudson, Winthrop and Corrigan, John. Religion In America: An Historical Account of the Development of American Religious Life. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992. Fifth Edition. Revision by Corrigan of 1965 Edition originally authored by Hudson.

Hynson, Leon. "Reformation and Perfection: the Social Gospel of Bishop Peck." Methodist History. January 1978, Volume XVI, Number 2.

_____. To Reform the Nation: Theological Foundations of Wesley's Ethics. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Francis Asbury Press of Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.

Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown, and Company, 1973.

Jennings, Theodore, Jr. Good News To The Poor: John Wesley's Evangelical Economics. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.

Jones, Donald G. The Sectional Crisis and Northern Methodism: A Study in Piety, Political Ethics and Civil Religion. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1979.

Jones, Donald G. and Richey, Russell. American Civil Religion. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Jones, Charles E. Perfectionist Persuasion: The Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Jordan, Philip D. "Immigrants, Methodists, and a 'Conservative Social Gospel..' 1865-1908." Methodist History. October 1978, Volume XVII, Number 1.

Lakeland, Paul. Theology and Critical Theory: The Discourse of the Church. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.

McLaughlin, William, Jr. Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham. New York: The Ronald Press, 1959.

Marty, Martin. Religion and Republic: The American Circumstance. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.

May, Henry. Ideas, Faiths, and Feelings: Essays on American Intellectual and Religious History. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

_____. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.

Mead, Sidney. The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Merkley, Paul Reinhold Niebuhr: A Political Account. Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Irony of American History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.

_____. The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York: World Publishing Company, 1957. Reprint of 1929 edition by Henry Holt and Company, Incorporated.

Norwood, Frederick A. The Story of American Methodism Nashville: Abingdon, 1974.

Outler, Albert C. Theology in the Wesleyan Spirit. Nashville: Tidings, 1975.

Peters, John L. Christian Perfection and American Methodism. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1985. Second Edition of 1956 Edition by Pierce and Washabaugh of Nashville, Tennessee.

Peukert, Helmut. Science, Action, and Fundamental Theology: Toward a Theology of Communicative Action Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1984. Translation by James Bohman of 1976 German text.

Richardson, Harry. Dark Salvation: The Story of American Methodism as it Developed Among Blacks in America. Garden City, New Jersey: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976.

Semmel, Bernard. The Methodist Revolution. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Smith, Timothy L. Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965. Reprint of 1957 Edition by Abingdon Press of Nashville, Tennessee.

Solomon, Robert C. Introducing Philosophy. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1986.

Tillich, Paul. Theology of Culture. new York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Titus, Harold H.; Hepp, Maylon H.; and Smith, Marilyn S., Editors. The Range of Philosophy. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1975.

Tucker, Robert C. The Marx-Engels Reader. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978. Second Edition.

Turner, George Allen. The Vision Which Transforms: Is Christian Perfection Scriptural? Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1964.

Tuttle, Robert G. John Wesley: His Life and Theology. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.

Warner, Wellman J. The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1930.

Williams, Charles Richard. The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes: Nineteenth President of the United States: With Portraits and other Illustrations. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1928. Reprint of 1914 Edition by F.J. Heer Printing Company. Volumes I and II.

Wuthnow, Robert W. The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II. Princeton, New Jersey: The Princeton University Press, 1988.