

WASHINGTON GLADDEN AND THE CHRISTIAN NATION

Alfredo Romagosa

This article deals with a question about the United States presented by minister and social reformer Washington Gladden: “The question is sometimes raised whether this is a Christian nation.”¹ Of course the answer would depend on what is meant by being a Christian nation. Gladden (1836-1918) is considered to be one of the foundational figures of what came to be known as the Social Gospel movement in the United States. Gladden raises our central question in many ways: “Is this a Christian nation? Does it possess a Christian character? Is its life a Christian life?”² This is a topic to which he often returns in his many books, and we will discuss his definitions and recommendations in some detail. We will also include references to some of his contemporaries and to later thinkers. One may ask about the relevance of this material in today’s world. As the social and religious reality in the United States becomes increasingly complex, many return to the thoughts of the founding fathers for clarifications. But their ideas, heavily influenced by the European enlightenment, were more philosophic than practical. The Social Gospel was the watershed of Christian social thought in the United States, and those interested in the political implications of Christianity for a democratic country should benefit from this analysis.

There are countries where a particular religion is established as the official faith in its constitution. This meaning is clearly disavowed by Gladden: “While we have no desire to see the establishment of any form of religion by law in this land, most of us would be willing to see the

nation in its purposes and policies and ruling aims becoming essentially Christian.”³ Can even this limited identity be generally acceptable or practical in the United States today?

The social gospel

Although the term Social Gospel can have a broad scope, a common usage is in reference to a Protestant movement in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and this is our usage in this article. The movement had its roots among Christian groups that had worked for the abolition of slavery, and was influenced by social thinkers from England and Germany. Along with Gladden, other key members of this group that we will discuss were Richard Ely (1854-1943), and Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918).

The Social Gospel was not an organized movement with designated leaders or the sponsorship of specific churches. It arose spontaneously from thinkers with different denominational backgrounds. Although it was primarily a Protestant development, there was some positive interaction with the social teachings of the Catholic Church, embodied in the papal social encyclicals. The primary concern of the movement was a dissatisfaction with traditional Christian “charity” or almsgiving, seeking instead real socioeconomic reforms that would improve the actual conditions of the poor and the underprivileged. The influence of this line of thinking declined after World War I. The realities of the war tended to dampen the somewhat idealistic and humanistic themes of the movement, and American Protestantism entered then an era of neo-orthodoxy, returning to a traditional emphasis on personal spiritual salvation. In recent decades, some Social Gospel concerns have been rekindled as a result of economic problems and of the civil rights movement.⁴

Washington Gladden

Washington Gladden was born in 1836 in Pottsgrove, Pennsylvania. His father, who was a school teacher, died when Washington was six, and the boy spent much of his childhood living with his uncle in a farm in Owego, New York.⁵ On feeling a call to the ministry in 1855, Gladden began his preparation at the Owego Academy.⁶ After finishing his education at Williams College,⁷ Gladden was ordained as a minister in 1860 and started his career working in a Congregational church in Brooklyn.⁸

He had assignments at several churches until becoming the pastor of the First Congregational Church in Columbus, Ohio, where he would serve for thirty-two years.⁹

While Gladden was serving at Springfield, Massachusetts (1875-1882), there was a great deal of tension there between labor and capital, due to a long industrial depression and resulting unemployment. Gladden was invited to speak to a group of workers, and he continued with a series of lectures addressed to both workers and employers.¹⁰ After moving to Ohio in 1883 he became even more involved in social issues, since the coal mines of southeastern Ohio were a continuous source of labor conflicts.¹¹ In addition to his pastoral and lecturing work, Gladden was very active in community and organizational activities. Gladden would go on to write over thirty books on religious and social issues, most of them a result of his preaching and lecturing.

Episcopalian Richard Ely had the advantage of being a trained economist, and he taught this discipline at the University of Wisconsin, John Hopkins University and Northwestern University. Ely studied philosophy and economics at the German universities of Halle, Heidelberg, and Berlin where he was influenced by the German historical school of economic thought.¹² Although Gladden and Ely could be considered to be the most important pioneers of the Social Gospel, and they were obviously aware of each other's work, they were largely independent thinkers. They developed their thought from primarily different sources, Ely from German economists and historians and Gladden from English and American religious authors such as Frederick Robertson and Horace Bushnell.¹³ As major contributors to the same cause, however, they met and interacted in a number of congresses and organizations.

Baptist minister Walter Rauschenbusch studied at the Rochester Theological Seminary after attending lectures at several German universities. He acknowledged his debt to the pioneers like Gladden and Ely,¹⁴ but his political ideas were more radical than theirs. He sought significant structural changes in the socioeconomic system of the United States. He was also the most accomplished theologian of the group.

The common good

Gladden's handling of our topic often begins with an important distinction between two sometimes competing aspects within the Christian

message: “In the New Testament teaching about conduct two truths are emphasized,—the independence of the individual, the solidarity of society.”¹⁵ Different Christian groups have sometimes emphasized one or the other of these aspects through time.

The individual aspect is well established in traditional Christian teaching, as Gladden affirms: “the nature of moral responsibility as personal and individual is clearly affirmed. The fact that guilt and blameworthiness are not transferable; that every man must bear his own burden; that every man must give account of himself unto God. . .” but he continues, “the solitariness of religious experience must not be denied, but neither must it be unduly magnified. Out of it may easily grow an unholy egoism which is far from the spirit of Christ.”¹⁶ Richard Ely adds: “Social solidarity means the oneness of human interests; it signifies the dependence of man upon man, both in good things and in evil things.”¹⁷ Clearly, the emphasis on the solidarity or community aspect would be an inherent characteristic of Social Gospel thinking.

This is not an exclusively Christian notion. Human solidarity is the consequence of his social nature, which was been clearly recognized throughout Western civilization, as witnessed by Cicero, “We are not born for ourselves alone, and our country claims her share. . . in this we ought to take nature for our guide, to throw into the public stock the offices of general utility by a reciprocation of duties. . . and to cement human society by arts, by industry, and by our resources.”¹⁸

The “corporate” view of human nature is clearly established in the Christian scriptures, including the images of the “Body of Christ” (First Letter of Paul to Corinthians, 12:12-32) and “the Vine and the Branches” (Gospel of John, 15:1-10).

Sociopolitical action

Christian social identity is not just a feeling of shared concern, it is seen to translate into political memberships and responsibilities: “it is a natural organism into which every human being is born; and the duties that pertain to it are no more optional than are our duties to God.”¹⁹

Few would quarrel with the fact that Jesus called his disciples and his church to practice charity, but political actions dealing with specific social problems are more controversial:

I know that there are some who will promptly say, "No; the nation in this sense is not Christian, and we do not want it to be... The business of a nation is not charity. Its function is not to practice benevolence, but simply to do justice. It ought to keep people from trespassing on one another; it ought to preserve the peace, and provide for the common defense; it ought, so far as possible, to give everyone a chance to exercise his own powers, and there it ought to end."²⁰

Regardless of Christian principles, there are many in the United States that would even question the constitutionality of government involvement, at least at the federal level, in socioeconomic programs:

There is, indeed, in the preamble of the national constitution, one clause which recognizes the duty of the government to 'promote the general welfare', but the implications of that clause have always been disputed; there are many who contend that it is not the nation's business to promote welfare, whether general or special... The prevailing idea of our political science has been that there is no common good, other than liberty, which the nation is organized to promote; that all it has to do is to provide a free arena, in which individuals may compete for such good things as are within their reach. The idea of a large organized co-operation for common ends, through the city or the state or the nation, has been regarded by most as a political heresy.²¹

This question is at the center of many political disputes today. Gladden is clearly on the side of political action to achieve social justice. His argument rests on human inequalities, and the imperfections of any socioeconomic system:

If all men were born equal in physical and mental equipment; if all were started in the race of life with equal powers and opportunities, this rule of *laissez faire* might be a practicable rule, but it is not so; there are vast inequalities... The truth is that this is a world where compassion must be a constant quantity; there is no kind of human association in which it can be spared; and when the State—that is 'all of us'—undertakes to adjust our human relations, it will not be possible to dispense with compassion.²²

On the Catholic side, papal teachings have been very emphatic on this issue:

The foremost duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as of themselves to realize public well-being and private prosperity. . . It lies in the power of a ruler to benefit every class in the State, and amongst the rest to promote to the utmost the interests of the poor; and this in virtue of his office, and without being open to suspicion of undue interference—since it is the province of the commonwealth to serve the common good.²³

The constitutions of many countries are chartered to be more socially proactive than that of the United States. This is not necessarily based on religion, although most religions are supportive of this. The complexities of the political system of the United States are open to controversies on this topic, but there have been enough constitutional rulings so that there is sufficient latitude for government action on social problems. It is the clear contention of the Social Gospel that Christian teachings require an assumption of social responsibility by social orders as well as individuals. Some still use the counter argument that Jesus and his disciples were not politically involved. Gladden addresses this issue:

The fact that Jesus and his apostles did not deal with social questions in their political aspects may be explained by the fact that those to whom they spoke had no political responsibilities. They were not citizens, they were subjects; to preach politics to them would be like preaching about dancing to people with amputated limbs. If the followers of Jesus had been sovereigns, men clothed with political responsibility, probably he would have had something to say to them about their political duties. The men to whom you and I preach are sovereigns,—the sovereign people; voters in this country are ‘the powers that be’; they are ordained of God to organize and administer civil society.²⁴

Given the assumption that the Christian has a sociopolitical obligation, there are a number of ways to put this into practice, as we will see in the following sections.

Political leadership

The first component of political responsibility would be to insure the wise selection of leaders: “The Christian is a citizen, and it is part of his Christian duty to see to it that the government is wisely chosen, and that it faithfully performs its duties. . . . There is no better opportunity of doing good than that which presents itself where responsible offices are to be filled.”²⁵

It is also important to bring civility to the political process, which is particularly applicable in the United States today: “Into this fierce and brutal strife the Christian ought to carry his Christianity; standing always for honor and fair play; for chivalry in the treatment of opponents; for truth and the whole truth against the perversions and concealments of partisans; for all things honest and of good report no matter with what party they may be identified.”²⁶

And responsibility does not end with election: “The price of liberty and good government is not only eternal vigilance but eternal courage and eternal sacrifice.”²⁷ A critical element wise selections and of “watchfulness” is to be an informed citizen, to take the time to learn about the specific problems of the communities and about the possible solutions: “Let no man speak on these themes who has not qualified himself by careful study; who does not thoroughly know what he is talking about.”²⁸ As an economist and educator, Ely emphasized the importance of detailed socioeconomic knowledge, and he was an important contributor in establishing the study of applied economics in the United States: “Better economic knowledge should bear its fruit in better citizenship. This was the principle which determined the development of the economics department at Wisconsin.”²⁹

Some Christians are called to further involvement in the actual exercise of leadership roles in political offices, which should be seen as a vocation to service: “Office is not to him a chance for self-aggrandizement or plunder, but a call to consecrated service.”³⁰ In an address to the Congress of the United States in 2015, Pope Francis exhorts this vocational role:

Your own responsibility as members of Congress is to enable this country, by your legislative activity, to grow as a nation. You are called to defend and preserve the dignity of your fellow citizens in

the tireless and demanding pursuit of the common good, for this is the chief aim of all politics. A political society endures when it seeks, as a vocation, to satisfy common needs by stimulating the growth of all its members, especially those in situations of greater vulnerability or risk. To this you have been invited, called and convened by those who elected you.³¹

Legislation

So far we have dealt with political leadership. When it comes to actual legislation, there was some divergence among Social Gospel thinkers. Gladden and Ely had enough faith in the political system of the United States, that they thought that solutions could be achieved through legislation:

[Gladden] “There are many good men, outside the church as well as within it, who believe that the existing social order can never be Christianized; that it must be replaced by a new social system. But most of us are still clinging to the belief that the existing social order can be Christianized, so that justice may be established in it, and good-will find expression through it.”³²

[Ely] We must work... to instill Christian principles into our entire public as well as private life... Religious laws are the only laws which ought to be enacted. But what are religious laws? Certainly not in the United States laws establishing any particular sectarian views or any theological tenets, in regard to which there may be diversity of opinion, but laws designed to promote the good life. 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.³³

Rauschenbusch, on the other hand, was more pessimistic: “We have an exaggerated idea of the importance of laws... Our zest for legislation blinds us to the subtle forces behind and beyond the law. Those influences which really make and mar human happiness and greatness are beyond the reach of the law.”³⁴ As mentioned above, Rauschenbusch was looking for more radical changes. Nevertheless, he is calling attention to

the reform of attitudes that is needed to make possible any kind of social progress. Gladden is aware of this; on dealing with social problems, he calls for the Church to “investigate them and discuss them, till a sound public opinion is created to deal with them.”³⁵

The public conscience

So far we have discussed some explicit ways in which Christians can act politically, from voting and watchfulness to political office and legislation. But as implied above, there are also more subtle ways of fostering a Christian nation. Gladden spoke of “public opinion,” but “public conscience” may be a better term for us to use in that it refers more clearly to issues with a moral content. This is the moral thinking of the majority of the people or perhaps of the most vocal or influential groups. It is a dynamic set constantly affected by events and by the public expressions of leaders from all spheres, including religion, and this is a very fertile field for Christian action. Following on his concern about legislation, Rauschenbusch emphasizes this religious role:

Religion creates morality, and morality then deposits a small part of its contents in written laws. The State can protect the existing morality and promote the coming morality, but the vital creative force of morality lies deeper. The law becomes impotent if it is not supported by a diffused, spontaneous moral impulse in the community. . . Thus it is clear that the Church has a large field for social activity before touching legislation.³⁶

Ely is more positive:

The Church can go in many respects far beyond the State. It can place ideals ahead of the State to which the State must gradually approach; it can rebuke and inspire the State; it can quicken the consciences of men, of those who can rule and those who obey. The Church always has the opportunity of doing work neglected by the State. . . Let all Christians see to it that they put as much as possible, not of doctrine or creed into the State constitution, but of Christian life and practice into the activity of the State.³⁷

Civil society

Gladden and other Social Gospel thinkers advocated the explicit actions discussed earlier, but this was easier in their time, when there was a clear majority of practicing Christians in the United States, when many moral issues, such as the rights of the unborn, for example, were seen as fundamental rather than sectarian. The debate on issues relating to gender have also become increasingly complex. This changed situation should not deter the resolve that they advocate, but it makes it more of a challenge. In considering the evolving environment, the current concept of a “civil society” could be helpful.

This is not a new term, and it has been used with different meanings through the centuries, receiving a significant focus during the Scottish Enlightenment, which influenced the early political thinking of the United States. It has come more to the fore after the fall of Russian control, when its former satellites sought guidance in reconstructing democratic ideals. The writings of social philosopher Michael Walzer have been very influential in this area. Commencing from a Jewish viewpoint, Walzer has written extensively on the political role of “intermediate” groups, including religions. What Walzer proposes is essentially a new conceptualization of social organization, including, but distinct from, the political and economic orders. Walzer defines civil society as “the space of uncoerced human association and also the set of relational networks—formed for the sake of family, faith, interest, and ideology—that fill this space.”³⁸ Rather than seeking precision, it is a recognition of the complex and “messy” nature of human society: “The picture here is of people freely associating and communicating with one another, forming and reforming groups of all sorts. . . .”³⁹

In contrast with historical ideologies that overemphasized the state or the economy, the civil society values the intermediate organizations where civility is learned. Not having exclusive power, the different groups, ethnic, religious, or “other,” “are free to celebrate their histories, remember their dead, and shape (in part) the education of their children.”⁴⁰ A key element here is the free association. Gladden had commented on the inconsistency of religious coercion, at least in the context of Christian principles: “we may say that the nation would not be Christian, in the highest and truest sense, if it undertook to enforce by law

Christian beliefs or observances. That would be an infraction of a principle that is fundamental in Christianity. A compulsory faith is a contradiction in terms.”⁴¹ Gladden also recognized the value of variety, in spite of the resulting tension:

In society, as in every other organized existence, beauty and perfection are secured by unity in variety, the harmonious combination of parts that differ. . . . To secure the variety that is desirable, it is well that the individuality of every man and woman be perfectly developed. It is necessary, therefore, to learn how to reconcile these two contending obligations; how to be in society, and not of it; how to respect yourself, your own judgment and conscience, and yet to love your neighbor as yourself; when to withstand the social influences, and when to yield to them.⁴²

Religions are by nature absolutizing, since they deal with ultimate realities. But recognizing the limitations of human renderings, there may be some value in religious pluralism. This is not to relativize beliefs, but to clarify them. There have been many attempts to find common moral elements among the world religions, and this can be useful in forging alliances. French philosopher Paul Ricoeur warns of the danger that these efforts may lead to superficiality, to dilutions, but he also recognizes that fundamental principles can sometimes be sharpened by reflecting on the actual contrasts: “We need the atheist so that we can better understand ourselves. . . . We need other religions and their criticisms so as to come out of an excessively interior position.”⁴³

While admitting the possible value of pluralism, if one is honest, one must recognize that a common ground of beliefs is preferable. But a mixed civil society may be all that is available, and this can work for religious groups if they can truly practice their celebrations, have control over the education of their children, and have some hope of being able to influence the public conscience. But what about groups that advocate policies that may be harmful to the common good? Christians must oppose such policies, not because they come from a specific group, but because they can be shown to be detrimental in the light of a constructively influenced public conscience. This is perhaps an example where Walzer’s “messiness” must be acknowledged, and no legitimate religious faith believes that all religions are equally valid. If one believes in one’s

religion as “good news,” one should have confidence on the value of its message in an open forum, both in its inspirational effect and in the beneficial results of applying its teachings about behavior.

Education

The subject of education is worth some discussion. Gladden had some interesting comments on this subject, speaking as a Protestant: “It is the Roman Catholic theory that the work of education belongs to the Church; our American policy entrusts it mainly to the State. Up to a certain point we may adopt the American theory; but it is a grave question whether we have not pushed it quite too far.”⁴⁴

Catholics continue to value parochial schools, but economic pressures are mounting, and a number of Protestant groups are beginning to have reflections similar to Gladden’s. The United States has an exaggeratedly strict interpretation of the separation of church and state, compared to other countries. Why should a group that wants more control of the education of their children be penalized financially? It would appear that private, religiously affiliated schools can be a vital component of a civil society.

Some states have school voucher programs that provide partial support for private schools, and “charter” schools that have some state regulation but receive less public funding than public schools are becoming more popular. Some of these charter schools are sponsored by religious groups. Questions arise about the practicality of these approaches, but some successful countries, such as Germany, have state-funded religious schools of different denominations. On questions of sizing efficiency, some public schools in the United States are becoming too large for effective management. The potential complications of all these issues should not be ignored, but the deficiencies of the current system also need to be addressed. More pluralism in education would be consistent with the aims of a civil society.

The Kingdom

According to biblical experts, the “kingdom of God” is Jesus’ central theme, as He proclaims: “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand.” (Gospel of Mark 1:15) But the kingdom of God, as used by Jesus, does not have a precise definition; it is more of a story or vision. This is

often the case with fundamental topics dealing with human life. Verbal definitions fail to capture a vision that is capable of providing the strongest motivation for action. The extensive use of stories and symbols is often more effective. The social gospel thinkers often make use of this theme in their calls for social activism:

[Gladden:] When we are bidden to seek first the kingdom of God, we are bidden to set out hearts on this great consummation; to keep this always before us as the object of our endeavors; to be satisfied with nothing less than this. The complete Christianization of all life is what we pray for and work for, when we work and pray for the coming of the kingdom of heaven. . . The kingdom of heaven is the entire social organism in its ideal perfection; the church is one of the organs- the most central and important of them all. . . society, without those specialized religious functions which are gathered up in the church, would not very readily receive and incarnate and distribute the gifts of the spirit of God.⁴⁵

[Rauschenbusch] The Kingdom of God is not confined within the limits of the Church and its activities. It embraces the whole of human life. It is the Christian transfiguration of the social order. The Church is one social institution alongside of the family, the industrial organization of society, and the State. The Kingdom of God is in all these, and realizes itself through them all.⁴⁶

In addition to their inspirational contents, both of the above statements anticipated Walzer's concept of the churches being important intermediate organizations, working with and within others, but providing an important "leavening" function. Note that we are not discussing here the various theological interpretations of the concept of the "kingdom," only its symbolic use in our context.

The kingdom of God term had effective appeal in the more faith conscious times of the Social Gospel, but the use of inspirational mottos can still be helpful. Kennedy's *New Frontier* tried to evoke the traditions of the American pioneers. Bush's *Compassionate Conservatism* attempted to be centrist. Unfortunately, partisanship tends to be a serious obstacle although there have been rare but hopeful bipartisan efforts, such as the *Secure America and Orderly Immigration* proposal of senators Kennedy and McCain with its appealing title. There is always a need for inspiration as seen in

the message from Reverend J. Brierley, quoted by Gladden: ‘What the world really wants. . . is men who have news from the land of the ideal, who have God’s life within them, who open afresh the springs of living water that quench the thirst of the soul.’ And Gladden continues:

But for what kind of news from the land of the ideal are men hungering and thirsting? For the news that brings the ideal down to earth; that makes it no mere dreamy possibility of far-off good, but the lamp of our feet and the light of our path now and here. For all this common life of ours there are ideals that uplift and transfigure and ennoble it. There is an ideal for the home and for the church, for the school and for the shop, for the factory and for the city; and the one refreshing and inspiring experience of life is to get sight of it, and believe in it. The ideal in all these social organizations is nothing else but God’s way,—the way that he has ordained for human beings to live and work together. The thing for us to do is first to discern it ourselves, and then to get men to see it, and believe in it, and work for it with heart and soul and mind and strength.⁴⁷

Conclusions

It should be clear by now that Gladden’s answer to the question as to whether the United States can be a Christian nation is affirmative, if it shows Christian behavior in its “purposes and policies and ruling aims.”⁴⁸ Legislation and political office are avenues to accomplish this, but they are not the only ones, and invectives and unchristian political actions are not acceptable as means. It is not a question of trying to impose moral views on others, it is a question of advocating measures that can be demonstrated to be for the benefit of the common good, and attempting to convince majorities of the value of these measures. This is particularly important, and perhaps most challenging, in implementing programs to protect minorities, especially the poor, against the powerful.

A related question may be: Is the United States more or less Christian now than it was in Gladden’s time? Clearly, the moral fiber of the nation has deteriorated, and this presents a significant challenge. There have been some positive developments in social programs. Social Security and Medicare can be recognized as Christian programs in their intent. The

“charter” school movement may provide some opportunity for better education. These programs, immigration issues, and health care initiatives have been examples of bitter disputes, but controversy should not be a deterrent, but an invitation to be “civil” and open to dialog: “It would seem to be nearly inevitable that when government is of the people and by the people, and when the people are compassionate and kind, their compassion and kindness will find expression in their national life.”⁴⁹

Notes

1. Washington Gladden, *The Church and the Nation* (Springfield, Mass.: The Congregational Home Missionary Society, 1905), p. 4.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
4. White, Ronald C. Jr. and C. Howard Hopkins, *Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976), pp. 292-4.
5. Washington Gladden, *Recollections* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1909), pp. 2-23, 33.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
9. Handy, Robert T., *The Social Gospel in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 22-4.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
11. Dorn, Jacob Henry, *Washington Gladden* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1968), pp. 208-9.
12. Handy, Robert T., *The Social Gospel in America*, pp. 174-5.
13. Dorn, Jacob Henry, *Washington Gladden*, pp. 32-3.
14. Rauschenbusch, Walter, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926), p. 9.
15. Gladden, *Ruling Ideas of the Present Age* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1895), p. 63.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 63-4.
17. Ely, Richard, *The Social Law of Service* (New York: Eaton and Maines, 1896), p. 127.
18. Cicero, *Three Books of Offices*, tr. Cyrus R. Edmonds (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892), pp. 14-5.
19. Gladden, *The Christian Way* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1877), p. 104.
20. Gladden, *The Church and The Nation*, p. 6.
21. Gladden, *Commencement Days* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), pp. 31-2.
22. Gladden, *The Church and The Nation*, p. 6.
23. Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum novarum [1891]* (The Vatican: Vatican Documents, 2010), p. 32.
24. Gladden, *Social Salvation* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902), p. 21.
25. Gladden, *The Christian Way* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1877), p. 115.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 120.

27. Ibid., p. 115.
28. Gladden, *Social Salvation*, pp. 22-3.
29. Ely, Richard, *Ground Under Our Feet* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938), pp. 186-7.
30. Gladden, *Ruling Ideas of the Present Age*, pp. 95-6.
31. Pope Francis's Speech to the Congress of the United States, September 24, 2015.
32. Gladden, *The Church and Modern Life* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902), p. 154.
33. Ely, *The Social Law of Service* (New York: Eaton and Maines, 1896), pp. 172-3.
34. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (NY: The Macmillan Company: 1907), p. 373.
35. Gladden, *Things New and Old* (Columbus, Ohio: A.H. Smythe, 1883), p. 287.
36. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 374.
37. Ely, Richard, *The Social Law of Service*, pp. 173-4.
38. Walzer, Michael, "The Concept of Civil Society," in Michael Walzer, ed., in *Toward a Global Civil Society* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), pp. 7-27, at 7.
39. Ibid., at 16.
40. Ibid., at 20.
41. Gladden, *The Church and the Nation*, p. 4.
42. Gladden, *Working People and their Employers* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1888), p. 129.
43. Paul Ricoeur, *Interview with Hans Kung*, 1998.
44. Gladden, *Things New and Old*, p. 283.
45. Gladden, *The Church and the Kingdom* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1894), pp. 8, 11-2.
46. Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), pp. 144-145.
47. Gladden, *Social Salvation*, pp. 28-9.
48. Gladden, *The Church and the Nation*, p 4.
49. Ibid., p. 7.