CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERN IN MAURICE AND RAUSCHENBUSCH

TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF SOCIAL CONCERN:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ELEMENTS

FOR SOCIAL CONCERN IN THE WRITINGS OF

FREDERICK D. MAURICE AND WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

of

John McNab, S.T.M.

ABSTRACT

After indicating the need for a theology of social

concern, this thesis investigates and compares the fundamental

elements of such a theology in the thought of Frederick Denison

Maurice, an Anglican and a citizen of England, and Walter

Rauschenbusch, a Baptist and an American citizen.   Both of

these men have had great influence on the social thought of the

Churches in the twentieth century.

Maurice provided the theological principles which

guided the Christian Socialist Movement in England between

1848-1854 in its endeavours to meet the problems raised by the

Industrial Revolution and to awaken the Church to its social

responsibility. Rauschenbusch came at the climax of many

movements within the Churches in America which endeavoured to

relate Christianity to the impact of the Industrial Revolu-
tion in the United States of America.

An examination and a comparison are made of the modes
of thought of these two men, the theological foundations of
their social thinking and their respective concepts of man
and his relationships. A brief conclusion indicates that
their fundamental areas of agreement can provide a theology
of society for today, especially for the countries of the
Third World.

TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF SOCIAL CONCERN:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ELEMENTS

FOR SOCIAL CONCERN IN THE WRITINGS OF

FREDERICK D. MAURICE AND WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

by

John McNab, S.T.M.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in
partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Religious Studies
McGill University
Montreal

March, 1972

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The need for a theology of social concern is evident

in the closing decades of the twentieth century. But per-

haps an even more fundamental issue needs to be discussed:

Does Christian theology have a social concern? For there is

still doubt in the minds of many Christians about the Church's

right to concern itself with political and social questions.

More directly for the purpose of this thesis is the need to

determine the theology which directs or should direct Chris-

tian social concern. That the Churches, at least on an offi-

cial level, are aware of the social dimension of the Chris-

tian Faith is evidenced in the statements and actions of the

World Council of Churches and of the Second Vatican Council

and subsequent Roman Catholic Synods, as well as in the re-

sponse of local Churches to national and international social

and political crises. As Max L. Stackhouse says,[1] the

churches are socially concerned and ecumenically slanted, but

somewhat unsure of their footing and direction. Stackhouse

raises once again the question that Ernst Troelstch raised

and which still remains unanswered: Can Christianity de-

velop another articulate "social philosophy" (i.e. other than

Catholicism and Calvinism) or is the social-ethical power of

Christianity at an end?

In the English speaking world of the last one hundred

and fifty years, two noteworthy movements attempted to relate

the Christian faith to social life. These are the Christian

Socialist Movement in England and the Social Gospel Movement

in the United States of America. There are obvious parallels

between the two movements. Basically both were responses of

Churchmen to the effects of the Industrial Revolution, and

particularly to the plight of the working classes and their

alienation from the churches in their respective countries.

Both were attempts by Churchmen to reach the working classes.

Two men stand out in these separate movements--Frederick D.

Maurice, who stands at the beginning of the English movement,

and Walter Rauschenbusch who comes at the high point of the

Social Gospel Movement. Both have had greater influence on

Christian Social Thought in Britain and the North American

Continent than any other figures of this period. Maurice is

unquestionably the most formative influence on socially con-

cerned Anglicans, and Rauschenbusch's thought is constantly

reaffirmed by exponents of social concern in the other Prot-
estant communities in North America and England.[2]

Maurice and Rauschenbusch are not typical members of
the movements to which they belonged, as these movements are
traditionally seen, but they are certainly the most outstand-
ing figures in them. There are two ways in which Maurice was
not representative of the Christian Socialist Movement in Eng-
land: in the first place, he was not a socialist in the sense
of being a radical in politics or even in the sense in which
his contemporary and close associate, Ludlow was; or later
Scott Holland, Charles Gore or William Temple were. Secondly
he did not belong to the Tractarian or Anglo-Catholic party,
with which the Christian Socialist Movement has quite fre-
quently been identified. We have only to recall Temple's place
in the later stages of the Christian Socialist Movement, the
composition of the Christian Socialist Union, and the ecumen-
ical nature of the Christian Socialist League and the Confer-
ence on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship to dis-
cover the error that is frequently made.

The idea, therefore, of comparison between the Social
Gospel in America based on liberal Protestant theology and
the Christian Socialist Movement in England based on Anglo-

Catholic sacramental theory may have some merit but it is misleading. This is in no way to dispute the fact that many Anglo-Catholics, such as Stewart Headlam and the members of the Guild of St. Matthew, played a most prominent part in the development of the Christian Socialist Movement after 1877.[3] Maurice's sacramental outlook proved consistent with their theology and therefore attractive to later Tractarians, but it is important to remember that Maurice's theological position was as firmly rejected by the early Tractarians as he rejected their position or indeed the position of any other party in the Church of England.

In the case of Rauschenbusch, I maintain that he is not typical of the Social Gospel Movement in the sense that he did not display the over-optimistic view of man and human society with which that Movement is so often charged. Rauschenbusch had a deep sense of personal and social sinfulness, he did not identify the Kingdom of God with any human social order though he spoke of Christianizing human institutions, and he did not believe in inevitable progress. Evidence for these assertions will be given later.

The foundations which underlie this present inquiry may here be briefly stated. Both Maurice and Rauschenbusch were men of deep personal faith in God and this conviction is

evident in all their writings. Maurice was a theologian
whose convictions about God and man led him into involvement
in politics. Rauschenbusch was an historian whose Biblical
orientation and personal religious and social experience led
him to see that Christianity was by its very nature a social
no less than a personal faith. Maurice states principles
with a minimum of social application. Rauschenbusch's prin-
ciples emerge from his Biblical exegesis, his historical sur-
veys and his social analysis. If we dare to label him, and I
have great reservations about this,[4] Maurice was a "conserv-
ative" in politics whose theological "hints" provided the
groundwork for the radical social and political views of his
close associates as well as for later Christian Socialists in
England and America. The interesting fact is that the concepts
and ideas of social reconstruction of Americans like Bliss (who
were influenced by Maurice) were similar to those of Walter
Rauschenbusch, who was to my mind a radical socialist. Yet
Maurice and Rauschenbusch appear to have come to their convic-
tions about society from very different theological positions.
Their own concepts of society were different, but a point which
could bear some investigation is the degree to which both men
tended to recognize elements of "the Divinely Constituted Soc-
iety" within their respective nations. Both regarded the forms

of government in their respective societies as manifestations of the divine order. The truth might therefore emerge that their conclusions about the principles which should govern society are not in fact dissimilar.

Is it possible to discover a standard for relevant Christian Social concern in these final years of the industrial age by an inquiry into the thought of these two men who faced the crisis at the beginning of the era? Would an examination show that their positions were not radically dissimilar but complementary (a view that would have been accepted by Maurice)[5], and that their common ground could provide a standard for Christians in an age when the Churches are aware that Christianity is not a "solitary" faith but are not quite sure why it is not? Do certain fundamental theological positions, no matter how derived, lead inevitably to social awareness?

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

1.   See Editor's "Introduction" to: Walter Rauschenbusch,
<u>The Righteousness of the Kingdom</u> ed. by Max. L.
Stackhouse (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968).
(Hereinafter referred to as <u>Kingdom</u>), p. 20.

2.   See J.V. Langmead Casserley, <u>The Retreat from Chris-
tianity: in the modern world</u> (London: Longmans, Green
and Co., 1952), p. 76; Robert Craig, <u>Social Concern
in the Thought of William Temple</u> (London: Victor
Gollancz Ltd., 1963), p. 14; Peter d'A Jones, <u>The
Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914: Religion,
Class and Social Conscience in Late Victorian England</u>
(New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968),
pp. 9 ff., 260; Benson Y. Landis ed. <u>A Rauschenbusch
Reader: The Kingdom of God and the Social Gospel</u>
(New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957),
p. xxii; Dores Robinson Sharpe, <u>Walter Rauschenbusch</u>
(New York: The MacMillan Company, 1942), p. 406;
H.P. Van Dusen, <u>The Cambridge History of American
Literature</u>, Vol. iii, p. 215, quoted in Sharpe, <u>op.
cit</u>., p. 410.

3.   Alec R. Vidler, <u>The Church in An Age of Revolution:
1789 To The Present Day</u>, Vol. V of <u>The Pelican History
of the Church</u>, ed. by Owen Chadwick (London: Penguin
Books, 1961), pp. 98-100.

4.   Frederick Maurice, ed., <u>The Life of Frederick Denison
Maurice: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters</u> (2 vols.;
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884). (Herein-
after referred to as <u>Life</u>.) Vol. 1, p. 485.

5.   Cf. Frederick Denison Maurice, <u>Social Morality</u>
(London: MacMillan and Co., 1872), p. 1.

CHAPTER II

THE LIFE OF FREDERICK D. MAURICE AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES

WHICH LED UP TO, AND INFLUENCED HIS SOCIAL THOUGHT

Three significant factors determined the rise of Chris-

tian Socialism in England. First,there was the social, eco-

nomic and political climate resulting from the rise of indus-

trialism simultaneously with the new ideas of democracy and

socialism. Secondly, there was the state and condition of the

Church in England and its inability to cope effectively with

the rapid change in life. Thirdly, there were the lives and

personalities of the chief architects of early Christian

Socialism--John Malcolm Ludlow, Frederick Denison Maurice and,

to a lesser degree, Charles Kingsley and others.

As the purpose of this thesis is to consider and com-

pare the basic elements of social thought in the writings of

Maurice and Rauschenbusch we shall begin this section with a

review of the life of Maurice. This is not to indicate that

Maurice is more important than Ludlow in the early stages of

the movement. Unquestionably his thought has had a greater

impact on later generations than the thought of Ludlow, but

at the outset it should be recognized that Ludlow was the

founder of the Christian Socialist Movement in England (here-

inafter referred to as C.S.M.). This fact was accepted and

stated by Maurice's son and biographer as early as 1889 when

he said, "John Malcolm Ludlow was the founder of the movement;

and he brought in my father by the force of his strong will,

after their first meeting had been held."[1] As Raven points

out, Ludlow's own modesty and self-effacement, his willingness

to submit to Maurice's leadership, his eagerness to pay tribute

to the contributions made by his colleagues who all predeceased

him, and his own insistence that the credit of the work belonged

chiefly to Maurice, led to an unbalanced emphasis on the part

played by Maurice and a neglect of the important contribution

made by Ludlow. Raven attempted to correct this view, and in

more recent years Torben Christensen and N.C. Masterman,[2] with

access to resources which were unavailable to Raven, have con-

firmed the hints and indications which Raven provided. Nor is

Raven's charitable assessment of Ludlow's character the total

picture, but to this we shall come later in our essay.

The Life of John Frederick Denison Maurice

Frederick Denison Maurice, as in later life he habit-
ually signed himself, was born at Normanstone, near Lowestoft,
Suffolk, England on August 29th, 1805. In considering
Frederick's life it is helpful to remember that his father was
a Unitarian minister, a modernist in religion, an enthusiastic
political liberal, a member of the Peace Party and a believer
in social reform.[3] In 1812, the family moved to Clifton, near
Bristol and subsequently to Frenchay where Michael Maurice
served as minister to the local Unitarian congregation. Between
1815-1861 the family passed through a series of religious crises;
in 1815, Frederick's older sisters and in 1821, his mother ceased
to attend the Unitarian chapel because they had been converted
to more traditional types of Christianity. By a family agree-
ment the older girls did not attempt to influence Frederick and
their younger sisters. Frederick was educated in his father's
school; but apparently even in their private conversations the
father inclined to political and philanthropic questions and
avoided questions of creeds. Any direct effort to influence
the son's religious opinions must have come from his mother.

In matters of social concern things were different.
Early in his life both parents initiated him in many practical

schemes of social improvement, whether connected with general
problems of national education, Sunday School work, the Bible
Society, the anti-slave trade and subsequently the anti-slavery
agitation, or with the Clothing Club, Soup Kitchen and other
kindred organisations.

Apparently as a solution to the family's religious
crises Frederick announced in 1821 his preference for the Bar
as a profession. With this objective he went to study in London
where he came under the influence of a lady (known to his mother
as 'dear Lucy') who introduced him to the thought and writings
of Mr. Erskine of Linlathen. Later Maurice spoke of Erskine as
one of the chief influences on his thought. He went to Trinity
College, Cambridge, where from 1823-1827 he studied Classics un-
der Julius Hare with whom he developed a lifelong friendship.
Here too his friendship with John Sterling began. Reluctant as
Maurice was to assume leadership, he found himself, through
Sterling's prodding, the acknowledged leader of the most re-
markable body of men within the University, The Apostles'
Club. Maurice entered Trinity Hall—the Law College of the
University—in his third year at Cambridge.

Basing his opinions on the "Minutes" of the Cambridge
Union Debating Society Christensen argues that at this period
of his life Maurice was politically inclined to the left.[4]

Some of the most prominent and powerful intellects among the undergraduates were at that time strongly influenced by Jeremy Bentham and James Mill--and this meant that the problems of the day were discussed in the light of Philosophical Radicalism. Coleridge's influence on Maurice, already considerable before he got to Cambridge, increased during his years there. His advocacy of Coleridge's philosophical thinking placed him in strong opposition to the Benthamites. The extent to which Coleridge and Wordsworth had taken hold of his mind, says Christensen, is shown in his articles in the _Metropolitan Quarterly Magazine_ which Maurice published in 1826 together with Whitmore, another member of the Apostles' Club. Christensen's view is that Maurice had broken with the views of the Enlightenment, but at the same time he had also rejected the philosophic presuppositions of Unitarianism; its adherents had followed Joseph Priestley's attempt to reconcile the Christian faith with Hartley's empiric-materialistic concept of life. But Maurice did not keep company with Coleridge and Wordsworth in rejecting the ideas of the Enlightenment. From being enthusiastic supporters of the French Revolution these two had become staunch defenders of England's ancient institutions.

Christensen claims that such was not the case with Maurice at this period. Although he preached Coleridge's and

Wordsworth's romantic-idealistic conception of man he still

stuck to the political traditions of the Unitarians. The

point Christensen wants to make is that at this stage in his

career Maurice was still to be found on the left politically

where he fully sympathised with the Philosophical Radicals.[5]

Maurice passed out of Cambridge with a First Class in Civil

Law but left the University without the degree because he

declined to subscribe to the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion

of the Church of England as the University required. Yet even

at this time Maurice was hesitantly turning towards the Church

of England.[6]

After leaving Cambridge Maurice returned to London to

read for the Bar but found little interest in these studies

and turned to journalism. He contributed articles to the

Athenaeum, edited the London Literary Chronicle and later be-

came the editor of the periodical which replaced these two.

According to Christensen, Maurice's articles in the Athenaeum

reveal to us a man whose thinking had been determined by the

influences of Coleridge and Wordsworth. He was not, however,

a slavish follower. He went to work on problems with a mind

of his own. He was a romantic-idealistic thinker who was con-

vinced that he had arrived at the solution of the fundamental

problems of human existence.

> . . . In the "Athenaeum" he combatted the
> Utilitarians as introducing a false view of
> man and the universe, by acknowledging only
> that faculty in man which dealt with the
> visible outer world. In contrast Maurice
> maintained that man also possessed a faculty
> which enabled him to come in direct contact
> with the invisible and eternal world. Only
> by virtue of this faculty was man able to
> contemplate truth and goodness and reach a
> true comprehension of the universe, the visible
> world being only symbols and manifestations of
> eternal laws and principles. At the same time
> it led man to a real self-knowledge in making
> him realize that he partook in the world of
> eternity. This faculty expressed the true
> essence of man.[7]

Though Christensen overstates his case in order to

prove that Maurice was a "progressive turned reactionary," his

analysis of Maurice's radicalism at this stage of his career

is helpful in determining the growth and development of

Maurice's political and social views. Christensen says that

Maurice's views on political and social problems were still

in full agreement with the Philosophical Radicals. This view

is not substantiated by the opinions expressed in Maurice's

autobiography.[8] Christensen comes to his conclusion because

Maurice contributed to the Westminster Review, the organ of

Philosophic Radicalism.[9] Christensen describes a review of

"Life of Theobald Wolfe Tone,"[10] which he attributes to the pen

of Maurice as an excellent example of the political views of

Maurice during this period. Tone had been convicted of high

treason and sentenced to death because he had negotiated with

France about the liberation of Ireland from English rule.

Maurice sympathized greatly with Tone because the latter had

made common cause with his people and therefore was able to

see clearly what could be of real benefit to them. The inter-

esting fact which emerges is that the quotation which

Christensen provides seems totally consistent with Maurice's

views which he expressed on national sovereignty in The Kingdom

of Christ.[11]

> The want of legislature which should express
> the feelings of the people-- . . . [was], he
> thought, the great obstacle to the improvement
> of his country's condition. It followed as a
> consequence, that parliamentary reform, and
> the removal of the English authority, were the
> remedies which it became Irishmen to seek. So
> far his notions appear sufficiently rational;
> and--if we can divest ourselves of the idea
> that it must necessarily be for the happiness
> of every country to bear our mild yoke--suf-
> ficiently patriotic. But who were to effect
> these magnificent objects, and by what means
> were they to be prosecuted? The agents, Tone
> thought, ought to be the party most interested
> in their success, the people themselves.[12]

The salvation of Ireland would follow the introduction of democ-

racy, and Christensen emphasizes that at this point in his

career this goal was neither "extravagant" nor "unattainable."[13]

Many aspects of Christensen's thesis, that Maurice was

a progressive turned reactionary need to be examined carefully.

He writes: "that Maurice was opposed to the Tories goes without

saying, but he was also critical of the Whigs--and in this respect he fully lived up to the traditions of the <u>Westminster</u>."[14]

This is not surprising since Maurice throughout his life was opposed to the false principles of Tories, Whigs, Radicals, Socialists, Democrats, Tractarians and Evangelicals while always seeking to discover the positive values for which each of these groups or parties stood.[15] It is possible that Maurice changed his views with regard to the question of democracy as he grew older but here again we need to examine what he understood by national sovereignty and autonomy and whether his ideas in this respect did not sanction a non-monarchical form of government for nations other than England.[16] Christensen argues that Maurice asserted in that article that Tone's life and work actually constituted a solemn warning to the reactionary forces, which were then in power and opposed all reforms that might benefit the people, being confident that "a superstitious veneration of ancient institutions will induce men patiently to endure practical grievances."[17] Just as the French Revolution contained "much useful instruction as to the necessity of the people confiding simply and exclusively in themselves,"[18] so the events in Ireland had shown that the people had nobody but themselves to look after their interests. Reactionary rulers could expect nothing of the future as the self-confidence and strength of the people increased day by

day. The aristocracy, with which Maurice also counted the Church, therefore had no choice but to try to come to terms with the people. If they ignored the interests of the people, then "time may convince them that their confidence was misplaced and their contempt premature."[19]

The salvation of the people was to be found solely in making the people truly independent so that they might manage their own affairs. A true democracy, combined with a real understanding of the laws governing the political and economic life, as the only possible way out of England's actual and social distress--such was the lesson which Maurice sought to convey to his readers. The question is, did Maurice ever change his mind on this issue? Was this radical element always an aspect of his thought?

But, Christensen continues, however much Maurice might agree with the Utilitarians, he, nevertheless, spoke from other suppositions. Their atomistic conception of society he must reject as a good romantic-idealistic philosopher. A nation was not an artificial creation, constituted by outward regulations which were maintained because they served to further the material well-being of the citizens. It was a living organism, upheld by living forces. These had always made themselves felt and lent a distinct character to national life and

contributed to shape the social structure of the country.[20]

To Maurice this did not mean, however, that the spiritual

principles of a nation as a matter of course were embodied

in the existing institutions of the country. This concep-

tion meant, on the contrary, a firm starting-point for a real

criticism of society and a criterion for true reforms: the

political and social fabric had to be a distinct expression

of the spiritual life of the nation. This was in constant

movement, and therefore national institutions must always be

changed to serve the spiritual life of the people. Likewise,

everything must be cast aside which in any way obstructed the

growth of national life and the development of individuals into

free beings.[21] Further, Christensen wishes to maintain that at

this period of his life Maurice, 'the radical,' was of the

opinion that the "ancient institutions of England" about which

the political reaction rallied were the kind of obstacles which

had to be swept away. The spiritual life of a nation was not

confined to certain classes alone. Since it embraced the whole

nation it was wrong that only certain sections of it were

granted privileges. All classes therefore must be endowed

with political power. To my mind, Maurice never changed his

mind about the question of privilege though this was to be

achieved by the regeneration rather than the destruction of

ancient institutions.[22]

Christensen's description of Maurice's religious pil-
grimage from his days at Cambridge to his ordination suffers
from the same defects: in attempting to combat the "hagio-
graphic" attitude which many have had toward Maurice, he places
too much emphasis on certain facts.[23] But here again his views
are useful to us in forming an estimate of Maurice himself,
even if at times the evidence he provides does not bear the
weight of the conclusions at which he arrives. He points out
that literature and philosophy were Maurice's primary inter-
ests at Cambridge, but that he still concerned himself with
religious questions, although they were now viewed in the light
of his romantic-idealistic philosophy. Thus in the articles in
the Athenaeum he maintained that religion was the realization
of God as the being who permeated the whole universe and had
manifested Himself in man's innermost heart and mind. Man was
endowed with a faculty whereby we see and "embrace the Divine
idea."[24] Consequently true self-realization must always lead
to an understanding of life in which one saw oneself and the
universe as being permeated by God as the only absolute good-
ness. Religion was, quite simply, part of true human life.
It was important to Maurice to show that religion was much more
than institutional and dogmatic Christianity. Religion sprang
from the inner nature of man and consisted in experiencing God
as the cosmic harmony. Religious feelings, therefore, did

not arise from outward ceremonies and were not dependent on

adherence to a certain religious community and its doctrines.[25]

God was not just the founder of a certain sect which was the

sole object of his love. On the contrary, God embraced all

mankind in His goodness and granted true religious feelings to

all people if only they would turn away from the sensuous

world and look into themselves, where they might meet God face

to face.[26] So all true philosophers and poets in Maurice's

eyes were ministers of God because they revealed the true

nature of man and the universe. Furthermore, the true reli-

gion, which man experienced quite spontaneously, could never

find adequate expression in institutions with fixed liturgies

and creeds.[27] Religious feelings were universal and common to

all men, while ecclesiastical bodies were always particular-

istic and attached importance to outward forms. True piety was

quite indifferent to ordinances and rites, and Maurice had

no desire to be called Churchman rather than Christian, a

believer in articles, rather than a believer in God.[28]

Christensen observes that with this concept of reli-

gion Maurice appeared to have solved the religious problem

which he inherited from his childhood. His romantic idealistic

views had led him to a new understanding of the nature of reli-

gion. Religion was the feeling of being in immediate communion

with the Divine power of love, truth and beauty which per-
meated all the universe and was revealed in the spirit of
man. To arrive at a true understanding of oneself and the
universe must therefore lead to a religious attitude towards
life. Man was always living in the presence of the Divine
power and he only needed to turn away from the sensuous outer
life to his own inner self in order to experience this fact.
To all appearances, says Christensen, Maurice's intellectual
and religious development had been brought to a close.[29]

So far, Christensen's analysis is useful and illumin-
ating even if some of the views which he describes as true of
Maurice at this period of his life remained true long after he
joined the reactionary Church of England.[30] It is in his assess-
ment of Maurice's turn to the Church of England that he is least
impartial. Maurice, Christensen writes, had by this time devel-
oped into an independent and consistent thinker. He was rightly
recognised as an outstanding figure among the intellectuals who,
because of their sharp criticism of the existing society and
current modes of thought, and for their courage in finding new
ways, seemed destined to exert great influence on the future
history of their country--as in fact they did. Maurice was a
leader in this avant-garde when suddenly he broke away and

joined the very church which he had found until then to be the
main hindrance to the progress and freedom of humanity.[31]

In this assessment Christensen ignores many facts.
The first and most obvious is that Maurice never ceased to be
critical of the Church of England though he believed that in
her teaching the fundamental elements of the universal society
were to be found. To say that Maurice believed that the Church
of England embodied these truths is an understandable but mis-
leading interpretation. His suggestion that Maurice was sud-
denly converted to Anglicanism is also not borne out by the
facts.[32] Nor can any careful reading of Maurice's _Life and_
Letters confirm the view that he was in full agreement with
the Radical elements.[33] Christensen himself writes:

> It was a unique intellectual and religious
> development which had led Maurice to the
> Church of England--and his conception of the
> truths embodied in that Church was no less
> striking. As we shall see, his joining the
> Church of England did not mean a decisive break
> with everything that Maurice had learnt until
> then. Thus he was still convinced that both
> the Unitarians and the romantic-idealistic
> thinkers were right in many ways, and that they
> had voiced 'vital principles' whose truth were
> beyond doubt. This their genuine concern, how-
> ever, could find no satisfaction in their 'sys-
> tems', but only in the Church of England.[34]

Yet Christensen finds the reason for Maurice's transi-
tion to the Church of England in the spiritual crisis which he

experienced towards the end of 1828.[35] The facts are: In 1828

his father lost a considerable source of income in an invest-

ment he made in Spain. In 1829 Frederick shared for the first

time the workings of his mind on religious questions with his

sister, Emma, and his mother, and with his father the thought

of returning to Cambridge and of becoming a clergyman. The

failure of the Athenaeum, his father's misfortunes and his sis-

ter's illness led to a period of deep depression and a return

to his home from London. Christensen says "he was led to a

deep consciousness of sin which made him pass judgement on him-

self and revealed to him the necessity of a personal Redeemer

who might deliver him from his sin."[36] There is little to sub-

stantiate any sudden conversion in Maurice's life though un-

doubtedly he had a strong consciousness of his own sins.[37]

However, by the time he returned to London it had been arranged

that he should go to Oxford to prepare for ordination in the

Church of England. Though he had been baptised previously by

his father with the Trinitarian formula Maurice received bap-

tism in the Church of England on March 29th, 1831. He was

ordained in 1834.

Christensen says,

> The religious crisis, which began towards the
> end of 1828, had meant a decisive turning point
> in Maurice's personal development. Religious

and theological problems had now become his
absorbing interests. According to Maurice him-
self, this did not mean that he had discarded
political and social questions altogether. By
proclaiming what he considered to be the truths
of the Church of England he believed he had
pointed to the sole remedy for all the evils of
the age. It cannot surprise us, however, when
his friends from the London Debating Society
thought that this change in his views had meant
a retrogression. He had left the avant garde
of those who could not tolerate the existing
society and had scorned its governing classes
because they would do nothing towards solving
the burning problems of the day, and instead he
had turned to the very Church which was the
stronghold of political and social reaction.
. . . Maurice must certainly have seemed a
renegade.[38]

Maurice's turn to the Church of England surprised his

associates like John S. Mill but this does not prove that there

was a radical change in his own views. His correspondence with

the King's College Council in 1860 indicates that the Church

of England's tolerance of varied opinion among its members was

one of the factors which influenced his decision to join it.

He wrote, "I took refuge in the Church of England because it

offered a bond of fraternity which allowed a diversity of opi-

nion among its members."[39] We shall see that Maurice encouraged

a similar "unity in diversity" within the Christian Socialist

Movement.

While at Bubbenhall, his first curacy, his first theo-

logical work, Subscription No Bondage, was published. In the

light of his refusal to sign the articles at Cambridge this
book has particular interest; but there is also the fact
that Maurice said of it, ". . .no book which I have written
expresses more strongly what then were, and what still are,
my deepest convictions."[40]

In 1836, Maurice became chaplain at Guy's Hospital,
London. In that year he declined a tutorship at Downing Col-
lege, Cambridge, but hesitantly allowed himself to be nominated
to the Professorship of Political Economy at Oxford. Later in
1837, after the publication of a pamphlet on baptism lost him
the support of Dr. Pusey and the High Church Party, his name
was withdrawn.[41] The publication of Letters to a Quaker, of
which the pamphlet on baptism was the second letter, unleashed
the warfare between Maurice and the religious newspapers which
marked the rest of his life.[42]

1839 was a momentous year. Chartism and Owenite so-
cialism were both becoming powerful factors in English life.
National education was generally regarded as the solution to
the plight of the labouring classes. A National Society for
Education had been founded in 1811, and received a charter for
the promotion of the education of the poor in the principles

of the Established Church.[43] Maurice had always had a deep

concern for national education and gave a course of lectures

on the subject in 1839. In September he undertook with some

friends, who were connected with the National Society but not

pledged to support its measures, the joint editorship of The

Educational Magazine and Journal of Scholastic Literature.[44]

In 1840 Maurice was appointed Professor of English Literature

and Modern History at King's College, London. In the Spring

of 1841 he gave up the Educational Magazine in order to re-

write The Kingdom of Christ.

In 1842 appeals came to him from Archdeacon Hare and

Mr. Daniel MacMillan for the provision of literature which

would reach the working classes.[45] Maurice's first response

was to provide signed tracts written "upon the principle of

acknowledging the people to whom they are addressed as reason-

able creatures, really desirous to know what is true and al-

ready having thoughts and feelings upon the subjects in which

they were interested".[46] The matter was discussed for some

time but Maurice, Hare and MacMillan could not agree on the

method of communication to be used and therefore no action

resulted. Maurice wished to write tracts for the poor people

to whom he ministered in Guy's Hospital. He believed that the

needs of all classes could be met if others, like Hare and

MacMillan, "in other spheres would write for their own flocks whom they know".[47] Two principles which Maurice upheld throughout his career within the C.S.M. are already evident--each person should concentrate upon the area in which he was best equipped and placed; persons of different social and political views could co-operate.

In 1843 Maurice rejected Archdeacon Hare's suggestion that he seek the Principal's post at King's College. He said then he felt that his vocation was towards "the outlying sheep rather than those in the fold . . . Quakers, Unitarians, Rationalists, Socialists, and whatever else a Churchman repudiates, and whatever repudiates him".[48] He recognized, however, that those people probably had less sympathy with him than with most of his brethren, looking upon him (if they looked at all) as a futile apologist for the English Church. Throughout his life Maurice shunned all preferments in the Church, for he believed that his unique religious development had made him see truths that had been forgotten by the religious world at large and had given him a specific vocation to proclaim these truths-- a vocation which could not be discharged if he occupied prominent offices in the church.[49]

During the summer of 1844 Maurice met Charles Kingsley. In replying to a letter from Kingsley, Maurice expressed his

hope to meet Kingsley to discuss topics which the latter had raised in his letter, _viz_, the Bible, Baptists and Infant Baptism.

Some personal details which might appear trivial yet which will help us to understand Maurice and the course of events within the C.S.M. must here be mentioned. Maurice's first wife, Annie Barton, died in March 1845. In 1849 he married Georgiana Hare.[50] In 1845 Maurice was appointed by the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London to deliver the Boyle lectures and in the same year the Archbishop of Canterbury requested him to give the Warburton lectures.[51] In 1846, along with R.C. Trench and Dr. McCaul, Maurice was appointed to a Professorship at King's College when the theological department was established. Dr. Jelf was appointed Principal. Maurice now gave up his work at Guy's Hospital and became Chaplain at Lincoln's Inn. It was here that Ludlow and Maurice met.

Towards the end of 1846 Ludlow called on Maurice at the suggestion of J.A. Anderson, the Preacher at Lincoln's Inn. The purpose of his visit was to seek Maurice's assistance in a scheme for bringing "to bear the leisure and good feeling of the Inns of Court upon the destitution and vice of the neighbourhood."[52] Maurice introduced Ludlow to the Incumbent of a

neighbouring parish who gave Ludlow one of the courts in this
slum area and allowed him a free hand in the work he had sug-
gested. Ludlow's impression of Maurice was "a good man but
very impractical".[53] The years 1848-1854 will be considered
in some detail in our section: "Christian Socialism 1848-1854".
Here we shall mention other involvements during these and sub-
sequent years, not merely to complete our narrative of
Maurice's life, but to be reminded that Maurice's participation
in the Christian Socialist movement was just one, and not his
primary, responsibility in these years.

In 1848 we get the first indication of Maurice's prob-
lems at King's College. Dr. Jelf complained of his numerous
efforts to resist the persecution of unpopular men, to which
Maurice replied that he believed it to be the business of a
College to lift its voice against every suppression of opinion.
About this time, he became involved in the Governesses' Bene-
volent Institution;   many of the professors at King's Col-
lege undertook, at Maurice's suggestion, to form a committee
to assist such women in improving their academic qualifica-
tions. This led to the establishment of Queen's College.
Charles Kingsley and a Reverend S. Clark were among the friends
of Maurice who were not King's College professors who were co-
opted to serve on the Committee.[54] Between February and April

1848 Maurice preached the famous Lincoln Inn Sermons on the

Lord's Prayer.[55]

In March of that year Maurice received a letter from

Ludlow in which Ludlow told him of his visit to France. This

letter has received considerable attention.[56] In it Ludlow ex-

pressed "his conviction that Socialism was a real and great

power . . . that it must be Christianised or it would shake

Christianity to its foundation, precisely because it appealed

to the higher and not to the lower instincts of the men."[57]

Maurice responded positively but indecisively. He spoke of the

new Revolution in France as more awful and more hopeful than

any previous one. But as yet he saw his way dimly: "this,

however, I do see, that there is something to be done, that God

Himself is speaking to us and that if we ask Him what He would

have us do, we shall be shown."[58] Besides his duties at King's

College, Queen's College and at Lincoln's Inn, Maurice was re-

vising several books and articles which were published in 1849.

That year also witnessed the continued attacks upon him by the

religious newspapers, as well as a letter from Dr. Jelf in-

quiring into the orthodoxy of his views on the Church, the

Ministry, the Creeds and the Liturgy. Finally he was dismissed

from his professorship on October 27th, 1853, on the pretext

that views he expressed in <u>Theological Essays</u>[59] "regarding the

punishment of the wicked and the final judgement are of a

dangerous tendency, and calculated to unsettle the minds of

theological students at King's College".[60] His association

with the Christian Socialists unquestionably influenced the

decision.[61] His dismissal from King's College led to his re-

signation from Queen's College also, although in 1856, at the

request of its Council, he resumed lectures there.[62] He was

appointed Principal of the Working Men's College in 1854,[63] a

post he held until his death.[64] He also assisted in establish-

ing other Working Men's Colleges in other cities in England.[65]

We shall need to speak further about the Working Men's

College.[66]

In 1866 Maurice was appointed Knightsbridge Professor

of Casuistry, Moral Theology and Moral Philosophy at Cambridge

and undertook the Cambridge Preachership at Whitehall in

1871.[67] Though his health was failing he continued his vari-

ous activities until his death on April 1st, 1872.[68]

The Social, Economic and Political Climate in England

Before we consider the work of the early Christian

Socialists we must summarize the circumstances under which

their protest was made and the attitude of Churchmen and poli-

ticians towards the problems of contemporary industrialism.

The late Canon C.E. Raven, on whose work, <u>Christian Socialism</u>

<u>1848-1854</u>, this section is based, said that to understand the

genesis of Christian Socialism in England we must go back to

the French Revolution which was itself only a symptom of a ra-

dical change in European civilization. No previous change had

come as rapidly or with such revolution as the appearance of

democracy and industrialism; and these changes caught the

leaders in both State and Church totally unprepared.[69] Conse-

quently they took refuge in a belief that Nature had best be

left to find her own remedies. They clung to whatever relics

of authority seemed to promise security and accepted the solu-

tions provided by the economists of the time.

The Manchester School of Economists had predicted that

the industrial enterprise in England would spread the wealth

of the nation. The fact was that it increased the wealth of

a few and brought poverty and suffering to the vast majority

in the manufacturing and agricultural districts; this led to

social discontent and consequent agitation. The old governing

class pursued the old methods of repression and ruled openly

in the interest of the landed aristocracy. Raven remarks that

in this situation the politicians and the philosophers, the

scientists and the economists united to declare that the condition of the poor, being the outcome of natural law, was unalterable and that any attempt at alleviation would but intensify the evil.

We cannot here treat in any detail the reasons why the theories of Adam Smith, Bentham, Malthus and Ricardo found such wide acceptance. Nor can we examine these theories. We can, however, state that the fear of state interference was one cause for the emphasis on liberty, a fear that was well grounded. The State's influence in the past had been deadening and and its methods corrupt. Consequently at this time individual liberty seemed synonymous with progress, and the extension of government powers with reaction. The fact is that self-interest, identified with freedom, ruled the day. The increase of industrial prosperity validated the theory, for this prosperity was explained as the result of individual freedom.

Raven's explanation of the interpretation of liberty and its practical expression is enlightening. It meant, he says, simply the right of the individual to follow his own interests unrestrained by the minimum of interference. The laws of the nation were, of course, not to be broken: but then these laws had been framed in order to leave the widest scope for the self-development of the prosperous.

> Wages must not be fixed--that would be to des-
> troy freedom of contract; workers must not
> combine--that would violate freedom to engage
> labour or to seek other employment; industry
> must not be controlled--freedom of competition
> was the source of national prosperity--even
> infants should enjoy freedom to spend sixteen
> hours a day in the mills; poor relief must
> be abolished--it interfered with the freedom
> of the poor to starve. The corn-trade and
> most imports, meetings, speech, and the prin-
> ting press, and until 1824 combination and
> emigration--in these things alone freedom
> was withheld.

Raven comments with some sarcasm: ". . . and so the cult of

laissez-faire continued; and the riots were suppressed; and

the leaders of labour were imprisoned and the rich grew fat;

and the trade-returns increased enormously."[71] The laws of

Commerce were seen as the laws of Nature and therefore the

laws of God.[72]

> Raven's conclusion is:

> Bad philosophy and bad economics were the
> chief cause and the chief excuse of the
> failure of Church and State.

> Among those ultimately responsible for the
> sins of laissez-faire, Bentham and the Utili-
> tarian philosophy must bear the heaviest
> blame.[73]

Under the combined influence of these champions of the obvious

and simple system of natural liberty the condition of the wor-

kers became desperate and their leaders were driven to the

advocacy of violent methods.

The protest against these social, political and economic conditions came first from men outside the Church and then from men within it. Men as diverse in outlook as Cobbett, Coleridge, Southey, Carlyle, Shaftesbury, Owen, Lovett, O'Connor, Maurice, Ludlow and Kingsley, saw that "the new discoveries and the new technics which were presumed and proclaimed by the political economists to be about to raise men to new heights of achievements were, in fact, plunging the majority of them into new depths of degradation and these men declared themselves against the evil system."[74]

Our purpose here is to trace the development of the Christian Socialist Movement in England and therefore it is beyond our scope to deal with the various movements which were inspired by those men who were mentioned in the previous paragraph. The collapse of one of these movements, Chartism, however, signalled the birth of the C.S.M.

Chartism

Max Beer tells us that the "two currents of social economic thought generated and developed by the school of Owen and the anti-capitalistic criticism reached, in the years from 1825 onwards, the thinking portion of the British working

class and created Chartism, which constituted a series of social revolutionary attempts to reorganize the United Kingdom on a socialist and labour basis."[75] Chartism itself was nurtured in the great disappointment which followed the Reform Bill of 1832 and which had enfranchised the middle class only, but the immediate occasion of its rise was the implementation of the New Poor Law of 1834. It received its name from the programme entitled, "The People's Charter", which was drawn up by William Lovett and adopted as their own by the London Working Men's Association. This charter demanded equal electoral areas, universal suffrage, payment of members of Parliament, the abolition of property qualification for Parliamentary candidates, vote by ballot and annual Parliaments.[76] The Chartists regarded political equality as the first step towards procuring social equality. While the moderates hoped to achieve this by moral force, the extremists were ready to employ physical violence.

While the movement was spreading across the nation, two Tory factory reformers, Richard Oastler and the Reverend J.R. Stephens were campaigning against the more unpleasant provisions of the Poor Law of 1834. Oastler and Stephens threw in their lot with the Chartists, along with an evangelical preacher, Henry Vincent and an Irish land-owner, Feargus

O'Connor. Both Stephens and O'Connor advocated the use of violence to achieve their goals.

Thomas Attwood, a member of Parliament, proposed the election of an anti-Parliament, to be known as a Convention, and to be called by the unenfranchised. This Convention would sit as a rival to the House of Commons and present a petition, signed by members of the working class, for the enactment of the Charter as the Law of the Land. It was proposed that if the Commons rejected the petition the Convention would call a general strike (the Sacred Month). The Convention was held in May and the Commons rejected the petition in July. Orders were given for the strike but later withdrawn through the influence of the moderates led by Lovett. Nevertheless, an attempt was made to free Vincent who had been imprisoned, but this proved futile. The authorities who had been informed of the planned insurrection then imprisoned all the leaders of the movement.

In 1841 the leaders were released but there was dis-harmony between the moderates led by Lovett and the extremists led by O'Connor. The latter finally succeeded in driving the moderate element out of the movement and a National Charter Association was founded. This was technically illegal but it gave coherence to the movement, secured the allegiance of a number of trade union branches and promoted a second petition

which was alleged to have received over three million signatures. In 1842 Chartism was at the peak of its prosperity and influence. In May of that year the House of Commons rejected the second petition and the executive of the Chartist Movement turned an existing strike at Ashton into a general strike. Just when the strike seemed to be gaining momentum O'Connor called it off declaring that it was a plot engineered by the Anti-Corn Law League. This marked the beginning of a period of decline during which interest was directed to a scheme for settling Chartists on land as small holders, by means of a National Land Company directed by O'Connor. Only one settlement materialised. Enthusiasm was revived in 1847 when O'Connor was elected to the House of Commons as the representative for Nottingham.[77] In 1848 O'Connor promoted a third petition which he claimed contained over six million signatures.

The People's Charter now became linked with the idea of a Socialistic order of society. O'Connor called a 'National Assembly' which assembled in London on April 4th and decided that a petition was to be presented by a procession of Chartists marching from Kennington Common to the House of Commons on April 10th. London was seized with panic and the fear of revolution; the army was called in and the procession was forbidden by law. Thousands met on Kennington Common,[78] and

dispersed peacefully on police orders after the speeches were

made. The National Petition was taken to Parliament by a small

deputation headed by O'Connor. The Government announced that

there were no more than two thousand signatures, and it was

discovered that the Land Company was bankrupt. O'Connor became

insane and efforts to revive the movement proved futile.

The State of the Church in England

In the midst of the blind terror caused by the Char-

tist agitation the established Church had no helpful word to

say. Its members did not attempt to understand the meaning

and nature of the Chartist appeal, and often the clergy were

loudest in the cry for the suppression of the movement.[79]

Generally speaking the Churches turned a deaf ear to the suf-

fering of the workers and their cry for help.[80]

Raven says that the Church of England had for nearly

a century been singularly lacking in spirituality or inspira-

tion. Under the Hanoverian Kings the Church had been regarded

as a respectable though little respected department of the

State. Her traditions decried enthusiasm as dangerous, relega-

ted piety to fixed days and places and persons, inculcated a

slavish adherence to the Crown and nobility, and a loyal

support to privilege and the <u>status quo</u>. Her bishops and cler-
gy were particularly ill-suited to detect the evils of the
times.

Raven maintains that while the countryside was being
depopulated and the new manufacturing towns were springing up,
no great churchman and, save Methodism, no great religious
movement rose above the very low level of English Christianity.
The treatment the Methodists received is adequate evidence a-
gainst the established Church. Yet Wesley himself and his
followers were not particularly concerned with the social prob-
lems of those for whose souls they displayed such passion.
Raven reminds us that when the early social reformers appeared
on the scene the established Church was dominated by two
schools--the Evangelicals and the Tractarians. The Evangelical
movement owed much to Wesley.[81]

Raven is critical of the Evangelicals but is far less
severe on them than he is on the Tractarians. He believed
that the Evangelicals, by reviving strong puritan habits and
insisting that religion was a matter not of the lips or reason
but of the heart and life, did a great work in redeeming the
failure of the Church. Whatever may have been the defects of
their theology they renewed the spiritual life of the Church,
afforded noble examples of practical philanthropy and helped

to form a conscience in English politics. Yet the Evangelicals, like the Tractarians, but for other reasons, were weak in treating the diseases of the body politic.[82] They aimed solely at individual conversions and cared little for the physical environment of their converts, and nothing for the causes that produced it. In fact they accepted as the teaching of Scripture the idea that God had made some men poor and consequently poverty was immutable. They did not conceive of the capacity of man to alter his own environment and so assist in the promotion of growth of goodness nor did they see the hopelessness of working on purely individualistic lines. Added to their individualistic viewpoint the Evangelicals were actively anti-revolutionary, quietistic and otherworldly.

Raven expresses the fear that at its worst their doctrine became a device for repressing honest aspiration and obstructing every attempt at progress but he believes that the Evangelicals served a very useful purpose in saving England from the bloodshed and horror which convulsed France. Nevertheless it did so at the cost of divorcing religion from life and fostering the alliance between the reformers and the secularists.[84]

The Evangelicals drew their strength from the Bible and they resisted the critical approach to it, which was part

of the liberal and democratic tendencies of the new scientific
approach to all literature; nonetheless it was from their de-
votion to the Bible that Evangelicals made their chief contri-
bution to social redemption: they made it involuntarily but
that does not diminish its effectiveness, and they did it by
being pioneers in promoting national education.

Raven saw great value in the Oxford Movement but he
said that in its reactionary character, its absorption in de-
tail and its neglect of social matters, it managed to side-
track English Christianity. To Raven, the Tractarians were
initially definitely hostile to the social reformers. He
points out that theirs was not merely or mainly a reaction a-
gainst the liberal movement; nor were they simply "Toryism in
ecclesiastical costume".[85] But Raven says that it is clear
enough that in the early Tracts the Tories were being summoned
to rally, that a challenge was being flung at the shallow lib-
eralism of the day.[86] There was much in the current liberalism
which the Christian had to resist--the individualistic inter-
pretation of freedom, and the gospel of enlightened self-in-
terest. Unfortunately, instead of concentrating on the opposi-
tion to the evils, the Tractarians took up an attitude of
thorough-going hostility to the spirit of the new age and
sought to obstruct rather than to guide, to reject good and bad

87

alike. While the Evangelicals were applying St. Paul's more
quietistic sayings to the circumstances of the industrial era,
Pusey was labouring to reconstruct in 19th Century England the
religion of the fourth and fifth centuries. By their concen-
tration on the past the Tractarians lost faith in the living
and present guidance of the Holy Spirit[88] and so confirmed
themselves in their hostility to liberalism. Furthermore they
diverted the attention of the Church from the crying needs of
the time in arguments upon archaeology. Even the greatest and
best of them--Newman, Pusey, Ward--were singularly blind to
the industrial problems of the time.[89]

The fact was, says Raven, that the Catholicism of the
Tractarians was almost as completely individualistic as the
Protestantism of the Evangelicals. They substituted membership
of the Church, observance of discipline, and sacramental commu-
nion with Christ, for conversion, puritanical strictness and
ecstatic consciousness of Christ. But they knew almost nothing
of man's corporate relationships and responsibilities, of those
social sins which the individual shares in but cannot personal-
ly cure and of social righteousness which flows from the a-
wakening of the common conscience. They made possible a wider
conception of the meaning of religion by bringing back the
ideals of catholicism and exposing the shortcomings of

individualism, but they failed to apply those ideals where
they were most needed and themselves exhibited a narrow sec-
tarian spirit.[90]

Raven acknowledges that the social involvement of the
later Tractarians, to a degree under the influence of Maurice,[91]
demonstrated that the principles of the Catholic faith do not
in themselves involve any such narrow ecclesiasticism and are
not necessarily dependent upon the belief that inspiration
ceased with the holding of the last Ecumenical Council, or
that democracy is of the devil. He recognizes that ultimately
the Tractarian emphasis upon corporate life and the duties of
membership in a society made it a potent factor in the develop-
ment of collectivist ideas. Yet it is apparent that the want
of faith and charity, the concentration upon trivialities, and
the blindness to large issues which characterised its early
supporters did grave disservice to Christianity in England.

It was with a Church dominated by these two schools
that Maurice, Ludlow, Kingsley and the others were brought
into contact. We said at the outset that the third factor
which determined the rise of the C.S.M. resulted from the lives
and personalities of Ludlow and Maurice. Before we look at
the development of the movement let us examine Ludlow's prepara-
tion for the vital part he played.

John Malcolm Forbes Ludlow

We have suggested that Maurice was the prophet, the
theologian, the sober statesman, in the C.S.M.;[92] but we have
also noted that John Malcolm Ludlow was the real Founder of
the Movement and in many ways the real activist in the group.
Born in India in 1821 Ludlow moved with his family to England
after his father's death in 1823, and later to France where he
received his education. His family's interest in political
and social issues, his childhood experience of political up-
heaval in France,[93] the religious influence of French Liberal
Protestantism and liberal Catholicism (chiefly in the person
of Lamennais) instilled in him a deep sense of Christian social
responsibility.

His life was marked by several religious crises. The
first came in 1837 when, on a visit to the West Indies, he
went through a period of great religious doubt. He survived
this crisis with a deepened faith. Christensen tells us that
at this stage Ludlow was not a party-man with a particular
political creed.[94] He thought that the obvious duty of the
politician was to be free of all personal ambitions and all
narrow party and class interests in order to strive only for
the good of the nation. The same principle applied to his

evaluation of political institutions and parties. It was in

his views on monarchy and democracy that Ludlow differed most

from Maurice. Ludlow was not against monarchy so long as it

remained the servant of parliament and the nation. Neverthe-

less he had a distinctive dislike of the monarchy as he had

experienced it; it had usually been combined with despotism

and blocked the way of freedom and progress.[95] Raven provides

us with an insight which will help us to understand much of the

difference between Ludlow and Maurice and consequently the

course of events in the C.S.M., 1848-1854.

> . . . In the atmosphere of Paris he [Ludlow]
> grew to understand the meaning of democracy
> in a way impossible for his English-trained
> contemporaries: monarchy, which was to
> Maurice a thing divinely sanctioned, as a
> guarantee of order and discipline, was to
> Ludlow simply 'government based wholly upon
> the selfish interests of a family, or rather
> of one old man': . . .[96]

Ludlow abhorred political and social privileges which

denied the equality of all men. He therefore disliked the

class distinctions, the aristocratic and hierarchical struc-

tures which he found in England. He regarded himself as "un

homme du peuple".[97] In consequence he was in favour of the

parliamentary system and believed it necessary to give the

whole adult population the opportunity, through adult suffrage,

to take part in the political government of the nation. He hoped, through education, to train the masses for mature political participation. Until this was achieved he believed that Members of Parliament had to think and act as trustees of the people, safeguarding their interest and combatting the political and social abuses under which they lived.

Ludlow's diary reveals that shortly after his arrival in 1838 he became well informed about the political situation in England. He had nothing but contempt for the Tories, little respect for the Whigs, and great enthusiasm for the Radicals. The Socialists whose ideas were spreading in France did not appeal to him. Apparently he felt that they neglected actual problems in their utopian plans for a new society. In spite of all this, Christensen says that at this stage Ludlow's social outlook remained definitely middle class.[98] Though he was impressed with the great industrial progress in England he still had little awareness of the new problems which it caused. However, through his participation in the British India Society Ludlow soon came into contact with many reform-minded Radicals and Dissenters;[99] and his interest in the work of the Society was soon extended to include also the Anti-Corn Law League.

During his first years in London, in his search for an adequate religious foundation, Ludlow attended the Church

of England, later the French Protestant Church, and afterwards
a Congregational Church. He was very critical of the Church
of England.[100] An earthquake in 1839 on the island of Marti-
nique in the West Indies where his sisters lived filled him
with anxiety and led to another religious crisis which he
spoke of as the turning point in his religious life.[101] He
now began to appreciate le Reveil, about which he had previous-
ly been extremely critical. For many years onwards he adopted
the fundamental religious views of le Reveil: the undeserved
redemption by the grace of God of sinful man, and the need for
personal sanctification. His own cultural interests led him
to find in Alexandre Vinet, the spokesman of le Reveil, a reli-
gious leader whom he could follow.[102]

In 1842 Ludlow was called to the Bar and in 1843 he
took chambers to practise as a conveyancer.[103] His mastery of
this subject proved to be a great factor in his social involve-
ment but at this stage his indecision about his career led to
despondency.[104] A love affair with his cousin, Maria Forbes,
whom he eventually married in 1869, saved him from suicide as
well as from a return to France which he seriously contemplated.[105]

Just about this time Ludlow came under the influence
of the thought of Thomas Arnold. He later wrote in his unpub-
lished 'Autobiography': "I had wished and wanted to work for

God and my fellowmen. Arnold had given me the work, Meyer

gave me the impulse which made me do so. Arnold, Meyer,

Maurice—-to those three men I owe under God my better self."[106]

Through Arnold's concept of Christian social responsibility

Ludlow began to emphasize social issues as of the utmost im-

portance.

Ludlow met Louis Meyer on his visit to Paris in 1846.

Meyer had been a Lutheran clergyman and like Ludlow became

interested in le Reveil through the influence of the brothers

Monod. In 1837 Meyer was appointed premier pasteur at l'Eglise

des Billets, one of the two churches of l'Eglise de la Confes-

sion d'Augsbourg in Paris. Here Meyer founded the successful

Société des Amis des Pauvres and tried to persuade Ludlow to

become involved in this work.[107] Ludlow promised to "see what

could be done in London towards interesting young educated men

in the condition of their poor neighbours".[108] It was Meyer's

suggestion which led to Ludlow's visit to J.A. Anderson and

subsequently to Maurice in his attempt to get the other barris-

ters at Lincoln's Inn interested in taking up evangelizing and

social work in the surrounding slums.[109] Ludlow had to abandon

his original intention through lack of support from his col-

leagues, but he continued visiting the people in the area and

here he got firsthand knowledge of the living conditions of

the poor and the feelings agitating them. Christensen observes
that, unnoticed by himself, his middle class approach to social
problems began to disintegrate. He became dissatisfied with
the forms of religious-philanthropic enterprises in contempo-
rary England and sought to discover methods to assist the poor
not only by religious and educational measures but also by im-
proving their social and economic conditions.

When the Revolution of 1848 broke out Ludlow, anxious
about his sisters in Paris, hastened there immediately. There
he came to the conclusion that the ideas of the Revolution
would spread throughout the world and might prove a blessing
to humanity. He believed that God was at work in the events
of the Revolution but he feared its godless nature.[110] He
returned to England where he tried unsuccessfully to raise the
necessary money to finance a newspaper in France, La Fraternité
Chrétienne, which he hoped would help to make the socialistic
revolution a Christian one. As we have already noted he had
written to Maurice from Paris.[111]

Raven tells us that Ludlow cared little for human
praise, was fearless and tenacious of his principles, assured
in his convictions, frank and outspoken in advocating what he
regarded as the right course; yet he was ready to accept the

leadership of others, provided they displayed a tenacity and strength of purpose similar to his own.[112] In spite of Christensen's apparent bias against Maurice and his emphasis on Ludlow's importance in the movement, he reveals Ludlow's willingness to accept Maurice's leadership. Maurice's principle of unity in diversity as well as his patience were severely tested by Ludlow's intolerance of the views of others in the co-operative movement; yet Raven is right when he speaks of Ludlow's restless activity and insatiable capacity for hard work, his fertile, well-informed and constructive mind, and his loyalty to Maurice.[113] Their relationship was a "model of frank and loyal friendship; where they differed, they discussed the matter fully and freely, with an outspoken directness which could only come from an absolute confidence in one another's honesty and affection".[114] Ludlow often played the "devil's advocate" in the Bible readings either to raise questions which others feared to ask or to acquaint Maurice with the real issues in the minds of average lay people.[115]

The Christian Socialist Movement in England

1848 - 1854

The account of the C.S.M. in England from 1848-1854
has been fully related by Charles Raven and, more recently, by
Torben Christenson. Our present purpose is to determine the
nature of Maurice's Christian Socialism; possible changes or
inconsistencies in his thought and action; and to what extent
persons or circumstances effected these changes. We shall do
this by considering some of the principal developments between
1848-1854.

Politics for the People

Maurice's meetings with Ludlow and Kingsley following
the Chartist demonstration of April 10th, 1848 marked a new
development in Maurice's life. His sermons on the Lord's
Prayer in March and April reveal that he, unlike the majority
of English clergymen of his time, had preached about the social
nature of Christianity, but from April 10th he himself became
engaged in practical social action. The discussions after the
issue of their placard to the "Workmen of England" followed the
same pattern as those he had with Hare and MacMillan.[116] This

time Maurice advocated the publication of a series of tracts,
the purpose of which would be to educate the clergy and church
members who through contempt or ignorance of politics had sepa-
rated religion from it. From the outset he envisaged education
as the means of social emancipation and regarded it as the area
in which he could make a contribution, while others, like King-
sley and Ludlow, applied themselves in other spheres.[117] The
idea of a newspaper prevailed over Maurice's idea of tracts,
and the first issue of _Politics for the People_ was published
on May 6th, 1848.

The Prospectus of the first issue was written by
Maurice and gives us an indication of the comprehensive nature
of his Christian Socialism. In his opinion, politics should
never be separated from religion but must start from the ac-
knowledgement that a Living and Righteous God rules in human
society. He did not wish to create another political party,
for there were virtues and vices in every political system;
he therefore invited men of all political persuasions to unite
for the good of the nation. He disclaimed "any fraternization"
among the contributors to the paper "on the ground of coinci-
dence in conclusions about certain measures".[118] Uniformity
of opinion would not be demanded; on the contrary, he desired
and promised readers a conflict of opinions. He hoped the

paper would show that "it was possible to realize the true Fraternity of which this age had dreamed, and without which . . . it cannot be satisfied".[119]

His defense of Kingsley and Ludlow, when Hare would have curtailed the free and frank expressions of their views, demonstrated the strength of this conviction.[120] Later his refusal to publish articles by Kingsley and his censorship of one written by Ludlow seemed to contravene this principle. His explanation was that those articles contradicted another of his firm principles, "reverence for the conscience of every man, high and low, rich and poor".[121] At this stage Ludlow and Kingsley were more to the left politically than Maurice, but they were equally opposed to the use of violent methods to achieve reform. Although Ludlow influenced Maurice's views on socialism,[122] his acceptance of Maurice's decision about the policy of _Politics for the People_ reveals the growing regard with which he and his colleagues held Maurice as their leader.[123] Actually socialism itself was not discussed until the last issue of the periodical in an article written by Ludlow.[124] In the same issue Maurice wrote "More Last Words" in which he noted that the strongest movements of the day emphasized the fact that men live in a society which is not based on a law of strife: "The People's Charter is an assertion that Government

cannot be carried on for or by parties: all the various forms of Socialism declare that men, whatever ends they propose to themselves, must co-operate for these ends."[125] There was therefore a duty to study all forms of Socialism "in the light of history; to see what great human sympathies are bound up with them; to consider what there is in them which makes them inconsistent and unreasonable; what there is in them which has a divine root and must live".[126]

By this time a group of young men had gathered around Maurice. There was no uniformity of thought but a strong desire to serve their fellowmen and a growing affection and respect for Maurice began to unite them.[127]

Their first united effort was the establishment of a free evening school for men in a London slum district. Later the school was extended to include boys and women.[128] At the suggestion of members of the group, Maurice conducted weekly Bible readings in his home. His approach to these discussions was typical of his method in dealing with all issues. He read the Scriptures. He explained its meaning as he understood it and invited all possible questions. He believed that by this means God would speak to each one and lead him to a true understanding of himself and the world.[129] Although with Ludlow's assistance, he encouraged free expression of opinion by the

group, the basic elements of his thought "became to a large
extent the religious impulses underlying Christian Socialism--
and in this way", writes Christensen, "Maurice may be said to
have been 'the master spirit' of the movement".[130] The young
men referred to him as "the Master" or "the Prophet" though
Maurice rejected all suggestions of being their leader.[131]

Maurice, to use one of his favourite expressions, "dug
down" to the truths which gave a foundation to the radical
thought of Ludlow and some of the other friends.[132] Often
they understood the implications of those truths in ways that
Maurice did not. He, in turn, was prepared to follow Ludlow
and the others in the practical application of these truths in
trade and industry.[133] These basic truths were: that God was
Father who had created a universal brotherhood in Christ; that
Christ is the educator of mankind in every sphere of life;
that the Church is the spiritual home of the nation and should
provide the regenerating power for social and political insti-
tutions; and that the principle of love is the foundation of
the universe and should govern all human relations.[134] Chris-
tensen observes that this last truth became the genesis of a
new evaluation of Socialism by Ludlow.[135]

Contact With the Working Classes

At first the group was unaware of the thinking of the
working classes but their work in the school awakened them to
some of the problems of the poor and made them eager to develop
a dialogue with their leaders. Ludlow induced Walter Cooper,
a tailor, an active Chartist and a prominent working class
leader in London, to hear Maurice preach at Lincoln's Inn.
Cooper then invited Maurice to meet with some of his associ-
ates; the result was that a committee was set up to discuss
the possibility of regular conferences between the two groups.
Maurice was apprehensive about the meetings but also dis-
tressed that poor men should be surprised at the willingness
of a clergyman to discuss political matters with them.[136] The
conference proved to be very successful and brought Maurice and
his friends in touch with many working class leaders, including
Lloyd Jones, "beyond doubt . . . the most extraordinary man
which the conferences brought out on the working men's side".[137]
Lloyd Jones was well informed about working class problems and
his personal acquaintance with the leaders of the workers
throughout England enabled him to introduce Maurice and his
group to them. Lloyd Jones is also important as he was the
link between Chartism, Owenite Socialism and Christian
Socialism.

Maurice and his friends attempted in the Bible classes and social gatherings to bridge the gap between the Church and the workers by showing them that Christianity had a practical bearing on their problems. In turn the workers gave the Christian Socialists an understanding of the motives which prompted them in their plans for political and social reform.[138] The questions of Home Colonies and Communism were frequently discussed at these meetings and the working class leaders were impressed by the readiness of the Christian Socialists to listen to them. They were surprised to find an absence of the customary upper class tendency to treat Chartism, Socialism, Communism and the idea of Home Colonies as infidelity and immorality. It even appeared at one time that Maurice and his friends were willing to support the establishment of Home Colonies.[139] Maurice became convinced that Socialistic and Communistic ideas expressed a desire for fellowship and a protest against the selfishness of the social environment. It witnessed to the principle of fellowship which to him had always been the constitutive element of society.

At this point Maurice met a friend of Ludlow's, one Jules St. André le Chevalier, a French Socialist refugee. Lechevalier (as he was called in England) had been influenced by minor French Socialist writings, notably by Proudhon

(1809-1865) the Socialist writer who, in 1840, had uttered the

famous dictum: "La propriété, c'est le vol." Lechevalier was

convinced that the essence of Socialism was to be found in

Co-operative Societies. Under the influence of Maurice's theo-

logical teaching, he became a Christian and joined the Church

of England.[140] He saw it as the Church's duty to show how its

message would affect society and become "the spiritual centre

of life". Christians ought to combat the theory of Political

Economy which, in glaring contradiction to the Christian faith,

taught that all men must compete with each other and should

feel responsible for no one but themselves. The Church had to

set a good example in such matters as production, distribution

and consumption of wealth, and in the daily labour of men.[141]

It is clear that these views influenced the thought

of Maurice and his friends because this was the pattern that

their movement actually followed. It is hard to determine to

what extent Maurice himself was won over to Lechevalier's views

though Christensen points out that "unless he had been influ-

enced by Lechevalier, it is difficult to explain why he a few

months later published an exposition of the tenets of Christian

Socialism, which to all appearances, marked a new development

in his theological thinking".[142]

Later we shall discover that Lechevalier helped to clarify the issue of the Central Board for the Associations to Maurice after the latter's initial rejection of the scheme.[143] With one or two others he also pioneered the link between the Co-operative movement and the Trade Unions.[144] But apparently he deliberately intrigued to aggravate the differences between Ludlow and Edward Neale, a conservative and wealthy man who was introduced to the group by Maurice.[145] Finally the rejection of Lechevalier's proposals for the reconstruction of the Central Agency ended his connection with the early Christian Socialists. He found support for his ideas among the Tractarians.[146]

The Scheme for a Crusade of Sanitary Reform

Maurice's idea of neighbourhood responsibility led him to support the group's efforts for sanitary reform on Jacob's Island, the worst hit area in the cholera epidemic of 1849.[147] But his experience in the National Society on Education, his conviction of the evil inherent in party unions, his idea of the gradual growth of social redemption through cells, inter alia led him to disapprove of a programme for a National Health League drawn up by Ludlow and two others.[148] Maurice

was convinced that parties and leagues would never achieve
their purpose because in them men tend to commit themselves to
ideologies and lose sight of the ultimate goal. Our experience
of party politics in the twentieth century confirms this con-
viction. Maurice's idea was to involve the barristers at Lin-
coln's Inn, King's College hospital doctors, inspectors of edu-
cation and his colleagues on the staff of King's College in
service to the neighbourhood slum districts. He believed such
a movement would spread by degrees in different circles. Ulti-
mately a universal society would evolve from such living but
primarily local efforts. Later we shall find that although
Rauschenbusch accepted socialism and believed that institutions
could be socialized to a much greater extent and on a much lar-
ger scale than Maurice ever did, yet their views on the gradual
growth by cells bear some similarity. In 1849 Maurice's atti-
tude displeased his colleagues but they abandoned the idea of
a nationwide crusade and concentrated on their work on Jacob's
Island.[149]

The First Working Men's Association

The events which accompanied the establishment of the
first Working Men's Association illustrate how deeply Maurice

was governed by principles; how carefully he distinguished
one principle from another; and consequently how easily his
motives and actions were misunderstood.[150]

When a certain Sidney Herbert suggested emigration as
a solution to the problem of London's workers, Charles Mans-
field, a member of the group, wrote a letter in the Morning
Chronicle protesting Herbert's suggestion on the grounds that
co-operation and not emigration was the solution. Maurice ob-
viously sympathized with Mansfield's view on co-operation as
the solution but defended the idea of emigration for many rea-
sons. "Colonization", he wrote, "is not transportation; it
is a brave, hearty, Saxon, Christian work."[151] Herbert's
scheme was open to criticism but it was to be respected as a
contribution to the problem. The episode demonstrates how
earnestly Maurice desired the exercise of charity in the treat-
ment of other men's ideas, and the co-operation of all for the
solution of national problems. Diversity of opinion, he be-
lieved, was not an obstacle to co-operation where there was
charity in judgement. Charges and countercharges, protests and
objections would never remedy evils. "Let us devise a Social-
ist Home Colonisation . . . provided only we give it a ground
to stand upon, . . . But in the meantime here is emigration."[152]

Maurice's fear of parties also led him to oppose the group's plan to work out a solution to the problem of the slop-workers (in modern terms, sweated labour). Here, he thought, was another attempt to set up a party with a programme of its own which would only foster exclusiveness and the condemnation of others. He obviously discovered that this opinion was wrong because, though uninvited by his colleagues, he attended the meeting they called to discuss the scheme. Ludlow writes, "Having regard to his late expressions of opinion, it was decided not to ask Mr. Maurice, but simply to tell him what we proposed to do. To our surprise and delight he invited himself, and not only offered no opposition but entered heartily into the plan."[153] They decided to organize a Working Men's Association for tailors.[154]

We do not really know what led to Maurice's change of mind. Ludlow's article "Labour and the Poor" in _Fraser's Magazine_ in January 1850 appeared too late to have been the cause. In any event there was nothing in that article which Maurice would not have endorsed.[155] The new thing in it was Ludlow's recommendation of Associative Workshops and Co-operative Stores. "_Les associations ouvrières_ in Paris had demonstrated . . . how the workers through Associative work might obtain the full profits of their labour."[156] On January

2nd, when Maurice commented on the Tailors' Association in a

letter to Kingsley, he said:

> I do not see any further than this. Competition
> is put forth as the law of the universe. That
> is a lie. The time is come for us to declare it
> a lie by word and deed. I see no way but
> associating for work instead of strikes. I do
> not say . . . that the relation of employer and
> employed is not a true relation . . . But at
> present it is clear that that relation is
> destroyed, that the payment of wages is nothing
> but a deception. We may restore the whole state
> of things; we may bring in a new one. God
> will decide that.[157]

We know that Maurice approved of Kingsley's article, "Cheap

Clothes and Nasty." This article, Raven tells us, had focused

the group upon the tailoring trade.[158] It is a reasonable

conjecture that Ludlow had discussed the contents of his

article, "Labour and the Poor" with Maurice before its

publication in Fraser's Magazine. This would account for

certain Maurician emphases in the Article.[159] Kingsley's

article, Ludlow's proposals, and the determination of friends

may well have led Maurice to decide that Associative Work-

shops were practical expressions of the principles he had

unearthed. His letter to Kingsley reads like that of a man

who is shifting his opinions. The false system of competi-

tion was threatening to destroy God's order and in this

emergency, Associative work was an efficient weapon of

protest.[160]

Tracts on Christian Socialism

The decision to follow up Maurice's idea of publishing a series of tracts reveals the method of the group's working.[161] Ludlow and Kingsley had advocated the issue of a periodical. Ludlow successfully opposed Maurice's idea that the tracts should take the form of "Addresses or Letters for different classes" in English society.[162] But they followed Maurice's idea to concentrate on the problems of the Metropolis and adhered to his desire to leave practical details of the Association to Ludlow while he applied himself to the literary department, ". . . in the one I must follow, in the other I may suggest."[163] Later, in 1853, Maurice maintained the same position. He wrote to Ludlow, "you and Neale have in great strength that in which I am utterly deficient. I know more of principles than either of you; yes, I say it boldly, even of the principle of Association than you do, though you have studied fifty books upon it for every page that I have read. But in organization, in external arrangements--in that which most concerns an Executive Committee, I am a child and you are grown men. I can do nothing in that way; it is most silly of me to attempt anything. I have left you to construct committees; I have often left you to work them."[164]

Two principles which are evident in the issue of these Tracts and in the work of the Associations explain much of the controversy and the course of events in the life of the C.S.M. Maurice wanted the Tracts to express firmly their Christian convictions and their determination to base their actions on them. He also wanted full freedom to unite with all men of honest purpose, "whatever their intellectual confusions may be," for practical purposes.[165] The title, Tracts on Christian Socialism, aroused considerable protest.[166] Maurice said it was the only title which defined their object and committed them to the inevitable conflict with the "unsocial Christians and the unchristian Socialists." At this stage he desired to "Christianise Socialism."[167] He outlined his understanding of Christian Socialism in the first Tract, "Dialogue Between Somebody (a person of respectability) and Nobody (the writer)."[168]

The Society For The Promoting Working Men's Associations

Maurice's account of Christian Socialism and his conduct in the activities of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, (S.P.W.M.A.) have been described as "puzzling and self-contradictory."[169] The events actually reveal important elements of Maurice's social thought.

The success of the Working Tailors Association led to the formation of many other Associations among other tradesmen. Maurice and his colleagues organized a "Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations." They themselves, with one or two of the working men, formed a "Council of Promoters" for the society. This Council acted as an advisory body to the Associations. It was an informal arrangement. They had weekly meetings for the discussion of business and for religious and social purposes. Charles Sully was engaged as a paid secretary to attend to the business affairs of the Council of Promoters.[170] He suggested the establishment of a Central Board independent of the Council of Promoters as a co-ordinating centre for the practical business of the Association. When he outlined his scheme, Maurice rejected it because its "mercenary, selfish and competitive spirit" contradicted the principles of brotherhood, fellowship and fellow-work.[171] It was an assertion of the doctrine that man was basically selfish and therefore a departure from the noblest concept of the English Socialist school--"that there are higher, truer impulses and desires with [men], leading them to a co-operation and brotherhood in spite of the selfishness which is drawing them asunder."[172] Ludlow told Maurice that his disapproval resulted from his "system phobia."

Maurice replied that Sully's scheme was an excellent example
of the system which he had always opposed in the Church,
state, family and man--"the organization of evil powers for
the sake of producing good effects."[173] God's order to him
was always the antagonist of such systems. Christian Social-
ism was the assertion of God's order. He desired to assist
every attempt to bring forth that order. On the other hand
he would resist every attempt which hindered the gradual
development of the divine purpose. He cited the "Organiza-
tion of Labour" and the "Central Board" as attempts to create
a new constitution of society when the real need was that the
old constitution should exhibit its true functions and ener-
gies. Besides demonstrating Maurice's determination to resist
the infiltration of the competitive spirit into the Associa-
tions, his high concept of man and society and his diagnosis
of the inherent evil in systems, the impasse up to this point
also revealed his reluctance to lead the group. He wrote to
Ludlow, "To guide and govern is not my business."[174]

Lechevalier then explained to Maurice that they did
not intend to change the functions of the former Council of
Promoters but that the creation of the Central Board would
improve the efficiency of the management of the Associations.
Thomas Hughes also gave assurances to him regarding the

operation of the Associations.[175]   Maurice now agreed and
the Central Board, comprised of the managers of the Associa-
tions, was established. It dealt solely with business
matters. The Council continued to act as a supervisory body.
Its members were expected to defend and promulgate principles
and disseminate information.

Maurice's actions were inconsistent but they are not
puzzling when we recognize the principles which guided him in
his actions. He firmly believed that practical action should
be guided by dialogue within the group. Once he was assured
that the scheme would not contradict fundamental principles,
he was willing to follow the leadership of others in practical
affairs. His choice of Edward Neale as one of the Promoters
demonstrates another principle--his willingness to co-operate
with all men of honest purpose. When the Central Board was
established a Constitution was drawn up for the Society and
the affiliated Union of Associations. Maurice was made
President of the Society and entrusted with the choice of
Promoters to the new Council. Maurice knew that Neale did
not accept his theological views but he considered him "an
honest fellow-worker" and he respected his practical efficiency
and self-sacrifice in the Co-operative movement.[176]

Ludlow and Sully were requested to prepare the draft

of the Constitution for the Society and the affiliated Union

of Associations but all the Promoters participated in the

final revision.[177] Raven writes that it reflected the prac-

tical experience of Sully, the legal knowledge of Ludlow,

the idealism of Maurice and the influence of the French

schemes of associations for work.[178] The Constitution

provided the pattern followed by many Co-operative Unions

in England and remained in force until the passing of the

Industrial and Provident Societies' Act in 1852.[179]

Ludlow included the words: "to diffuse the principles

of Co-operation as the practical application of Christianity

to the purposes of trade and industry," among the functions

of the Council.[180] That clause created a problem which

probably accounts for a change in Maurice's thinking. Some

members found them difficult to accept. When the Constitu-

tion was revised in 1852, Maurice said that when he had agreed

to them in 1850 he had not regarded those words as a special

test or confession of faith for those who took part in the

work of the society, or he would have objected to them as

vague, and a snare of conscience. He took them merely as

an expression of fact. He said that the vagueness of expres-

sion led to one of two unfortunate results. Either Christian

principles were identified with definite detailed methods

employed in trade; or they were regarded as much less definite

and less connected with human life than economic maxims and

methods.[181]   Other events in his life and his desire to co-

operate with all men convince me that he did not regard the

clause as a confession of faith. But it was his experience

with the Associations that had shown him the results of the

vagueness of the phrase.

We should note that the Industrial and Provident

Societies Act of 1852 gave legal status to the Co-operative

societies and that it resulted from the efforts of Ludlow,

Neale and Hughes.[182]   Maurice's professional duties prevented

him from participating in many of the activities of the

S.P.W.M.A.[183] Nevertheless the members recognized this and

expressed their gratitude to him for

> the important services [he] rendered . . .
> mixing freely with working men, without
> regard to their differences of opinion,
> treating them as brethren, children of the
> same common Father, presiding over their
> Conferences, instructing them . . . aiding
> them by [his] influence, help and guidance,
> at all times pointing out the moral principles
> of action by which alone such societies can
> become successful.[184]

"The Christian Socialist"

Once the S.P.W.M.A. was started, Ludlow returned to the idea of a newspaper. Maurice again objected, and this together with financial considerations led to a decision against the issue of a newspaper; however, it was agreed that a periodical should be published. Ludlow raised the required capital and was its sole editor. Maurice wrote very little for the periodical.[185] When compared with Maurice's writings, the articles of the Christian Socialist show the divergence of views between Ludlow's and Maurice's concepts of socialism, democracy and monarchy.

As we have seen, the free expression of a diversity of opinions and criticisms formed an integral part of Maurice's Christian Socialism. Ludlow now described himself as a socialist and wrote about the reorganization of society into a Socialist State in which every citizen would be "well placed, well employed, well educated."[186] He maintained that a socialist society, based on brotherhood and fellow work, would eliminate class distinctions and privileges. Democracy was the political expression of Socialism: "the Government of the People must mean, not the letting loose of all the accu-mulated selfishness of the many, but the giant self-control

of a nation, ruling itself as one man, in wisdom and right-
eousness, beneath the eye of God."[187] Associations were the

great school of self-government for the People. He believed

in monarchy or the "rule of one" but such rulers were to be
democratically elected.[188]

The Central Co-operative Agency

The entry of the Christian Socialists into Co-operative

Distribution through the establishment of a Co-operative Store

in London and the Central Co-operative Agency (C.C.A.) led to

a controversy which marked the turning point in the history

of the movement.[189] It also exposed the difficulty of main-

taining the principle of co-operation between men of diverse

views, a principle basic to Maurice's Christian Socialism.

In practical terms, the question was whether the group should

give priority in their work to Consumers' or Producers' Co-

operation.[190] As generally happens, the course of events was

partially determined by the personalities of the disputants.

Ludlow laid the emphasis on Producers' Associations, Neale

and others were the architects of the C.C.A. The latter

group successfully made contact with the co-operative societies

in the North of England and took the initiative to set up a

Consulting Committee between the Trade Unions and the Co-

operative movement. Ludlow regarded the schemes of the C.C.A.

as attempts to undermine the work and ideas of Christian

Socialism.[191] He accused the leaders of avoiding any com-

ment on a basis of Christian principles. He insisted that

Producers' Co-operation must take absolute priority over

that of Consumers' or the selfish element in man would

dominate.[192] Neale rebutted Ludlow's argument with the view

that production and consumption were integral parts of human

life and therefore the question of the priority of either

should not arise within Christian Socialism. Finally Ludlow

took the issue of a Circular from the C.C.A. to the Trade

Unions as the occasion to summon an extra-ordinary meeting

of the Council of Promoters and the Agency.[193] Using the

pretext of the refusal of the Agency to allow its employees

to share in the profits, as Article 3 of the Constitution

required, he unsuccessfully moved a resolution for the ex-

pulsion of Neale and the other trustees of the C.C.A. from

the Council of Promoters.[194] Ludlow now resigned from the

Council.

Throughout the dispute Maurice endeavoured to reconcile

the views of both sides by emphasizing the valid principles

which each man held. He agreed with Ludlow that the only

justification for the existence of Christian Socialism was
to testify to men that Christ had constituted a human fellow-
ship in which they were to live and act towards one another
as brothers in acknowledgement of a Heavenly Father.[195] But
he disapproved of Ludlow's conduct and firmly rejected the
demand for a "religious test" in their associations. It would
be another example of exclusiveness and a denial of the uni-
versal brotherhood in Christ.[196] This conviction led to
Maurice's support of Neale's position. There was good ground
for man's impulse towards co-operation. A Christian had to
act on this belief and regard it as sinful to keep aloof
from his fellowmen under any pretext. Maurice's only stipula-
tion was that each man should be free to express his convic-
tions and criticisms honestly, for all men are divinely
inspired. All are servants of Christ and therefore anyone
promoting co-operation was a fellow-worker.[197] The fact was
that in this case each man had expressed his views honestly
and acted conscientiously and this had resulted in disharmony.
Maurice's principle had proved impractical even among men of
honest purpose.

Again, the members of the group looked to Maurice for
a solution. With the exception of Ludlow, they accepted his
compromise proposal that the Council should declare publicly

that it was not responsible for the Agency's actions and
that the Society's work rested on Christian principles.[198]

When Ludlow turned down the Council's request to with-
draw his resignation from the Council and/or to continue as
editor of the Christian Socialist, Maurice replaced him with
Hughes and changed the name of the periodical to "Journal of
Association."[199]   Maurice had heard that the articles on
politics in the Christian Socialist had damaged the cause of
English Association. He had always maintained that a news-
paper was not the right instrument for pressing the Christian
and moral principles of Co-operation. He also hoped that
the change in name might help him to retain his position at
King's College.[200]

Once again Ludlow attributed Maurice's actions "to the
influence of men greatly inferior to himself, on whose opi-
nions he set an exaggerated value."[201] The nature of the
relationship between Maurice and Ludlow is exemplified in the
fact that in spite of Ludlow's resignation and expressions,
he drew up a prospectus for the Journal of Association accord-
ing to Maurice's directions, and Maurice continued to consult
him on the business of the society and published articles he
wrote in the Journal.[202]

The Christian Socialists and the Trade Unions

The Christian Socialists regarded the Trade Union move-ment as indispensable to the workers in a competitive society. Nevertheless they criticized the Trade Unions for their accept-ance of the competitive spirit, their preoccupation with wages, their neglect of the consumers and the creation of divisions between skilled and unskilled workers.[203]   In spite of these criticisms, they were consulted by several men who were in-volved in Trade Unions in England and Scotland. Their influence was strongest in the formation of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, Machinists, Smiths, Millwrights and Patternmakers (A.S.E.).[204] Generally speaking, Maurice and his friends were sympathetic to aims of the A.S.E. which led to the engineers' strike of 1852. The general lock-out by the Employers convinced the members of the A.S.E. that the establishment of Associate workshops was their only hope. Neale and his cousin financed two such Workshops, though with the others they cautioned the workers to proceed carefully and methodically, especially with regard to financial commit-ments.[205]   Apparently Ludlow and others entertained plans to establish a Co-operative society which would gather together the whole labour movement and co-ordinate all Associative efforts.

Maurice permitted the expression of the varied opinions

of Promoters on the issue of Strike in articles in the Journal

of Association. He counselled his colleagues to be patient,

cautious and moderate in recommending Associative Workshops

as the remedy for the evil. He feared that Ludlow's proposals

might have denied rather than affirmed the principle of co-

operation. He accepted Ludlow's charges of cowardice and

obstructiveness as part of the burden of leadership which they

had thrust on him. But he refused to call on the workers to

make the sacrifices which Associations demanded on the ground

that such sacrifices would prove morally and physically dif-

ficult. He believed that the unconditional surrender of the

workers to the employers would have demonstrated the "brute

force that was in capital" and bring "the case of the working-

men fairly before the public, as a struggle of human beings

against mere money power."[206] He knew the workers would not

do that and he sought an alternative to set before them.[207]

Maurice remained sympathetic to the cause of the workers but

he refused to chair a meeting of the Trade Unions in London

because he felt he had no case and the meeting seemed like a

proclamation of war with the capitalists.[208] Neale substituted

for Maurice. However, the strike ended in victory for the

employers.[209]

Tension Between Maurice and Ludlow

According to Christensen, Ludlow felt that Maurice had

betrayed the cause of Christian Socialism and missed no

opportunity to resist further obstructions.[210]   He apparently

told Maurice "to cling to the College, as he was doing no

good among the Promoters or the Working Men."[211]   When the

Journal of Association ran into financial difficulties,

Maurice sought Ludlow's support for the resumption of Politics

for the People as a replacement. Ludlow again accused him of

deserting Christian Socialism.[212]

Maurice wrote to Ludlow expressing his regret at

Ludlow's sustained opposition, at the same time denying that

he had betrayed Christian Socialism--a phrase he himself had

suggested. But he agreed to abandon the idea of a period-

ical.[213]   Ludlow now assumed full financial and editorial

responsibility for The Journal of Association. It is not

difficult to understand, when six months later Ludlow's

effort failed, why Maurice wished to find a way to gratify

safely Ludlow's desire for a periodical.[214]   Basically there

was a mutual respect and love between both Ludlow and Maurice,

and Maurice had a reconciling spirit. Further he wrote that

the times demanded a publication which would fulfil the true

function of The Christian Socialist.

Revival of Conferences with Working Men 1852

In 1852 Maurice welcomed the idea of reviving the

conferences with working men; but he objected to the subject

proposed for the first discussion--"What are the relations

which should exist between capital and labour."[215] He

preferred discussions on men, their duties and relationships

as he thought that those on capital and labour would lead

to endless controversies. Consequently the first subject dis-

cussed was "Trade-unions, their effects on the condition of

the working classes in past-times, and their probable future

as connected with the co-operative movement."[216]

Maurice's letter to Ludlow at this time is of crucial

importance. He wrote:

> the   reorganization of society and the
> conservators of society are at war because
> they start from the same vicious premisses;
> because they tacitly assume lands, goods,
> money, labour, some subjects of possession,
> to be the basis of society, and therefore wish
> to begin by changing or maintaining the condi-
> tions of that possession; whereas, the true
> radical reform and radical conservatism must
> go much deeper and say: "Human relations not
> only should lie, but do lie beneath these,

and when you substitute . . . property relations
for these, you destroy our English life and
English constitution, you introduce hopeless
anarchy." . . . We say that the working classes
exist to assert the dignity of man, and to be
witnesses against the glorification of things
which has destroyed the other two [Foreign
Socialism and English Capitalism]. Everything
. . . depends on the clearness with which we
see this to be the issue . . . and upon the deci-
sion and moderation with which we assert it to
be so.

. . . The world has never understood what we are
about, because we have not understood it. I
feared the Christian Socialist Journal because I
feared it would embarrass the question more;
strongly asserting the religious principle, being
very busy with commercial details; leaving the
public in doubt whether we were pressing a com-
mercial scheme upon religious maxims, or intro-
ducing a new religion into commerce . . . To set
trade and commerce right we must find some ground,
not for them, but for those who are concerned in
them, for men to stand upon. That is my formula.[217]

This explains Maurice's conduct throughout the history

of the movement. Newspapers covering a wide range of topics

were not suitable for Christian instruction. Their use led

to misunderstanding. He would have resumed Politics for the

People and the conferences with the working men; he would

teach and write, with the purpose of educating men in right

human relations. He was incompetent to deal with commercial

issues and would leave the practical working of those ventures

to others. For that reason he had opposed Ludlow's proposal

to bring the agency under the control of the council of

promoters. If those engaged in commerce and industry were
instructed about the divinely constituted order of human
brotherhood, they would be guided by those principles in
planning their enterprises.[218]

The Reform of the S.P.W.M.A.

In 1852 Ludlow submitted a proposal, "Thoughts", to
Maurice for the restructuring of the S.P.W.M.A. Basically
the society was to become a "model brotherhood" through the
fusion of three forces: a thoroughly democratic spirit, a
thoroughly aristocratic constitution and a thoroughly monar-
chical government.[219] In its President, Ludlow wrote "the
society had one man brave enough, pure enough, self-denying
enough to lead such men onward in their work."[220] At the
invitation of the Council of Promoters and the Central Board,
Ludlow resumed his place on both. A revision of the Constitu-
tion was immediately initiated.[221] Maurice was requested to
lay down the guiding principles for the new constitution.[222]
His principal recommendation was that the new constitution
should state clearly that the activities of Council and Board
were based on the conviction that human society was one body
with many members. Consequently "co-operation, not rivalry,

had to be the law of labour, just as the principle of jus-
tice..and not that of selfishness--must regulate exchange."[223]
He stated also that "the Christian revelation was only taken
seriously when Christ was asserted as the creator and preserver
of the human order working in each human being, fighting his
evil tendancies and prompting him to love his fellow-men."[224]

Maurice's proposals were accepted as a basis and Neale,
Hughes and Ludlow were commissioned to work out the details
of the new Constitution. The final draft included the leading
features of Ludlow's "Thoughts" with the omission of the clause
which spoke of co-operation as the practical application of
Christianity to trade and industry. This led to further dif-
ficulties with Ludlow. The acceptance of Ludlow's recommenda-
tions gave Maurice far reaching powers. He was elected as
President for life. He was to choose the members of the new
Council and its standing committee. He should govern as "the
monarch together with οἱ ἄριστοι the self-elective Coun-
cil."[225] Maurice delayed the implementation of Ludlow's
proposals: "that part of it [the scheme] gave me--as president--
powers which I did not believe that I would rightly or safely
exercise."[226] But once the Council approved the Constitution
he exercised the responsibilities in so far as his duties and
difficulties at King's College permitted. Ludlow opposed his

first decision--the choice of Neale and Ludlow--as assessors.

Eventually Maurice acquiesced to Ludlow's choice of Hughes

and Cooper but signified his desire to be deposed by the

Council.[227]

The Working Men's College

During the period of his crisis at King's College

Maurice was greatly encouraged by the support of his close

associates in the C.S.M. and the working-men of London. In

one of his speeches at a function organized in his honour by

the working-men of London, the hope was expressed that he

would become Principal of a Working Men's College. Plans for

such a college, patterned on the People's College in Sheffield

had been shelved by the Christian Socialists in 1852. When

Maurice was dismissed from King's College they established

the College and appointed him Principal.[228]

Education had always been Maurice's chief interest.

At the time of his dismissal from King's College, he planned

to write a series of educational tracts to show the clergy and

people the causes which hindered Churchmen from fulfilling

their true vocation. He wrote to Kingsley expressing these

ideas and the hope of a meeting with young London clergy to

consider,"'How is the chasm between Priests and People to be filled up?' From that might come my college as a practical carrying out of the idea of the tracts."[229] The Working Men's College was the product of his colleagues' observations of People's College at Sheffield and Maurice's own ideas on education and Christian Socialism. Christensen maintains that an analysis of Maurice's "Scheme of a College" and Learning and Working demonstrates that Maurice's aims for the College were fundamentally different from those which were implied in the work for promoting Associations.[230] This, he says, "did not escape Ludlow's sharp and critical eyes."[231]

Maurice had in fact begun to fear the rise of a sect of Christian Socialists and the dissensions within the group.[232] Consequently the name College was very attractive to him. It implied "a Society for fellow work, a society of which teachers and learners are equally members, a Society in which men are not held together by the bond of buying and selling, a society in which they meet not as belonging to a class or caste, but as having a common life which God has given them and which he will cultivate in them."[233]

The establishment of the Working Men's College coincided with the dissolution of Christian Socialism. "It was Maurice

who aimed the final blow . . .,"[234] is Christensen's verdict.

He omits many other factors.[235]   Yet, in retrospect, in 1866

Maurice wrote in a letter to Ludlow that in 1854 he considered

that:

> . . . another opening for the assertion of the
> principle of Co-operation . . . [had presented
> itself.] A College expressed to my mind . . .
> precisely the work that we could undertake, and
> ought to undertake, as professional men; we
> might bungle in this also; but there seemed to
> me a manifestly Divine direction towards it in
> all our previous studies and pursuits. And so
> far as we could give a hint of the way in which
> the professional and working classes might co-
> operate, so far I believed we should help to
> heal one of the great sores of the commonwealth,
> counteract the exclusiveness of literary men,
> undermine the notion that patronage of rank or
> wealth is that which is wanted to elevate the
> labourer.[236]

We see then, that between 1848-1854 Maurice, Ludlow

and their close associates became more aware of the needs

and aspirations of the working classes. Maurice's actions

were often puzzling to his associates but these actions were

the result of firmly established theological principles. He

was a theologian and educator, in his own word, a "digger."

His "Christian Socialism" however was not a static idea.

Its comprehensive nature never changed but the very attempt

to accommodate the valid principles of every shade of polit-

ical and social thought under the umbrella of Christian

Socialism led to a variety of expression and strong differ-
ences of opinion within the group of people who gathered
around Maurice.[237] Indirectly it led to a change, if not
growth, in Maurice's thought. His willingness to leave the
practical application of the principles he unearthed to
others, provided their schemes validated these principles,
had a similar effect. It led to different practical ex-
pressions of Christian Socialism; but by 1854 it made Maurice
far more cautious of terms like "Christian Socialism" and
"the application of Christianity to the purposes of trade and
industry."[238]

It would be difficult to compare Maurice's place in a
cohesive group, which we have labelled, "C.S.M. 1848-1854,"
and Rauschenbusch's place among a very diverse group of men
whom we shall call "Progressive Moderates"[239] in our next
chapter. A more feasible inquiry would be to compare "C.S.M.
1848-1854" to the "Brotherhood of the Kingdom,"[240] or the
purposes of Politics for the People with For the Right. But
comparisons are not intended in these initial chapters. In
them we seek to show the environments in which the social
thought of Maurice and Rauschenbusch was nurtured. Maurice
stood at the beginning of the social movement of the churches
in England.[241] We shall go on to show that there were many

links between the Christian Socialist Movement which developed
from the early efforts of Maurice and his associates and the
heritage into which Rauschenbusch entered in America. The
inescapable fact is that both movements were the response of
minority groups within the Churches to the effects of the
industrial revolution. The economic assumptions which deter-
mined the social structure of both communities were identical.
The acceptance of these assumptions as laws of nature was
true of Churchmen in England in 1848 and in America in 1890.
Maurice at the beginning of an epoch and Rauschenbusch at the
close of another attacked the Churches because of the economic
dogmas which they had accepted and which for Maurice and
Rauschenbusch were "lies."

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

1.   Benjamin Jones, Co-operative Production, i. p. 110,
      quoted in Charles E. Raven, Christian Socialism:
      1848-1854 (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1920),
      p. 55.

2.   Torben Christensen, Origin and History of Christian
      Socialism 1848-54. Acta Theological Danica Vol. III.
      (Denmark Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus: 1962),
      N.C. Masterman, John Malcolm Ludlow: The Builder of
      Christian Socialism (Cambridge: University Press,
      1963.

3.   Christensen says, "The Unitarians at that period were
      progressives. They openly faced the burning issues
      of the age and attempted to solve them, without being
      hampered by the traditions of the past. In religion
      they were 'modernists,' taking pride in reconciling
      the essentials of Christianity with contemporary
      philosophic and scientific thought. Politically, they
      had given up the belief in a theocratic society and
      were ardent advocates of the idea of the sovereignty
      of the people. They demanded the abolition of all
      civil disabilities. They were critical of existing
      society with its established political and religious
      institutions, and considered them as great hindrances
      to the full development of man as a rational creature
      and the attainment of the true happiness of mankind.
      A new order of society, based on reason and freedom
      was their aim. Consequently they were eager in
      exposing all political and social abuses and in
      demanding sweeping reforms. At the same time, they
      were active in starting and supporting all educational
      and philanthropic schemes which might help in better-
      ing the conditions of their fellowmen." op. cit., p. 11.

4.   Christensen, op. cit., p. 16, n. 21.

5.   Ibid., pp. 14-15.

6. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 177 and 524. "I did not want to make that profession [membership of the Church of England] as I had been brought up a Dissenter, though I should have been much more reluctant to profess myself a member of any of the Dissenting bodies." p. 177. Cf. "After two years, when I believe I may say that I had less outward motive to bar my judgement, I had been convinced that they are true, and I did sign them." p. 524.

7. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 16.

8. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 79ff and 178.

9. See Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 17, note 26. "This periodical . . . ruthlessly criticised . . . _The Edinburgh Review_, representing the Whigs, and the Tory, _Quarterly Review_. It advocated radical reforms and was consequently at war with the aristocracy and the Church and its clergy, in short, with everything which constituted a hindrance and opposition to radical reforms. _The Westminster_ was primarily interested in politics and social problems and, although it also carried book reviews, they had to serve the Utilitarian cause. All the articles were anonymous, ... everything tended to serve the views of the paper. The editor was, furthermore, free to correct the articles and to adjust them according to the policy of the paper. Maurice could not possibly have been ignorant of this practice and, since he nevertheless became a contributor, it can only mean that in many respects he himself felt in accordance with the Philosophic Radicalism of the _Westminster Review_."

10. This appeared in _Westminster Review_, Vol. IX, Jan. 1828, pp. 71-98, referred to in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 17.

11. Frederick D. Maurice, _The Kingdom of Christ: Or Hints on the Principles Ordinances and Constitution of the Catholic Church in letters to a Member of the Society of Friends_, 2 Vols. (London: James Clarke and Co. Ltd., 1959) (Hereinafter referred to as _Kingdom of Christ_) Vol. II, Part III, pp. 268, 323-329.

12. *Westminster Review*, Vol. IX, Jan. 1828, p. 78, quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

13. Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

14. *Ibid.*

15. Cf. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. I, pp. 79-80. *Kingdom of Christ* (2 vols.) is devoted to this.

16. *Supra*, n. 11.

17. *Westminster Review*, Vol. IX, p. 98, quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

18. *Westminster Review*, Vol. IX, p. 85, quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 18. Cf. F.D. Maurice, *The Lord's Prayer: Nine Sermons Preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn* (Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1861) (Hereinafter referred to as *Lord's Prayer*), pp. 39-40.

19. *Westminster Review*, Vol. IX, p. 98, quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

20. Based on *Athenaeum* (18/6,1828), quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 19, n. 36.

21. Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 19. Based on the *Athenaeum*, 11/3, 1828. Christensen's summary is inconsistent. There was a change in Maurice's outlook, *infra.* pp.54, 87, but Christensen's thesis that Maurice was a "progressive turned reactionary" is not substantiated.

22. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. II, p. 550.

23. Cf. Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, "A New Assessment of F.D. Maurice's 'The Kingdom of Christ'": *The Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. IV, No. 1, July 1971, pp. 38-49.

24. Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 20, citing *Athenaeum*, p. 193.

25. Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 21, citing *Athenaeum*, p. 65.

26. Christensen, op. cit., p. 21, citing Athenaeum, p. 351.

27. Ibid., [The emphasis on adequate is my own. That is the operative word. No human institution in Maurice's mind (at any stage in his career) could give that expression.]

28. Ibid.

29. Christensen, op. cit., p. 22.

30. As Christensen himself acknowledges later in his work. See p. 23.

31. Christensen, op. cit., p. 22.

32. See Maurice, Life, Vol. I, pp. 92-96, 138-139, 245ff. Vol. II, pp. 376, 570.

33. See Supra, n. 8; Maurice, Life, Vol. I, chs. VI and VII passim; Vol. II, pp. 485-486 sums up his attitude to Tories, Whigs and Radicals throughout his career.

34. Christensen, op. cit., p. 23.

35. Ibid., p. 27.

36. Ibid., p. 22.

37. Caution, hesitance and self-examination marked Maurice's entire life. This resulted from his temperament and desire to be sure of the principles and motives which prompted his actions. His hesitance was one cause of the tensions which developed among his associates in the C.S.M. Raven provides a useful comment on these aspects of Maurice's character. op. cit., pp. 77-84.

38. Christensen, op. cit., p. 27.

39. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 376.

40.   <u>Ibid</u>., Vol. I, p. 174.

41.   The second of <u>Letters to a Quaker</u>.

42.   See <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, pp. 212-214. Initially he was
        attacked by the Tractarians because of his views on
        "Baptismal Regeneration" but the Evangelicals
        became his most severe critics. The question of
        eternal life and eternal punishment became the chief
        issue; but Maurice's defence of free expression of all
        opinions, his opposition to parties and partisan
        newspapers, and his association with the Christian
        Socialists who challenged the <u>status quo</u> met with
        the hostility of the Evangelicals. Their hostility
        eventually led to Maurice's dismissal from King's
        College. Maurice's reluctance to employ a newspaper
        (as opposed to tracts) for Christian education within
        the C.S.M. resulted partially from his experience of
        the distortion of views which occurred frequently in
        the religious press.

43.   See <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, p. 269. Cf. <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>,
        Vol. II, pp. 254-264 <u>passim</u>. The lectures were pub-
        lished under the title, <u>Has the Church or the State
        the Power to Educate the Nation?</u>

44.   See Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, pp. 273-274, 278. Cf.
        Christensen, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 28-29. "Both [Michael
        and Frederick Maurice] had supported the British
        and Foreign School Society and consequently had been
        strongly opposed to the National Society for the
        Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Estab-
        lished Church throughout England and Wales. Maurice's
        [Frederick's] conversion here meant a change of loyalty.
        Education was still of the greatest importance to him
        but in consequence of his new ideas only the Church
        of England could educate the nation. He therefore
        sided with the National Society." <u>Life</u>, Vol. I,
        pp. 35-36 provides an account of a meeting of the
        British and Foreign School Society which Maurice
        wrote to his sister. It says nothing of his views.
        He was ten years old! (Christensen, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 28,
        n. 55: Vol. II obviously a typographical error.)

45. MacMillan had attended Chartist and Socialist meetings and believed that the working classes had little faith in the existing churches and their spiritual guides and were ignorant of the real opinions and designs of the Church. He wanted Maurice to write a book to meet the need. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 329.

46. _Ibid_., p. 331.

47. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 369.

48. _Ibid_., p. 358.

49. _Ibid_., pp. 355-360.

50. _Infra_., p. 76. Ludlow frequently attributed Maurice's hesitance to action to the influence of Julius Hare and Maurice's second wife who was Hare's sister.

51. Boyle lectures published as: _The Religions of the World_, and Warburton lectures published as: _The Epistle to the Hebrews_.

52. Cf. Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 57.

53. _Life_, Vol. I, p. 430. See also Ludlow's "Autobiography" Ch. XVII, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 56. Christensen's comment that Maurice proved utterly unsympathetic to Ludlow's ideas appears inconsistent with the account in _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 430-431 and with Christensen's footnote 100 on pp. 56-57. Ludlow was obviously disappointed but Maurice seems to have endeavoured to help as far as he was able at the time.

54. Dr. Jelf's complaint, see Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 451. Cf. Rauschenbusch, _infra_, p. 167. Queen's College. See _Life_, Vol. I, p. 455.

55. Published as _The Lord's Prayer_, see _supra_, n. 18, and in _The Prayer Book and the Lord's Prayer_ (London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1902) (Hereinafter referred to as _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_). Availability of books has made it necessary to cite and quote both editions in this thesis.

56.   Raven regards this letter as the starting point of
        the Christian Socialist movement. Christensen
        disputes that. The latter reveals that Ludlow wrote
        in his "Autobiography" ch. XVIII that in this letter
        he "unbosomed himself." _op. cit._, p. 63.

57.   See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 458; Ludlow wrote
        in his "Autobiography" ch. XVIII, "that Socialism
        must be made Christian to be a blessing for France
        and for the World." quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._,
        p. 61, n. 11.

58.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 458.

59.   Maurice knew that the publication of the Essays would
        end his career at King's College. _Life_, Vol. II,
        pp. 161, 213. The repudiation of the idea of eternal
        punishment gave offence to the Evangelicals who were
        highly influential at this time. See _Life_., Vol. II,
        p. 234. _The Record_ figured prominently in the entire
        issue.

60.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 191.

61.   _Ibid._, pp. 90-96, 101, 198.

62.   _Ibid._, pp. 215-216; 301.

63.   _Ibid._, pp. 232-233.

64.   _Ibid._, p. 641.

65.   _Ibid._, p. 378.

66.   _Infra_, p. 84,   W.M.C.

67.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 542, 545, 635.

68.   These activities included ministerial duties at (i) St.
        Peter's Church, Vere Street, London 1860-1869. The
        appointment was made by the Crown. The Evangelicals
        were outraged and through the _Record_ called on the
        clergy to protest the appointment. Maurice, _Life_,
        Vol. II, pp. 361-362; (ii) St. Edward's Church,
        Cambridge 1870-1872; (iii) Membership on the Royal
        Commission on Contagious Diseases.

69.   Maurice B. Reckitt, <u>Maurice to Temple: A Century</u>
       <u>of the Social Movement in the Church of England</u>.
       (London: Faber and Faber Limited, MCMXLVII), pp. 22
       and 23 gives a timely warning against oversimplifying
       a complex matter after the manner of J.L. and B.
       Hammond who, in <u>The Age of the Chartists</u>, said that
       "the chief cause of the Church's unpopularity was ...
       the feeling that the Church gave its sanction to all
       the injustices and abuses that degraded the poor and
       outraged their self respect ... For the Church, like
       every other part of the system of aristocratic
       government, had been corrupted by the abuses that
       come thick and fast when the sense of property is
       stronger in any body of men than the sense of duty."

70.   Raven, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 29.

71.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 31.

72.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 32 quoting Burke: <u>Thoughts on Scarcity</u>,
       p. 31.

73.   Raven, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 33.

74.   Reckitt, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 29. See also Raven, <u>op. cit</u>.,
       pp. 33-42 for a full treatment of this topic.

75.   Max Beer, <u>History of British Socialism</u>, (London:
       G. Bell and Sons, 1929), p. 280.

76.   Ludlow examined the People's Charter thoroughly in
       <u>Politics for the People</u>. Christensen provides
       extensive quotations from the relevant sections of
       the journal, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 80-81.

77.   Christensen says that the economic crisis of 1847
       and the crop failures of the previous years had
       severe consequences on the working classes. Unemploy-
       ment and reduction in wages were characteristic of
       the labour market, with hunger and distress as
       inevitable companions. In this situation the Exec-
       utive Committee of the National Charter Association
       revived the agitation for the Charter but the response
       to the attempt to obtain support for a new national
       petition in 1847 was not enthusiastic. (<u>op. cit</u>.,
       p. 68).

78.   The figures varied from 25,000 - 250,000. See
       Christensen, op. cit., p. 69, n. 2.

79.   Like most other clergymen Maurice and Kingsley were
       opposed to the use of physical violence. So was
       Ludlow. Maurice actually enlisted as a volunteer
       to assist the police in the event of insurrection;
       and Kingsley's first idea seems to have been to
       distribute handbills to try to persuade the Chartists
       to desist from their suicidal action. See MS Letter,
       Maurice to Ludlow, 10/4, 1848, quoted in Christensen,
       op. cit., p. 70, n. 4.

80.   See Raven, op. cit., pp. 2-6; Arthur V. Woodworth,
       Christian Socialism in England (London: Swan
       Sonnenschein and Co., Lim., 1903), pp. 4-5.
       Christensen implies that this was not the case. "The
       papers of the various denominations and sections of
       the Church of England, all made it clear that the
       complaints of the Chartists must be taken seriously,
       and likewise expressed their good-will towards the
       workers. Law and order must, of course, be obeyed
       but they appealed to the nation to do something to
       alleviate the social distress of the working classes.
       The most pressing need was, however, for the moral
       elevation of the workers, being the condition for
       granting them political rights. The situation called
       for intensified evangelization and extended Church
       activities among the working classes."
       In a footnote on the same page, Christensen writes,
       "The only paper to demand the granting of the People's
       Charter as an act of simple justice was the Nonconformist,
       the mouthpiece of influential liberal Dissenting bodies.
       The impartiality and political sobermindedness charac-
       terizing the leading articles of its competent editor,
       Edward Miall, make a favourable contrast to the mode
       of voice of the other religious papers dealing with
       the problem of Chartism and even to that of Kingsley's
       Manifesto. op. cit., p. 72 see n.13. Woodworth and Raven
       are followed here as the C.S.M. was really at this time
       a Church of England movement.

81.   See Raven, op. cit., pp. 5-22 for a full treatment
       of the aspects of the Evangelical and Tractarian move-
       ments which hindered the Church in effectively facing
       the challenge. He points out that many of Wesley's
       influential followers (e.g., John Newton) never left
       the established church. Canon Raven suggests that
       part of the Church of England's failure at this
       juncture was due to the rivalry between the Evangelicals
       and the Tractarians which had diverted the attention of
       the Church from the crying needs of the time.

82.   See Raven, op. cit., pp. 12-13, Reckitt, op. cit.,
       pp. 24-25, on exceptions (in some respects) like
       Wilberforce and Shaftesbury.

83.   Cf. Kingsley's comment on the Bible as having been
       turned into "a mere special constable's handbook--an
       opium--dose for keeping beasts of burden patient while
       they were being overloaded." Parson Lot's "Second
       Letter" in Politics for the People, p. 58, quoted in
       Raven, op. cit., p. 14.

84.   It was from men of this school that the Christian
       Socialists received their fiercest persecution, and
       by their organ, The Record, that Maurice was hounded
       from his post at King's College.
       Raven, op. cit., p. 13.

85.   Life and Correspondence of R. Southey, I, p. 176,
       quoted in Raven, op. cit., p. 17.

86.   Tracts for the Times, III, p. 1, cited in Raven,
       op. cit., p. 18.

87.   Cf. Maurice, Life, Vol. I, pp. 225-226. "Their error,
       I think, consists in opposing to τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ αἰῶνος
       τούτου the spirit of a former age, instead of the
       ever-living and acting Spirit of God, of which the
       spirit of each age (as it presents itself to those
       living in it) is at once the adversary and the
       parody."

88.   Ibid., p. 226.

89.   See Raven, op. cit., pp. 19-21: Cf. Reckitt, op.
       cit., pp. 21-23.

90.   Raven is here very dependent on Maurice's own
       views.

91.   It is useful to remember that Maurice was rejected
       by the Tractarians almost as decisively as by the
       Evangelicals, and received no help from either party
       for his social work. This point seems to be ignored
       by many writers. Cf. John Kent's chapter "The
       Social Gospel in America" in Jean Daniélou, A.H.
       Couratin, and John Kent, The Pelican Guide to Modern
       Theology, Vol. II, ed. by R.P.C. Hanson (Middlesex:
       Penguin Books, 1969). Kent writes: "The writers
       [Hopkins, Paul Carter, A. Abell and Henry May (infra
       ch. 3)] showed how the American Social Gospel arose
       primarily as a reaction to economic and social con-
       ditions in the high capitalistic era after the Civil
       War, and how its theology depended upon Liberal
       Protestantism and not upon Anglo-Catholic sacramental
       theory." p. 344.

92.   Reckitt speaks of Maurice as ideologically the fons
       et origo of what we, inevitably yet inadequately,
       call the social movement in the Church of England.
       Reckitt's understanding of Maurice's rôle is correct.
       While recognizing that it was Ludlow who challenged
       him to face the existing social problems, Reckitt makes
       us aware that Maurice's greatness lay in his capacity
       to see and to show that his theology was deep enough
       to answer all the questions which a secularized
       economic development and a secular idealism alike had
       raised. Maurice's capacity to be what he was and to
       lead as he did arose from no special interest in or
       knowledge of social questions, but from a profound
       grasp of the answers which God in Christ had already
       given to them. Maurice's sermons on the Lord's Prayer
       in 1848, and his statement that "as a child anything
       social and political took hold of me such as no object
       in nature beautiful or useful, had"; leads me to
       question the validity of the statement that he had
       "no special interest in social problems" but for the
       rest I believe Reckitt to be very accurate.
       See Reckitt, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

93. In <u>Politics for the People</u>, pp. 14, 15; 22-24; 60-62;
     Ludlow described his experience of the soul-destroying
     influence of Louis Philippe's personal government.
     See Raven, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 57. See <u>infra</u>, p. 46, views
     on monarchy.

94. Except where otherwise acknowledged, this summary of
     Ludlow's early preparation and the later development
     of Christian Socialism between 1848-1854 is chiefly
     dependent on Torben Christensen's valuable and well
     documented work. Besides proving the prominence of
     Ludlow, at which Raven and Reckitt had only hinted,
     Christensen's work makes other contributions which
     are of particular interest. (a) He shows the mild
     form of socialism in the thought of Maurice and the
     development of his thought under the influence of Ludlow
     and his 'friends', the representatives of the workers,
     and Lechevalier. (b) He reveals that Ludlow and other
     of Maurice's young friends, as well as the represent-
     atives of the workers, (and I would add, many Chris-
     tians of later generations) found in Maurice's
     theology the seminal thoughts which led them to radical
     positions on social issues, or provided the basis for
     an already formed radicalism. The fascinating point
     to me, and this I believe was the exasperating thing
     to Ludlow, was that Maurice seemed often unaware of
     many of the implications of his own thought.
     (c) Christensen reveals that there was a progressive
     development within the early phase of Christian
     Socialism in England. Cf. <u>Politics for the People</u>
     with <u>The Christian Socialist</u>. An interesting com-
     parison with the American development is that whereas
     the English movement seemed to grow out of theological
     foundations, chiefly those of Maurice, the American
     development gives the impression of being a search
     towards a theology for social concern. Cf.
     Rauschenbusch's <u>Towards a Theology for The Social
     Gospel</u>.
     (d) Christensen shows that Ludlow was the Socialist
     who urged the group to more radical commitment and
     that there were greater tensions than Raven was aware
     of. In spite of this, Raven often appears to express
     the more objective position. (e) Finally, the question
     which Christensen's work raises for me is: if Maurice
     was the kind of person Christensen portrays, if his

social thought was so mild and unconvincing, how do
we explain the acknowledged debt of Ludlow and
Lechevalier, Gore and Temple, to Maurice for providing
them with theological premises for social concern?
Cf. supra, n.92.

95.   This will be further considered in our examination
of the diversity of views within the C.S.M. "Thus
he thoroughly approved of the Revolution's doing away
with the monarchy in France; Ludlow had virtually
turned anti-monarchist." Christensen, op. cit.,
p. 41.

96.   Raven, op. cit., p. 58.

97.   Christensen, op. cit., p. 42.

98.   "He had exactly the same opinion of the Chartists
as the middle class had, ... He considered them an
expression of the basest passions of the people; they
represented a real threat to the order of society.
The People's Charter appeared to him to contain
'absurdes et sanguinaires projets' and 'coupables et
insensés desseins.'" Christensen, op. cit., p. 44,
notes 39 and 40.

99.   His uncle was deeply involved in this movement and
Ludlow himself maintained a lifelong interest in British
Colonial policy.

100.   He disliked its liturgy and preaching and he saw it
as a Church of the aristocracy and a political institu-
tion.

101.   "It was what the Evangelicals would call my conversion.
I really turned to God, consciously, willingly. From
that hour of submission I have been a Christian,
however imperfectly so." "Autobiography," ch. X,
quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 49.

102.   Vinet's fusion of the personal Christ-centred piety
and cultural interest appealed to Ludlow.
Christensen, op. cit., p. 50.

103. Ludlow had been articled to Bellenden Ker, a very
     able conveyancer who served on the Royal Commission
     of 1837 which investigated the laws of partnership.
     He helped Ker draw up the first Joint Stock Company
     Regulation Act of 1844, together with an Act to
     regulate joint stock banks. The co-operatives,
     trade unions and working men's colleges benefited
     greatly from Ludlow's legal experience under Ker.
     See N.C. Masterman, op. cit., pp. 34-39; Christensen,
     op. cit., pp. 40, 43 n. 27, p. 272.

104. See MS. "Couldn't-have-beens and Might Have Beens"
     also "Autobiography" ch. XIII, quoted in Christensen,
     op. cit., pp. 50-51.

105. "One curious result of my love was, that it made an
     Englishman of me. England, not France, was now my
     heart's home . . . I began now to think habitually
     in English." "Autobiography," ch. XII quoted in
     Christensen, op. cit., p. 51.

106. Ch. XVII, quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 52.
     Ludlow had read A.P. Stanley's The Life and Correspond-
     ence of Thomas Arnold. Unfortunately ch. XIV is
     missing from Ludlow's "Autobiography" and we cannot
     say with certainty what Arnold meant to Ludlow.
     See Christensen, op. cit., pp. 52-53 for a possible
     reconstruction.

107. "The purpose of the society was to alleviate distress
     (among the poor) without encouraging laziness and
     idleness; to restore by advice and intelligent
     direction this moral sense which is extinguished so
     often in people crushed by poverty and privation."
     (From a prospectus kept among the Ludlow papers:
     "L'idée fondamentale de la Société des Amis des Pau-
     vres," quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p.55, n. 92).

108. "Autobiography," ch. XII, quoted in Christensen,
     op. cit., p. 56.

109. See supra, p. 28,   Ludlow's first visit to Maurice.

110. MS Letter from Ludlow to Charles Forbes, March 1848,
     quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 60, n. 9.

111. See *supra*, p. 30,   Ludlow's letter to Maurice from Paris.

112. Raven, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

113. *Ibid.*, p. 59.

114. *Ibid.*, p. 66; e.g., Cf. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. I, p. 484.

115. Raven, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.

116. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. I, pp. 459-460. For a copy of Placard see *Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memories of His Life,* edited by his wife (New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Company, 1877), pp. 95-96.

117. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. I, pp. 477-478. See also Maurice, "Equality a Dialogue" in *Politics for the People*, pp. 97-103, quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

118. *Politics for the People*, pp. 4-5, quoted in Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

119. *Ibid.*

120. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. I, pp. 460-461, 471-476. See Raven, *op. cit.*, pp. 371-375, "Appendix A", for a complete list of authors of contents. Raven (*op. cit.*, p. 108) attributes the idea of a newspaper to Julius Hare who with J.A. Scott had joined the meetings with Maurice, Ludlow and Kingsley. Christensen says it was Ludlow's idea. (*op. cit.*, p. 73).

121. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. I, pp. 478-481. Christensen attributes his refusal and censorship to pressures brought on him by Hare. *op. cit.*, pp. 83-85. Cf. Raven, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-116. *Supra*, p. 28, *Infra*, p. 76.

122. N.C. Masterman, *op. cit.*, p. 43 "radical and urban." See also pp. 1-6 and ch. 2 *passim*. Cf. Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 108 "In 1848 Ludlow had not the least inclination for socialistic thinking."

123.   Cf. Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XIX, quoted in
       Christensen, op. cit., p. 86; Maurice, Life, Vol. I,
       p. 458, says that Ludlow had set him thinking.
       Cf. Maurice, Learning and Working (London: Oxford
       University Press, 1968) "Dedication." A comparison
       between his sermons on the Lord's Prayer and "More
       Last Words" indicates a more positive approach to
       socialism in the latter.

124.   Politics for the People, pp. 273-274, quoted in
       Christensen, op. cit., p. 86.

125.   Politics for the People, p. 283, quoted in Christensen,
       op. cit., p. 87.

126.   Politics for the People, p. 284, quoted in Christensen,
       op. cit., p. 87.

127.   Raven, op. cit., pp. 121-125, provides a full list of
       members and sympathizers of the group. Christensen,
       op. cit., pp. 90-97, says that Ludlow rather than
       Maurice was the leader and moving spirit at this time.
       Based on Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. IX.

128.   See Maurice, Life, Vol. I, pp. 482-483; also Raven,
       op. cit., pp. 128-129 for a full account of its
       origins. It is worthy of mention that Maurice was
       instrumental in the establishment of Queen's College
       London, supra p. 29 and for classes for women at the
       Working Men's College in London from 1855-1860.
       See Life, Vol. II, pp. 260, 379. He also supported
       the proposal for female suffrage in 1870. Life, II,
       p. 578.

129.   Maurice, Life, Vol. I, pp. 488-495, Vol. II, p. 236.

130.   Op. cit., p. 93.

131.   Maurice, Life, Vol. I, p. 484.

132.   In spite of Christensen's emphasis on Ludlow's dis-
       agreement with Maurice over many issues, the
       reverence for Maurice applied equally to Ludlow.
       See Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XVIII, and

MS Letter of 17/8 1858, Ludlow to Maurice, quoted in Christensen, op. cit., pp. 94 and 97; also Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 551 and infra, p. 82, Ludlow's proposals for the revision of the Constitution of the SPWMA. Edward Neale was probably the only one of the close associates who remained uninfluenced by Maurice's theological position yet his respect and loyalty to Maurice was unquestioned.

133. Infra, p. 64.

134. See Christensen, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

135. Ibid., p. 95, n. 27.

136. See Maurice, Life, Vol. I, pp. 513, 519, 537-538; Vol. II, pp. 40-41; Raven, op. cit., pp. 141-142; Christensen, op. cit., pp. 98-100. See also Ludlow, "History of this Journal," Christian Socialist, Vol. I, p. 73, and Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXI, cited in Christensen, op. cit., pp. 97 and 99.

137. Christensen, op. cit., p. 101.

138. Maurice, Life, Vol. I, pp. 537, 495, 544; Vol. II, p. 57; Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXI, quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 104.

139. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, pp. 6-7; MS Letter of 13/8 1849, Ludlow to Kingsley, quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 105, n. 33. "The Master is all but professing Communism . . . telling our working friends that what chiefly engaged his mind during the debates on Home Colonies has been 'far less what he should say, than what he should do in the matter,' Fancy our all squatting on the earth with the prophet at our head." Home Colonies were communes. The establishment of Home Colonies was the pivotal idea of the Owenite "New Moral World."

140. Maurice and Ludlow grew to distrust Lechevalier. See Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 549; Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXII, quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 119, n. 43. Christensen's work brings out Lechevalier's useful contribution to the C.S.M. op. cit., pp. 109-119.

141. Lechevalier, _Five Years in the Land of Refuge, A Letter on the Prospects of Co-operative Associations in England. Addressed to the Late Society for Promoting Men's Associations_ (London, 1854) (Hereinafter referred to as _Five Years_), pp. 35, 62, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 116.

142. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 118. Christensen does not name the exposition. I suspect he refers to the first of _Tracts on Christian Socialism_, _infra_. p. 65.

143. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 45. _Infra_, p. 68.

144. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 198. _Infra_, p.74 n. 193.

145. _Infra_, p. 69. See Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 162-167. In spite of Kingsley's fame, next to Maurice and Ludlow Neale became the most prominent of the early Christian Socialists. He placed his entire fortune (₤60,000) at the disposal of Associative work and was tireless in his efforts for the Associations. He attracted his cousin, A.A. Vansittart, to follow his example. _Infra_, p. 77.

146. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 286. This is the first link I have found of Tractarian involvement with the C.S.M. Later the movement came to be described as a Tractarian development. _Infra_, ch. 3 "Introduction." _Supra_, ch. 2, n. 91.

147. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 13, Raven, _op. cit._, pp. 144-146. Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 120-124.

148. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 23-27. The two others were Charles Mansfield and a medical doctor, Charles Walsh, who as Superintending Inspector to Southwark and Bermondsey had taken his friends to see this "capital of Cholera"--Jacob's Island, a patch of ground surrounded by a common sewer. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 120.

149. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 23-27, 30. See Walter Rauschenbusch, _Christianity and the Social Crisis_, ed. by Robert D. Cross (New York: Harper Torchbooks, The University Library, 1964) (Hereinafter referred to as _Social Crisis_), pp. 372-380; Walter Rauschenbusch, _Christianizing the Social Order_ (New York: The

MacMillan Company, 1921) (Hereinafter referred to as _Social Order_), Part III, chs. i and ii.

150. Cf. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 142, n. 35.

151. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 28. Ludlow agreed with Maurice, see MS Letter Ludlow to Kingsley, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 127, n. 10.

152. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 29. Christensen writes that this letter to Ludlow resulted from Ludlow's rebuke that Maurice had been unfair to Mansfield. This, he claims, led to self accusations, etc., by Maurice: "He knew he could invite their goodwill by flattering that habit of mind." _Op. cit._, p. 126. It is Christensen and not Raven, _op. cit._, p. 148, who misunderstands "the true motivation of Maurice's attitude." See Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 126, no. 9.

153. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 31. See Raven, _op. cit._, p. 149, Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 131.

154. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 40.

155. _Ibid._, pp. 33-34 (Letter to Ludlow of 5.1.1850). Christensen (_op. cit._, p. 132) dismisses Raven's belief that the friends' zeal and determination helped to cause a change in his outlook. Raven however did not speak of a "change in his fundamental theological convictions" as Christensen writes. See Raven, _op. cit._, p. 148. Maurice's son suggests that his father "was not unwilling to enter any scheme for helping forward co-operation for working men . . . He was only anxious not to make co-operation an excuse for interfering with any work that might be done by others." _Life_, Vol. II, p. 30.

156. _Tracts by Christian Socialists_, No. III, Part II, p. 18, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 129.

157. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 32.

158. _Ibid_., p. 31. See Raven, _op. cit_., p. 146.

159. See Christensen, _op. cit_., pp. 127-129, Ludlow's article was reprinted in _Tracts by Christian Socialists_, No. III, Parts I and II (1852).

160. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 49. Cf. Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 133.

161. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 33-36; Christensen, _op. cit_., pp. 134-142; Raven, _op. cit_., pp. 154-157. Raven gives a list of the eight Tracts on p. 157.

162. See MS Letter of 5/1 1850 Maurice to Ludlow, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 135, n. 2.

163. _Ibid_.

164. MS Letter of 6/8 1853 from Maurice to Ludlow, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 333. _Infra_, p. 83.

165. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 33.

166. _Ibid_., p. 34. See also Raven, _op. cit_., p.155.

167. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 35, 36.

168. _Ibid_., p. 36. Raven, _op. cit_., p. 157.

169. Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 142. Cf. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 40-41 and Raven, _op. cit_., pp. 182-224, _passim_.

170. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 40-42. Sully was introduced to the group by Lechevalier. He had a thorough knowledge of Associative work in Paris. See Christensen, _op. cit_., p. 143, n. 4. Based on Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XIX, Raven, _op. cit_., pp. 184-185.

171. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 42.

172. _Ibid._, p. 43.

173. _Ibid._, p. 44.

174. _Ibid._

175. _Ibid._, p. 45.

176. The _Economic Review,_ Vol. III, pp. 40-41, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 150. For Neale, _supra_, n. 145.

177. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 75. It was published in _Tracts on Christian Socialism_, No. V. See Raven, _op. cit._, p. 187.

178. Raven, _op. cit._, p. 196. Cf. Christensen, _op.cit._, pp. 148-149.

179. Ludlow was requested to draft the bill by the Government. See Masterman, _op.cit._, pp. 107, 222, Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 275.

180. See Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 147.

181. See Maurice's "Memorandum" in 1852, reprinted in _The Founder of the Working Men's College and Its Objects. Two hitherto Unpublished Papers by the Revd. Frederick Denison Maurice, with an Introduction by his Son, Major General Sir Frederick Maurice K.C.B._ (London, 1906) (Hereinafter referred to as _Founder of W.M.C._), p. 9, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 149, n. 25, _infra_ p. 83.

182. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 52, 156-158; Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 271, 279.

183. He did go on a tour with Hughes through Lancashire to promote working-men's associations. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 56.

184. _The First Report of the S.P.W.M.A. To which is added, A Report of the Co-operative Conference, Held in_

London at the Society's Hall 34, Castle Street East,
on 26th and 27th July, 1852. (London, 1852), p. 60,
quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 283.

185. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 55, 88; MS Letter
11/10 1852. Ludlow to Kingsley, quoted in
Christensen, op. cit., p. 152.

186. _The Christian Socialist,_ Vol. I, p. 201, quoted in
Christensen, op. cit., p.154.

187. _The Christian Socialist,_ Vol. I, p. 49, quoted in
Christensen, op. cit., p. 158.

188. _The Christian Socialist,_ Vol. II, p. 84, quoted in
Christensen, op. cit., p. 159.

189. Christensen, op. cit., pp. 176-192; Raven, op. cit.,
pp. 264-275, 313; Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 75.

190. Ludlow and Mansfield laid the emphasis on Producers'
Associations; Neale, Hughes, Lechevalier, and Lloyd
Jones were the moving spirits in Consumers' Co-
operation.

191. Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXVIII, quoted in
Christensen, op. cit., p. 186, n.39.

192. _The Christian Socialist,_ Vol. I, pp. 241-242, quoted
in Christensen, op. cit., pp. 186-187.

193. The Circular was written by Lechevalier. It invited
the Trade Unions to become the means of applying
the principle of Industrial Association to Production,
Consumption and Distribution, to use the Central
Agency as a link between the Associations and the
Stores and to consider what kind of connection they
would establish with the S.P.W.M.A. See Christensen,
op. cit., pp. 198-199. Raven, op. cit., pp. 238-242.

194. Only Mansfield and one other supported Ludlow.
See "Autobiography," ch. XXX, quoted in Christensen,
op. cit., p. 202.

195. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 56; description of Maurice's role on the Council. See also _Tracts on Christian Socialism_, No. VIII. "A Clergyman's Answer to the Question 'On what grounds can you associate with men generally'" (Hereinafter referred to as "Clergyman's Answer"), pp. 13-15, 21-22, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 201, n. 38, 202-203, nn. 42-46.

196. "Clergyman's Answer," pp. 14-15, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 203; Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 76-77.

197. "Clergyman's Answer," p. 20, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 203.

198. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 76-77. Cf. His declaration published in _The Christian Socialist_, pp. 362-363, cited Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 206-207.

199. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 104.

200. See Letter dated December 1851 found among Ludlow's papers, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 211. See also Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 115. I cannot accept Christensen's view of Maurice in this episode as one who "veiled his true intentions by advancing a number of more or less irrelevant arguments." (See _op. cit._, p. 214) Deception was not a characteristic of Maurice. His post at King's College had in fact been imperilled by his association with the Christian Socialists: e.g. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 74 where reference is made to J.W. Croker's attack on him in an article in the _Quarterly Review_.

201. Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXX, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 212. _Supra_, p. 103 n. 121.

202. The Prospectus for the new Journal was published in the last issue of _The Christian Socialist_, Vol. II, pp. 405-406, dated 27/12/1851, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 212. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II,

pp. 104-105. See also Christensen, _op. cit._,
pp. 216-283, for the effects of the controversy on
the growing influence of the Christian Socialists
on social, political and economic issues in England.
Christensen writes of six factors which accounted
for the rising influence of the group. (1) Maurice's
prominence as an intellectual leader (though
Christensen adds that the public never really under-
stood what Maurice was saying). (2) Kingsley's
rôle as a propagandist along with the writings of
others, chiefly Ludlow. (3) The group's concern
with the "Condition of England" question. (4) The
impact of their ideas on the discussions for the
formulation of new working class politics. (5) The
group's activity in making the Trade Union Movement
(particularly through the A.S.E.) adopt new policies.
(6) Their achievements in the Co-operative Movement
through their publications, lectures, and the Indus-
trial and Provident Societies Act of 1852.

203. See _The Christian Socialist_, Vol. I, p. 43, Vol. II,
pp. 114-115; _Journal of Association,_ p. 26, quoted
in Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 240-244, _passim_.

204. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 103; Christensen,
op. cit., pp. 242-249.

205. See _Journal of Association_, pp. 26, 31, 47, quoted
in Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 258-259.

206. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 107.

207. _Ibid._, pp. 103-107.

208. _Ibid._, pp. 111-112.

209. _The Operative_, p. 361 (edit. "The Necessity of Co-
operation," 17/4, 1852), quoted in Christensen,
op. cit., p. 266, n. 88.

210. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 290.

211. Based on MS Letter of 31/1 1852, Maurice to Ludlow,
quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 289.

212. Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXX, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 290. Maurice wanted a periodical devoted to Christian instruction.

213. MS Letter of 1852, Maurice to Ludlow quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 290, nn. 25-27.

214. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 122.

215. _Ibid_., p. 113, _supra_ p. 57, The conferences had developed into discussions of matters of business.

216. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 113.

217. _Ibid_., p. 115.

218. _Ibid_.

219. Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 310-317.

220. "Thoughts," ch. 7, quoted in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 316.

221. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 320.

222. _Supra_ p. 31; _Infra_ p. 85. Maurice's proposals were reprinted in _Founder of W.M.C._, pp. 5-10 cited in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 320, n. 3.

223. _Founder of W.M.C._, p. 9, cited in Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 322, n. 12.

224. Christensen, _op. cit._, p. 322.

225. _Ibid_., p. 328.

226. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p.160.

227. See _ibid_., pp. 159-161, 172-174. Cf. Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 333-334. Christensen (pp. 319-331) provides a summary of the details of the re-organization. His bias against Maurice is evident.

He writes that Maurice did not "throw himself whole-
heartedly into the work." p. 332. He omits to
mention Maurice's work and problems at King's College
at this time when he gives the reasons for this.
Ludlow's objection to Maurice's choice of Neale and
himself contradicted his own recommendation regarding
discipline and obedience to officers in the Society.
Maurice thought that Ludlow was influenced by his
dislike of Neale. See MS Letter 6/8 1853, quoted
in Christensen, op. cit., p. 333, n. 44.

228. See Maurice, Life, Vol. II, pp. 221-223, 232-233,
237-238, 250; Ludlow, "Autobiography," ch. XXXV,
quoted in Christensen, op. cit., p. 341, n. 16.

229. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 232.

230. Christensen, op. cit., pp. 345-349; a useful
analysis.

231. Ibid., p. 351 based on Ludlow, "Autobiography,"
ch. XXXV.

232. See Maurice, Life, Vol. II, pp. 200, 550.

233. Prospectus of College and First Term Programme
(copy in Working Men's College Library) quoted in
Christensen, op. cit., p. 340; see Maurice, Life,
Vol. II, p. 221 for summary. Cf. Walter Rauschenbusch,
Social Order, pp. 382-383.

234. Christensen, op. cit., p. 361.

235. Factors such as the depletion of funds, and failure
of many associations; see Raven, op. cit., ch. X.

236. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 550.

237. Ibid., p. 551. This quotation from Ludlow's address
when Maurice was appointed to Cambridge expresses
the differences of opinions which existed between
Ludlow and Maurice as well as the position Maurice
held in the group.

238. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 220-221, 550, which may well indicate Maurice's preference for the term College to Christian Socialism; pp. 159-161 suggest his hesitance about speaking of applying Christianity to the purposes of trade.

239. _Infra_, p. 142.

240. _Infra_, p. 166.

241. _Supra_, n. 92. Reckitt (_op. cit._, pp. 18-19) speaks of the Church of England. Theologically, the claim cannot be made for Maurice with regard to the other churches in England. But the C.S.M. was soon to become inter-denominational. Maurice, Ludlow, Kingsley _et al_ were pioneers of that movement.

CHAPTER III

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH AND THE HERITAGE OF THE SOCIAL

GOSPEL MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

An appreciation of Rauschenbusch's social thought necessitates an examination of developments in Protestant Christianity in America in the nineteenth century. He comes at the climax of these developments. In this respect he is to be contrasted rather than compared with Maurice. Rauschenbusch was the heir to a tradition which had many strands. He has been described as the best exponent of "Progressive Social Christianity";[1] but in fact he has a great deal in common with the two other main Protestant groups--the conservatives and the radicals.[2] A survey of these developments in America also shows that there were links between the English and American movements and that Rauschenbusch may have been influenced indirectly by Maurice.

The Effects of the Industrial Revolution in America

There was a tremendous upsurge of creative life in America after the Civil War. It showed itself in various ways. The first Transcontinental Railroad, completed in 1869, joined the old East to the new West. The years 1873-1878 saw the introduction of refrigeration, telephone and electric lighting. In the 1890's, the Industrial Revolution swept across the Western World leaving few people untouched. Uprooted Europeans migrated to America in the thousands in search of freedom and higher wages. Frequently they settled in slums and "foreign" districts of the big cities where they provided an unlimited supply of cheap labour.[3]

American cities grew rapidly as the economic basis of the country shifted from a rural and agricultural economy to a predominantly industrial and commercial one. Immigration was not the only source of the urban population growth. When the frontier of the West ceased to offer opportunities to the landless and penniless, the big cities became the places where work and wages were to be obtained. The success stories of the Vanderbilts, the Astors, the Harrimans, the Goulds and the Rockefellers increased the attraction to the cities. Generally speaking, it was a period of great prosperity with intermittent

periods of depression. But the great wealth was in the hands of a comparatively small minority while the masses suffered the evil effects of unemployment, poverty, corrupt city and state governments and cut-throat competition in business and industry. The exhibitionism on the part of the newly rich concealed the disease, the undernourishment, the insecurity, the suffering and the fear of the poor in tenement houses.[4]

Climate of Religious Thought

Conventional, institutionalized, orthodox Protestantism provided a foundation of complacency for the acceptance of these evils.[5] Yet it would be unfair to say that the problems of human suffering in the cities were ignored by Protestants.[6]

Churches participated in efforts to alleviate the suffering of the poor, but for the most part they remained faithful to the status quo, regarding it as divinely ordained. The success of the industrial giants in the post Civil War era and their generosity to religious and charitable work served to strengthen these convictions. The few radicals who revolted against the contemporary selfishness and materialism

and called for a new order were either dismissed or ignored.[7]

However, between 1877 and 1900 this traditional conservatism

was severely shaken socially and theologically. But it did

not disappear completely. It never has, as the last decade

has shown. It is also to be noted that many who became

engaged in Christian social action still maintained tradi-

tional orthodoxy.

Charles Hopkins maintains that the social gospel move-

ment probably obtained its great intellectual stimulus from

the enlightened conservatives who sought to reconcile the

truths of Christianity with the new science, and to reorient

Protestant ethics to the needs of a newly industrialized

society. Their leaders embraced a progressive attitude that

was to lead far from the sentimental piety of "the gilded

age". Their views were later to be formulated carefully, if

somewhat inconsistently, in the "new theology of the 1880's",

while the movement itself was destined to ripen into the mod-

ernism of the early twentieth century. They stressed the love

of God rather than the attributes of justice and majesty and

tended to emphasize heaven and the rewards of religion. Divine

judgement was tempered by a romantic optimism and the Chris-

tian conception of crisis was smothered over with the idea of

progress. In addition to its humanistic leanings, progressive

orthodoxy also served the rising social conscience by its

conception of the Kingdom of God as an actuality realisable

on earth. Although the definitions of the kingdom were to

lack concreteness, the belief that the ideal preached by

Christ was a terrestrial social kingdom as well as a spiritual

one was of great importance to a nascent social gospel.[8]

The social gospel also inherited the evangelical zeal

that had inspired an earlier generation's crusade against

slavery and intemperance and had promoted bold missionary

enterprises. In elaborating this view, which he attributes

to H. Richard Niebuhr,[9] Hopkins says that this stratum in the

theological atmosphere of the period was the heritage from an

evangelicalism that had seen the element of social crisis in

human life and looked to the divine initiative to accomplish

the necessary revolutionary change. Its upholders sought the

realization of the kingdom of God in the world as the needed

resolution of that unfortunate dualism between heaven and

earth, present and future, that had followed in the wake of

revival movements from Jonathan Edwards to Charles A. Finney.

According to Richard Niebuhr, evangelicalism had prophesied

an earthly kingdom of justice and righteousness since the days

of Jonathan Edwards. This element was to have a prominent

place in the thought of Walter Rauschenbusch.[10]

A fourth stratum of mid-nineteenth century religious

thought to influence the development of the social gospel

was the Unitarian school that challenged both the presup-

positions and the ethics of conservatism. Leading Unitar-

ians, in advance of Christian Liberals, were pointing out

the ethical character of the Kingdom, claiming that Jesus had

definitely social purposes in view in the establishment of

the Church and that an ideal Church should symbolize the

brotherhood of man.[11]

We shall return to consider other American influences

on the social gospel development, but at this point we should

bear in mind that the Church in the United States of America

was not alone either in its earlier failure to respond to

the challenge of the Industrial Revolution or in its later

response. We have already seen the response of the Church in

England. Similarly in Germany and France the impact of the

Industrial Revolution had led to the formation of Christian

social movements which based their approach on the message of

the prophets and the teaching of Jesus and derived much from

the insights of the developing historical and social sciences.

The German and French movements affected the American develop-

ment in its later stages.[12] So did the writings of the

Russian, Leo Tolstoi. British influences, however, are evident

from the earliest beginnings of the movement in America. The

actions and the writings of men as diverse as Thomas Chalmers,

Frederick D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, John R. Seeley and

Henry Scott Holland were well known. Maurice and Kingsley

were frequently mentioned in the American religious press.

"The wide popularity of John Seeley's Ecce Homo: A Survey

of the Life and Work of Jesus provides an excellent example

of the occasional and imponderable influence of significant

British thought upon the movement in America."[13] As early as

1888, a Pan-Anglican Congress, at which American delegates

were present, stated that there was no difference between

Christianity and socialism except in the methods of the social-

ists.[14] The English influence was naturally strongest among

the Episcopalians in America but it was not restricted to

them.[15]

But while noting these foreign influences, the partic-

ularly American nature of the development must be stressed.

As we have already seen, there were indigenous religious in-

fluences which helped to shape the turn of events in the

growth of a social awareness within the churches. There were

also some native radicals with decidedly religious inclina-

tions who influenced this growth, outstanding examples being

Henry George and Edward Bellamy.

Henry George was unquestionably at this time the great-
est radical influence on American Protestantism. In his book,
Progress and Poverty, he painted a dark picture of American
society. He believed that the industrial pyramid rested on
the land since the land was the source of all wealth. He said
that the necessary result of material progress, land being
private property, was to force labourers to work for wages
which gave but a bare living. Labour could not reap the ben-
efits which advancing civilization brought because these were
intercepted. Wages did not increase,for the greater the earn-
ings of labour the greater the price that labour had to pay
out of its earnings for the opportunity to make any earnings
at all.[16] He attributed the great cause of inequality in the
distribution of wealth to inequality in the ownership of
land.[17] The only remedy for this evil was to remove the
cause--the monopoly of land. This could be achieved by substi-
tuting common ownership for individual ownership.[18] George
said that the recognition of the common right to land would
involve no shock nor dispossessing. It would not be necessary
to confiscate the land, it would only be necessary to confis-
cate the rent. He therefore proposed to abolish all taxation
save that upon land values.[19] Hence the term "the single tax".
This proposal was regarded as utopian and confiscatory by the
majority of churchmen.

In his novel, _Looking Backward_, Bellamy's famous
dream of the year 2000, the transfer to socialism has been
achieved peacefully. In that society men found themselves
able to appreciate Christ's teachings for the first time
through their actual experience of Christian love. Though
only a few Christian radicals followed Bellamy,[20] for thou-
sands of Protestants _Looking Backward_ was the first socialist
book they had ever read.

It must also be recognized that the social gospel
movement flourished at a time when many middle-class Amer-
icans were exhibiting an unusual degree of moral idealism and
optimism and were ready to respond to pleas for social reform.
The climate of opinion, itself a compound of the Protestant
crusading spirit and the mood created by remarkable scientific
and technological advances gave to the movement its air of
excitement and eager expectancy.[21] Dores Sharpe reminds us
that while all the visible changes of the Industrial Revolu-
tion were taking place, the American people were passing
through a definite revolution in belief.[22] Darwin's theory
of evolution became the dominant intellectual concept during
the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the
twentieth century, as mankind broke away from the concept of
a static universe and adopted a philosophy of change. Not

unconnected with this was a new freedom for the human mind.
Political democratic theories were spreading rapidly around
the world, undermining age-old political institutions. Men
felt free to attack the most secure assumptions of science,
philosophy, and religion with all the practical corollaries
of these assumptions. Conservatives protested but even they
acknowledged the right to attack. One form which this new
intellectual freedom took was the application of historical
criticism to the Bible. Religion itself was seen to have had
a development throughout the entire Biblical period rising to
ever higher and higher ground, until it reached its climax in
Jesus of Nazareth.

One other intellectual factor in the making of the age
must be mentioned--the rise of Marxian socialism. Marxian
theory predicted an evolutionary development on a world-wide
scale, growing out of the necessary logic of history itself.
Capital would become more and more concentrated, and workers
would be more and more ground underfoot, until there would be
two classes left. Bitter class warfare would follow, and a
great revolution would take place. The workers who had nothing
to lose would become the owners and rulers of everything. In-
dustry would thereafter be run for the general good in a class-
less society. "From each according to his ability, to each

according to his need." Rauschenbusch pointed out that while

Marxian socialism was materialistic and atheistic, it was

intellectually far more finely wrought than its opponents

realized. Its doctrines of surplus value and class warfare,

its economic interpretation of history, explained--rightly or

wrongly--a great deal that no one else could explain, while

its challenges to injustices stirred men's consciences.[23]

We have already alluded to the social crises which

spurred the Protestant churches to concern for the social con-

ditions in America. Henry May speaks of three "earthquakes"

which shook the complacency of the churches:[24] the railway

strike of 1877, the labor troubles of 1886, and the strikes

of 1890-1894. These "forced clerical observers to admit the

existence of problems ignored, or waved aside, by the pat

theorists of earlier times."[25] A less intense but still

notable pressure upon social thought was the awareness that

the expanding cities were breeding poverty, misery, vice and

crime. Josiah Strong in his book, Our Country, argued that

the last and greatest peril which threatened the American land

of promise was the city, which had become a menace to civiliza-

tion.[26]

The Social Message of the Churches

Unlike its British counterpart, the American Social

Gospel was non-denominational from its outset. This probably

accounts for its diversified nature. May says that social

Christianity in America was divided into three wings--con-

servative, moderately conservative and radical.[27] I accept

and follow this classification with the proviso that it is

seldom possible to follow it rigidly. Frequently conservative

social teachers express progressive or radical views while

progressives or liberals retain elements of thought that are

decidedly conservative. I shall consider chiefly the contrib-

utions of those whose thought is similar to that of

Rauschenbusch, or who appear to have influenced him; or who

reveal links between the British and American movements.

The Conservative Wing

The principal exponents of conservative social Chris-

tianity were Joseph Cook, Roswell D. Hitchcock,[28] President

of Union Theological Seminary, Joseph P. Thomson,[29] A.J.H.

Behrends,[30] and Minot J. Savage, a Unitarian. This group dif-

fered from the earlier conservatives mainly in that they were

not complacent about the conditions of society. They sought

to deal with social problems without challenging individual-

ism. They differed in detail but they all emphasized the

value of voluntary "Christian" methods against "Socialism"

and "Materialism".[31]

Usually these people were skeptical or hostile towards

trade unions. The solutions they urged, ranging from consumer

co-operatives to savings banks, involved no practical chal-

lenge to contemporary economic assumptions. The conservative

social Christian echoed many of the theories of _laissez-faire_,

except that he urged the poor to be patient in the hope of

eventual improvement.

Joseph Cook, a Congregational minister, was one of the

earliest of this group. He is a good example of the way in

which conservative theological and economic theories as well

as radical social views can be present in single individuals.

In an attempt to reform the shoe factories in Lynn, Massa-

chusetts, he exposed the immoral conditions of the industry

in a series of Sunday evening lectures. Later his utterances

in a series of meetings in Boston (1877-1878) made him ex-

tremely popular among those who held conservative views in the

conflict between science and religion.[32] He rejected Socialism

on the practical grounds that it could not be actually real-
ized, would lead to even worse government corruption than was
then present and would discourage personal initiative and
lead to dictatorship. He declared that socialism would be
detrimental to the lower classes in fostering dependence on
"state-help".[33] But Cook endorsed co-operatives of the
Rochdale type and the German co-operative saving banks on the
grounds that these institutions fostered "self-help" on the
part of the poor and were aids in the solution of the labor
problem.[34] He was no equalitarian and believed that in a free
society those with merit would rise and therefore the worth-
less would always form a separate class at the bottom.

Though he was hostile towards associations like the
Knights of Labour, he was sympathetic to the concept of trade
unionism, upholding that no protest could be raised when
either capital or labor combined for legitimate ends. But he
feared the socialistic trend of labor unions.[35] It is his
views on wages which strike the reader as most radical for
this time; he wanted to see legislation instituted against
the lowering of wages through the introduction of machinery
and as a protection against the use of women and children in
factories.[36] Following the younger British economists, he
rejected the classic wage-fund theory which asserted that

wages were outside human control. His recommendation was
that to support a family according to the American standard,
the laborer must earn twice the cost of his unprepared food.
He claimed that this modest level was not to be imposed by
law for employers would sooner or later recognize just wages
as the only adequate protection against communists and social-
ists. He called on the Church to assert a democratic and
theocratic standard over against the power of the plutocracy
and secularization of morals: "only the Golden Rule can bring
about the Golden Age". The Church must be the sheet anchor of
moral reform.[37]

The Radicals

At the other extreme were those who tended to reject
the existing social and economic structure. Their remedies,
non-violent and often unrealistic, were sweeping.[38] They
spoke in terms of crisis and crusade and were willing not
only to differ from the mass of church opinion but to accept
rebuke, ridicule and loneliness. May's classification of
these radicals under one umbrella is too comprehensive; he
speaks of "isolated radicals,"[39] certain Episcopalians, George
Herron, and Christian socialists amidst the secular socialist

movement, chiefly Henry Demarest Lloyd.[40] Herbert Casson

(an "isolated radical"), the Episcopalians, and Herron demand

our attention.

Herbert N. Casson was a Methodist minister who with-

drew from that communion because of his dissatisfaction with

the ineffectiveness of the organized church in reaching the

working classes. He believed that there could be no reconcil-

iation of the masses to the church until the latter repented

and became converted to a socialized gospel. To this end he

organized a branch of the Labour Church, which had been founded

in England in 1871 by John Trevor, a British Socialist and

Unitarian. The Labour Church had four main aims: (i) to

remove religious superstition and to develop the moral nature

of the Labour Movement; (ii) to promote social intercourse,

and practical co-operation; (iii) to educate people in prep-

aration for the social crisis; (iv) to proclaim the Co-

operative as the ideal of society. The organization described

itself as composed of wage earners who believed the social

question to be the ethical problem of the day; it maintained

socialism "to be the present ideal of industry, and perfect

freedom of thought to be the ideal of religion".[41] The task

Casson foresaw for the Labour Church was that of providing

unity and solidarity through its teaching of Christian love.

When he left Lynn in 1900 the movement collapsed.[42]

Among the Episcopalians whom May lists as radicals
were J.O.S. Huntington, W.D.P. Bliss, and P.W. Sprague.

Huntington's importance for us arises partially from
the fact that he was one of the founders of the Church
Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labour
(C.A.I.L.).[43] He was also deeply influenced by the Tractar-
ian movement and in 1881 he founded the Order of the Holy
Cross, a monastic organization which engaged in mission work
on New York's East Side. Henry George was one of the form-
ative influences on his thought and he became convinced that
the Single Tax was the fundamental cure for the misery and
injustice of the masses. He contrasted this basic and, as
he thought, sufficient reform of George with the piecemeal
methods of the Church, which methods he had grown to consider
as ineffective, patronizing and actually harmful.   Like
Rauschenbusch he supported George in his 1886 campaign.[44]

William Dwight Porter Bliss began his ministerial
career as a Congregationalist clergyman, but later became a
priest in the Episcopal Church because he believed that church
was better suited to his expanding social philosophy and gave
him greater freedom of thought and action.[45] His socialistic
views grew out of his observation of the village life of the

working classes and the reading of the writings of Henry

George and articles which appeared in the <u>Christian Union</u>.

In 1889 while at Grace Church, in South Boston, he, along

with E.E. Hale and P.W. Sprague, founded the first "Nation-

alist" Club; and later organized the Society of Christian

Socialists (S.C.S.). This society asserted in its "Decla-

ration of Principles" that "all rights and powers are gifts

of God . . . for the benefit of all" and therefore "all social,

political and industrial relations should be based on the

Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man" because God is

the source and guide of all human progress.[46] Its indict-

ments of the existing social order were: concentrations of

ownership of resources and inventions, planless production

resulting in business crises, concentration of control of

industry in the hands of a dangerous plutocracy guiding the

destinies of the masses, and the consequent prevalence of

such moral evils as mammonism, overcrowding and prostitution.

The society then declared that a united Christianity must

protest a system so based and productive of such results,

and demand a reconstructed co-operative social order in which

distribution and production would benefit all. The possible

dynamics of such a society could be seen in contemporary

trends towards business combination. There is a close

similarity between many of the views of Rauschenbusch and
those expressed in the S.C.S. manifesto.

The practical objectives of the society were: to show
that the aim of Socialism is embraced in the aim of Chris-
tianity; to awaken members of Christian churches to the fact
that the teachings of Jesus Christ lead directly to some
specific form or forms of socialism; the Church therefore has
a definite duty in this matter and must, in simple obedience
to Christ, apply itself to the realization of the social
principles of Christianity.[47] Besides its meetings and dis-
cussions, the S.C.S. published a newspaper, The Dawn, and
many tracts. It sometimes took an active part in local labor
struggles.[48]

Newspapers played a prominent part in the life of
Christian socialism both in England and America. The Dawn is
a good example both of their success and their failures. It
was first published by Bliss in 1889, and became the official
organ of the S.C.S. in 1890. Six months later Bliss resumed
full financial responsibility for the paper because it proved
too heavy a drain on the society. It appeared irregularly
but remained essentially his own organ while it served for
seven years as the principal outlet for the views of radical

Christian social thought. Its associate editors and contributors included many moderates.[49] The newspaper proposed "no magic panacea" but rather an evolutionary, experimental progress toward a co-operative society which would be characterized by fraternity and democracy; which would provide for the development of true individuality; which would hold land and all resources under some system as the gift of God equally to all his children; and which would control capital and industry for the benefit of the whole community.[50] But the S.C.S. was not content with purely educational programs. The first issue of The Dawn suggested as legislative measures: the nationalization of land, railroads, telegraph, telephone and all resources; public ownership of local transit, light and heat systems; women's suffrage; compulsory education; the eight-hour day; and prohibition.[51]

Groups of the S.C.S. were formed in other cities. Leighton Williams, the close associate of Rauschenbusch, was a member of the group in New York. In 1890 Bliss gave up Grace Church and founded the Mission of the Carpenter, a Christian Socialist congregation, though a regularly constituted Episcopal mission church. The Mission of the Carpenter became the headquarters of the Brotherhood of the Carpenter, another propaganda group with purposes very similar to those

of the S.C.S. In the following year the Brotherhood acquired

a house which became the Wendell Phillips Union, the head-

quarters of the Anti-Tenement House League and the Wendell

Phillips Purchasers League.[52] The Mission ended in 1896 when

Bliss became the travelling secretary of the Christian Social

Union.

The Episcopal Christian Social Union was founded in 1871

as the direct outcome of British stimulus to a felt American

need for the scientific study and analysis of social problems.

Adopting its principles from its Anglican parent, the Union

proposed: (i) to claim for the Christian law the ultimate

authority to rule social practice; (ii) to study in common

how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity

to the social and economic difficulties of the [present] time;

(iii) to present Christ in practical life as the Living Master

and King, the enemy of wrong and selfishness, the power of

righteousness and love.

The Union conceived of its task as purely educational

and left practical activities to the older Episcopal society,

C.A.I.L. Its monthly Publications frequently reprinted state-

ments of Christian Socialist theory by such Anglicans as B.F.

Wescott and Charles Gore. It dealt with such subjects as

"Arbitration and Conciliation in Industrial Disputes" and

"The Church's Opportunity in the City Today" by W.S. Rainford.
Two of its important achievements were: (a) it organized
courses of lectures in Episcopal Theological Schools and
(b) it exerted such pressures upon the General Convention of
the Episcopal Church for the recognition of the claims of
social Christianity that in 1910 a permanent Commission on
social service was set up by that Church. In 1911 when a
full time secretary was appointed for the Commission, the
C.S.U. was disbanded.[53]

We have already seen that through the "Nationalist"
club and the S.C.S. Bliss ventured beyond the confines of his
own denomination. After the turn of the century he was assoc-
iated with Josiah Strong in the American Institute of Social
Service and along with Strong edited the widely studied Bible
lessons on social Christianity published as "The Gospel of
the Kingdom".[54] With the exception of Ely, Bliss probably
received greater national recognition than any other person
among the Social Gospel leaders. He was twice sent to Europe
by the American government to study unemployment. Perhaps
his greatest contribution to American Social thought was his
Encyclopedia of Social Reform,[55] the first convenient compila-
tion of sociological data published in the U.S.A.[56]

George Herron was the most controversial of all Christian radicals in America. He was appointed to the chair of Applied Christianity at Iowa College (later Grinnell College) in 1893. He was forced to resign from that post in 1898 because by then he had become the centre of considerable national controversy.[57]

In his earlier work he was under the influences of Mazzini, Maurice and the English Christian Socialists.[58] The later development of his thought shows the influence of Hegel, Lotze, and contemporary German theology, as well as that of Calvin, Newman and Edwards.[59] There is another factor which makes Herron of particular importance to us: sections in the writings of Rauschenbusch bear a remarkable resemblance to the thought of Herron. These include the criticism of organized Christianity for its preoccupation with theology, mystery, worship and ecclesiastical systems to the exclusion of social concern;[60] the close affiliation of the Church with powerful business interests;[61] the belief that there is a tendency towards brotherhood, co-operation and justice within historical movements;[62] the concept of the organic nature of society as it affects the views of sin and salvation;[63] the conviction about the impossibility of justice under the

capitalistic system;[64] and the task of organized religion to Christianize industry.[65]

Before his resignation from Iowa College and his subsequent withdrawal from the institutional Church, Herron participated in the founding of the American Institute of Christian Sociology. This organization, founded at Chautauqua under the presidency of Professor Richard T. Ely,[66] included many progressive leaders in its membership. It sponsored a Summer School of Applied Christianity which Herron had already organized at Iowa College.[67] In 1894 a group of socially minded Christians led by George Gates, the President of Iowa College, and Herron took over the Northeastern Congregationalist and renamed it The Kingdom. This Journal became an important regional organ of the social gospel. Though Herron was a frequent contributor, much of the newspaper's content was far less radical than his own views. For example, Josiah Strong and Washington Gladden were occasional contributors.[68]

Ralph Gabriel points to two concrete results which were produced by Herron's gospel of sacrifice: Charles Sheldon's In His Steps and the Christian Commonwealth of Georgia.[69]

Sheldon's book served to propagate the Social Gospel
in America in much the same way as Kingley's novels served
the Christian Socialist Movement in England. Herron believed
that the redemption of society by sacrifice was a divinely
implanted idea.[70] It is this idea which inspires Sheldon's
book. In it, he considers and rejects the answers of the
single taxer and the socialist who try to answer the job-
less questioner. Sheldon's answer was that when the Kingdom
of God shall have been realized on earth, the law of that King-
dom which is sacrifice and the bearing of one another's bur-
dens will be triumphant. In such a world no man can lack
work. While Sheldon repudiated the Christian Socialism of
Bliss, he added Gladden's concept of the socialized individ-
ual and the Herron doctrine of social redemption through
individual sacrifice.[71] The concluding sentence of the book
epitomizes the romantic sentiment and the utopianism which
gave it a place next to the Bible as the most widely read
religious book in America in the first decade of the twen-
tieth century:

> And with a hope that walks hand in hand with
> faith and love, Henry Maxwell, disciple of Jesus,
> laid down to sleep and dreamed of the regeneration
> of Christendom and saw in his dream a Church of
> Jesus, "without spot or wrinkle" or any such
> thing following him all the way, walking obediently
> in His steps.[72]

The Christian Commonwealth Colony was started on an
old plantation near Columbus, Georgia. The ecumenical nature
of the group is evident from the denominational traditions of
its founders: Rev'd. Ralph Albertson, the moving spirit of
the venture, a Congregationalist; John Chipman, an Epis-
copalian priest; Jacob Troth, a Quaker; and William C. Damon,
a Methodist.[73] Many of the founders had been brought together
by contributing articles to The Kingdom.[74] The Colony
attracted about four hundred people as citizens in its four
years of existence, and through its magazine Social Gospel
enlisted the support of religious radicals in all parts of
the United States. The colonists sought to realize in prac-
tice the kind of society envisaged in the theories of such
men as Herron, Bliss and Bellamy. They claimed their social
philosophy to be a mixture of ideas drawn from Jesus, St.
Francis and Karl Marx. The most important principles of the
group were its insistence on the common ownership of property
and the acceptance of all who asked for membership. Hopkins
observes that among its two thousand readers the Social
Gospel popularized its title, which gradually became the
accepted name for social Christianity in America. Shailer
Mathews used it in 1910 as the title of his study manual on
the social teachings of Jesus and their modern applications.[75]
This popularized it still more.

Progressive Social Christianity -- "The Social Gospel"

The third strand, which Henry May describes as Pro-
gressive Social Christianity, is the phase of social Chris-
tianity in America to which the term "Social Gospel" is
usually applied. Originally May included the following as
representative of this progressive social Christianity:
Washington Gladden, a Congregationalist; R. Heber Newton,
Dudley Rhodes, J.H. Rylance, Bishops H.C. Potter and F.D.
Huntington, Episcopalians; Edward E. Hale, a Unitarian;
J.H.W. Stuckenberg, a Lutheran; and T. Edwin Brown, a
Baptist. Handy adds, among others, the names of Richard T.
Ely and Walter Rauschenbusch.[76]

Here we shall look first at some general descriptions
of this movement recognizing always that there was no smooth
and cohesive development; systematic presentation of any
movement must nearly always be inadequate if not defective.
Summaries invariably reveal the particular bias of those who
write them rather than the thought of those whose writings
are summarized. Nowhere is this more true than in analyses
of the Christian social movement in Britain and America. With
these precautions we shall proceed.

Robert Handy says that the advocates of this element
of social concern were keenly aware of the contemporary
social questions and took a moderately reformist tone. They
pressed for social improvement, drawing upon the late nine-
teenth century and early twentieth century currents of pro-
gressive thought. Their attitudes were essentially middle
class, combining a call for social action with an emphasis on
the importance of the individual, his rights and responsibil-
ities. Their insistence that the Gospel had its social as-
pects, and their call for reform, were regarded as radical by
many Protestants schooled in the older individualism. One
cannot help observing that in this respect there was little
difference between radicals like Bliss and moderates like
Ely and Rauschenbusch. From 1890 to 1940, the moderates
remained a highly influential and articulate minority in all
the Churches. Some would say that the decline of their in-
fluence really began in 1914 and by 1940 that influence had
virtually disappeared.[77] My own opinion is that their in-
fluence continues up to the present time, particularly within
the World Council of Churches whose pronouncements on social
issues owe much to the ground work laid by the social move-
ments within the Churches in Britain, the United States of
America and Europe. Naturally that influence continues also

within the National (formerly Federal) Council of Churches

in America whose pioneers were many of the prominent advo-

cates of social Christianity.[78]

In general terms it can be said that the thinkers

associated with this "Progressive Social Christianity" (which

we shall call the "social gospel" for the rest of this chap-

ter) were adherents of the "new" or liberal theology: men

of evangelical liberal theological premises who had accepted

biblical criticism and the theory of evolution and who were

informed religiously by Ritschlian "Kingdom of God" theology

and socially by the progressive movement. They were careful

to distinguish their liberal theology from the earlier forms

of liberalism represented by Unitarianism and Transcendental-

ism. They sought deliberately to mediate between traditional

Christianity and modern thought. Theirs was an "evangelical"

or Christocentric liberalism. They sought in the biblical,

theological and historical resources of their faith a social

philosophy and program more adequate for their times than the

one in which they had been reared. Stimulated often by Chris-

tian social literature from abroad, assisted by contributions

from progressive elements among sociologists and economists,

and startled by the criticisms of their avant-garde socialist

movement, social gospel thinkers advocated positions sharply

at variance with the older, individualistic social attitudes

associated with laissez-faire. They were convinced of the

validity of their views and interpreted opposition as nothing

other than stubborn conservatism which served the ends of

those who desired to retain the status quo.

Handy provides three summaries of theological inter-

pretations which were given of the social gospel movement.

A review of these will clarify our own understanding of the

issues. The first of these is of that of Theodore T. Munger

(1830-1910), a Congregational pastor and a friend of Washington

Gladden. Defensively Munger said that the new movement did not

propose to do without a theology, did not depart from the his-

toric faith of the church, did not reject specific doctrines

emphasized by the Church in the past, (such as the Trinity,

the Incarnation and the Atonement), was not iconoclastic, and

did not intend to find its field outside of the existing

churches. More positively he explained that the new theology

made a somewhat larger and broader use of reason than had been

customarily accorded by theology; that it sought to interpret

Scripture in "a more natural" (i.e. historical) way; and that

it aimed at replacing an excessive individuality with a truer

view of the solidarity of the race. The new theology offered

a contrast to the old theology in calling for a wider study
of man; it recognized the necessity of a restatement of
eschatology.[79]

Another such effort was undertaken by the editors of
The Andover Review. They said much the same as Munger regard-
ing the new theology and the historic faith of the Church.
They added that it was the sense of "reality" which was the
new characteristic of the Social Gospel. Its advocates
wanted theology to deal more with persons and the progressive
unfolding of Christian truth than with speculative doctrines.
Their theology was essentially Christocentric: "everything
in Christianity centers in Christ"; "the ultimate test of
progress is Christological".[80] They emphasized the doctrine
of the Atonement and affirmed that "a truly Christocentric
system would be won when, and not until, the person of Christ
rather than His work is made central in redemption, and is
seen at the same time to be central also in creation, revela-
tion and the universal kingdom of God."[81] They also sought
to modify the prevailing concept of the divine transcendence
with a greater appreciation of God's immanence. They did
this by emphasizing his nearness and continual activity among
men.[82]

A third and recent statement of the essence of liberal-
ism comes from Henry P. Van Dusen who speaks of liberalism as
"bridge-theology".[83] It had one foot firmly planted in Modern
Thought, the other deeply rooted within Religious Evangelical-
ism. Four distinct contributions came from each side of the
bridge. From Modern Thought came fidelity to truth, defer-
ence to science and the historical movement, tentativeness
concerning metaphysical certainty, and the assumption of
continuity (between revelation and reason, Christ and other
men, God and man). Religious Evangelicalism provided the
authority of Christian experience, the centrality of Jesus
Christ, loyalty to historical faith, and moral and social
compassion and dedication. He adds that the whole liberal
mood was strongly influenced by a rather general but per-
vasive philosophic current: romantic, monistic idealism.[84]

Handy recognizes that the Social Gospel was a complex
and dynamic movement and was variously expressed by its
several generations of leaders yet he believes that its
special emphases can be reasonably briefly stated. For their
authority they looked to the "real" Jesus whom they believed
could be known by historical scholarship. They put forward
the social principles of Jesus, which again could be deter-
mined from the New Testament, as guides to personal and

social life, and as eternally valid. They explained that

the Kingdom of God was central to the message of Jesus.

They understood the Kingdom to be an historical possibility

which would be realized in some fulness in the foreseeable

future on earth. The coming Kingdom would bring with it

social harmony and the elimination of gross injustices. They

believed that the Church of their day had recovered the key

to the coming Kingdom.[85]

The injudicious proclamation of the immediacy of the

Kingdom on the part of some leaders gave the Social Gospel

movement a utopian cast. I do not believe that this charge

of utopianism and unrealistic optimism can be substantiated,

at least in the case of the more important advocates of the

Social Gospel. It is certainly not true of Rauschenbusch,

nor of Ely, nor even of Gladden in his later writings. To my

mind, these three men identified the Kingdom of God with the

social order to no greater extent than the prophets of the

eighth and ninth centuries B.C. identified God's righteous

rule with the Kingdom of Israel which stood always under God's

Judgement. They laid great stress, as they claimed Jesus

did, upon the immanence of God, but did not deny his transcend-

ence. They saw God at work in the regular processes of

nature and history, progressively working his purpose out.

They believed in progress but they did not believe it to be inevitable or automatic, for it was seen as conditional upon man's response to divine leading.

They had a high estimate of man and his potentialities, his goodness and his worth. In many cases they affirmed that man could be educated to make the right choices and so contribute to the ushering in of the Kingdom but they saw the coming Kingdom as God's action and they had a developed concept of man's sin which they saw as primarily selfishness. They were sensitive to the facts of the corporate transmission of sin through human institutions; consequently they believed that social salvation would come as institutions and individuals came under the law of love. God who is Love works in and through the Kingdom of Love, a co-operative commonwealth in which socialized and enlightened men will work for the good of all and so hasten the Kingdom's coming. Economic issues, particularly the relations between capital and labor, demanded their attention and became one of their primary concerns.

Washington Gladden has been described as the father of the movement while Walter Rauschenbusch stands out as its leading prophet.[86] Richard T. Ely represents many outstanding

liberal social scientists who were attracted to the social gospel.[87] So far we have spoken in general terms about theological trends within this phase of the movement. Let us look specifically at Washington Gladden and Richard T. Ely before reviewing the life of Walter Rauschenbusch.

Gladden was especially indebted to Horace Bushnell who pointed out to him the humanity of Jesus. The British influence on him did not come from the Christian Socialist Movement but from Frederick W. Robertson,[88] a contemporary of F.D. Maurice. By 1870, Gladden was one of the most important leaders of the Social Gospel. He believed that the theory of evolution offered a new understanding of the process of creation, and that historical criticism was the friend rather than the enemy of the Scriptures. He welcomed the liberation from the doctrine of literal inspiration and became a crusader for the new liberalism.

While he was a Congregational minister in Columbus, Ohio, Gladden won the confidence and respect of both the capitalists and the laborers. He also brought to the attention of his ministerial colleagues the fact that their churches were following rather than leading American social movements.[89] In dealing with the problem of labor, he rejected

complete communism and socialism and firmly adhered to the

traditional American emphasis upon the individual. Yet he

proposed that co-operation was the only hope for labour to

achieve economic independence and security. He advocated

in addition a limited State socialism in the form of public

ownership of utilities. He believed that the railways, the

telegraphs, the mines and the public service industries of

the cities should come under government control and owner-

ship: "Any business which is actually or virtually a

monopoly must ultimately be owned and managed by the Govern-

ment."[90]

By 1894, Gladden became convinced that in American

civilization the forces making for disruption were gaining

the ascendency over those making for cohesion, and he sought

desperately for a principle or formula which would stop it.

He believed that the State was providing not a bond of unity

but was in fact a cause of strife. Gladden said that the

Church should be the institution which would overcome the

forces of disintegration. But it could do so only if it

were true to the ideals of its Founder. His look at the

Church revealed a body divided by petty rivalries and

demoralized by corrosive jealousies. It had a tendency to

take a class view of all social questions and to regard the

grievance of the laboring poor as wholly imaginary and their complaints and uprisings as evidences of depravity; as a consequence, it was prone to take sides, rather positively, with the employing class. Yet Gladden was hopeful of the prospect of regeneration for the Church which would make it effective in the world.[91] This regeneration would include a restoration of its unity and a vision of social justice by its ministers if it were to lead the world to a sense of unity and social righteousness. Still, he recognized that he had not found the principle which would check the disintegration of American society. Recognizing the dangers of unmodified individualism and regarding socialism as enervating he found the mean between the two extremes in the formula of the "socialized individual".[92] But he went beyond the idea of wealth as a stewardship--he found the unifying principle which would save society in the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.[93] The humanists, who affirmed merely the latter half missed, thought Gladden, the central truth. But so far as they went, they were right.

> What men call "natural law" by which they
> mean the law of greed and strife . . . is
> not a natural law . . . it is unnatural, it
> is a crime against nature; the law of
> brotherhood is the only natural law.[94]

Richard T. Ely was one of the economists who popul-
arized the historical-ethical approach to economics in Amer-
ica in place of the older <u>laissez-faire</u> views. He also played
a prominent part in the shaping of the social gospel. He was
brought up as a Presbyterian but in adult life he became an
Episcopalian. He studied in Germany, where, in 1878, he met
Karl Knies, one of the founders of the historical school of
economic thought. Knies' example engendered in him a deep
interest in the aspirations of the working men. When he
returned to America in 1880 he taught at Johns Hopkins Uni-
versity and wrote several useful books on political economy.
He was very sympathetic towards the growth of internationalism
and the mild, evolutionary socialism favoured by Christian
leaders. He wrote,

> Professors of political economy, finding
> themselves forced to abandon every hope of
> reconciling adverse interests of society
> without a moral and religious regeneration
> of the varied social classes, turn to Chris-
> tianity, and appeal to it for cooperation in
> their endeavours to bring about an era of
> peace and harmony. Professorial socialism
> terminates in Christianity. Christian social-
> ism seeks in it a starting point.[95]

Ely believed that a wider diffusion of sound ethics was an
economic requirement of his times and saw Christian morality
as the only stable basis for a State professedly Christian.
He said that an ethical demand of the age was a clearer

perception of the duties of property, intelligence and social position. Extreme individualism had to be clearly recognized as immoral. The absolute ideal, Ely believed, had been given by Christ who established the most perfect system of ethics the world has ever known.[96] Ely saw in the struggle between the organized forces of labor and capital an unprecedented, unparalleled opportunity for the church to direct the conflicting forces into such fruitful channels that they might become powerful for the "good of man and the glory of God."[97]

"It appears quite obvious that Ely worked out his whole social theory from religious assumptions. His ultimate questions were answered by the acceptance of Christ as the true revealer of God's will for man."[98] True Christian faith was concerned with the affairs of this world and was summed up in Christ's summary of the Law. The function of social science was to teach how the second commandment might be fulfilled.

In principle, he saw no serious tension between church, state and science. He concluded his book on the labor movement:

> In the harmonious action of state, church, and
> individual, moving in the light of true science,
> will be found an escape from present and future
> social dangers. Herein is pointed out the path
> to safe progress; other there is none.[99]

This is predicated, says Handy, on a religious interpretation of the state. "Now it may rationally be maintained that, if there is anything divine on this earth, it is the state, the product of the same God-given instincts which led to the establishment of the church and the family."[100] Handy says, "One of Ely's central themes was 'social solidarity'[101] the oneness of all human interests. According to his monistic idealist view of reality, the truths of science and religion were complementary, and all the institutions of men--church, state, family, school, industry--should work together to advance human progress."[102]

He took the lead in 1885 in the formation of the American Economic Association of which many leading exponents of the social gospel were charter members. Ely served as its first secretary and later as its president.[103] He also served for several years as secretary of the Christian Social Union.[104] His principal literary contributions to the Social Gospel were Social Aspects of Christianity and The Social Law of Service. In March 1891 Rauschenbusch wrote to Ely thanking him for his balanced and daring book, An Introduction to Political Economy and commenting on the appalling conservatism of the churches.[105]

The Life of Walter Rauschenbusch and the Heritage of the
Social Gospel Movement in America

Walter Rauschenbusch was born at Rochester, New York, on October 4th, 1861. His parents were German immigrants to the United States of America. His father came from a long line of Lutheran pastors and was himself a Lutheran missionary to a German settlement along the Missouri. He was subsequently won over to Baptist views and in 1858 became a professor in the German department of Rochester Theological Seminary where he served for forty years.[105]

It can hardly be said that the younger Rauschenbusch's social interest developed out of his early training. He spent his childhood (June 1865 – July 1869) in Germany: first with his mother at Neuwied on the Rhine, a seat of the Herrnhüter Fraternity, a Moravian religious sect founded by Zinzendorf. He was reared in a pietistic German Baptist environment—"a religious home without any social insight or outlook".[107] He returned to the United States of America in 1869 where his formal education was completed.[108] It is possible that his father's excessive drinking influenced Walter's strong convictions about the evils of alcoholism and his support of the

temperance movement. His first experience of the conditions

of the working class came while he worked for a farmer in

Lycoming County in Pennsylvania. Rauschenbusch recalls

that as a happy experience; but he attributed his first oppo-

sition to long hours of oppressive work to the exhausting ex-

perience he had earning 25¢ for a day's work on a farm in New

York.[109]

In 1879 a conversion experience led to his baptism.

Though later his theological interpretation of his conversion

experience was liberalised, he said of it: "Such as it was,

it was of everlasting value to me. It turned me permanently,

and I thank God with all my heart for it. It was a tender,

mysterious experience. It influenced my soul down to the

depths. Yet there was a great deal in it that was not really

true."[110] The glow and power of a vital, vivid and personal

experience of the living God permeates all his writings. Yet

the theology and the gospel to which he turned immediately

after his conversion were individualistic with little or no

social interest.[111]

In 1879 he returned to Germany where he studied at the

Gymnasium of Gutersloh in Westphalia. He graduated in 1883

with first-class honours in classical studies. For a time he

travelled extensively in Germany and studied briefly at the

University of Berlin where he heard Mommsen and Curtius.

During this period, he was a diligent student of Art and had

contact with many artists, writers and economists. He had

now decided to enter the ministry though many urged him to

become a novelist and a wealthy uncle tried to induce him

to study law. On his return to the United States, he was

allowed simultaneously to complete his senior year at the

University of Rochester and to begin his studies at Rochester

Theological Seminary. While at Rochester University he came

under the influence of Professor Harrison E. Webster who

appears to have been the first to direct his attention to

the social sciences and to Henry George.[112] At the close

of his time at Rochester he wavered between the choice of a

teaching or preaching ministry. At this time also he was

rejected by his Church when he applied for a post in India

as President of the Telugu Theological Seminary at Ramapatnam.

Although other reasons were given at the time, it was known

that he was rejected because of his liberal views of the Old

Testament.[113] After a summer pastorate in 1884 in a small

German Baptist Church in Louisville, Kentucky, he decided to

become a pastor.

A letter to his friend Munson reveals an attitude which

bears striking similarity to the spirit of Maurice. It speaks

of the sense of unworthiness or humility and of the convic-
tion of Divine guidance.   Relating his success at Louisville,
Rauschenbusch wrote,

> How foolish I would be to attribute that to
> myself! This is beyond my faintest imaginings
> about my own powers; there is One behind me,
> I am but the instrument in his hand. ... It is
> now no longer my fond hope to be a learned
> theologian and write big books; I want to be
> a pastor, powerful with men, preaching to them
> Christ as the man in whom their affections and
> energies can find the satisfaction for which
> mankind is groaning.[114]

Other interesting aspects of Rauschenbusch's character
which find ready parallels in the character of Maurice emerge
from Rauschenbusch's diary at this time. Two particularly
arrest our attention: the concept of self-sacrifice and the
relationship of doctrine to life. Commenting on the second
request from the Louisville congregation in 1885 Rauschenbusch
wrote,

> I had a chance to do something for others
> and I believe true happiness is proportioned
> to the degree of unselfishness which enters
> into any act or state. Unselfishness and self-
> sacrifice seem to me the idea of Christ's life
> and therefore the expression of God's character.
> In proportion as they become the dominant facts
> of our life, are we conformed to his image.
> I tell you I am just beginning to believe in
> the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, not exactly
> in the shape in which the average person pro-
> claims it as the infallible truth of the Most
> High, but in a shape that suits my needs, that
> I have gradually constructed for myself in

> studying the person and teaching of Christ,
> and which is still in rapid progress of
> construction. I don't believe that believing
> any doctrine will do a man any good except so
> far as it is translated into life. I don't
> believe that when a man believes in the
> vicarious death of Christ that death will be
> imputed to him; how can it? But if he begins
> to live a Christian life, he will find that
> tho' there is no Cross for him to be nailed
> to, he will die piecemeal by self-sacrifice
> just as Christ did even before his crucifixion
> and then he is at one with Christ and placed
> by God into the same category.[115]

Rauschenbusch graduated from the University of Rochester
in 1884, from the German Department of the Theological Seminary
in 1885, and from the English department in 1886. In that year
he accepted his first pastorate as Minister of the Second German
Baptist Church in New York City, on the edge of one of the
city's worst slums known as Hell's Kitchen. He served there
from 1886 to 1897. He began his ministry of reconciliation in
the orthodox fashion of preaching and pastoring, intent on
saving souls and bringing them up in the holy faith of God.
He had no definite social program. In Hell's Kitchen he was
confronted with the pressing social problems of the time and
saw the terrible, inhuman effects of unemployment, poverty,
wretched housing, disease, crime and economic exploitation. His
thought underwent a gradual but profound change as he discovered
the ineptness of individualistic pietism in which he had been

schooled in dealing with the real needs of his parishioners.[116]

This experience led him further to the conviction that something was radically wrong with the capitalistic system. His analysis led him to reject the theory that industrial crises were part of the natural course of events in human life. They were inevitable in capitalism.[117]

He began to participate in social reform movements and to study progressive and socialist literature. He supported Henry George, author of <u>Progress and Poverty</u> and advocate of the single tax, in his campaign for mayor of New York in 1886. In <u>Christianizing the Social Order</u>, Rauschenbusch wrote: "I owe my first awakening to the world of social problems to the agitation of Henry George in 1886, and wish here to record my lifelong debt to this single-minded apostle of a great truth."[118] With Jacob Riis he sought to establish playgrounds and other social amenities for his slum dwelling parishioners.

During this period, he began to read widely in the literature of social analysis and reform and to participate in movements for social betterment. He began his search for a principle which would unify the individual and social aspects of the Gospel. This he found in the concept of the Kingdom of God.[119]

In 1889 Elizabeth Post, J.E. Raymond, Leighton Williams and Rauschenbusch founded For the Right,[120] a paper for the working people. It was published monthly from 1889-1891. In the second issue its purpose was defined:

> This paper is published in the interests of the working people of New York city. It proposes to discuss from the standpoint of Christian socialism, such questions as engage their attention and affect their life. This paper is not the organ of any party or association whatever. Nor has it any new theories to propound. Its aim is to reflect in its pages the needs, the aspirations, the longings of the tens of thousands of wage-earners who are sighing for better things, and to point out, if possible, not only the wrongs men suffer, but the methods by which these wrongs may be removed. The editors . . . [are] animated solely by the hope that their efforts may aid the advancement of that kingdom in which Wrong shall have no place, but Right shall reign for ever more.[121]

Editorially in the same issue the paper read: "We desire to make this paper a 'people's paper': one that shall express their best sentiments, their highest thoughts, their truest aspiration, and their sincerest opinions on all matters of a practical, social, literary, or religious significance."[122] Another issue denied their intention to reform society but affirmed their hope to point out the wrongs men suffer and the methods by which these wrongs may be righted, to encourage the toiler, and prove to men that there is a spirit in the world which is not of the devil.[123]

Rauschenbusch wrote on economic and industrial issues, politics, socialism, state insurance, separation of Church and State, religion, society and the individual, and the Kingdom of God. In April 1890, For the Right set out its Declaration of Principles for the Christian Socialist Society of New York City.[124] Rauschenbusch's conviction that personal regeneration and social reform must go hand in hand is reflected in the issues of the pamphlet.[125] The editors held three articles of religious faith: The existence of God, the atonement of Jesus, and the unity of the human race. Upon the first they based their hope of the world's future happiness, upon the second they rested their assurance of the ultimate victory over sin, and the third is the ground of their expectation for the era of human brotherhood.[126]

During this period, in addition to his duties as pastor and as editor of For the Right, Rauschenbusch prepared several German editions of gospel hymns, edited Der Jugend Herold, wrote a Christian study course on Das Leben Jesu, wrote frequently for The Sunday School Times, The Examiner, and The Inquirer; and spoke frequently at important gatherings. In February 1892, at a meeting in Philadelphia, he was appointed Secretary of the Baptist Congress. He also gave support in newspaper articles to the Populist Party.

These were also years of controversy. The most signif-
icant one was in 1886 when Rauschenbusch defended Dr. Nathaniel
Schmidt who had been dismissed from Hamilton Theological
Seminary for his acceptance of higher criticism. Rauschenbusch
found himself in great despair over his inability to defend
his other close associate, Leighton Williams, in yet another
denominational dispute. Other controversies included: "the
flaunting of wealth in New York"; on the question of baptism,
with the editor of the Chicago Gegenwart; on the "the right
to strike" with the Reverend A.J. Behrends, pastor of a wealthy
church in New York and a representative of the conservative
emphasis in social Christianity; and a controversy in The
Examiner on Millenarianism.[127]

Rauschenbusch became partially deaf in 1888 as the
result of a serious illness. In 1891 he travelled to Europe
and studied European socialism and social movements in gen-
eral. He was particularly interested in the British Co-
operative movement and studied it in the home of Sidney and
Beatrice Webb, the English leaders of Fabian socialism.
German theology, sociology and economics continued to attract
him. He saw the British and German Democratic Socialist move-
ments as closely tied to co-operatives in their idealistic
pre-war days and was eager to use that idealism and power in

support of his own ideas of a more Christian Commonwealth.
At this time also he was greatly impressed with the work
of General Booth and the Salvation Army though later he
regarded their relief work as dealing superficially with
the social problem.[128]

This period marked a decisive turn in the thought of
Rauschenbusch. From this point his theology grew more lib-
eral, he adopted critical approaches to the Bible and to the
history of Christianity, and identified himself with the
names of Schleiermacher, Bushnell, Ritschl, Wellhausen and
Harnack. His work reflected the romantic, monistic idealism
that pervaded much of liberal theology. He had a passion for
unity, and sought to establish a coherent relation between
religion and science, faith and history, Christianity and
secular culture, theology and sociology. The Kingdom of God
became for him the unifying force which would bind all things
together.[129]

On his return to New York in 1891 Rauschenbusch became
an influential leader in the developing social gospel move-
ment. He made speeches and wrote articles on social issues
and frequently presented papers on ethical and economic issues
to the Baptist Congress. Early in 1892 he joined forces with

other Baptist ministers--Leighton Williams, Nathaniel Schmidt, Samuel Batten, George Dana, Boardman Williams, Newton Clarke-- in the formation of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom. The purpose of this organisation was to "permeate modern social movements with the social ideal, and to attempt this by emphasizing Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom of God, the central idea of the Gospel."[130] Local chapters of the Brotherhood were established at Boston, Los Angeles, Rochester and other places. Though small in numbers the Brotherhood became the crucible in which some of the most significant concepts of social Christianity were fused. It was the vanguard movement within the Baptist Church in the application of these principles to the everyday affairs of life. Here Rauschenbusch was the central figure; he found support for his views among these kindred spirits "who were all passing through the same molting process."[131] They all opposed "the unsocial Christians and the unchristian Socialists" and in return were feared and hated by both.[132]

In 1897 the Brotherhood supported the great coal strike with a resolution of sympathy for the strikers which was moved by Rauschenbusch. Generally he supported the aims of the Trade Union movement and foresaw trouble ahead unless the injustices against which it protested were corrected. He claimed

that the Brotherhood had accomplished much: it had helped
to bring to the forefront of Christian thought in the United
States of America the need for Christian Union, the his-
torical study of the Bible, purer politics, abolition of
privilege and the rights of the people against corporations,
Christian Socialism (though not unanimously) and the pre-
eminence of the Kingdom of God in Christian thought.
"Thereby . . . [it] tended to substitute a power, more
ethical, more synoptic or a more Christian type of doctrine
for the old 'scheme' of salvation, and all theology is drift-
ing that way."[133]

In 1897 the German department of the Rochester Theo-
logical Seminary appointed him Professor of New Testament
interpretation, natural sciences and civil government; he
added English and other subjects. In 1901 he published a
biography of his father, Das Leben von Augustus Rauschenbusch,
and in 1902, Die Politische Verfassung Unseres Landes. In
1902 he accepted the chair of Church History in Rochester Theo-
logical Seminary (now Colgate-Rochester Divinity School).
We may note that Rauschenbusch was more fortunate than Maurice
in at least one respect: the President of Rochester Seminary,
Dr. A.H. Strong, staunchly defended Rauschenbusch throughout
his career, especially during the stormy days when he was

under fire from the fundamentalists and some members of the
board of trustees.[134]

A minor detail which would interest Canadians is that
in 1909 the Rauschenbusch family acquired land near Sturgeon
Lake, Bobcaygeon, in Ontario where the family spent the sum-
mers until the outbreak of World War I in 1914. It was at
Canandaigua Lake that Christianity and the Social Crisis was
finally completed. Dores Sharpe speaks of the Canadian sum-
mers as days of an idyllic existence. In fact the years be-
tween 1907 and 1914 were said to be the happiest years of
Rauschenbusch's life. He enjoyed "security, an usually
harmonious family life, a wide audience, national and inter-
national fame."[135]

The publication of Christianity and the Social Crisis
in 1907 established him as the recognized leader of the
social gospel movement. From this time onward he travelled
extensively across the United States in response to requests
for lectures. His second book, For God and the People:
Prayers of the Social Awakening, appeared in 1910. This book
of prayers tells much of his tenderness, love, sympathy and
understanding as well as of his conviction that the social
gospel needed to be grounded in religion and that the new

type of religious experience ought to find conscious social

expression. <u>Christianizing the Social Order</u> was published

in 1912; <u>Unto Me</u> in 1912, <u>Dare We Be Christians?</u> in 1914,

<u>A Theology For the Social Gospel</u> in 1917. Other works

appeared in German and he also wrote the section on the United

States in Krugen's <u>Church History</u>.[136]

Among the lectures he delivered the most notable were:

the Earl Lectures at the Pacific School of Religion in 1910;

the Merrick Lectures at Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware,

Ohio, 1911; "The Minister and the Social Crisis," a lecture

at Yale Divinity School in 1911; the Gates Lectures at

Grinnell College, in 1914 and the Taylor Lectures at Yale

Divinity School in 1917.[137]

In 1908, Rauschenbusch joined with other leading

citizens in organizing the "People's Sunday Evenings" in

Rochester. This organisation held public forum meetings in

the National Theatre which were intended for the great mass

of thinking people who had lost touch with the Church. It

also served as a clearing house for the unemployed and a

personal service bureau for those in need of help and those

troubled with religious doubt. Rauschenbusch always had a

real interest in left-wing movements provided they were

serving the higher interests of humanity. As we noted earlier, he was very enthusiastic about the co-operative movement. He remained a life-long foe of the liquor trade and because he saw it as the special enemy of the working man he continually spoke against it.

In the present period of social strife in America one finds it difficult to understand why the oppression of black people in America received so little attention from Rauschenbusch and from exponents of the social gospel generally. After a visit to the South, Rauschenbusch admitted that for years the problem of the two races in the South seemed to him so tragic and so insoluble that he had never ventured to discuss it in public. His own convictions, however, are affirmed today by advocates of black dignity. He said,

> . . . no solution will satisfy the Christian
> spirit of our united nation which does not
> provide for the progressive awakening of hope
> and self-respect in the individual Negro and
> the awakening of race pride and race ambition
> in all Negro communities. ... However great
> the practical difficulties may be, the Chris-
> tian way out is to take our belated black
> brother by the hand and urge him along the
> road of steady and intelligent labour, of
> property rights, of family fidelity, of hope
> and self confidence, and of pride and joy in
> his race achievements.[138]

World War I demands our attention, not only because of its effects on Walter Rauschenbusch but also because for many

it marked the decline of the social gospel movement itself.

As an American of German parentage the war brought severe

emotional anguish to Rauschenbusch. He was accused of being

pro-German and disloyal to America. The war itself filled

him with uncertainties, especially for the future of social

Christianity, and for the whole future of civilisation it-

self. There has been considerable discussion as to whether

Rauschenbusch was a pacifist or not. It seems clear that his

views on war as on many other social issues underwent consider-

able development and clarification between 1898 and 1910. By

the latter year he was against most wars though he still

approved the use of force as the _ultima ratio_.[139]

Between 1914 - 1918, Rauschenbusch was probably more

sympathetic to Germany and more critical of Britain than may

have been judicious at that time.[140] With Dr. Charles F.

Aked, he denounced America's munition traffic in a manifesto

entitled "Private Profit and the Nation's Honor: A Protest

and a Plea".[141] His opposition to America's "preparedness"

for war and his advocacy of non-intervention confirmed suspi-

cions of his disloyalty and popular antagonism grew against

him in America and Canada. Towards the close of the war his

utterances grew increasingly pacifist in tone. He then joined

the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist organization

founded in England.

In spite of his German sympathies and his attempts

at impartiality, Rauschenbusch was an American, not in senti-

ment alone, but one who took American democratic principles

very seriously and who used his life to inculcate and spread

them in America and Europe.[142] His social point of view was

very far removed from the autocratic, imperialistic and

militaristic philosophy evidenced in Germany. He was not sure

that a victory for the allies would, of itself, free the world

from imperialism.[143] History proved him right. The hostility

of friends and foes alike towards his views between 1914-1918

hurt him as deeply as the war itself. He died of cancer on

July 25th, 1918.

In summary, then, there was a developing awareness of

social responsibility among the Protestant Churches in America

between 1870 and 1918. It was primarily an indigenous re-

sponse composed of various currents of Christian social thought

frequently intermingling one with another. But British in-

fluences were always present, and as exemplified in Herron,

Ely and Rauschenbusch, German and French influences were also

present in the later stages. Rauschenbusch came at the climax of the movement and made use of its insights and drew on several streams within it as he sought to apply his understanding of Christianity to the society of his time. [144]

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1.   Robert T. Handy, ed., <u>The Social Gospel In America</u>
<u>1870-1920: Gladden, Ely, Rauschenbusch</u>, A Library
of Protestant Thought (New York: Oxford University
Press, 1966), p. 262; see also Waldo Beach and H.
Richard Niebuhr, eds., <u>Christian Ethics: Sources</u>
<u>of the Living Tradition</u> (New York: The Ronald
Press Company, 1955), p. 446.

2.   Henry F. May, <u>Protestant Churches and Industrial</u>
<u>America</u>, with a new introduction by the author,
(New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row,
Publishers, 1967), p. 264.

3.   Carl Rauschenbusch migrated to America to minister
to such German immigrants. See <u>infra</u>, p. 156.

4.   Dores Robinson Sharpe, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 3-4.

5.   Charles Howard Hopkins, <u>The Rise of the Social</u>
<u>Gospel in American Protestantism: 1865-1915</u>
(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 14-15.
See also May, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 80-87.

6.   Cf. Aaron Ignatius Abell, <u>The Urban Impact on</u>
<u>American Protestantism 1865-1900</u> (Hamden:
Archon, 1962), p. 4.

7.   May, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 73-79.

8.   Hopkins, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 14, 18-20.

9.   H. Richard Niebuhr, <u>The Kingdom of God in America</u>
(Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1937),
ch. iv.

10.   Hopkins, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 14, 20-22.

11.   James Freeman Clarke, <u>Orthodoxy: Its Truths and</u>
<u>Errors</u> (Boston: 1866), p. 402, quoted in Hopkins,
<u>op. cit</u>., p. 22.

12. May, op. cit., p. 152.

13. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 23. See Maurice, Life, Vol. II, pp. 511-512 for comment on Seeley's work. It reveals Maurice's distaste for the critical methods employed by Renan and Seeley.

14. May, op. cit., p. 150.

15. Herron is a good example; infra, p. 138.

16. Henry George, Progress and Poverty, An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want With Increase of Wealth: The Remedy (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, MCMXIV), p. 280.

17. Ibid., p. 293.

18. Ibid., p. 326.

19. Ibid., p. 406.

20. Bliss owed much to Bellamy: see May, op. cit., p. 242; Bellamy's influence was also very strong in the Christian Commonwealth Colony in Georgia. See James Dombrowski, The Early Days of Christian Socialism in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), pp. 133, 147.

21. Handy, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

22. Sharpe's comments apply to the later stages of the development, more especially to "Progressive Social Christianity."

23. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 7-8; see also Walter Rauschenbusch, "Dogmatic and Practical Socialism," unpublished Address given at Rochester before the Labour Lyceum on February 24, 1901, cited in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 203-216; Walter Rauschenbusch, Social Order, pp. 394-405, passim.

24. There has been some dispute as to whether the primary causes which lie behind the growth of social concern within the Protestant Churches in America were social or theological. May provides a balanced statement in his "Introduction to the Torchbook Edition," op. cit., p. x, "The movement of Protestant spokesmen from social complacency to social concern was immediately brought about by reaction to social crisis. The nature of this reaction was determined in part by the new theological tendencies and the whole intellectual climate of which these were a part."

25. May, op. cit., p. 110.

26. Handy, op. cit., p. 9.

27. May, op. cit., p. 264.

28. Roswell D. Hitchcock, Socialism (rev. ed., New York, 1879) cited in May, op. cit., p. 166.

29. Joseph P. Thompson, The Workman: His False Friends and True Friends (pamphlet, New York, 1879) cited in May, op. cit., p. 166.

30. A.J.H. Behrends, Socialism and Christianity (New York, 1886), cited in May, op. cit., p. 166.

31. May, op. cit., p. 168.

32. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 40.

33. Ibid., pp. 74-75.

34. Ibid., p. 31.

35. Ibid., p. 42, Hopkins compares Cook to Gladden. See infra, p. 151.

36. The Canadian Minister of Labour (December 31, 1971) said that job security would be Labour's chief concern in the year 1972.

37. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 42.

38. May, op. cit., pp. 235-262.

39. Ibid., p. 237.

40. Ibid., p. 259; Hopkins, op. cit., pp. 179, 196.
     Dombrowski, op. cit., pp. 121-131.

41. See Hopkins, op. cit., p. 87.

42. See May, op. cit., pp. 247-249 for a full description
     of the Labour Church at Lynn. Hopkins writes also
     of The Labour Church in New York started by Charles
     Stelzle in 1910. See pp. 87, 283.

43. "In many respects the most remarkable organization
     in the half century of social Christianity's
     growth, with the exception of the Federal Council
     of Churches, was the Church Association for the
     Advancement of the Interests of Labor. This
     Episcopal society not only typified the advanced
     social thought of that communion but was a
     specific example of the transfer of British exper-
     ience to America through the medium of Anglican
     influence." Hopkins, op. cit., pp. 150-151.

44. May, op. cit., pp. 239-241; Vida D. Scudder,
     Father Huntington (New York: E.P. Dutton and
     Company, Inc., 1940), pp. 169-174.

45. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 173, n. 5.

46. "The Nationalist movement was the popular follow-
     ing attracted by Edward Bellamy's utopian novel,
     Looking Backward 2000-1887 ..." Hopkins, op. cit.,
     p. 173.

47. Hopkins, op. cit., p.175, no. 9. The Dawn, I,
     No. 1 (May 15, 1889). "The Declaration ... may be
     found in the 1897 edition of the Encyclopedia of
     Social Reform, p. 258; in Ely, Socialism (New
     York and Boston, 1894); Appendix VII; and in
     Dombrowski, op. cit., pp. 99-100."

48. "Though it [The Dawn] always maintained that strikes could never achieve labor's aims by themselves, it heartily supported most of the principal strikes of its day, including those at Homestead and Pullman:" May, op. cit., p. 245.

49. Besides Bliss, the associate editors were O.P. Gifford, P.W. Sprague, Hamlin Garland, Edward Bellamy, R.H. Newton, J.O.S. Huntington and Miss Frances Willard. Contributors included Daniel DeLeon, George Herron, Washington Gladden, Edward W. Bemis and Albion W. Small. See Hopkins, op. cit., p. 176 for further information on the social views of Bliss and The Dawn.

50. Cf. Walter Rauschenbusch, Social Order, Part V, chs. I-VII. See May, op. cit., p. 243, "[Bliss's] Christian Socialism was actually socialism and not just reform, but it was gradualist and political in its methods." Cf. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 180. These descriptions of Bliss in May and Hopkins would apply equally to Rauschenbusch. Hopkins recognized the similarity between Bliss and Rauschenbusch though he says Rauschenbusch was not a "party man in the sense in which Bliss and Herron supported the political Socialist movement." pp. 226-227. See also pp. 218, 243. There are in fact many similarities between the writings of Herron and Rauschenbusch. How do we account for the similarities between the thought of Bliss and Herron and that of Rauschenbusch? The interesting fact is that these radical social- ists, Bliss and Herron, were influenced by the writings of F.D. Maurice. There may well be an indirect influence of Maurice's thought in the writings of Rauschenbusch. Handy writes, "Rauschenbusch's mature position also showed the influence of the transformationists who envisioned the turning of man and his culture from man- centeredness to Christ-centeredness ... Trans- formationist ideas were expressed in the writings of such men as F.D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley ... to all of whom Rauschenbusch made reference

in his own work. Yet he drew upon them in a free and often quite original way." Op. cit., pp. 260-261. In support of this view, Handy cites Donovan E. Smucker, "The origins of Walter Rauschenbusch's Social Ethics," typed Ph.D. thesis, (University of Chicago, June 1957), and "Multiple Motifs in the Thoughts of Rauschenbusch: A Study in the Origins of the Social Gospel," Encounter, XIX (1958), 14-20.

51. Cf. Walter Rauschenbusch, Social Order, Part VI, chs. III and IV.

52. May, op. cit., p. 242.

53. See Hopkins, op. cit., pp.165-168.

54. Ibid., p. 179.

55. May describes the Encyclopedia of Social Reform (New York, 1897) as an important contribution to American social science, p. 242.

56. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 259.

57. Ibid., ch. XI; May, op. cit., pp. 249-256; Dombrowski, op. cit., ch. XIII.

58. Dowbrowski, op. cit., p. 191.

59. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 185.

60. George D. Herron, "The Social System and the Christian Conscience," The Kingdom, August 25, 1898, quoted in Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 181.

61. Herron, Social Meanings of Religious Experience (New York, 1896), pp. 69-70, quoted in Dombrowski, op. cit., pp. 181-182.

62. Herron, The Larger Christ, p. 65, quoted in Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 185.

63. Herron, "The Social System and the Christian Conscience," The Kingdom, August 25, 1898, quoted in Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 183.

64. Ibid.

65. Herron, A Plea for the Gospel, (New York, 1892), p. 41, quoted in Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 186.

66. Infra, p. 153.

67. See May, op. cit., pp. 253-256. Hopkins, op. cit., pp. 194-195.

68. Infra, p. 151.

69. Ralph Henry Gabriel, The Course of American Democratic Thought: An Intellectual History Since 1815 (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940), pp. 320-324.

70. Herron, A Plea for the Gospel, p. vi, quoted in Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 183.

71. Infra, n. 92. Washington Gladden - socialized individual.

72. Charles M. Sheldon, In His Steps: "What Would Jesus do?" (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, n.d.), p. 301, quoted in Gabriel, op. cit., p. 322.

73. See Dombrowski, op. cit., ch. XII.

74. Hopkins, op. cit., p. 195. Keir Hardie (1856-1916), a Congregationalist, a Christian Socialist and a prominent member of the British Labour Party, was a friend of the colony, and two Christian Socialists from England, Mr. and Mrs. Franks, joined the Commonwealth group. See Dombrowski, op. cit., p. 143.

75. See Hopkins, op. cit., pp. 196-197, citing Shailer Mathews, The Social Gospel (Philadelphia, 1910).

76. May, _op. cit._, pp.170-181; Handy, _op. cit._, pp. 3-16.

77. Handy, _op. cit._, p. 15.

78. _Ibid._, pp. 12-13. See also Beach and Niebuhr, _op. cit._, p. 446.

79. Theodore T. Munger, _The Freedom of Faith_ (14th ed., Boston, 1886), quoted in Handy, _op. cit._, p. 7.

80. "Progressive Orthodoxy: A Contribution to the Christian Interpretation of Christian Doctrines," _The Andover Review_ (Boston, 1886), pp. 5, 7, 13, quoted in Handy, _op. cit._, pp. 7-8.

81. Handy, _op. cit._, p. 14.

82. _Ibid._, pp. 7-8.

83. Henry P. Van Dusen, _The Vindication of Liberal Theology: A Tract for the Times_ (New York: 1963), p. 22, quoted in Hendy, _op. cit._, p. 8.

84. See Handy, _op. cit._, p. 8.

85. _Ibid._, p. 10.

86. _Ibid._, pp. 7, 32.

87. _Ibid._, pp. 12, 173.

88. F.W. Robertson was an English preacher of international fame. Cf. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 512-516. Maurice had a high regard for Robertson, though he wrote: "in questions of doctrine, we should never probably have understood each other." p. 516.

89. Gabriel, _op. cit._, p. 312.

90. Gladden, _Christianity and Socialism_, (New York, 1905), pp. 126-127, quoted in Handy, _op. cit._, p. 28, n. 29.

91. See Handy, op. cit., p. 31, re. Gladden's optimism regarding the Church.

92. Gabriel, op. cit., p. 314. "Individualism unmodified, affirmed Gladden, creates a society which is like a pile of sand ... Socialism ... creates a society which is like a liquid solution ... Gladden found the mean between the two extremes in the formula of the Socialized individual."

93. Gladden, Present Day Theology (Columbus, 1913), p. 30; The Interpreter (Boston, 1918), pp. 267-268, quoted in Handy, op. cit., pp. 26, 32.

94. Gladden, Social Facts and Forces (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1897), p. 220, quoted in Gabriel, op. cit., p. 314. Cf. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 32.

95. Richard T. Ely, French and German Socialism in Modern Times (New York, 1883), p. 187, quoted in Handy, op. cit., p.175.

96. Ely, The Labour Movement in America (New York, 1886), pp. 311-313, quoted in Handy, op. cit., p. 176.

97. Ely, Ground Under Our Feet: An Autobiography. (New York, 1938), p. 72, quoted in Handy, op. cit., p.176.

98. John R. Everett, Religion in Economics: A Study of John Bates Clark, Richard T. Ely, Simon N. Patten (New York, 1946), p. 97, quoted in Handy, op. cit., p. 176.

99. Ely, The Labour Movement in America, p. 332, quoted in Handy, op. cit., p. 178.

100. Ely, The Labour Movement in America, pp. 325-326, quoted in Handy, op. cit., p.178.

101. See Ely's essay, "Social Solidarity," in _The Social Law of Society_ (New York, 1896), reprinted in Handy, _op.cit._, pp. 235-241.

102. Handy, _op. cit._, p. 178. The quotation (n.100 _supra_) is similar to many in F.D. Maurice, _Life_, Vols. I and II as well as _The Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II. Ely had been influenced by men who belonged to the Maurician tradition. See Handy, _op. cit._, p. 178, nn. 19 and 21. Ely provides another link between Maurice and Rauschenbusch, _infra_. p. 178 n. 50.

103. Handy, _op. cit._, p. 180.

104. _Supra_, p. 136,   Ely and Bliss in the Christian Social Union. See also _supra_, p. 139,   Ely, Herron and Gladden were founders of the American Institute of Christian Sociology. See Hopkins, _op. cit._, pp. 164-165.

105. Ely Papers, Box 6, quoted in Handy, _op. cit._, p. 183.

106. Sharpe, _op. cit._, pp. 13-23.

107. _Ibid._, p. 194.

108. _Ibid._, pp. 23-40.

109. _Ibid._, p. 40.

110. _Ibid._, p. 43.

111. _Ibid._, p. 243.

112. _Ibid._, p. 195.

113. _Ibid._, p. 58.

114. Walter Rauschenbusch, "Diary" May 30, 1885, quoted in Sharpe, _op. cit._, p. 54.

115. _Ibid._, Sharpe, p. 55.

116. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 58-79.

117. Walter Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, p. 238.

118. Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 394.

119. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 62.

120. Supra, p. 135; infra, p. 166. Leighton Williams was a member of the C.S.S. in New York and provides a link between Rauschenbusch and Bliss.

121. For the Right, Vol. I, No. 2 (November, 1889), quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., p. 86.

122. Ibid.

123. Ibid., Vol. I, No. 3 (December, 1889), quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., p. 87.

124. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 88, 91-92. Supra, n. 120.

125. Cf. Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, pp. 460-463.

126. For the Right, Vol. I, No. 10 (July, 1890), quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., p. 96.

127. See Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 98-115 passim. Behrends, supra, p. 127.

128. Ibid., p. 427.

129. Cf. Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 93.

130. Walter Rauschenbusch: Letter quoted Sharpe, op. cit., p. 117. See also Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 94, and A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York: Abingdon Press, 1945) (Hereinafter referred to as Theology), p. 131.

131. Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 94.

132. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 125. Cf. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 35.

133. Walter Rauschenbusch, "Letter sent to the 1907 Marlboro Conference," quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 137-138.

134. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 142-156. Cf. Maurice, Life, Vol. II, pp. 176, 188-194.

135. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 74.

136. Ibid., p. 157.

137. The Earl and Merrick Lectures formed the nucleus of Christianizing the Social Order. See pp. VII-VIII of that work. The Taylor Lectures appeared in elaborated form in A Theology for the Social Gospel. See its "Foreword."

138. Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Belated Races and the Social Problem," American Missionary Association, quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 166-167.

139. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 356-366.

140. See "Be Fair to Germany. A Plea for Openmindedness," Congregationalist, (October, 1914), quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 369-371.

141. Published July, 1915, quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 373-374.

142. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 377.

143. Walter Rauschenbusch, Letter to Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin, May 1, 1918, quoted in Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 385-388.

144. I have indicated but not examined closely Rauschenbusch's engagement in social reform movements. For greater detail of his civic action in his first pastorate in New York and later at Rochester, his participation in the publication of For The Right, and his leadership of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom which among other things gave support to the aims of the Trade Union Movement, see Sharpe, op.cit., pp.86-96, 137-138; Hopkins, op.cit., pp. 214-219; A. Abell; op.cit., pp.114-115.

CHAPTER IV

THE TWO MEN AND THEIR METHODS OF APPROACH

Their Styles of Writing

In coming to the study of the thought of Maurice and
Rauschenbusch, a preliminary statement must be made about
their respective styles in writing, each man's concept of
his own vocation, and his method of approach.

Maurice's works make difficult reading. After a
first reading of The Kingdom of Christ, it is easy to
understand why his writing has been described as "misty and
confused, intricate, bewildering, obscure, mystifying,
vague, tedious and repetitive."[1] "Confused" is perhaps the
only inappropriate adjective here. He may leave us confused
as to his meaning but he himself is careful, methodical and
logical and above all cautious.[2] Nearly every sentence has
so many qualifying clauses that the reader must wade through
a welter of words to arrive at the meaning. Nonetheless,
when the principles which he lays down are discerned, they

are profound and comprehensive and express essential truths
about human society; even if one must also add that they
almost always come to us as hints in shadowy, negative and
sinewy terms.[3]

Another difficulty which we encounter is that of
attempting to find some kind of coherent system in Maurice's
thought.[4] This difficulty arises for two reasons. The first
and most obvious is that after pages of examination of the
theories of his contemporaries, Maurice suddenly expresses
in a single, intricately worded paragraph his own thought
about God and about human society. The second reason is
allied to this: all his thought forms a single whole.
Maurice never speaks of man, or sin, or competition, or
socialism or democracy save in reference to God and the
Divine Order.

A brief comment should also be made of certain
paradoxes and contradictions which are evident in his
writings. Maurice is almost always both denunciatory and
conciliatory towards those with whom he is in dialogue:
always he is seeking to discern and to be respectful of the
truths his opponents expound yet always conscious of the
"falsehoods" they maintain. This readiness to recognize

valid principles in every system may account for the apparent eclecticism in his thought.[5] Another contradiction is his humility and diffidence about his own opinions combined with an almost arrogant confidence and tenacity in upholding principles which he believed God had revealed to men.[6] His initial unwillingness to undertake the responsibility of leadership followed by firm and determined leadership when once that responsibility had been thrust upon him is part of the same apparent contradiction.[7]

In contrast to Maurice, Rauschenbusch's clarity, lucidity, directness in application of principles to the social situation in which he found himself, simplicity in language and expression, and his use of graphic illustrations are very refreshing. At first one is led by the simplicity of his presentation to regard him as less profound than Maurice: yet further contemplation of the principles he expounded reveals that his mind is no less penetrating.

We spoke of Maurice as methodical and logical but involved. Rauschenbusch is no less methodical and logical but in a different way. The development of his arguments is easy to follow and the arrangement of his material is easily classified. His thought is as theocratically oriented as

Maurice's but he treats various aspects of an idea in a
logical order.

Maurice sought to be a peacemaker with all men.[8] His
writings were not always conducive to harmony even where one
can detect his longing for the reconciling spirit and his
penitence over his failures. Rauschenbusch was also aware
that his utterances would give men the choice of social
repentance or the bitterness of moral resentment but his
writings appear to be more eirenic than Maurice's. He was
more sensitive to man's apprehensiveness concerning new
truths. He said that he wrote "with malice toward none and
with charity for all".[9] This spirit is very evident in his
works, coupled as it is with a sympathy for wrongdoers and
with their tendency to entrench themselves in order to save
their self respect.[10]

Their Concepts of Their Respective Vocations

We have seen Maurice clearly as a theologian, an
educator, a pastor who almost against his will became
involved in social, political and economic upheavals. With
Rauschenbusch our task is not as simple. We are dealing

with a pastor and university professor who was filled with a
passionate zeal for social righteousness and who was
continually striving to discover and articulate an adequate
theological basis for the reconstruction of society.[11] It
is highly doubtful that Maurice would have applied the term
"Christian" to any social structure or to any human organiza-
tion. Nor would he have spoken of social reconstruction as
Rauschenbusch frequently did. In Rauschenbusch's writings
the question frequently arises whether we are reading the
words of a sociologist, or a radical social reformer, or a
Church historian, or to a lesser degree, a Biblical scholar.

But how did each man conceive of his vocation?
Greater access to the personal letters of Maurice no doubt
accounts for the fact that we have a clearer picture of
Maurice's own conviction about his vocation than we have of
Rauschenbusch's.[12]

Though Maurice repeatedly emphasized his vocation as
a theologian, he had misgivings about using that title
because, according to his own deep convictions, theology was
not (as the schoolmen represented) the climax of all studies
but the foundation upon which they all stand. Further he
felt that even that language would be easily misunderstood

unless the name God replaced the name theology, that is,

"God Himself is the root from which all human life, and human

society, and ultimately through man, nature itself are

derived."[13]

We have observed in Maurice that keen, almost morbid

sense of his own inadequacy. Another aspect of this

diffidence coupled with compulsion is evident in his fear of

undertaking tasks to which he believed himself called by God.

He wrote:

> Sometimes I do feel it very strongly and
> begin to gird myself to the work; and then
> comes a shame over me as if I had no
> business to think that I was born to set
> things right. But the fact is . . . one
> must speak, in spite of diffidence, despair,
> and the devils outside and within one.[14]

Here humility is combined with a deep feeling of dependence

upon God and a willingness to be used as God's intelligent

instrument.[15] In other words, Maurice felt compelled to

speak in God's Name.

> . . . if God has provided me with a witness
> that there is a ground of fellowship and
> comprehension, can I hold my tongue and not
> say so [lest I offend] . . . My vocation is
> with the discontented, wearied, hopeless,
> with all that are in debt and disgrace,
> with outcasts and ragamuffins in the
> different bodies.[16]

He believed that he was sent into the world to persuade men

to recognize Christ as the centre of their fellowship with each other, so that they might be united in their families, their country, and as men, not in schools and factions.[17] That is the keynote to an understanding of Maurice's interpretation of his vocation.[18]

He wished to furnish men with a _test_ by which they would try the worth of everything. Maurice's meaning of the word "test" is important. For him it had a Platonic sense. It meant a standard against which to view and overcome the fearful slavery to opinions, journals, systems, parties into which people had fallen. He saw himself as a man of War against all parties.[19] He said that his only desire was to hasten the impending end of the rotten sectarian system of mutual hatred and suspicion in all areas of life. He believed he could do this by showing people that there is a "Rock" (God and the Divine Order) upon which they could and should stand.[20] He wrote that his business was to "treat" all passing occasions in the light of that principle. He endeavoured in his writings to help men to feel that there is an eternal connection between history and mystery; to fix in their hearts that Christianity as expressed in sacraments, the written word, and an apostolic

ministry, belongs to every country and every age and enables
men to feel and know that which is eternal and unchangeable.[21]

It is crucial to an understanding of Maurice's
concept of social reformation to recognize that throughout
his life he was an inquirer who sought to discern the
principles of the Divine Order and to examine the existing
order to determine which elements in it were eternally
valid and which "false".[22] The following quotation
illustrates this search and demonstrates also that he did
not equate any existing order with that Divine Order:[23]

> . . . my business, because I am a
> theologian, and have no vocation except
> for theology, is not to build, but to dig,
> to show that economy and politics . . .
> must have a ground beneath themselves,
> that society is not to be made anew by
> arrangements of ours, but is to be re-
> generated by finding the law and ground
> of its order and harmony the only secret
> of its existence in God. ... The Kingdom
> of Heaven is to me the great practical
> existing reality which is to renew the
> earth and make it a habitation for blessed
> spirits instead of demons.
>
> To preach the Gospel of that Kingdom, the
> fact that it is among us, and not to be
> set up at all, is my calling and business
> . . . by proclaiming society and humanity
> to be divine realities, as they stand,
> not as they may become, and by calling
> upon priests, kings, prophets of the world
> to answer for their sin in having made
> them unreal by separating them from the
> living and eternal God who has established
> them in Christ for His glory.[24]

Maurice had a strong sense of vocation to be a church reformer and to link Church reformation with social reformation. As we have seen he believed he could do this by joining with earnest men, as friends not as allies, who were agents of social change. This is again one of the keys to understanding Maurice. He was not a social activist. Though he had "no vocation except for Theology" he hoped that the practical application, by men fitted for that task, of the principles which he himself unearthed would meet the needs of "suffering, discontented, resolute men" thereby showing that these principles are founded on God's will and are not merely human notions.[25] We should also notice his emphasis on each man's responsibility to fulfil his own unique vocation.[26]

Rauschenbusch on the other hand said he was not a theologian--neither by professional training nor by personal habits of mind. He said, "Professional duty and intellectual liking have made me a teacher of Church History, and events of my life, interpreted by my religious experiences, have laid the social problems on my mind."[27] He believed that the social revolution which swept across Europe as a result of the Industrial Revolution had reached his country in his own lifetime, and he conceived it as his duty and that of every Christian to try to grasp and to explain to others the causes of

the crisis of their time and to awaken the conscience of Christians into applying the Christian spirit and teaching to all economic and intellectual questions. In the Introduction to Christianity and the Social Crisis, he said he had written that book "to discharge a debt" to the working people on the West Side of New York City, to ease the pressure which bore them down and to increase the forces that would uplift them. "I shared their life as well as I then knew . . . In recent years my work has been turned into other channels, but I have never ceased to feel that I owe help to the plain people who were my friends."[28]

The consciousness of personal inadequacy is not as obvious in Rauschenbusch's writings as in Maurice's but his feeling of dependence upon God and of his own vocation under God are no less evident. In the Foreword to Christianizing the Social Order, Rauschenbusch wrote,

> When Christianity and the Social Crisis was published in 1907, I thought I had said all that God had given me to say on social problems, and might henceforth with a clear conscience leave that line of work to those who carry less handicap than I do.[29]

This was not to be the case. He returned from Europe, where he had devoted himself to historical studies to find himself "caught up in the tail of the storm" of social awakening in

America and was drawn, in spite of his own inclinations, into
public discussions of social questions.[30]

> Naturally my mind worked on problems which
> had been raised in my book, but had not really
> been taken in hand there. I had urged a moral
> reorganization of social institutions, a
> christianizing of public morality. Men asked:
> 'What must we do? and what must we undo?
> What social guide should guide us? What me-
> thods can we safely use in realizing it?'[31]

So Rauschenbusch set himself the task, in <u>Christianizing the
Social Order</u>, of facing these problems and of seeking the an-
swers to these questions.

He saw the problem of Christianizing the social order
as one which "welds all the tasks of practical Christianity
with the highest objects of statesmanship".[32] Like Maurice
he believed that in its working the social order of his day
was an acute contradiction of the Christian conceptions of
justice and brotherhood. Like Maurice, Rauschenbusch was also
an inquirer. Their difference lay in Rauschenbusch's socio-
logical awareness and interest. Rauschenbusch's questions are:
Where do the sources of mankind's wrongs lie hidden? What has
wrought such deadly results from a civilization that had such
wonderful promises of good? Why does mankind continue to pro-
duce evil in spite of its right intentions? In different lan-
guage, Maurice might have asked similar questions. What he

would not have asked, as Rauschenbusch did, was: How can the fundamental structure of society be conformed to moral demands of the Christian spirit? Maurice accepted the structure as an expression, even if a distorted one, of the Divine Will, to a degree that Rauschenbusch did not. The latter concluded his Foreword to Christianizing the Social Order: "I have written it as a follower of Jesus Christ. My sole desire has been to summon the Christian passion for justice and the Christian powers of love and mercy to their share in redeeming our social order from its inherent wrongs."[33]

Their Methods

Since the concept of the Kingdom of God is central to the social thought of both Maurice and Rauschenbusch our most fruitful line of inquiry will therefore be to compare what Maurice calls the theocratic principle or doctrine with what Rauschenbusch speaks of as the theocratic concept. But properly to appreciate such a comparison we need to examine the methods by which they arrived at their respective conclusions.

Briefly stated Maurice's method was as follows: he was convinced that there is a divinely constituted society in

the world according to which the family, the nation, and the universal society are fashioned. The position which Maurice ascribed to Augustine applied equally to himself. The world which God has made must be good. And therefore he had to believe also that there is an order at the bottom of it, and that this may and must vindicate itself one day.[34] Maurice said that 'hints' of this divinely constituted society are observable in human relationships--in families, in nations, in the universal society--the church, in parties and systems. These relationships are images of the Divine idea but man's sin often makes them contradict the fundamental idea. Furthermore a moral order in the world is an integral part of the Divine ordering. Man's conscience not only responds but bears witness to this moral order; contradictions of this moral order bring inevitable disaster. Pagan nations give hints of the Divinely established society; Nature expresses it. The Bible reveals the nature of this society.

Maurice's theocratic principle therefore implies that the Will of God to a certain extent "is", may be, and should be recognized in all human affairs, public and private. The nature of this divinely constituted society may therefore be determined by an examination of "what is". As God is active in the world leading all men into truth, therefore existing

human institutions manifest the Divine intention to some de-

gree. In the Bible (an element of "what is") we find a des-

cription of the divinely constituted society. An examination

of the opinions and systems of men will lead us to discover

in them those principles which correspond to the eternal

truths revealed in the Bible and supremely in Jesus, the In-

carnate Word who revealed the Father. Generally speaking, all

men bear witness to this truth and no man has a monopoly on

truth in its entirety. Maurice always asserted the importance

of each man being allowed free scope for his own view of truth

because Truth itself is larger than any man and is exposed

through the exchange of the partial views of each contender in

a debate.[35] "For truth I hold not to be that which every man

troweth, but to be that which lies at the bottom of all men's

trowings, that in which those trowings have their meeting

point."[36]

Rauschenbusch's method is different from Maurice's,

yet even at this point it must be said that however different

their language and method might be there are areas of similari-

ty in their presuppositions about human society. We have

noted that Rauschenbusch was an historian with a strong inter-

est in social analysis. At times he appears to have arrived

at conclusions about man and society and then to have gone

back to the Bible for confirmation of his views. Like

Maurice he finds in the Bible the norm for any just social

order. But where Maurice starts from a belief in God and

the divinely constituted society to which the Bible, human

society, the Church, and Nature bore witness, Rauschenbusch

begins constantly with the teaching of the Bible and sustains

a constant and definite dependence on his understanding of

the Bible throughout his writings. He arrives at a theory

of a divinely constituted society derived from Scripture;

Maurice believes in a divinely constituted society to which

Scripture bears witness.

I do not wish at this stage further to anticipate

an examination of each man's use of the Bible, but as some

have said that history was the fundamental category of the

structure of Rauschenbusch's social ethical theory,[37] it is

necessary to point out that it was an interpretation of history

based on his own understanding of the prophetic conception of

history which finds its fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth. It

is the Kingdom of God which is central to his thought. He

said that he traced the religious development of the prophets

of Israel, the life and teachings of Jesus, and the dominant

tendencies of primitive Christianity, in order to ascertain

what was the original purpose of the Christian movement in

history. His conclusion is that the essential purpose of Christianity was to transform human society into the Kingdom of God by regenerating all human relations and re-constituting them in accordance with the will of God.[38]

In examining each man's thought we shall also have to consider his approach to questions of religion, theology, doctrine, creeds, dogma, systems and parties. These will be dealt with as they arise. At this stage we shall mention only their use of sources.

Both Maurice and Rauschenbusch readily acknowledged the sources which had influenced them. In both cases a complete list would be extensive. Maurice spoke most frequently of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, Julius Hare, Samuel T. Coleridge, and the method of Plato.[39] Rauschenbusch said that he owed his awakening to the world of social problems to his contemporary, Henry George. He spoke also of Josiah Strong, Richard T. Ely, Washington Gladden; of Leibniz, Herder, Immanuel Kant and Johannes Weiss; and of the scientific evolutionary method which originated with Charles Darwin.[40] I must admit serious misgivings about the exercise of tracing the sources of a man's thought. Having determined a source, what have we gained? Some would suggest illumination

and understanding. In the case of Maurice and Rauschenbusch they employ sources in their own original ways.[41] Their ideas are their own. Hence we shall be concerned with the application of their ideas rather than their derivation, with the one exception of their use of the Bible; which, as we have seen, played a dominant role in the writings of both men.

For Maurice, the Bible contained an eternal message that is relevant to all ages and in all circumstances. The meaning of that message is available to all men who seek it humbly and endeavour to act upon its teaching.[42] It is primarily the history of God proclaiming Himself as man's deliverer from the state of slavery to systems, to superstitions, to the world, to himself, to Atheism,[43] a state in which man is ever ready to sink.[44] The Revelation contained in the Scriptures confirms the feeling in man's heart and conscience that God is a Righteous Being in whom man can absolutely trust. It is the witness of the unfolding of God's purpose for a universal community[45]--the revelation of God's designs for the world, and consequently of man's self-understanding.[46] It speaks of a Kingdom of Righteousness and Peace and Truth with which men may be in conformity or in enmity now and not only in a world to come.[47] It is a means

of attaining to the knowledge of God. At the same time
Maurice was wary of making the Bible an end in itself. The
Bible communicates a message which is the knowledge of God
not merely about God to every man.[48]

Another important point for Maurice was that the Bible
was meant to tell us of God and his ways, not merely to save
people's souls and make them good. He feared the tendency
to turn the Bible into a "Religious Book". It is a Book of
work and business and politics; a book emphatically
declaring the way in which God who had made man in his own
image had revealed Himself to them--a book explaining and
illustrating and justifying other common books, heathen and
Christian, philosophical and economical.[49]

The everlasting truth of the Old Testament rested on
the witness it gave of the sacredness of the earth and on
the preparation it made for the revelation of the unseen King-
dom; or, to speak more correctly, the beginning of it.[50]
The Gospels were to be read simply and directly as the revela-
tion of him upon earth who is the light that enlightens all
men.[51] He who said,

> . . .'I am the Word who spoke to the prophets'
> would not have satisfied the wants and cravings
> of the Israelites, unless He could have said
> also, 'I came from a Father; I will baptize

you with the Holy Ghost.' He was expected;
He was the desire of that nation and of all
nations.[52]

The Gospel then is a message to all mankind of the redemption

God has effected in His Son.

Maurice did not like the application of the term "the

Word of God" to the Bible. "The Word of God, I believe, as

St. John taught and as George Fox taught, to be very much

above the Scriptures, however he may speak by and in the

Scriptures."[53] This is not unrelated to the way Maurice

applied the message of the Bible to contemporary situations.

As J.V.L. Casserley has written: "Certainly he [Maurice]

speaks in a very real sense out of the Bible, but he speaks

always of the things of his own time to people of his own

time, always as a prophet of God."[54] For Maurice, the Bible

taken in its most simple literal sense declares God to be

the present ruler of the world. Consequently if men have

faith in Him and in His word they will find a help and a

teacher in their common life. God promises guidance into all

truth and deliverance from falsehood.[55] The Word who spoke

through the prophets spoke at all times to all men. As a

consequence Maurice believed that sound political teaching

was what was needed to restore sense and power to Bible

studies in his own day.[56]

Maurice is not consistent in his attitude towards

Biblical criticism. He is certain of one fact: the message

of the Bible, that is, its principles and truths, is un-

affected by human criticism of the books which comprise the

Bible.[57] The Bible shines in the light of divine revela-

tion. It is the revelation of a Father whom men are feel-

ing after and cannot find, and who declares Himself to them

in Christ. The Bible does not contain human notions and

ideas of God but is God's revelation to men. Because of

this, it is able to satisfy all that is real in man as nothing

else can.[58]

The following facts show the inconsistency of his

approach to Biblical criticism. Occasionally he appears to

encourage Biblical criticism and seems prepared to accept the

conclusions of those who engaged themselves in it.[59] At times

he implies that he had employed methods of criticism but he

has found them fruitless. At other times he appears indif-

ferent. Once he told Kingsley that analysis of the books of

Scripture was not one of the vital questions of the time.[60]

In some of his statements, particularly in relation to Bishop

Colenso's book on the Pentateuch he appeared openly hostile

to Higher Criticism.[61]

We need to pay greater attention to Rauschenbusch's
use of the Bible than we did in the case of Maurice. The
Bible is no less important to Maurice than it is to
Rauschenbusch, but in the latter's writing the emphasis
upon it is greater. It is not surprising that Rauschenbusch
commenced his first major work on social issues with a con-
sideration of the Hebrew prophets. He believed that the re-
construction of the whole of life in accordance with the will
of God and under the motive power of religion which was the
ruling purpose of Jesus' life had been derived by Jesus him-
self from the Old Testament prophets.[62] It is also evident
that his ideas of social analysis, his scientific compre-
hension of social development, his concepts of the immutabil-
ity of the moral law and of the universal reign of right, and
his ideas of human solidarity, democracy, the communal owner-
ship of land, and the inevitability of the suffering of God's
messengers all have their roots in his understanding of the
message of the Old Testament prophets.

He said that in all history it would be hard to find
any chapter so profoundly instructive as that in which the
prophets of the Old Testament took the leading part. Their
message formed an integral part of the thought-forms of
Christianity. From the beginning, the Christian Church

appropriated the Bible of Israel as its own book and thereby
made the history of Israel part of the history of Christen-
dom. That history lived in the heart of Christian nations
with a very real spiritual force. Throughout the Christian
centuries the historical material embodied in the Old Testa-
ment had been regarded as not merely instructive, but as
authoritative. The social ideas drawn from it were power-
ful factors in all attempts of Christianity to influence
social and political life. This had had negative and posi-
tive results: whenever the laws and institutions of the Old
Testament had been used as models without regard to the
historical connections it had resulted in blunder and disaster.
Whenever the spirit which inspired the prophets and the Mosaic
Law was caught it became a powerful force for democracy and
social justice.[63]

One cannot therefore approach Rauschenbusch's social
thought without paying considerable attention to his treat-
ment of the Hebrew tradition as accepted, rejected, developed
or redefined by Jesus. For him, Jesus felt most kinship with
the personalities and teachings of the prophets and expected
to share their lot. The people of his day also discerned
this kinship and although Jesus did not sanction all the
actions nor copy all the methods of the prophets, he drew

parallels between their work and lot and his own. He was

not a timeless preacher philosophizing vaguely on human gen-

eralities. He did not invent the idea of the Kingdom of God

for it had been woven into the tissue of Jewish thought by

the prophets.[64] He spoke for his age about concrete condi-

tions, responding to the stirrings of life that surged about

him.

Rauschenbusch's understanding of the Old Testament

had been deeply influenced by the German historical-critical

school but, like Maurice, he maintained that, however

scholarly views of the Bible may change, every religious

man would continue to recognize that God had given a vivid

consciousness of his will to the elect minds of the Jewish

people. The teaching left by these men therefore carries a

permanent authority, in their main tendencies at least, for

all who wish to know the higher justice of God.[65]

He limited his use of the Old Testament to the prophets

for two basic reasons. The first was that he believed that

they were the real makers of the unique religious ideas of

the life of Israel. Their contribution arose out of their

ethical view of religion which led to a social understanding

of it and Rauschenbusch regarded this insistence on morality

as the core of religion to be of fundamental importance.
The prophets were the heralds of the eternal truth that
religion and ethics are inseparable and that ethical con-
duct is the supreme and sufficient religious act.[66] He
believed that the prophets advocated the abolition of the
sacrificial system and of all ceremonial rites for they
believed that God required obedience to his righteous will
as the sole test and fruit of religion. Consequently,
Rauschenbusch himself, in contrast to Maurice, emerges as
consistently "anti-ritualistic".[67] His second reason was
that the prophets were the creators, directly or indirectly,
of Israel's Law,[68] its historical and poetical literature,
and its piety. They were therefore the moving spirits in
the religious progress of the nation. Without their utter-
ances little of moral and religious value would remain in the
Old Testament.

The prophets insisted that the national life could
only be built on social righteousness; this was their
primary concern. Rauschenbusch consistently contrasted this
teaching with the pietistic individualism of his own day with
its emphasis on private virtues of the individual and personal
salvation. Since the evils against which the prophets pro-
tested were social and political, their methods of redress

were political also. Their religion did not displace politics but used it. They were religious reformers demanding social action, the centres of religious unrest, creators of divine dissatisfaction and the unsparing critics of all who oppressed or corrupted people. Their political ideal for Israel was a theocracy which meant the complete penetration of the national life by religious morality.[69]

The prophets' spiritual progress and education were intimately connected with their open-eyed comprehension of the larger questions of contemporary history. There was constant interplay between the two. Social ideals of lofty moral value grew out of a deepening of the understanding of religion. The reverse is historically true: the religious life of Israel could develop only within a nation that cherished and maintained high ideals of justice. "Every heart-beat of their nation was registered in the pulse-throb of the prophets."[70] They made the history of their nation but in turn the history of the nation fashioned them. They learned their religion from a living God.[71] Consequently their concept of God and God's purposes was enlarged and clarified as their political horizons widened. Patriotism, Rauschenbusch believed, was the emancipating power which set their feet on that new and higher path which was destined to lift the Hebrew prophets far above

the soothsayers of other nations.[72] The religious passion

which turned against a foreign invader was equally ready to

turn against the domestic oppressors of the people (e.g.

Amos 1:3ff).[73] So the series of prophets which began with

Amos taught the nation to rise on the ruins of its national

past to a higher faith. He believed that in the classical

times of prophetism the prophets interpreted past history,

shaped present history, and foretold future history on the

basis that God rules with righteousness in the affairs of

nations. He said that the Day of the Lord was to the prophet

what the social revolution is to the modern radical reformer.

Rauschenbusch's own mixture of idealism and realism is

clearly derived from his view of the prophets. He spoke of

them as the revolutionists of their age--they were dreamers

of Utopias who pictured an ideal state of society in which

the poor would be judged with equity and the cry of oppres-

sion would no longer be heard (Isaiah 2:4). No slight

amelioration contented them, nothing but a change so radical

that they dared to represent it as a repealing of the ancient

and hallowed covenant and a construction of a new one (Jeremiah

31:33ff).[74] They all had a radiant hope of a future when a

society would arise based on social justice. This included

emancipation from foreign tyranny, peace and order throughout

the land, just and humane rulers, fertility of the soil,

prosperity for all, a glorious capital city and a splendid

temple. It was the social utopia of an agrarian nation.

But these prophets did not expect such a change to

come about without a struggle. There were not mere imprac-

tical dreamers and declaimers. They were men of action,

agitators and tribunes of the people, who rebuked rulers

and overthrew dynasties, e.g., Elisha. They expected a day

of vengeance when the Lord would have a reckoning with op-

pressors of the people (Isaiah 24:21-22; 3:13-15; Malachi

3:2,5).

To Rauschenbusch the canonical prophets were in a sense

pessimists in that they opposed the complacent optimism of the

people and their popular spokesmen (the "false" or court

prophets). They were regarded by their contemporaries as

disturbers of religious peace, as unpatriotic, treasonable

and blasphemous. They were men of the radical minority. Yet

paradoxically Rauschenbusch saw them as "really profoundly

and magnificently optimistic".[75] As long as the people were

falsely optimistic, the prophets persisted in destroying

their illusions; when they were despairing, the prophets

opposed their false hopelessness. Because the prophets

believed in the immutability of the moral law, they trembled
at any departure from it, but they could also feel its un-
shaken strength under their feet when all things went to
pieces about them. They never doubted the ultimate victory
of God, of his righteousness, of his people. This observa-
tion of Rauschenbusch is important for two reasons: his own
conviction of the invincibility of right was derived from it
as was his belief that the prophets shared the fate of all
leaders who are far ahead of their times. (He said this was
true of Maurice, Kingsley and Hughes.)[76] They [the prophets]
did not themselves see the triumph of their convictions, yet
they had the satisfaction of knowing that the world must
come their way whether it would or not, because "they are
on the way to justice, and justice is on the way to God."[77]

For Rauschenbusch, the foregoing applied chiefly to
the pre-exilic prophets. He said that after the national
life had been crushed the prophets addressed themselves to
the individual life and to a great degree lost the large
horizon of public life.[78] His argument is that religious
concern in politics ceased only when politics ceased, and
though religious individualism was a triumph of faith under
abnormal circumstances it was not a normal type of religious
life. He appreciated the full significance and value of

personal religion developed during the Exile but he lamented the loss that this meant, as personal religion became an end in itself. He also points out, however, that in spite of the growth of individualism, the concept of community was never entirely lost.[79] The hope of the Jewish people underwent changes in the course of history and not all the changes were for the worse, even during the Exile.

For example, their hope became more universal as they were drawn into closer contact with other peoples. The really decisive change came with the impact of Babylonian and Persian religions. The national judgement was enlarged into a world judgement; the national salvation into a cosmic renewal; and the Messiah of the Davidic line into a heavenly deliverer.[80]

On the negative side the sane political programme and the wise historical insights of the great prophets turned into apocalyptic dreams and bookish calculations detached from present events. This Rauschenbusch regarded as disastrous for later Judaism and Christianity. Though the national hope was never surrendered, its character changed under the influence of Persian dualism. This can be seen, Rauschenbusch said, in the fact that in the Old Testament there is hardly

a glimpse of Satan and his evil angels; yet after the Exile, a great hierarchy of darkness becomes the main enemy of God and the angelic hosts in popular Jewish thought. These demonic forces were seen to lurk behind Israel's oppressors and would have to be overthrown if the Kingdom of God was to be set up.[81] It was no longer a plain human fight against wrong but a supernal contest against spiritual principalities and powers. Rauschenbusch says that under these influences the prophetic hope was transformed into an apocalyptic one. This, he claimed, was not a product of pure Hebrew growth, but was, in fact, a departure from Hebrew religion. The apocalypticists moved in a world of unreality and their influence passed over into Christianity as is evidenced by the inclusion of Daniel and the Apocalypse in the Canon of Scripture.

Later we discover that Rauschenbusch valued the Apocalypse but he notes that because Daniel and the Apocalypse presented a systematic and coherent theology and a philosophy of history which the prophetic books did not, and since it was an axiom of biblical interpretation that all sacred writings were equal in value and without contradiction in their contents, it came to be assumed that all the prophetic writings meant what these two books meant. So the apocalyptic

thought-world spread to all the prophetic sections of the

Bible and obscured the thought of the prophets beneath their

brilliant colours. In this way apocalypticism with its

dualism and determinism came to dominate the Christian view

of history. Rauschenbusch believed that this had been one

of the chief causes why the hope of the Kingdom had lost

its power. In this debased and irrational form it is hope-

lessly foreign to modern life and thought.

He believed that the idea of the Kingdom of God had

to be freed from its apocalyptic dress if it was to become

the religious property of the modern world. Those who hold

it must cease to put their hope in salvation by catastrophe

and learn to recognise and apply the law of development in

human life. They must outgrow the dualistic aspects which

Judaism had received from Persia and face the stern facts

of racial sin. They must break with artificial schemes and

the determinism of an unhistorical age and use modern re-

sources to understand the way God works out retribution and

salvation in human affairs.[82]

We can therefore understand why Rauschenbusch was so

hopeful that the historical critical study of the Gospels

and the intense social interest of the 19th and 20th centuries

would enable Christians to recognise the social and revolution-
ary nature of the Gospel which Christ intended.[83]   But he is
careful to emphasize that Jesus was not a social reformer or
sociologist or political economist; and that he was more
than a teacher of morality. "Jesus had realised the life of
God. ... He knew the Father, and saw it as his highest social
duty to teach men to live in the presence of their Father."[84]

Under the impulse of Jesus, primitive Christianity was
a socially aware faith but this was soon overshadowed by many
factors. First there was the inevitable gap between the
leader's message and the understanding of it by his follow-
ers. In spite of this, the Apostolic writings of the New
Testament establish the view that Christianity was a
revolutionary movement inspired by high social ideals and
imbued with strong social energy. This can easily be recog-
nized although the historical sources are defective and one-
sided. The eschatology of the primitive church was as varied
as it had been among the Jews and as it is today. But
Rauschenbusch saw a gradual change of emphasis in early
Christianity as the Hebraic hope for the Kingdom of God for
humanity shifted to the Greek emphasis on eternal life for the
individual. The Hebrew emphasis on social hope is evident in
the Epistle of James, "the most democratic book in the New

Testament", and in the Apocalypse which purposely veils its

revolutionary hopes and passions.[85] In spite of its defects,

the eschatology of the Apocalypse was the orthodox eschatology

of primitive Christianity.[86] There is an interesting parallel

between Maurice and Rauschenbusch in their views on the social

hope in the Apocalypse. Maurice wrote that the Apocalypse

was a book of <u>Christian Politics</u>. He believed that eventually

it would come out "of the hands of soothsayers and prognos-

ticators, as a real lesson-book respecting the dealings of God

with the nations, respecting the method and issues of right-

eous government."[87]

Rauschenbusch wrote that the social hope waned as

primitive Christianity which had been predominantly Jewish

disappeared; and the Greek individualism grew strong as

Catholic Christianity developed. Nevertheless, insofar as

Christianity retained the impact of Jesus, John the Baptist

and the prophets of Israel, its hope was predominantly a

social hope.[88] Rauschenbusch believed that many books perished

because they did not suit the tastes of those schooled by the

great doctrinal controversies of the third and fourth

centuries. Many were suppressed because they were hostile

to the Roman authorities.[89] Consequently the social spirit

which was dominant in Jewish Christianity is not adequately

represented in early Christian literature and this accounts

for our general impression that the social impetus in

primitive Christianity was small.[90]

Rauschenbusch says that Paul, whose writings make up

the bulk of the New Testament, was a radical in theology but

a conservative in politics; and was therefore not a true

representative of primitive Christianity.[91] Unfortunately,

many have seen Christianity mainly through his eyes and have

therefore been strengthened further in their conviction that

it is an individualistic next-worldly faith. Paul maintained

the Messianic Hope,but he expected an immediate spiritual-

ization of the entire Cosmos (1 Corinthians 15; Romans 8:

18-25). His outlook was almost devoid of social elements.

To him the spirit was all. This material world could only

be saved by ceasing to exist.[92] Yet Rauschenbusch contends

that even Paul was not apathetic towards social questions.[93]

He formulated his social philosophy from the biology of human

organisation. The ideal society to him has an unlimited

diversity of organs and functions, but a fundamental unity of

life, motive and purpose. It is perfect in the measure in

which every member has the support and protection of the

whole body and in turn serves the whole in its due place.

Paul's philosophy of the Christian Church is therefore the

highest possible philosophy of human society.[94] Nor did the revolutionary aspects of his utterances of Christ as superior to "all governments and authority and power and lordship and every name that is named" (Ephesians 1:21) and "blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of lords" (1 Timothy 6:15) pass unnoticed by the Roman authorities.[95]

Rauschenbusch admitted the one-sidedness of his treatment of the Bible but claimed that it was the only way in which to do justice to the social impetus of early Christianity. An antidote was necessary against its use for purely personal devotion or for the discovery of dogmas with which to bolster up ecclesiastical systems.[96]

Maurice and Rauschenbusch differed in their method: Maurice was theological and biblical, Rauschenbusch was historical and biblical. But they were at one in this: the social order must be a reflection of the will of a just and loving God. That will has been revealed in the history of Israel which culminated in Jesus Christ. Because of his theological conviction that the Kingdom had been established and his acceptance of the traditional concept of society as a static hierarchical order, Maurice believed that it was possible to unearth the divine order and thus show men the

true way of life together. Rauschenbusch on the other hand
was influenced by theories of evolution. For him the purpose
of God revealed in the prophets and in Jesus had not yet
come to fruition. The ideal society was not a static sys-
tem underlying the present disorder, but something to be
built. Where both, each in his own time, stood apart from
the majority of their fellow-Christians was in the con-
viction that Christianity was a social faith needing a social
expression and taking the whole of life and of the world as
its field of operation.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. See Alec R. Vidler, <u>F.D. Maurice and Company</u>:
    <u>Nineteenth Century Studies</u> (London: SCM Press Ltd.,
    1966), (hereinafter referred to as <u>F.D. Maurice</u>),
    pp. 17, 29-31.

2. Cf. Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, p. 54, Maurice's
    awareness of his complex manner of expression.

3. Cf. <u>Ibid</u>., Vol. II, pp. 67-70, Comments of his
    son.

4. Cf. <u>Ibid</u>., Vol. II, p. 37, Maurice's own comment
    on the study of Plato in a letter to Hort.

5. See <u>Ibid</u>., Vol. I, pp. 339 and 358; Maurice,
    <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>, Vol. I, pp. 178-182.

6. See <u>The Church Quarterly Review</u>, Vol. IV, No. 1
    (July, 1971), p. 40. Cunliffe Jones considers
    this problem. See <u>supra</u>, ch. 2, n. 23.

7. See Maurice <u>Life</u>, Vol. II, p. 68, Kingsley's
    observation of this characteristic. See also
    pp. 42-45 re. Sully and the Central Board;
    pp. 105-107 re. Strike of Engineers; p. 116
    re. revival of conferences and topics to be
    discussed.

8. Cf. <u>Ibid</u>., Vol. I, p. 500.

9. Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Crisis</u>, p. xxiv.

10. <u>Ibid</u>.

11. This culminated in <u>A Theology For the Social
    Gospel</u>, which I find the least satisfying of
    his published works. His theology is clearer
    in his other works than in this book in which he
    attempts to define doctrines of the Church.

12.   Unfortunately the unclassified papers in the
        Rauschenbusch material at the American Baptist
        Historical Society, Colgate-Rochester Divinity
        School have not been available to me.
        See the Bibliography compiled by Max Stackhouse
        in Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, pp. 304-307.

13.   See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp.136-137.

14.   _Ibid_., p. 500.

15.   See _Ibid_., p. 538.

16.   _Ibid_., p. 513.

17.   _Ibid_., p. 240; Vol. II, p. 137.

18.   The references in n. 17 are also good examples
        of Maurice's compact paragraphs and unity of thought.
        Cf. _Ibid_., Vol. I, p. 271.

19.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 506.

20.   _Ibid_., Vol. I, p. 513; Vol. II, p. 136.

21.   _Ibid_., Vol. I, p. 271.

22.   See _Ibid_., Vol. II, p. 67, where Maurice's son
        speaks of his father's attitude as a learner
        throughout his life. Maurice's Platonic
        method is also evident in this.

23.   Christensen, _op. cit_., e.g. pp. 23-26, 95.

24.   Cf. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, pp. 136-137.

25.   _Supra_, n. 24 "no vocation except for theology";
        n. 16 "suffering discontented resolute men,"
        Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 8.

26.   See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 500; Vol. II,
        pp. 7, 8 and 137. _Supra_, ch. ii, p. 65.

27.   Foreword to Rauschenbusch, _Theology_. See also
        Rauschenbusch, Letter to W.G. Ballantyne, June 24,
        1912, quoted in Sharpe, _op. cit_., p. 322.

28. Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, p. xxv.

29. _Ibid._, p. vii.

30. _Ibid._

31. _Ibid._

32. _Ibid._, p. viii.

33. _Ibid._, p. x.

34. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 110.

35. _Ibid._, p. 442; _supra_, pp. 53, 69, 72, 78.

36. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 337; cf. p. 608.

37. Cf. Max L. Stackhouse in "Editor's Introduction,"
"The Continuing Importance of Walter Rauschenbusch,"
in Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 28.

38. Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, p. xxiii.

39. Erskine: See Frederick D. Maurice, _The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament_ (Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1853) (hereinafter referred to as _Prophets and Kings_), pp. iii, vii and ix; Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 121, 183, 302-307, 420, 443-444, 533; Vol. II, pp. 150, 384, 562;
Hare: Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 55; Vol. II, pp. 255-257 and numerous letters which passed between them.
Coleridge: Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 176, 178, 251, 502, 510-511;
Plato: Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 465; Vol. II, pp. 37-38.

40. George: See Rauschenbusch, _Social Order_, pp. 392, 394; _Social Crisis_, pp. 289, 354; Strong, Ely, and Gladden, Rauschenbusch, _Social Order_, p. 9;
Darwin: _Social Order_, pp. 88-89. Sharpe, _op. cit._, pp. 220-221, also mentions the influence of Horace Bushnell through Gladden as well as Ruskin, Robertson and Marxian Socialism.

41. Cf. Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_, pp. 32, 37; Handy,
     op. cit., pp. 260-261.

42. Frederick D. Maurice, _The Gospel of St. John:
     A Series of Discourses_ (Cambridge: MacMillan and
     Co., 1857) (Hereinafter referred to as _St. John_),
     pp. 4, 8, 9; Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 497.

43. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 497, Vol. II, p. 421.
     Maurice often spoke of the revelation in the Bible
     as a history. Cf. _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II,
     p. 137. He also used the word, "Atheism" in a
     unique sense. For a good example of this, see
     Life, Vol. II, p. 571 and pp. 152, 239; see also
     Prayer and Lord's Prayer, p. 301.

44. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 517, Vol. II, pp. 241,
     267.

45. _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 497, Vol. II, pp. 353-354.

46. _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 421.

47. _Ibid._, p. 227; cf. _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I,
     p. 261.

48. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 132-133, 372; Vol. II,
     p. 502.

49. _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 511; Vol. II, p. 229.

50. _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 497; Vol. II, p. 352.

51. _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 510; Vol. II, pp. 227, 353.

52. _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 353.

53. _Ibid._, Vol. II, pp. 500-501, 511.

54. See Casserley, _op. cit._, p. 77.

55. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 511; Vol. II, p. 396.

56. _Ibid_., Vol. I, p. 511; Vol. II, p. 396.

57. Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II, pp. 147-148, 150-151.

58. _Ibid_., Vol. I, pp. 282-283; _Prayer Book and the Lord's Prayer_, p. 295; _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 333, 372-373; Vol. II, p. 383.

59. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 373; Vol. II, pp. 226, 229; _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II, pp. 144, 152.

60. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 271.

61. _Ibid_., pp. 423, 425, 429, 490, 510. Cf. comments on Strauss in _Life_, Vol. I, p. 349; Vol. II, pp. 454-455, on Renan, pp. 461-465.

62. Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, pp. 49 ff. and 343; _Social Order_, p. 57.

63. Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, pp. 2-3.

64. _Ibid_., p. 53; Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 71; _Social Order_, p. 50.

65. Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, p. 2.

66. _Ibid_., p. 8.

67. _Ibid_., pp. 71-73; Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, pp. 264-271.

68. Whether we follow the old interpretation and see the prophets as drawing their ideals from the Law and their preaching as a summons to obey it; or we follow modern critical interpretation and regard the bulk of the Law as the outgrowth of prophetic ideas and agitation of the seventh century B.C., the relation of the two is very close and causal. On the one hypothesis the Law created the prophets, on the other the prophets created the Law. See Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, pp. 3 and 18.

69.   *Ibid.*, p. 8;   *Social Order*, p. 51.

70.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, p. 22.   This constant interplay between History and Theology is one of the main characteristics of Rauschenbusch's own method.

71.   Cf. Maurice's belief in God's continual activity in the world.   *Supra*, p. 198.

72.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 24, 337.

73.   *Ibid.*, p. 25.

74.   Rauschenbusch, *Kingdom*, p. 71;   *Social Order*, pp. 50-53.

75.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, p. 39.

76.   *Ibid.*, p. 417.

77.   *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

78.   *Ibid.*, pp. 27 ff.;   Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, pp. 53-54.

79.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 56 ff.

80.   *Ibid.*, pp. 27-32;   Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, pp. 53-54.

81.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, p. 54.

82.   *Ibid.*, pp. 54-56.

83.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 44-46.

84.   *Ibid.*, p. 48.

85.   *Ibid.*, pp. 98 and 86.

86.   *Ibid.*, pp. 93-98, 106;   Rauschenbusch, *Kingdom*, p. 77.

87.   Maurice, *St. John*, p. 2.

88.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 101-111.

89.   Rauschenbusch was suspicious of passages in the
       New Testament which implied political loyalty to
       the Roman Empire. He conjectures that Luke
       may have written Acts as an apologetic to the
       upper classes, and that Paul's exhortation to the
       Romans to obey the government may have been a
       precaution against the risk of the letter falling
       into influential and hostile hands in the capital.
       See *Social Crisis*, p. 96.

90.   *Ibid.*, pp. 97-103.

91.   *Ibid.*, p. 102. Cf. Rauschenbusch, *Kingdom*,
       p. 78.

92.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, p. 104.

93.   *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

94.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, p. 366.

95.   Rauschenbusch, *Kingdom*, p. 78.

96.   Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 102-103.

CHAPTER V

FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS IN THE THOUGHT OF

MAURICE AND RAUSCHENBUSCH

GOD AND HIS KINGDOM

Concepts of God

We have seen that the concept of theocracy is funda-
mental to the thought of both Maurice and Rauschenbusch.
Maurice found it impossible, in a sense which is not true of
Rauschenbusch, to speak of God without constant mention of
Christ, the King of the Universe, and the Spirit of God, who
leads men into all truth. As early as 1829, he explained to
his father that he believed God to be Love in the most absolute
and unqualified sense. But he had no idea of the perfect
spirituality of God's character except in the light of the
Incarnation, and of the spirit of God dwelling in his heart
to enable him to think rightly and to pray in the right way.[1]

Later, in 1848, he said to Ludlow that his understanding of God began from the proclamation of Christ the everlasting Word as King of Kings and Lord of Lords.[2] He believed, too, that God gives his Spirit of Truth to guide men in all truth. This led him to the confidence that God's wisdom could be imparted to his own and every other man's mind. Because of this he was prepared to subject all his beliefs to any test.[3] In fact he thought that a belief could only be proved and effectively propagated if it were severely tested.

The importance to Maurice of this belief in God the Father, who through Christ and the Holy Spirit is creatively active in the world, must be clearly recognised before we say anything further of his concept of God.[4] But there are other factors which must be noted. First of all he was convinced that all attempts to arrive at definitions of God are inadequate and that all notions of him are misleading. No Churchman should permit notions or speculations or theories of any kind to conceal the fact that God is near to everyone. All men need to learn not how to define God, "(define God! Repeat the words to yourself, and think how terrible they are), but that He is."[5] God knows man even though men know so little of Him.

There were also certain external factors which in-
fluenced what Maurice said about God. He feared the tend-
ency in all men to look first at man's necessity or misery
and only afterwards at his relation to God, and at God's
nature. The latter was made dependent upon the former. "We
are conscious of a derangement in our condition; simply in
reference to this derangement do we contemplate Him who, we
hope, may reform it."[6] This tendency had many facets: he
traced the process in heathenism. He recognized it in the
divines of all Christian traditions who regarded the Fall of
Man as the foundation of theology and the Incarnation and
Death of Christ as provision against its effects.[7] Speaking
in another connection he said that one of the effects of sin
is to make us think of ourselves as centres of the universe;
and then to look upon our sinful condition as the chief
determinant of what we are. The result is that we corre-
late divine revelation to our sinfulness. In other words
our understanding of God is based not on Creation but on the
Fall. Allied to this was the fact that in no sense whatever
would Maurice countenance the idea that the world was ruled
by the devil.[8] Rauschenbusch struggled with this problem.
It may be significant that in spite of recognizing that the
Fall became more fundamental in later theology than it had

been in Biblical thought, he devoted six chapters in A Theol-

ogy For the Social Gospel to sin and the fall. He said that

the doctrines of sin and salvation were the starting point

and goal of Christian theology.[9]

Maurice also believed that it was necessary to recog-

nise that knowledge of God does not depend upon man's feel-

ings. The very opposite is the case: man's feelings depend

on God. Man's task is to learn that there is a substance

for faith to lay hold of, and that faith does not create that

substance. There is a ground and source of faith which is

deeper than all the acts which proceed from it.

> We have . . . the Spirit of God within us
> . . . the confidence of a power always at
> work within us manifesting itself in our
> powerlessness, a love filling up our loveless-
> ness, a wisdom surmounting our folly, the
> knowledge of our right to glory in this love,
> power and wisdom, the certainty that we can
> do righteous acts by submitting to this Right-
> eous Being.[10]

Maurice was no less deeply aware of the danger of

crediting the blessings of our awareness of God's presence

to man's own initiative.[11] He also resisted every notion

which equated God's sovereignty with power, for it was the

basis of contemporary Christian misconceptions as

well as non-Christian fables. The whole revelation in the

Old and New Testaments is a continuous unfolding of the

truth which protests against this human tendency to worship

all the different shapes and appearances of power in the

world. The revelation leads men to experience the need of

some power of an altogether higher and different kind to

rule themselves.[12]

Having said this about the revelation, it is important

to remember Maurice's warning against the danger of making an

idol of the Bible.[13] According to him, perhaps the greatest

temptation of his time was to think of the Most High as one

about whom men read in a book rather than as the Living God,

the name by which the Bible always speaks of him. Prayer,

he said, brings this evil vividly before us and helps us to

overcome it.

> We worship _some_ Being but _what_ Being we hardly
> dared ask ourselves. Flashes of God's
> presence during times of prayer were assurances
> and admonitions that the Father of all lives
> though our spirits be ever so dead.[14]

Like Maurice, Rauschenbusch was cautious about defini-

tions of God. He believed in the Trinity but he said that

the Trinitarian concept that came nearest to satisfying him

was:

> the Modified Sabellianism of Schleiermacher and
> Bushnell. God and Christ may differ for my
> analytic intellect but for my religious life
> they are convertible terms. The God of the

> stellar universe is a God in whom I drown.
> Christ with the face of Jesus I can comprehend
> and love and assimilate. So I stick to him
> and call him by that name. Let others do
> differently if they are differently made. I
> prefer to superimpose the two concepts on
> each other and get more out of each.[15]

Rauschenbusch certainly falls among those whom Maurice describes as having a tendency to begin from man's condition in determining their concepts of God.[16] For Rauschenbusch not only wrote that sin is the starting point of theology, he also believed that a concept of God held by a social group is a social product.[17] The latter is for him a complex of views. The understanding of God in Hebrew thought originated in the spiritual ideas of the prophets. But their high concept of God was both a social achievement and a social endowment.[18] The prophetic idea of God was coarsened and materialized by the historical experiences of the nation.[19] The Christian concept of God had gone through a similar process.

> When he [Jesus] took God by the hand and called
> him "our Father", he democratized the conception
> of God. He disconnected the idea from the
> coercive State and transferred it to the realm
> of family life, the chief social embodiment of
> solidarity and love. He not only saved humanity;
> he saved God.[20]

Rauschenbusch here meant that Jesus' concept of God as Father released man from despotic ideas of God's nature. His language is unfortunate.

But Rauschenbusch's own concept of God was strongly
influenced by his social environment. He substituted the
terms, despotic or democratic, for the traditional clas-
sifications of theology, Latin or Greek, Catholic or
Protestant. It is true that he wrote that whenever human
solidarity, especially sympathy for the poor and oppressed,
were found in concepts of God their origins went back to
Jesus or the prophets, and the social gospel was God's
agent to eliminate autocratic concepts of God.[21] But he
also wrote: "The worst thing that could happen to God would
be to remain an autocrat while the world is moving toward
democracy. He would be dethroned with the rest."[22]
Rauschenbusch wrote that the Kingdom of God, the true democ-
racy, is the necessary background for the Christian idea of
God.[23] The social movement was one of the chief ways in
which God was revealing that he lives and rules as a God
that loves righteousness and hates iniquity.

As we noted in an earlier chapter, Rauschenbusch wrote
of the nature of God chiefly in the terms of the Old Testa-
ment prophets and the teaching of Jesus. Maurice also speaks
of God's nature and attributes. To him God is a real Personal
Being. He is Spirit, but he is Reality. He is Truth; a true
Being in the highest sense who is _Father_ of all mankind: in

spite of man's unbelief.[24]   Maurice's entire concept of

society hinged on the conviction of God as the Father.   We

shall return to consider this more fully.   Here as we deal

with his concept of God two facts may be noted.   First, he

said that we must begin from the Father in order that we

may know something of the Son and the Spirit.   Secondly, the

greatest national errors and shortcomings had resulted from

man's departure from the life which God had marked out for

him.[25]

Immanence and Transcendence

According to Maurice, God is both immanent and tran-

scendent.   The Gospel justifies the truth of his immanence.

By taking human flesh and dwelling among us, Christ declared

that heaven had stooped to earth.   But the Gospel does not

stop with the Incarnation.   It speaks also of Christ's

Resurrection and Ascension.   By these actions man is delivered

from his sin and assured of his home with God.   The fixed

relation which Christ's birth, death, resurrection and

ascension established between the littleness of the creature

and the majesty of the Creator finds very adequate expres-

sion in the words, "Our Father which art in heaven."[26]

Maurice believed that there had been persons in all religions who restlessly sought a knowledge of God and union with him.[27] All religions pointed to the Incarnation and the Incarnation explains them all. The yearning for a home with God by prophets, philosophers, patriarchs and priests could not be satisfied until Christ died, rose and ascended to God and invited men to sit with him in the heavenly places. The revelation of the divine mystery in Christ was given in order that the mystery would no longer be hidden from man. Man therefore has no excuse for ignorance of God;[28] indeed knowledge of God _is_ the key to all knowledge. At the same time Maurice makes a definite distinction between knowledge about God and knowing God. To know God is eternal life. Through Christ and the Spirit of God this is a present reality for man.[29]

There is very little difference between Maurice's concept of the knowledge of God and Rauschenbusch's theory of the "blessed life". Rauschenbusch writes:

> the main thing is to have God; to live in Him;
> to have Him live in us; to think his thoughts,
> to love what he loves and hate what he hates;
> to recall His presence, to feel His holiness,
> and to be holy because He is holy, to feel
> His goodness in every blessing of our life
> and even in its tribulations; to be happy and
> trustful; to join in the great purpose of God
> and to be lifted to greatness of vision and

faith and hope with him--that is the blessed
life.[30]

But Rauschenbusch obscured the idea of divine transcendence

in A Theology For the Social Gospel:

> The old conception that God dwells on high and
> is distinct from all human life was the basis
> for autocratic and arbitrary ideas about him.
> On the other hand the religious belief that he
> is immanent in humanity is the natural basis
> for democratic ideas about him.[31]

This results from Rauschenbusch's search for a concept of

God that would satisfy modern democratic aspirations. The

difference in the theological presuppositions of Rauschenbusch

and Maurice are very marked here. Rauschenbusch said the

Logos idea was the consequence of the overemphasis on God's

transcendence in Platonic philosophy. "It [Platonic philos-

ophy] had to devise the Logos-idea to bridge the abyss be-

tween the silent depths of God and the world and to enable

God to create and reveal himself."[32] In this respect the

Cross is to Rauschenbusch what the Word becoming flesh is to

Maurice. ". . . God", writes Rauschenbusch, "has always suf-

fered with and for mankind and the Cross is a permanent law

of God's nature: 'The lamb has been slain from the beginning

of the world.'"[33] The theory of evolution and the social

movement shows that our consciousness of God is the spiritual

counterpart of our social consciousness.

Yet glimpses of the idea of divine transcendence recur
in Rauschenbusch's writings: ". . . at its [the Kingdom's]
consummation God would interfere with awful judgements and
demonstrations of his power from on high."[34]

> Jesus brought heaven into the world and
> commended it to the love of men, and so,
> even though they killed him, the Kingdom
> of heaven is here and has gained its
> habitation through the influence of his
> personality.[35]

Even when Rauschenbusch writes that Jesus democratized the
concept of God there is a hint of his belief in divine tran-
scendence:

> By raising the value of the human soul and its
> life on the one side, and by bringing God
> down close to us as Father, he laid the reli-
> gious foundations for a modern democracy and
> anticipated the craving of the modern spirit.
> We today conceive of the Reign of God as the
> Commonwealth of God and Man.[36]

Rauschenbusch's historical and social analysis led him to lay
emphasis on God's immanence but undergirding this was the
prophetic motif of divine transcendence.[37]

Maurice laid equal stress upon divine transcendence
and immanence. Rauschenbusch tended to emphasize the immanence
of God. It must again be emphasized that this resulted from
his search for a concept of God that would satisfy modern
democratic aspirations. The point is that when Rauschenbusch
writes that the theory of evolution will lead men to

understand that God always suffered with humanity he comes

to a view which is very similar to Maurice's concept of

God's activity in the world. Rauschenbusch writes:

> If he lives and moves in the life of mankind
> he can act directly on the masses of men.
> A God who strives with our striving, who
> kindles his flame in our intellect, sends
> the impact of his energy to make our will
> restless for righteousness, floods our
> sub-conscious mind with dreams and longings,
> and always urges the race on toward a higher
> combination of freedom and solidarity--that
> would be a God with whom democratic and
> religious men could hold converse as their
> chief fellow-worker, the source of their
> energies, the ground of their hope.[38]

The difference is that Maurice applied this through the

Logos doctrine and that of the Holy Spirit to all men and

Rauschenbusch tended to restrict it to the "converted":

though here Rauschenbusch is not consistent. He also speaks

of protesting forces as ministers of God.

Character and Will of God

To Maurice the character and the will of God exactly

correspond to each other. The Bible reveals him to be right-

eous and true, just and without iniquity. He presents himself

to the conscience, heart and will of men as the Author of all

that is right and good in them and in the universe. We cannot

therefore think of God's character as expressing goodness,
mercy, loving-kindness at all without thinking of his will
directed towards other beings and exercising itself upon
them.[39] The revelation also shows that God's power must
be a will; that it must be moral; that righteousness must
be its true nature and power its instrument. Jesus revealed
the perfect will of God in his acts. "To enter into the in-
most recesses of that Will, was His only, who perfectly
delighted in it."[40] God's perfectly loving will is always
active in the world to accomplish his purposes. Maurice
constantly maintains that we must acknowledge the absolute
goodness of that will as it was manifested in act by Christ
or we shall merely make it an image of our own. It is the
Cross which shows us how this will can be obeyed by intel-
ligent spiritual beings in holy and cheerful obedience.[41]

Fatherhood

As already noted it is the Fatherhood of God which was
of fundamental importance to Maurice. It implies the
acknowledgement of God as the Source of all blessings. He
upholds humanity, created, redeemed and glorified in his
beloved Son. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the Father and

the Son, is given to us that we may be united to each other and fitted for all knowledge and all love.[42] Maurice saw the unity of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit--a unity of life and love--as the basis of unity amongst men. It is the groundwork of all human society and all thought. It accounts for all the good that is found in the youngest child and the perfection of the saints in glory.[43]

"When we go out of ourselves and enter into the life of God, we must take our brethren with us, for solitude in such possessions is a kind of selfishness and therefore contradictory."[44] It follows then that what we desire for ourselves and for our race--the greatest redemption man can dream of--is gathered up in the glory of God.[45]

Maurice emphasized that Fatherhood described God's relationship to all men. Underlying the word "our" in the Lord's Prayer is the principle that all people belong to one family irrespective of humanly created barriers, such as class prejudices, factions, party feelings, hostility to wrong doers, petty personal disagreements and opposition of inter-ests. He observed that new and more arbitrary lines of division were replacing legal and formal distinctions of caste as the latter became less marked in his own day. He regarded the tendency to treat an adversary with contempt, by

identifying him more completely with his opinions, or by con-
demning him either for those opinions or for his bigotry in
advocating them, as equally sinful. The point which Maurice
makes clear is that when Christians pray "Our Father" they
associate themselves with all men, and human barriers are
denials of this fact of association which is fundamental to
human life. Their claim is nullified if it is not one which
is valid for all other men. Here again it is the Incarnation
and the gift of the Spirit which enables men to say, "Abba,
Father" (Galatians 4:4-6).[46]

Maurice knew that this raised the question of the dis-
tinction between the believer and unbeliever,--"as natural
men we are not His children though we are His creatures."[47]
Maurice said that his text was: "Know ye not that Christ is
in you."[48] The Gospel is "Christ is with you, and in you,
and He is in me. I cannot live except it were so, nor can
you. I can live because it is so; and you can do the same."[49]
"For in Him we live and move and have our being."[50] God tells
us that in Christ, he had created all things in heaven and
earth. Christ is Head of _every_ man. The distinction Maurice
makes between the believer and the unbeliever, however, is
not always clear though he does say that there is the greatest
difference: "but the difference is not about the _fact_, but

precisely in the belief of the fact."[51] The believer knows

the fact and the unbeliever does not.

Those who do not believe that Christ is the Head of

every man walk "after the flesh."[52] They do not believe

that they are joined to an Almighty Lord of life who is

nearer to them than their own flesh. Consequently they do

not act upon this belief. Because they do not think they

are joined to Christ they do not ask him to "fill, animate,

inspire and sanctify them."[53] But for Maurice, even if

every man in the world lived in this way, Christian truth

forbids us to regard this as the real state of any man.

"They believe a lie. They make a lie. They will not live

the truth."[54] The truth is that every man is in Christ.[55]

God has not only created man through Christ but he has

redeemed and recreated mankind in Christ. He has not left

men to be fleshly creatures. He has acknowledged men as

spiritual creatures, has claimed men in that character to

be his servants and children, and has given his Spirit to

them.

> The condemnation of every man is, that he will
> not own the truth; he will not act as if this
> were true. He will not believe . . . the truth,
> that, except he were joined to Christ, he could
> not think, breathe or live a single hour.[56]

Disobedience to God's two commands follows upon separation

from Christ because man cannot obey one of God's commands,

or hope, or love if he is not in Christ. Christ has

constituted man to do that; the state of independence,

"the fleshly Adam life" is no state at all; it is a lie.[57]

Dependence is man's true condition.

Maurice's conviction is that when man returns to God

his Father, he renounces his vile, selfish and exclusive

life, and takes up that human privilege which God has given

him in Christ. He enters upon his state as a man when he

confesses God as his Father. In other words, through Christ

we experience our true manhood, that is, as a child of God.

God has bestowed this on all men through Christ. It is when

a man makes this discovery, or rediscovery, that he becomes

a true man. The implication of all this is that since the

birth, life, death, resurrection of Christ and the gift of

the Spirit, all mankind is affected and not only the baptized

or converted member of the church. The revelation is grounded

upon an act done on behalf of Humanity--an act in which all

men have a like interest, for Christ took the nature of all

men.[58] This is closely linked with Maurice's idea that the

love and unity of God is the foundation of all unity among

men as a family. And it is more than that. It is the

primary idea which is fundamental to all human life for it
makes real not only the dream of a Father which had been
present in all human expectations prior to the coming of
Christ but it is also the basis of man's continual
striving after the fundamental principles of human existence
in all secular movements.[59]

In fewer words and different terms Rauschenbusch
expresses the same belief as Maurice about the Fatherhood
of God. "It [the Social Gospel] is wholly in sympathy with
the conception of the Father which Jesus revealed to us by
his words, by his personality, and by his own relations to
the Father."[60] Similarly he believed that God is the bond
of racial unity and the common basis of all our life.[61] "The
all pervading life of God is the ground of the spiritual one-
ness of the race and our hope for its closer fellowship in
the future."[62] With much greater practical application than
Maurice, Rauschenbusch asserted that God was a "breaker of
barriers from the first."[63] All who have a Christian exper-
ience of God are committed to the expansion of human fellow-
ship and the overthrow of barriers. Paul's writings,
Rauschenbusch says, have preserved the impression of liberation
which the Christian idea of God made on him and his contem-
poraries (e.g. Galatians 4:6).[64]

Maurice is more definite in his emphasis upon God as the Father of all men and consequently on the universal brotherhood of all men. He is vague in his distinction between the believer in Christ and the unbeliever. Rauschenbusch hints at the Divine Fatherhood and universal brotherhood but makes a clear distinction between the believer and unbeliever: "A man is saved according as he enters or does not enter the Kingdom."[65]

Not only does the insoluble problem of the doctrine of the Trinity come into sharp focus when we compare Maurice's and Rauschenbusch's concepts of Christ and the Holy Spirit, but the divergencies between the theological presuppositions of each man as well as the similarities between their views on the principles which should govern society can be seen. Maurice is often described as thoroughly Johannine. He wrote, "His [John's] Gospel appears to me a perfect summary of Christian theology."[66]

> . . . that Gospel is . . . the setting forth
> how Jesus Christ proved Himself in human flesh
> to be that Word of God in whom was life, and
> whose life was the light of men, who had been
> in the world, and by whom the world was made,
> and whom the world knew not; how in that flesh
> He manifested forth the glory as of the only
> begotten of the Father; how He manifested the
> fulness of grace and truth.[67]

Here he is fundamentally different from Rauschenbusch.
Maurice believed that Christ was before all things, that
through him all things came into existence and were sustained
by him. The Incarnation, though it came later than the Fall,
was really in God's purpose before it.[68] The whole of the
Gospel, the very ground of man's trust and hope, is in the
completeness of Christ's Incarnation. His struggles and the
struggles of all men are identical, for he stood in the
strength of a nature in which all men are sharers. His
faith and dependence in the Temptations affirmed the reality
of his filial relationship with God and his fraternal kinship
with all men.

Christ's life on earth was the continual recognition
of good in, and imputation of good to, those among whom he
dwelt. Throughout his earthly life wrong and falsehood
caused him acute suffering. Man's need is to apprehend the
meaning of such "all embracing discriminating love."[69] The
divinity of Christ's suffering consists in this love. We
must begin from that and recognize that his love was the
reflection of his Father's love. In this way we may under-
stand the difference between Christ's grief and ours which
is contaminated with selfishness. It does not differ from
ours in intensity; nor is it taken out of the range of our

sympathies. But these two facts taken together--the divine love perfected and manifested in submission and sacrifice, and the human sympathy with actual sorrows--seemed to Maurice to constitute the mystery of the Passion.[70]

Maurice said that he regarded the death of Christ to be far more than a mere peace-making, though that view of it is the root of every other. It is actually and literally the death of the whole human race. By this he means the extinction of all our selfishness and individualism.[71]

> To believe that we have any self is the devil's
> lie; and when he has tempted us to believe it,
> and to act as if we had a life out of Christ,
> he then mocks us and shows us that this life
> was a very death. ... We have each a life, our
> only life--a life not of you nor me, but a
> universal life--Him.

Christ, Maurice says, will live in us and awaken us to all life and love. He will enable us to understand the possibility and to experience the reality of loving God and loving our brothers.

> . . . We are, by fixed and everlasting institution,
> members of a body. We try to set up our own inde-
> pendent individuality--but it is a lie. I there-
> fore say to myself, I am united to Christ and my
> brethren; it may be hard to believe, but it is
> so. To live as if it were so is not a high
> attainment, an anomalous privilege, but conformity
> to the law of my being, as a Churchman and as a
> man. God, therefore, I have a right to hope, will
> bring me into that, obedience to which is his

>own order, and give us to enjoy that gift
>which he has made mine by every title of con-
>quest,--pardon, inheritance of communion with
>Him and with my race, granted upon the death of
>the independent self.[73]

Whereas Maurice is dependent on the Fourth Gospel,
Rauschenbusch's view of Christ and the Holy Spirit was a
mixture of ideas derived from the prophets, the Synoptic
Gospels and his own historical observations. He said that
the prophets expected the renewal of the world and the per-
fection of the theocracy through three forces: the Messiah
as the perfect theocratic King; the general outpouring of
the Spirit of God; the purified and glorified nation as the
seat of God's manifestation. These expectations had been ful-
filled within Christianity: Christ, the Spirit and the
Church.[74]

Though Maurice and Rauschenbusch arrived at similar
views of Christ's rôle in society their methods are very dif-
ferent. To Rauschenbusch, Christ was the initiatory power of
the Kingdom of God. He sustains it in the world. He bore
the Kingship of God within him. He saw things as God views
them and his actions were in entire obedience to the Father's
will. His teaching expressed his world view and demanded a
reversal of values and a reconstruction of society. His aim

was to rid men's minds of delusions and free them from the

devil's control. His teaching never becomes outdated. Its

revolutionary influence is continually experienced in indiv-

iduals and nations.[75] "We cannot overestimate the effect

which it has had in the course of history in training men

to see clearly and judge fearlessly."[76] He wrote:

> A church based absolutely on the teachings of
> Jesus would be the most revolutionary society
> on earth and its platform would be further
> ahead of existing conditions than any plat-
> form in this age of platforms.[77]

Challenging and powerful as Christ's words and actions

are, the real secret of his power lies in his personality.

The whole life of Jesus incarnated the principles he taught.

This was his real power. Jesus is himself the best witness

concerning himself. He calls himself the Son of man and

thereby asserts his humanity. Yet he is Man in a unique

sense. He calls himself the Son of God in a manner and in

a sense different from those he taught to call God Father.

He was conscious of a unique intimacy with God, knowing him

and known of him in a way which could not be asserted of

others (Matthew 11:27). He was conscious of a unique relation

both to God and to humanity in which he stood solitary, of a

personality which transcended that of all other historical

persons in value, and of a power to fulfil the entire past,

to initiate a new era, and to give the ultimate realization
to the aspirations of humanity.[78]

Rauschenbusch rejects the method of appeal to the
theological dogmas of the later church. He believed that a
study of the records of Christ's life, the impression he made
on his contemporaries, and the influence of the historical
Christ across all the centuries confirm the rôle that Jesus
claimed for himself. Rauschenbusch cites Paul as an example
of one who grew to know Christ as, "the centre of the new
humanity . . . the Lord through whom are all things, the
head of the church and its life giving spirit, the coming
judge, the restorer even of the travailing creation."[79]

The same argument holds in qualified form concerning
the concept of Jesus expressed in "the Apocalypse, one of
the earliest Christian writings . . . and in the Fourth
Gospel, one of the latest."[80] It was because the glory of
the man Jesus in grace and truth was so great, that the
spiritual eye discerned in him the eternal Word made flesh.
The personality of the Galilean Jesus of the Synoptics,
writes Rauschenbusch, was so great that it could bear the
exceeding weight of glory of the Incarnate Word and Life as
he is portrayed in the Fourth Gospel. Historically also many

have found in him "the way, the truth and the life" (St.John

14:6). Even those who reject the Church's doctrine (e.g.

Spinoza, Goethe, Strauss) witness to the greatness of his

personality. The detractors of the Church compare its short-

comings to the intentions of its founder. When hostile ele-

ments have gained control of the church and turned Christianity

into a conservative and reactionary force Jesus' true character

emerges to impel new men to revolutionary efforts.[81]

The Spirit of Truth, Maurice wrote, will not allow us to

be content either with "the husks of truth in systems" or with

"the juice of truths in feelings and sympathies . . . nor yet

to be alternately choosing one and the other. He compels us

to feel that the whole truth, in all its substance,in all its

juiciness, lies at the roots of our being, and sustains it."[82]

In contrast to Rauschenbusch, Maurice wrote confidently of

the distinct Personality of the Holy Spirit. He is a universal

spirit working in all men and uniting all men. He came from

the Father and leads men to Jesus. Yet because men experience

his presence in them as he speaks to their consciences, they

must distinguish though they can never separate him from

Christ whom they must always think of as the common Lord of

all and the Mediator between man and God. "Just as likewise

they must distinguish the Son from the Father."[83]

Maurice wrote: "we are _in_ the age of the Spirit."[84]

To him, the gift of the Spirit opened the new Kingdom:

> It [the Kingdom] is the recognition of men
> . . . of every nation . . . as the sons of
> God in the only begotten Son; the acknowledge-
> ment of men as spirits capable of holding com-
> munion with the Divine Spirit, capable of
> falling under the dominion of evil spirits,
> redeemed from that dominion by God Himself,
> consecrated to be His ministers. The Baptism
> of the Spirit was thus the formation, out of
> a particular nation, of a universal society
> capable of adopting all nations into itself,
> a society having its home both in earth and
> Heaven; witnessing of God's love and gracious
> purposes to all kindreds of earth, witnessing
> that they are, as spiritual beings, under the
> direct government of God Himself.[85]

To Maurice this manifestation of a personal Spirit was impos-

sible until Christ was glorified.

We see then that Maurice laid much greater emphasis

upon Christ and the Holy Spirit as personal and distinct

beings than Rauschenbusch, who though he laid great emphasis

on the Person of Jesus more often spoke of Christ, the Holy

Spirit and the Church as forces. In the New Testament,

Rauschenbusch wrote, Christ and the Spirit are not two distinct

forces, different perhaps in character demands and dividing

our alliance (Matthew 28:20, John 14:16-19; 15:5, Galatians

2:20, Romans 8:9-23, Ephesians 1:13, Acts 16:6-7).

Rauschenbusch has no desire to dogmatize but he says that this

easy interchange of expression in the New Testament certainly

shows that the idea of the glorified Christ and that of the

Holy Spirit are for all practical purposes nearly identical

to the early Christian. If so, the discussion of these

two forces may be united and regarded as the discussion of

the twofold influence of one force, the Logos of God, first

by the perennial influence of his historical manifestation in

humanity, and then by his abiding personal influence upon and

in men's hearts.[86] This ties in well with Rauschenbusch's

"modified Sabellianism" but there are inconsistencies here.[87]

In no other place in the writings of Rauschenbusch

does the doctrine of the Logos occupy such a prominent place,

In fact, as we have noted, in one place he said that doctrine

was an attempt to counteract the extreme view of divine

transcendence in Greek thought; and in another he employed

it as an historical example of the permanence of the indelible

impression of the person of Jesus as he is portrayed in the

Synoptic gospels.[88] In the same chapter in which he wrote of

Jesus and the Holy Spirit as the "twofold influence of one

force" (the Logos and the Paraclete) he had previously written

that it would be a misconstruction of Jesus' words and sub-

sequent facts to regard the gift of the Spirit as the

enlightening influence which God exerts upon all men: "the

Fourth Gospel evidently distinguishes between the Logos
which is the light of men and illuminates every man, and
the Paraclete that was to complete the work of Christ."[89]

The same ambiguity regarding the work of the Spirit
in the Church and in the world exists in the writings of
both Maurice and Rauschenbusch. Neither is consistent. Per-
haps no one can be. In A Theology for the Social Gospel,
Rauschenbusch wrote that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is
one of the most religious of all Christian doctrines. It
deals with the most intimate and mystic experiences of the
soul, and does not seem to belong to the field especially
cultivated by the social gospel. But, he goes on to say,
"in fact the social nature of religion is clearly demonstrated
in the work of the Holy Spirit."[90] Like Maurice, he says that
the new thing in the experience of Pentecost was that the
Holy Spirit had become the common property of a group. It may
be in emphasis rather than in fundamental belief that Maurice
differs from Rauschenbusch in regard to the universal influence
of the Spirit. It seems more likely, however, that the dif-
ference was that Maurice believed that since the glorification
of Christ the Spirit of God ruled in the world, whereas
Rauschenbusch believed that the Spirit ruled in the redeemed

community whose task was to overcome the evil spirits which control man's actions.

Rauschenbusch wrote that if Paul's epistles are taken simply as historical evidence concerning the life and condition of the early churches, they demonstrate the existence of a new spiritual force in the world, which Paul found only in connection with the gospel of Christ and which he regarded as an abiding contact between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God, he wrote, is continually active in the world working towards truth and right and love; protesting against falsehoods, injustice and oppression. Historically it has been a revolutionary force, for man's real emancipation is in experiencing the truth and presence of God by the Holy Spirit in their own souls and in a community of spiritual men (1 Corinthians 3:16, Ephesians 2:22).[91]

Rauschenbusch approaches Maurice's belief that the Spirit guides all men when he writes that in human society the Spirit is the constructive power of a new and more perfect society, for in the long range of history the forces which appear destructive, because they protest against unjust laws, will be recognised as God's ministers. It was only the acceptance of the immutability of the contemporary unjust

society that made these protests appear destructive rather
than positive proposals for a better society. But Rauschenbusch
does not leave this unqualified. He adds that the Spirit
which led to the brotherhood of humanity uniting Jew, Greek
and Barbarian remains the most powerful impulse towards
liberty and an ideal society but it is by no means co-extensive
with Christendom.

The Kingdom of God on Earth

Maurice based his belief in the Kingdom of Christ on
earth on the testimony of Christ regarding the Father's will
and the belief that God's will is continually at work in the
world through the agency of the Holy Spirit. He said that
there was evidence to show that there are thousands of free
obedient persons who are effectively guided by God in the
world. It was clear to him that God had taken account of this
earth for his purpose of restoring its inhabitants. "There is
nothing, surely, in this fair earth to make it an unfit
dwelling for all that is pure and gracious."[92] But man's re-
sponsibility is to seek the Kingdom. Only God can establish
it. Here we shall discover a difference between Maurice and
Rauschenbusch. Maurice's static view of the social order

contrasts with Rauschenbusch's evolutionary concept of society.
As we shall see, a combination of factors contributed to their
difference.

For Maurice it is man's "selfish self-seeking" spirit
which hinders the growth of God's Kingdom on earth which Christ
had already set up.[93]   Man's submission to God's will will make
God's potential dominion actual. Maurice believed that men
who had yielded to the tyranny of the evil power were daily
being set free from its control. He regarded individual sor-
rows and national disasters as instruments through which God
had led men to feel that it was "better to dwell in the Father's
house than to feed on the husks and starve."[94] For this reason
man's efforts after brotherhood in the nineteenth century, even
when based on wrong assumptions, were not to be despised.

Rauschenbusch expresses the same concept in this way:
the Kingdom of God was the aim of the revolutionary movement
inaugurated by Jesus. Because Jesus was not merely an initiator
but consummator of the Kingdom the New Testament provides no
definition of it; but Jesus discusses its blessings and the
obstacles to its coming.[95] The really new element in Jesus'
teaching was that the Kingdom was at the point of coming.

The prophetic teaching on the Messianic Hope--the perfection of the theocracy--had remained alive in the hearts of Jesus' contemporaries. Its contents varied with the character of those who held it but there was one common element: the theocratic idea was at last to have its perfect realization in a Kingdom of God on earth with the Messiah as its head.[96] It was a revolutionary hope for which all longed because it meant the establishment of a radically different state of affairs (Luke 1:51-53, 71, 74-75; 2:34-35).[97] This idea of the Kingdom, writes Rauschenbusch, was central to the mind of Jesus. "He too lived in, and from it looked out on the world and the work he had to do."[98] He elevated and transformed the common hope. In his development of some aspects and his rejecting of others Jesus worked towards the same goal as that toward which the Spirit of God had been slowly leading the prophets.[99] The evolutionary idea of the gradualness of the Kingdom of God is central to Rauschenbusch's concept of the social gospel; and he wrote, "to those whose minds live in the social gospel the Kingdom of God is the marrow of the gospel."[100]

In spite of their difference in views of change in society, there is a marked similarity between Maurice's and Rauschenbusch's attacks on the interpretations of Jesus' view

of the Kingdom current in each man's day. Again the difference lies in their method of approach and the premise from which each man started. Maurice maintained that though the interpretations current in his day appeared remote from each other they were not incompatible; for him, each interpretation contained an element of truth though none had total validity. Rauschenbusch is more severe in his criticism of those views which were common in his day; yet he too recognizes certain aspects of truth in the "preconceived notions and prejudices" which, he said, made generations of Christians fail to recognize the social hope and revolutionary nature of the gospel.[101] Rauschenbusch maintains, however, that some of these interpretations were unscriptural. Employing different methods of dealing with the gospels, both Maurice and Rauschenbusch regard Jesus as the sole authority who can determine the validity of an interpretation. As we noted, Rauschenbusch believed that the historical study of the Gospels would enable men to see the life and teaching of Jesus as Jesus intended them to be understood, that is, social in their thoughts and aims.[102] Maurice "had only a perfunctory interest in questions of historical criticism,"[103] but he also understood the social implications of Jesus' message.

The first interpretation with which Maurice deals is
that of those who hope for a better future or a better order
in all men's relations to each other and in all circumstances
which affect men on this planet. That hope,he said, was ex-
pressed in different ways. Some relied on changing civil
orders; others on a better ecclesiastical organization, or
a freer working of those which existed. Others trusted in a
universal education. Failing all these, some believed that
God who is above all rulers and systems would soon claim the
earth as his rightful possession. The last mentioned saw
violent revolutions in human society as signals from God of
the impending destruction of the existing evil structure.[104]

Rauschenbusch does not cite the case of those who
rest their hope in the change of civil orders or in universal
education. The fact is that he believed that the coming King-
dom would be hastened by a change in the social order and by
education. Maurice believed that social regeneration rather
than reconstruction would result from education. Rauschenbusch's
belief in social reconstruction is a more logical development
than Maurice's was. Like Maurice, he wrote sympathetically
but critically of those who, influenced by Paul, objected to
a social interpretation of the gospel because they believed
in the speedy second coming of Christ when the government of

the world would fall before him and his saints, and justice

and peace would reign. Consequently they believed that

until then the Kingdom existed only in the church whose

only province was to snatch individuals from the mass of the

world to be ready for the coming of the Lord.[105] For the

most part Rauschenbusch himself never really rejected that

aspect of this concept which implied that the Kingdom existed

only in the church, that is among the converted and baptised

members of it. Maurice also links the Kingdom on earth--the

universal society--with the Church. To this we shall return

later. They were one in their rejection of the idea that

the Church's function in this world was merely to prepare

its members for the next world.

The second interpretation which Maurice considers was

the anticipation of a better inheritance after death, in

which, in his own words, "men long for an escape from earthly

tumults and revolutions."[106] They long for death "when the

Good Shepherd will lead them and their brethren out of a land

of pits, a thirsty wilderness, a valley of the shadow of death,

to a peaceable and sure dwelling place."[107]

Rauschenbusch arrives at a very similar conclusion when

he speaks of the view of those who affirmed that the theocracy

of Israel had failed and since the coming of Christ a new
theocracy is not part of God's plan. All God now desires
is the sanctification of many souls.[108]   Consequently he
thought that the Church of his day was taking a defensive
attitude against the world rather than an offensive one.
Both Maurice and Rauschenbusch were aware that there were
close connections between these varied misinterpretations,
e.g., Rauschenbusch said that the belief in the immediate re-
turn of Christ was linked to the idea that a new theocracy
was no longer in God's plan; this resulted in an unconcern
with the world. In the same way Maurice mentions divine in-
tervention at the end of the age in the first, and hope beyond
the grave in the second interpretation which he considered.

The third interpretation with which Maurice dealt was
the view that the Kingdom of God exists only in the heart of
man. Those who hold it require a blessing which is needful
and applicable to the present and the life after death. They
long for a beauty and righteousness and truth which can be
imagined in the world around them, but of which the source
must lie much nearer to themselves. Maurice ascribed this
longing to humanists and agnostics who long after righteous-
ness, as well as to those who believed that only God could
free them from inward pride and self-seeking in order that

they might confess his righteousness and be clothed with it.
To this end the latter pray for God's rule over all that is
within them--conscience, affection, reason, will--that they
may be directed to accomplish His design not theirs.[109]

Rauschenbusch initially restricts his parallel to
those who acknowledge the permanence of the theocratic ideal
and the purpose of Christianity to bring about a perfect
humanity on earth. To Rauschenbusch the chief defect of this
view is its individualistic approach to humanity; society can
be changed only when the units in it are changed; the King-
dom of God can only be extended by the conversion of as many
persons as possible.[110] As we examine his attack on this
interpretation we shall find that ultimately Rauschenbusch
does not rigidly apply this interpretation to Christians
only.

In dealing with these interpretations both Maurice and
Rauschenbusch wrote that Jesus confirmed the hope of a better
order on earth. His contemporaries expected a coming King-
dom--a divine Kingdom, the Kingdom of God--which would
deliver them from the House of Herod and Roman rule. Though,
as we have noted, Rauschenbusch points out that the contents
of the hope varied with the character of those who entertained

it, there was one common element: the theocratic idea was

at last to have its perfect realization in a Kingdom of God

on earth with the Messiah as its head.[111]   Both Maurice and

Rauschenbusch emphasized the fact that Jesus used the

phrases, "Thy Kingdom," "the Kingdom of God," "the Kingdom

of Heaven," on every possible occasion, though he knew the

expectation of his hearers. He began his preaching with

the words, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

His words and actions confirmed the hope of his contemporaries

for their deliverance by God out of their oppressed condi-

tion.[112]   Maurice wrote that Jesus admitted the necessity

that his people had to be brought into a different social posi-

tion before they could attain freedom. "Jesus," writes

Rauschenbusch, "like all the prophets and like his spiritually-

minded country-men lived in the hope of a great transformation

of the national life about him. He shared the substance of

that hope with his people."[113]   Both Maurice and Rauschenbusch

agree that Jesus' public acts declared him to be the Messiah

but the difference between Jesus' teaching and many of his

contemporaries was that he rejected all violent methods.[114]

Maurice says that it followed from this that Jesus did

not intend men of any age to ignore the actual confusions and

oppressions which their fellow-men suffer. We are not to think

that his Kingdom is too transcendent in character to take

account of human transactions. The great truth is that as

nothing should be foreign from those who are partakers of

humanity, nothing can be foreign from him who is its

Head.[115]   Jesus affirmed that there is an order among men

which is hidden from them by their own sins and selfish-

ness. That order must and will assert itself in human

affairs.

Rauschenbusch expressed the same view when he wrote

that,by adopting the theocratic idea and proclaiming himself

to be the Messiah,Jesus accepted the idea of an ideal human

society constituted according to divine laws and governed by

God.[116]   He deliberately rejected force, Rauschenbush wrote,

and rested the hope of the Kingdom in the invincible power

of truth.[117]

It is in their application of this idea to the existing

society that the differences between Maurice and Rauschenbusch

become evident. Starting from their common ground that Jesus

admitted the necessity of a changed social condition

Rauschenbusch's concept of social reconstruction seems a far

more logical development than Maurice's concept of social re-

generation. We can say that in this respect they were men of

their age but the remarkable fact is that Maurice's col-
league, Ludlow, found Maurice's theological position the
groundwork for views on social reconstruction that in many
ways were similar to those of Rauschenbusch.   And
Rauschenbusch commenting on the reconstructive power of
Christianity wrote: "Maurice and Kingsley, Ruskin and
Carlyle, Lamennais and Mazzini and Tolstoi, were true seers
of God, and they made others see."[118]   Yet Maurice was con-
fident that Jesus did not speak of his Kingdom, or his
Father's Kingdom, as if it were to set aside the constitu-
tion of the universe, of which men had seen tokens in family
and national institutions.   Jesus did not deny the dreams of
those who thought of a higher and more general fellowship.
To Maurice the error of his time was that all those who
recognized the evils of the day and sought to correct them--
whether they were politicians, ecclesiastics or millenarians--
assumed that the constitution of things is evil, and not that
men are evil in departing from it.   They entertain the un-
christian sentiment that "the devil is the lord of the
universe" and consequently believe that "the evil power may
be weakened or broken only by an improvement in the arrange-
ments of civil life, or by a stronger assertion of priestly
authority, or by the final coming of the Son of Man."[119]

Maurice maintained that even before the coming of
Christ the prophets had protested against that view. Though
the universal nature of the Kingdom had not yet been shown,
they believed in its existence. They declared its laws,
testified that the heathen were at war with their own proper
ruler, and told the chosen race that by their evil acts as
kings, priests and people, they were breaking the everlasting
covenant.[120] Furthermore Maurice claimed that those who held
the view that the devil was lord of the universe could not
effectively connect our Lord's command, "Repent," with his
announcement, "The Kingdom of heaven is at hand"; though
his example forbade separation of the two.[121] They renounced
his authority and denied the reality of the Incarnation. Un-
doubtedly Maurice would have classified Rauschenbusch among
those who entertain the view that the devil is the lord of
the universe.

For Maurice, then, the crucial questions for each man
were: What have I done to frustrate the ends for which the
Kingdom of Heaven has been established upon earth? How can
I cease my strife with it and become an obedient servant?
His static view of society guided him to resist any thought
of social reconstruction. Rauschenbusch, in contrast to
Maurice, believed that the perfection of the Kingdom on

earth could be hastened on by change in the social order.
This could be achieved by the deeper loyalty of Christians
to the teaching of Christ. Christ's second coming, he
wrote, will depend largely on Christians, for in all God's
dealings with man the human element is the variable quality.
God allows man free action and the fulfilment of his counsel
is hastened or retarded by man's obedience or disobedience.[122]

Rauschenbush identified forces in society that were
antagonistic to Christ and had to be dethroned so that Christ
could reign.[123] The Christian's work in the world was to
make it a fit habitation for our Lord. Like Maurice he
believed that the world must never be regarded as merely a
place of preparation for the next; and Christians,
Rauschenbusch wrote, have the weapons, truth and faith, to do
that work, power to serve Christ by winning stubborn hearts,
uncovering social lies, and making injustice vanish. When
Christ returned it would be to judge and not to upbuild.
Though no one could determine to what extent the transforma-
tion could be made, Christians now possessed the power to
change the world. The experience of the centuries had shown
that they could, and it also confirmed Jesus' doctrine of
the gradualness of the Kingdom (Matthew 13:31-32). Jesus,
Rauschenbusch wrote, rejected the apocalyptic anticipation

of divine catastrophic intervention and reaffirmed the

earlier prophetic view that the future would grow out of

the present by divine help. Jesus believed in the law of

gradual growth.[124]

Experience also teaches us that Christ would not re-

turn immediately, yet men are to act as if he were coming

immediately. We can keep ourselves in that state of tension

only by understanding the law of evolution of the Kingdom.

The Kingdom has come (Matthew 11:3-5; 12:28, 34; 21:31). It

is coming (Matthew 6:10, 15).

> As God is in all three tenses, the God that
> was and is and shall be, so is the Kingdom
> behind which is the force of the living God.
> It is forever coming. Hence it is forever
> pressing. The time is always short. One
> era after the other passes away. The need is
> always desperate.[125]

It must be stressed that Rauschenbusch lays greater emphasis

on human responsibility than Maurice does. Man's failure to

respond to God's call in one era, wrote Rauschenbusch, hinders

the coming of the Kingdom in the next. Rauschenbusch's dis-

tinction between two attitudes which he labels "religious"

and "spiritual" shows his own understanding of Christ's

presence in history. He rejects the view of the "religious"

man who believes that God did great things in the far past

and will do great things in the distant future. The "spiritual"

man sees God acting in history now:

> He sees the great Avenger standing ever within
> the shadow of history. He feels the spirit
> of the living Christ working in the hearts of
> men that think they know him not. ... In the
> moanings of the nations, in their feverish
> stirring, in the shrill laugh of skepticism,
> in the gropings of fanatics he sees the work-
> ing of him who, like his Father, is ever
> working without haste and without rest, and
> with beating heart he whispers to himself:
> "The Kingdom of God is at hand, arise!"[126]

Maurice does not show the developed eschatological

view of Rauschenbusch. For him Jesus did not disparage the

longings of those who projected their thoughts wholly into a

future state but he discouraged anything in these anticipa-

tions which despaired of the present; for Jesus hallowed

all human life. Nevertheless he cherished and confirmed the

hope for the future. God is the God of hope and therefore to

hope for the future must be good. But men must not think that

we wait for death to solve an unresolved problem. The death

of Christ solved it once and forever. Our mortal death will

only reveal to us how perfect that solution is.[127]

Nevertheless Maurice questioned the usefulness of

speculations about the life after death. He believed in the

final revelation of Christ. "Christ's appearing is as

certain as the Sun's rising, or as our deaths."[128]   But Maurice

could provide no description of its nature.   "'Looking for the

revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ,'"[129] were the only words,

he said, which gave him any glimpse of its future state.   All

our considerations of this future state must begin, as those

of St. Paul and St. John did, with acknowledgement of Christ

as the King over men's spirits as their Redeemer from the

evil Spirit, as the Ruler of the Universe.[130]   They must be

connected with the restoration of the earth, and its deliver-

ance from whatever hinders it from being the Kingdom of God,

and of his Christ.[131]   The perfection of all of man's present

activities must form part of our future hope.   This perfection

will involve freer and more effective service to Christ.   "If

we are now the sons of God, we may leave Him to settle what

we shall be, in what exercises we shall be engaged, what

special tasks shall be assigned us."[132]

Rauschenbusch, as we have seen, did not begin as

Maurice did with the belief that Christ is the King over men's

spirits now: as the Ruler of the universe (though he often

comes close to saying just that).   But like Maurice he in-

sisted that Jesus never transferred the Kingdom hope from

earth to heaven.   God's purpose was not to admit one member

of the Kingdom after another into heaven and to leave the

world as it was.[133]   "The Kingdom was so much of this earth

that Jesus expected to return to earth from heaven in order

to set it up."[134]   Because it is true that Christ promised

the completion of the Kingdom at his second coming (Matthew

13:24-30, 47-50; 25:1-13, 31-56; 7:21-27; 22:11-14; 8:11) it

was natural that his apostles, even if they could have, did

not attempt to change the existing social order. But,

Rauschenbusch wrote, such an attitude is untenable for Chris-

tians after nineteen centuries. The watchfulness for the

Coming of the Son of Man which Jesus commanded now consists

in obedience rather than in expectation. This is of course

linked to his concept of human responsibility in hastening

the coming of the Kingdom. He states that Christ appeared

the first time when "'the fullness of the time' had come

(Gal. 4:4). He will appear the second time when the fullness

of the time shall have come. When that will be, depends

largely on us."[135]

For Maurice, while Jesus sanctioned the longings of

those who look for a better government of the world, and of

those who look for a world after death, he also satisfied the

longings of those who sought here a kingdom of righteousness,

truth and love. In fact Jesus spoke to these longings before

he could respond to the others.

> Our Lord spoke straight to the conscience,
> reason, will in man, which were asking after
> the Unseen, which were seeking for a Father
> . . . He manifested forth the true state and
> glory of man, as the child of God, and the
> inheritor of truth and righteousness, and built
> His Church upon that foundation of His own
> divine Humanity, against which the gates of
> hell shall not prevail.[136]

This was a continuous process. The Kingdom of God begins within but it must penetrate man's feelings, habits, thoughts, words and acts. It must also penetrate man's whole social existence and fashion all things according to its laws. This would accomplish the extinction of all tyranny whether exercised by particular men or by the masses. It must expose and destroy man's inward and outward corruptions because it upholds truth in all departments of government, art and science. It recognizes the true dignity of all professions. It demands just dealings in trade and the deepest concern for the richest and the poorest persons of the land.[137]

For Rauschenbusch, because Jesus believed in the organic growth of the new society, he encouraged its growth cell by cell. This was achieved in two ways. Every person brought under the control of the new spirit which he revealed and embodied was an advance in the kingdom. Progress was also made each time his teaching of the Father and the right

life among men was put into action. But he is careful to say that though Jesus worked on and through individuals his real purpose was not individualistic, but social. ". . .the new society would have to nucleate around personal centres of renewal. But his end was not the new soul, but the new society; not man, but Man."[138]

While Jesus began his work on the inward and spiritual side of human life, he did not divorce the inward from the outward. He initiated his kingdom on earth by establishing a community of spiritual men, in inward communion with God and in outward obedience to him. This was the living germ of the Kingdom. Thus far Rauschenbusch has restricted his concept of the Kingdom to believers in Christ. But he goes on to say that the increase of its membership was not the only method of extending its power. By the power of the Spirit of God dwelling in it, it was to overcome the spirit dominant in the world and thus transform the world. Every increase in mercy, justice and truth would be an extension of the reign of God in humanity: an incoming of the Kingdom of God. At all the important junctures in the process and especially at the consummation God would "interfere with awful judgements and demonstrations of his power from on high,

co-operating with the spiritual work of the church in secu-
ring the triumph of Christ".[139]

The difference between Maurice and Rauschenbusch is
that Maurice would never have spoken of any spirit dominant
in the world other than Christ whom man has only to acknow-
ledge as Ruler of the universe. The difference may well have
arisen from the fact that Maurice started with the doctrines
of Creation and Incarnation and Rauschenbusch with the Fall.
At times their language leads me to believe that the differ-
ence was one of language rather than of thought, as the fol-
lowing similarities to Maurice's thought in Rauschenbusch's
discussion on inward religion show.

Jesus, Rauschenbusch wrote, never held "a purely ab-
stract internal, spiritualized conception of the Kingdom,
which claims only the inner world of the soul and its ethical
outflow for God, and leaves the outward organization of the
world" to wrong and misery.[140] No sound religious faith can
tolerate a bisection of the world into a spiritual Kingdom
of God and a material Kingdom of the devil. Jesus' purpose
was the social redemption of the entire life of the human
race on earth. This involved the regeneration of every in-
dividual to divine sonship and eternal life, and the victory

of the spirit of Christ over the spirit of the world in every

form of human society and a corresponding alteration in all

human institutions formed by human society. These two are

simultaneous aims. Each one is indispensable to the success

of the other.

> It is only when a man understands that this
> earth with all it contains is to become the
> habitation of God, that all the homely ser-
> vices and relations of human life if rightly
> done are a loving service of the brethren
> and hence of Christ, and that any improvement
> in the method and spirit of human relations
> is the perfection of God's will, only then
> can the whole life of the common man become
> a sacrifice and his plain daily toil a love-
> offering to God.[141]

Rauschenbusch goes on to say that Jesus extended the

limits of the Kingdom. He substituted the idea of God's na-

tion with the idea of God's humanity (Matthew 8:10-12;

Luke 4:23-30; 10:25-37; 17:11-19). He revealed the theocracy

to be a Kingship of God in all nations binding their diversi-

ty together by the unity of spirit and oneness of sovereignty.

"He approached the bold cosmopolitanism of Paul, that 'in

Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek'."[142] (Galatians 3:28).

He eliminated all hope of personal or national self-aggran-

disement from the concept of the Kingdom and laid down the

law of service as its fundamental law (Matthew 20:20-28).

He disconnected it from ceremonial and ecclesiastical religion and set it within the domain of secular and ethical relations. Like the prophets, all Jesus' enthusiasm went out towards justice, mercy and goodwill among men (Luke 4:16-21; Matthew 11:2-6). By his entire life Jesus showed that the spiritual nature of man--the religious and moral element--is the core of individual life and the real formative force in the life of the society. History, Rauschenbusch wrote, also asserts this position.[143]

He also wrote that a subtle and significant change in the concept of the Kingdom resulted from a combination of the modifications Jesus gave to the concepts of the Kingdom held by his contemporaries. The Kingdom in one sense was already here. Its consummation was in the future but its fundamental realities were already present. There is material for both views in the sayings of Jesus.

> . . . while he took the long outlook, he felt the nearness of the Kingdom more than they all. To him it was not merely near, but here, germinating in their hearts, pulsating in their common thoughts, reversing their valuation of things, sweetening their relations, lifting the least of them above the highest representative of the old order [Matthew 11:11], and quietly creating a new world.[144]

Maurice and Rauschenbusch differed in their theological presuppositions. Maurice, as we have said, was thoroughly Johannine in his approach and started from the doctrines of Creation and Incarnation. Rauschenbusch was drawn to the Synoptic Gospels and laid the emphasis upon the teaching and Person of Jesus. Yet in spite of differences in method, emphases and premises their conclusions about the Kingdom of God on earth bear remarkable similarity.

We said earlier that Rauschenbusch emphasized human responsibility for the ushering in of the Kingdom. This is not to suggest that he overlooked the divine initiative. It is true that Maurice emphasizes more than Rauschenbusch did that the Kingdom is not man's but God's. Maurice wrote that when man looks at Nature he is compelled to recognize that he did not call that Kingdom into existence. But he does in fact exercise great power over it. In our present threat of ecological imbalance Maurice's words take on unique significance.

> "Man the servant and interpreter of Nature,
> knows nothing, can do nothing, except what
> he had first observed in her." All the
> boastings to which two centuries of wonder-
> ful success might have given birth are
> stopped by the recollection, that obedience
> to this canon has been the single secret of
> success, that any one who would resist it,

> and determine to conquer without stooping,
> has gone away discomfited. Nature, even
> when she seems most confessing the dominion
> of man, is saying with all her voices,
> "Yours is not the power; you are learners,
> interpreters, receivers; you can use the
> strength which you have first asked for;
> that is all."[145]

Maurice also warns men against a false sense of autonomy in the realm of human society but here it is more difficult. Because man exercises considerable influence in that sphere he is constantly tempted to think that he established it and upholds it. Maurice maintains, however, that there are forms of constituted authority in every nation which should convince man that all his power is derived from a power higher than himself. The forms indicate that all men in authority derive that authority from God and must account to Him at all times for their stewardship. Jesus showed that the Kingdom is not man's, though man is called to occupy an honourable place in it. Some men occupy more prominent offices but each man is assigned "_some_ place in it; some work and office . . . by the Great King, a rule over a portion of His subjects".[146] The Kingdom will come on earth only through God's power. "The love of God is the only power in the universe which will accomplish _any_ result."[147] Man must learn that all the powers he finds in himself are derived

from God. These powers must be directed and sustained by
God if they are to be used for the welfare of all humanity.
God's purpose is to create the well-being of his children.
His glory consists in promoting the welfare of his children.

Rauschenbusch's emphasis on man's responsibility in
building the Kingdom does not contradict this principle of
the divine initiative. He wrote that God is the real creator
of the Kingdom. It is not to be set up by man-made evolu-
tion. "Like the old prophets, Jesus believed that . . ."[148]
The two emphases are complementary rather than contradictory;
our task is to reconcile them in determining a theology for
social concern today.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 96.

2. _Ibid._, p. 485.

3. _Working Men's College Magazine_, Vol. III, p. 14, quoted in Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 493-494.

4. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 41.

5. _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 447.

6. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 378.

7. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 450; _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I, p. 126. Cf. Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_, pp. 39-40.

8. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, pp. 325, 390. Cf. Arthur Michael Ramsey, _F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology_ (Cambridge: Universtity Press, 1951), p. 22.

9. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, pp. 38-42, 167. Chs. 1-3 deal with the importance of the social gospel; the next six with sin and the fall.

10. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 246.

11. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, pp. 289-290.

12. _Ibid._, p. 320; Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 593.

13. _Supra_, p. 203.

14. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 289; _Life_, Col. I, p. 510.

15. Rauschenbusch, Letter to W.G. Ballantyne, January 24th, 1912, quoted in Sharpe, _op. cit._, p. 322.

16. _Supra_, p. 231.

17. Rauschenbusch, _Theology,_ p. 167.

18. _Ibid._, p. 169.

19. _Supra_, p. 214.

20. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, p. 175; see also _Social Order_, pp. 60-61.

21. Autocratic environments, Rauschenbusch said, had influenced Athanasius, Anselm, Duns Scotus. Even Luther and Calvin, though they helped to end the reign of fear, were not themselves totally liberated.

22. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, p.178.

23. _Ibid._, p. 181.

24. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 288.

25. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 253.

26. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, pp. 288-292.

27. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 384.

28. _Ibid._, p. 135; Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 292.

29. This was the cause of his conflict with Mansel. It became part of the issue which led to his dismissal from King's College. Ramsey, (_op. cit._, ch. III) links Maurice's concept of eternal life with his socialism.

30. See Sharpe, _op. cit._, p. 341, quoting Rauschenbusch article, "God as Father," _For God and the People: Rochester Baptist Monthly_, Nov. 1897, p. 45.

31. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, pp. 178-179.

32.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 179.

33.   Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 88.

34.   <u>Ibid</u>.

35.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 130.

36.   Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Order</u>, p. 61; <u>supra</u>, n. 20.

37.   Cf. Beach and Niebuhr, eds., <u>op. cit</u>.   In ch. 15
      "Walter Rauschenbusch," Beach writes: "Its [the
      Social Gospel's] concept of God is a mixture of
      Biblical and especially prophetic motifs combined
      with ideas derived from scientific and intellectual
      currents of nineteenth century secular thought."
      p. 447.   This was certainly true of Rauschenbusch.

38.   Rauschenbusch, <u>Theology</u>, p. 179.

39.   Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, pp. 319-320;
      <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, pp. 383-384, 395.

40.   Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 320.

41.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 325.

42.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 398;   Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, p. 292;
      Vol. II, pp. 253, 581.

43.   Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, p. 414;   <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>,
      Vol. I, pp. 133, 282; Vol. II, p. 16.

44.   Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, p. 292.

45.   Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 398.

46.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 284.

47.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 288.

48.   Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. I, p. 154.

49.   _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 510.

50.   _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 154.

51.   _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 155.

52.   _Ibid._

53.   _Ibid._

54.   Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 288.

55.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 155, 510.

56.   _Ibid._, p. 155.

57.   _Ibid._, p. 156.

58.   Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 288.

59.   Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I, pp. 135, 318;
       Life, Vol. I, p. 508.

60.   Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, pp. 177-178;
       cf. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 122.

61.   Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, pp. 168, 184.

62.   _Ibid._, p. 186.

63.   _Ibid._, p. 187.

64.   _Ibid._, p. 174.

65.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 99.

66.   Maurice, _St. John_, p. 25;   cf. Ramsey, _op. cit._,
       pp. 20, 23, 94-95; Craig, _op. cit._, p. 14.

67.   Maurice, _St. John_, p. 25.

68.   _Supra_, p. 231.

69. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 532.

70. _Ibid._, p. 532-535.

71. Maurice wrote that this was what Paul meant in Romans 6 and every other epistle; see _Life_, Vol. I, p. 106.

72. Maurice, _Life_, Vol, I, pp. 106-107.

73. _Ibid._, p. 187, cf. p. 97 and Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I, p. 227.

74. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 118.

75. _Ibid._, p. 126.

76. _Ibid._, p. 121.

77. _Ibid._, p. 122.

78. _Ibid._, pp. 123-130. Rauschenbusch depends on the Synoptic Gospels which he says are the oldest and most reliable records. See p. 126.

79. _Ibid._, p. 124.

80. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 125.

81. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, pp. 123-124, 131.

82. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 247.

83. _Ibid._, Vol. II. p. 350.

84. _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 352.

85. _Ibid._, Vol. II, pp. 353-354.

86. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 149.

87. _Supra_, p. 233.

88.   This fact, along with the strong emphasis on the
      revolutionary nature of the Kingdom, may well be
      the reason why Rauschenbusch never published
      The Righteousness of the Kingdom. Cf. C.H. Hopkins
      Book Review on The Righteousness of the Kingdom,
      Union Seminary Quarterly, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, Winter
      1969, pp. 211-213. "Doubtless The Righteousness
      of the Kingdom is authentic Rauschenbusch, but it
      is difficult to accept it as such. Launched on
      a revolutionary note, ... it was less mature than
      the author of Christianity and the Social Crisis...."

89.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, p. 133.

90.   Rauschenbusch, Theology, p. 188.

91.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, pp. 133-141.

92.   Maurice, Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer, p. 327.

93.   Maurice, Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer, p. 328.

94.   Ibid.

95.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, p. 79; Social Crisis,
      p. 54.

96.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, p. 81; Social Crisis,
      p. 56.

97.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, pp. 71-74; Social Crisis,
      pp. 49-53.

98.   Rauschenbusch, Theology, p. 131; cf. Social
      Crisis, p. 54.

99.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, pp. 82, 88-89; Social
      Crisis, pp. 57, 64. Supra, ch. 4.

100. Rauschenbusch, Theology, p. 131.

101. Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, pp. 44-46.

102. <u>Ibid</u>.; cf. Maurice, <u>The Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 29.

103. Ramsey, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 83; cf. Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. II, p. 384.

104. Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 304.

105. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 105.

106. Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 306.

107. <u>Ibid</u>.; cf. Maurice, <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>, Vol. II, p. 122.

108. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 98. Rauschenbusch indicates that there is ample evidence of this attitude in existing systematic theologies and hymnologies where the emphasis is thrown on individual and not world salvation.

109. Maurice, <u>The Lord's Prayer</u>, pp. 28-29; cf. <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>, Vol. I, p. 61.

110. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 101.

111. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 81; <u>Social Crisis</u>, p. 56.

112. Maurice, <u>The Lord's Prayer</u>, pp. 29-31; Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, pp. 71-76; <u>Social Order</u>, pp. 48-67, <u>passim</u>; <u>Social Crisis</u>, pp. 49-64.

113. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 98; cf. Maurice, <u>The Lord's Prayer</u>, pp. 30-31.

114. Maurice, <u>The Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 30; Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, pp. 89ff., 98.

115. Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 308; <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>, Vol. I, pp. 248ff.

116. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 98.

117. Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Crisis</u>, pp. 57-58; <u>Social Order</u>, pp. 58-59, 66; <u>Kingdom</u>, pp. 88-95.

118. Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Crisis</u>, p. 338.

119. Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 312.

120. Cf. Amos, chs. 1 and 2; see <u>Kingdom of Christ</u>, Vol. I, pp. 243-244; <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 311.

121. Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, p. 312.

122. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, pp. 107-108.

123. Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Order</u>, pp. 30-39. He mentions such forces as the conservative stupidity and stolidity of human nature, psychological conservatism of the age, the power of institutional tradition and the reactionary church.

124. Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Crisis</u>, p. 59; <u>Social Order</u>, pp. 64-66.

125. Rauschenbusch, <u>Kingdom</u>, p. 109.

126. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 110.

127. Maurice, <u>Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer</u>, pp. 312-314; <u>Life</u>, Vol. II, pp. 242-249.

128. Maurice, <u>Life</u>, Vol. II, p. 247.

129. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 243.

130. <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 244, 288.

131. <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 245-249.

132. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 245.

133. Rauschenbusch, <u>Social Order</u>, p. 66; <u>Kingdom</u>, pp. 84-88.

134.   Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 66.

135.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, p. 107.

136.   Maurice, The Lord's Prayer, p. 37.

137.   Ibid., pp. 36-38; cf. Life, Vol. II, p. 247.

138.   Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, pp. 59-61;
        Social Order, pp. 64-66.

139.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, p. 88. See also pp. 84-88;
        Social Order, pp. 62-64, 66; Social Crisis, p.65.

140.   Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 57.

141.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, pp. 111-112. Cf. Social
        Order, p. 66.

142.   Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, p. 61.

143.   Rauschenbusch, Social Order, pp. 59-66; Social
        Crisis, pp. 61-62; Kingdom, pp. 98ff.

144.   Rauschenbusch, Social Order, p. 65.

145.   Maurice, The Lord's Prayer, p. 123; cf. Maurice,
        St. John, p. 17.

146.   Maurice, The Lord's Prayer, p. 120.

147.   Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 528.

148.   Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, p. 63.

CHAPTER VI

MAURICE AND RAUSCHENBUSCH

MAN AND HIS SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

For Maurice and Rauschenbusch, the Kingdom of God

exists in this present world. Maurice believed that God had

established a spiritual and universal constitution for human

society throughout the world. This divine order was present

in the world and was not to be constructed by mankind or

awaited as the climax of the historical process.[1] Maurice

had very little to say about the future of the Kingdom either

in history or in "the world to come". As Olive Brose says:

> Maurice refused to consider the Kingdom
> as future--it was eternal, hence had always
> existed. It was the constitution of the
> universe. Christ had already spoken to the
> hopes of those who yearned for a Kingdom
> of righteousness, truth and love. In the
> root of man's being--the conscience, the
> will--His work was still going on, carrying
> with it the promise of knowledge of Him who
> was, had been, and was to come.[2]

Maurice himself accounted for his silence about the future

on two grounds: (i) he felt an overwhelming responsibility

to teach that "the Kingdom of heaven is ever present with man; different in kind from the visible world, but affecting it and swaying its movements continually."[3] (ii) The descriptions he had heard of the future state were not only vague and selfish but they denied the truth of the redeemed state of man.[4] His concern then was more with the present than with the future either in history or beyond history.

God, he believed, has given all things their right type and order. They are good when they are in the relationship to God. Disorder results from man who, as a voluntary creature, can abandon allegiance to God. The restoration of things begins, therefore, in man's submission to God; this consists in the confession that God's will is the good will.[5]

When Maurice looked at both the past and the present he concluded that God's order is manifested in the institutions of the family, the nation, and the church--the universal society. Tendencies and therefore evidences towards these exist in every nation. Consequently men need only "dig" to discover the true foundations which underlie these institutions. In another connection, but applicable here, Maurice wrote:

> ... the greatest progress consists in the
> assertion and elucidation of first
> principles; ... when they are asserted
> and elucidated, all faithful effort is
> seen to have been directed to the search
> for them--all unfaithful, self-seeking
> efforts, to the construction of systems
> on hypothetical sand.[6]

Man

Maurice emphasized that each man is made in the image of God. That image is revealed in Christ--the Word made flesh--who is the Son of God and the Son of Man. We must look at Christ and not at Adam (as Christians have often done) to see what the man made in the image of God is like. For Maurice it is Christ who is the Head of mankind from the beginning. We are

> not to think that world was created in Adam,
> nor stood in his obedience; for the Scriptures
> of the New Testament, illustrating those of
> the Old, teach us that it stood and stands
> in the obedience of God's well-beloved Son,
> the real image of the Father, the real bond of
> human society and of the whole universe, who
> was to be manifested in the fullness of time,
> as that which he had always been.[7]

Maurice maintains that Scripture never contemplates the derangement of man's state, which is the consequence of man's disobedience, as determining what that state is. It looks upon the unfallen creature or the creature renewed after the fall as the proper representative of humanity.

> The true form of man's existence and society
> has not perished because certain fragments
> have been severed from it. Christ, in whom
> the whole harmony stood perfect came to
> reunite the fragments.[8]

He wrote that if we believe that the Kingdom is to come on

earth as it is in heaven it is not difficult to suppose the

existence of multitudes of blessed creatures, formed and

kept in the image of Christ. At the same time man has no

goodness apart from Christ. All his goodness comes through

union with Jesus who is perfectly good. But Maurice insists

that an evil condition is not man's true state. Goodness is

the state for which God has created and redeemed him. Evil

is the denial of that state. Maurice said that the Epistle

to the Hebrews asserts on every page that the ascended Head

of the race had claimed for men their true position as sons

of God.[9] All men are to be regarded and to regard themselves

as created in Christ and therefore as righteous beings. The

Redeemer, who is also the Creator, restores men to their

original state in the divine purpose. The word redemption

itself signifies that "the partakers of it were not brought

into some novel or unnatural state, but into that for which

they were created, that which was implied in their human

constitution."[10]

Man is also God's minister, acting for him and able to perform God's intention towards God's involuntary creatures. Again, because man is a voluntary creature he is able to obey or disobey God's will.

> There is a selfish evil nature in every
> man . . . there is a Divine root of
> humanity, a Son of man, whence all the
> good in Churchman or man of the world
> springs- . . .[11]

> . . . man is a twofold creature, having
> inclinations towards sensible things,
> being united to the divine Word, by trusting
> in whom he may rise above these inclinations
> and attain to a spiritual life and communion.[12]

Man's true condition is one of dependence and his proper way of fulfilling that condition on earth is by seeking God's help for the correction of his tendency towards independence of God and his fellowmen.[13] Temptation is part of the human experience; it is part of the privilege of a voluntary creature. Man's whole life is one continual procession of temptations. God does not tempt man, but the circumstances of life into which man is led by God involve temptations because man has the choice either of glorifying God in these events or of glorifying himself or someone other than God. The circumstances of riches and poverty, health and riches, various gifts and endowments, all have their peculiar temptations. The lives of busy men in every

day life, as well as the contemplative, the monk and the
married man, the halls of philosophical debate, the realms
of politics and chiefly the religious all have their tempta-
tions.[14] Man's security lies in the knowledge that God <u>is</u>
and that he determines the whole frame and condition of
men's lives and these are the best possible for men. God
will deliver men out of temptation if men will trust him.

Jesus' example is the standard by which man must
judge himself for he is subject to no more severe test,
<u>mutatis</u> <u>mutandis</u>, than Jesus was.

> His [Jesus'] first act of dependence and
> obedience was to go whithersoever he was led;
> not to choose His circumstances for Himself;
> to be equally ready for the desert or the
> market-place. His second act of dependence
> was in the desert or market-place, in the
> full sight and foresight of the Temptations
> which beset Him to say, "Father, bring me not
> into them."[15]

Temptations then are common to all men and all men have a
common Deliverer.

> . . . the human $\eta\theta os$ is . . . that of trust;
> <u>the</u> man, the Divine Man being the Truster Him-
> self and the Source of Trust in all the race.
> . . . Christ's trust in the Father is the sign
> and witness of His divine nature, that which
> corresponds and shows forth the righteous-
> ness of God, that which is the basis of right-
> eousness for man.[16]

Man as an independent creature has lost his centre. He cannot
stand by himself. The disorder in the world results from

man's assertion of his independent individuality and this

can only be corrected when man discovers his condition of

dependence.[17]   Man, like Christ, can resist the tempta-

tions of the devil.   "Dependence and trust are not incon-

sistent with the condition of creatures who are human, and

who have sinned."[18]   There could be no families, no nations,

no social impulses, no laws, nothing to resist selfish

tendencies which men experience in themselves and their

neighbours, if there had not been one living centre of human-

ity, one Head of every man.[19]

> The Gospel . . . is the full discovery of
> Him who is the Living Centre of the Universe,
> the assertion that all men are related to
> Him; the destruction of every wall of parti-
> tion between Man and Man; the admission of
> all who desire it into fellowship with the
> Father of the whole family in Heaven and
> Earth.[20]

We have noted earlier that Maurice maintained that

anyone who assumed that the constitution of things is evil,

and not that men are evil in departing from it, could not

effectively connect Jesus' word "Repent" with his announce-

ment that "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." Rauschenbusch

did precisely this and therefore provides a good test of

Maurice's assertion.

Rauschenbusch wrote that the doctrine that man is
by nature good and tends upward, if only he is not dragged
down by outward forces, was the presupposition of the
doctrine of inevitable progress. He said that he had been
obliged to abandon both these and to affirm the doctrine of
Original Sin, the corruption of Man's heart, because it is
not true that man tends by nature upward. It is the down-
ward way that is easy. It requires no effort to yield to
temptation; the effort comes when man tries to resist. No
one drifts naturally into purity, justice and unselfishness.
Humanity if left alone would roll "into a hell on earth,
into rottenness, beastliness and self-destruction."[21] Every
association of men and every human institution sags down-
ward--politics, church, charitable organizations, educational
systems through "mere moral inertia" as well as by "conscious,
determined malicious love of evil."[22]

By moral inertia, Rauschenbusch meant that the natural
thing is for man to do evil because it appears attractive and
then to repeat it because it has acquired a power over Him.
In this way the downward course develops. Yet Rauschenbusch
writes that while man is doing evil he knows it to be evil
and wishes he did not do it and is pained to see the young
and innocent acquiring the same bad habits. By conscious

love of evil he meant that it is possible for the human spirit
to give itself to evil, to love it, to delight in systematic-
ally corrupting the minds of innocent people and to inter-
fere consciously with the efforts for a better society.
"Such are children of the devil" and they have power in both
the broad spectrum of history and in local, political and
social circles.[23] They can accomplish more than good men
can because they appeal to the lower instincts of man: lust,
hate and pride. These instincts give momentum to the
naturally downward trend of humanity. So,he writes:

> our wrestling is not merely with the
> natural weakness of flesh and blood but
> "against the principalities,against the
> powers, against the world rulers of this
> darkness, against the spiritual hosts of
> wickedness."[24]

But he also writes that while the establishment of the Kingdom
of God on earth will involve a severe struggle it will come,
for God wills it. Perhaps human nature is too complex for
logical discussion. In spite of Rauschenbusch's "realism",
Maurice's view of man appears to me to be the more balanced
and therefore the more attractive. His argument is more
consistent; as we shall see, Rauschenbusch also affirms
that God has the whole world in his hands.

Human Society

Like Maurice, Rauschenbusch also examined the past but he came to quite different conclusions. Here again Maurice's philosophical and theological approach contrasts with Rauschenbusch's biblical and sociological one. Like Maurice, Rauschenbusch said that the Kingdom of God is present in the world, but there is a distinct difference between their respective beliefs in the Kingdom that has come. Maurice's view is more tangible, concrete and fixed than Rauschenbusch's. For Maurice, through Christ's victory over evil, the earth had become not potentially but actually God's. The spirit of man has been brought to desire that he should serve God on earth as he would in heaven.[25] But for Rauschenbusch the Kingdom was still to be realized. This same contrast between Maurice and Rauschenbusch will be seen again when we compare their concepts of the Church.

When Rauschenbusch looked at the past, his concern, unlike that of Maurice, was centred on the future of human civilization. Because Rauschenbusch had at one time believed in the doctrine of inevitable progress he lays great emphasis in his writings on the fact that history disproves the optimistic illusion that "nothing can stand in the way of human progress."[26]

The continents are strewn with the ruins of dead nations and civilizations. Citing the examples of Greece and Rome, he maintains that the stages of the powerful nations of history have been wealth, civilization, international power and decay. He believed that modern nations would follow a similar fate if they did not learn the causes of the decay of earlier nations and strive to remove these causes from their own. To Rauschenbusch neither progress nor decay is the necessary destiny for any nation but one or the other inevitably occurs. No society is static. He saw no inherent reason why a group of nations such as those of Western civilization should not overcome every social evil as it arose and employ every attainment as a stepping stone to a still higher culture. He knew that this had never been tried but he believed that it could be done in a civilization such as his own in which Christianity was the salt and the leaven.[27]

Rauschenbusch was convinced that "nations do not die by wealth, but by injustice."[28] The forward impetus comes through historical opportunities which stimulate the production of wealth, break up the rigid order of the past, call forth creative leaders to the front, quicken intellectual life and intensify patriotic service. On the other hand,

progress slackens when a single class appropriates the
social results of the common labour, protects its privileges
by unfair laws and throttles the masses by political central-
ization and suppression. When this happens, productive
energy falls and distrust and bitterness grow among the
citizens. "Men no longer love the Commonwealth, because it
does not stand for the common wealth. ... Internal convul-
sion and external catastrophes will finally reveal the state
of decay."[29]

Rauschenbusch was convinced that this would happen
in the modern world unless the causes of social wrong were
removed. He saw the twentieth century as a decisive turning
point in the history of Western civilization. Future his-
torians would see it either as the golden age prior to the
total collapse or the period of "the real adolescence of
humanity, the great emancipation from barbarism and from
the paralysis of injustice, and the beginning of a progress
in the intellectual, social, and moral life of mankind ..."[30]
Which it would become would depend on the moral energies
which the Christian nations exerted in the fight against
wrong. Therefore it would be either "a revival of social
religion or the deluge."[31]

But Rauschenbusch was hopeful because he believed

that there were a few nations (European and American) whose

progress during the last two thousand years seemed headed

towards the Kingdom of God. Their progress had by no means

been unchequered but they had gone forward and seemed to have

the powers not only of planting new and vigorous societies

but of enlivening their "paralytic sister nations."[32] In

spite of the obvious difference between Maurice's static

view of society and the evolutionary concept of Rauschenbusch,

this particular point in Rauschenbusch's writing bears an

interesting resemblance to Maurice's idea of colonization

"as a brave, hearty, Saxon, Christian, work."[33]

Thus far, Rauschenbusch's examination of history is

logical and provides a dimension at which Maurice had merely

hinted. Yet he validates Maurice's conviction that we can-

not effectively connect the words "Repent" and "The Kingdom

of God is at hand" if we assume man to be naturally evil.

Rauschenbusch assumed that it is the natural thing for man

to do evil and yet he can discuss the invincibility of right

and the ultimate victory of God's will in the world. He

writes:

> To do right against all considerations of
> utility is the categorical imperative of
> duty. To believe in the triumph of right
> against all appearances of defeat is the

> categorical imperative of faith. To deny
> the former is moral suicide. To surrender
> the latter is religious suicide.[34]

If man is naturally evil, as he says on more than one occasion, how can this be? Of course he goes on to qualify his statement as he logically must: "Insofar as Christianity is identical with the cause of God, its ultimate victory is certain. But I am not asserting that it is victorious at all times and all along the line."[35] While he maintained his faith in the destiny of humanity and in the capacity of every nation to grow into an ever higher stature and "into an endless bloom of manhood,"[36] yet he also asserted that history solemnly warns that there are lost nations as well as lost individuals. The Bible itself tells how God's chosen people had been rejected by God when they failed to do his will. Maurice said the same.

Rauschenbusch really held two affirmations in tension: (i) the world would not evolve into the Kingdom of God by natural processes. The establishment of the Kingdom would involve a struggle with the evil powers inherent in man. Maurice accepted the former part of this affirmation. The latter part he regarded as a "lie" since for him the Kingdom was already established and goodness rather than evil was man's natural condition.

(ii) Rauschenbusch's second affirmation was that ultimately

the Christian concept of society would prevail because God

wills it. Here he and Maurice only appear to be at one.

Rauschenbusch wrote:

> He is immanent in the world, forever active
> and working. It is his force and his
> guidance which moulds his existing works
> into higher forms through his Kingdom . . .
> His will is set toward his Kingdom on earth.
> His Spirit works upon the spirits of men and
> of nations. Within limits known to him, and
> for reasons known by him, he suffers their
> disobedience and resistance. But he wearies
> not. His force is still put forth. And the
> medium through which it is most exerted is
> those human spirits who have freely surrendered
> themselves to the will and service of righteous-
> ness. There God gets a purchase on humanity.
> There he can grip it. Such spirits he fills
> with the ideas and impulses which their time
> needs . . . These are the prophetic souls
> . . . The upward forces communicated through
> them have to overcome the downward inclination
> of flesh and blood. . .[37]

If man is naturally evil, and God's influence is chiefly

exerted by those who have freely submitted themselves to

him, how can Rauschenbusch maintain that men "outside the

church" were revolutionists "whether they knew it or not"

when they tried to overthrow the throne of Satan?[38] Quoting

Mazzini, Rauschenbusch says that only the religious idea has

the power to transform the world. It is the very breath of

humanity: its life, soul, conscience and manifestation.

Humanity exists in the consciousness of its origin and the

presentiment of its destiny and only reveals itself by con-
centrating its power upon one of the intermediate points
between the two. That idea constitutes a faith in an
origin and future common to all men. It "unites all the
active faculties on one sole centre, whence they are con-
tinually evolved and developed in the direction of that
future, and guides the latent forces of the human mind
towards it."[39] Maurice would have endorsed this view with
this exception, that he would not have restricted God's chan-
nels to the prophetic souls nor would he have made a distinc-
tion between religious, political and educational ideas as
Rauschenbusch did in this discussion. At other times,
Rauschenbusch does not make this distinction, especially when
he considers the prophetic ideal of religion as concerned
with the whole of life.

The difference between the concept of man in Maurice
and Rauschenbusch respectively is that Original Sin, not in
the form of biological but of social transmission, plays a
more important role in the latter than it does in the former.
The fact that I find Maurice's view of man and society more
attractive because he is more consistent in his argument is
perhaps a subjective view and may be the effect of my own
ecclesiastical background. What I assert is that if the

Churches in the twentieth century are to provide an adequate

theology for social concern they must determine what the con-

cept of man is and these two opposite views by men who

attempted to relate Christianity to social questions in the

industrial age may be the basis for a dialogue to discover

what it is. Men like Adolf Hitler and men in the field of

commerce who ruthlessly exploit human society and the natural

environment make me veer to Rauschenbusch's concept of man as

evil. Yet Rauschenbusch and Maurice themselves, along with

others like Gandhi, William Temple, Pope John XXIII and Martin

Luther King Jr. suggest to me that there is inherent goodness

in man in spite of his tendency to evil. And Rauschenbusch

by his exceptions permits this view.

The Family

Maurice, we have already noted, asserted that God's

order is manifested in the institutions of the family, the

nation, and the universal society--the Church. He wished to

examine what he calls "positive facts."[40] He finds the fact

that men exist in families an indisputable one. The second

and third facts are that there are different nations and that

there is a Universal Society, constituted on a certain prin-

ciple, of which all men are members. "The Family is not lost

in the Nation, nor the Nation in Human Society. They are
co-existent; ..."[41]   As Vidler says:

> To Maurice, it was first through a family,
> then through a nation, and finally through a
> universal society, that God had made himself
> manifest, and the earlier manifestations were
> intended to be continued within the last. The
> smaller societies are training grounds where
> lessons are learned that are to be lived out in
> the wider and universal sphere.[42]

The divine order, then, is founded on relationships.
The fact that men exist in families is the first indication
that a moral and spiritual constitution is appointed for man-
kind. Yet this order belongs to men as voluntary creatures.
This brings us back to Maurice's concept of man in relation-
ship to his environment. Man finds himself in two inevitable
and distinct states. He is in a world of objects which offer
themselves to his senses and are available to him for his
use. But primarily man "is a son, perhaps he is a brother."[43]
His use of material things must be governed by the basic fact
of his relationship as a son and a brother. Maurice argued
that when we speak of a man as a bad son or a bad brother we
imply that there is a want of harmony between man and his
true condition and signify that there need not be this dis-
harmony: ". . . he is voluntarily acting as if he were not in
a relationship in which nevertheless he is, and must remain.

This inconsistency we describe by the term moral evil or whatever equivalent phrase we may have invented; ..."[44] "The family state is the <u>natural</u> one for man."[45] The affections which correspond to this state are especially man's natural affections.

Maurice is sympathetic to, but critical of, the tendency to describe man's inclination to disregard the responsibilities which arise from the bonds of family and to set up an independent life, by the word natural. These inclinations, he believed, can be controlled by discipline and by the affections which attract men to the members of his family. The very inclinations are marks of the spiritual constitution; that is to say, all men have the marks of the state of a voluntary creature, whether he approves it or not. The circumstance of being parents, brothers, and sisters is common to all men and should govern all men's relationships.

The idea of a covenant between God and man, Maurice also wrote, is the central one in the Bible. This covenant was first made with a <u>family</u>.[46] It is impossible to look upon the patriarchal character of Abraham as something accidental to his character as the chosen witness and servant of God. These two positions are absolutely inseparable. In other words, the fact of Abraham's relationship to God is

interpreted to him by the feeling of his human relations,

and his capacity of fulfilling them arose from his acknowl-

edgement of the higher relation.

> That there is a God related to men and made
> known to men through their human relations,
> this was the faith of Abraham, the beginner
> of the Church on earth. But this truth
> could not be exhibited in one individual
> faithful man; it must be exhibited through
> a family.[47]

The true order of the world in which alone men can be free

is one in which all independent choice or self will is recog-

nized as rebellion. The promise of the Covenant was that

in the descendants of Abraham all the families of the earth

should be blessed.

So then, basing his convictions on the positive fact

of life and the testimony of the Scriptures, Maurice affirms

that a mass of human units has never existed. Men are mem-

bers of a society from the moment of birth. This relation

of a child to his parents is the primary fact of his existence.

Within this framework of family life, persons learn the meaning

of authority, obedience (child and parent), trust (husband and

wife), fraternity and equality (brothers and sisters). These

relations are not the creation of formal Law; but they are

implied in it, lie beneath it, must be recognized and adopted

by it as soon as it comes into existence.[48] Relations then

are the core of human society; "they are implied not only

in its well-being but in its very being."[49]

> If we do not take account of those societies
> in which we must exist, we shall attach a
> very disproportionate value to those in which
> we _may_ exist. The Class and the Club will be
> superlatively precious and dear as the Family
> is lost out of sight. Men will recognise
> themselves more and more by their badges and
> colours when they cease to care about the ties
> of blood.[50]

Rauschenbusch deals with the family in a completely

different way but lays equal stress on its importance to

society as a primary social unit and one of great educational

value. Christianity, he wrote, sums up religious duty in

love to God and all ethical duty in love to man. Love is

the force that draws men together. It runs through all human

relations and is the foundation of all human institutions and

no social organization is so directly the institution of love

as the home.[51] The family is the structural cell of the

social organism for it is not only the source of the increase

in population but the foundation of morality in the nation

and its chief educational institution.[52]

His analysis of the structure of American society

led Rauschenbusch to classify the home or family as one of

the social institutions which had passed through constitutional

changes that made it to some degree part of an organism through

which the spirit of Christ could do its work in humanity.

Of all these institutions--the family, school, church,

state--the family was the most Christian.[53] The argument

is that historically the family had not set out with the

love and beauty which characterised it in Rauschenbusch's

day but had gone through a long sanctifying process. This

is not to suggest that the patriarchal family in nations

like Rome, Greece and Israel was totally evil. Nevertheless,

as an institution the family in those societies had been

based on despotism and exploitation. The relations of

husband and wife, of father and children, of master and

slave, were often ennobled by personal goodness but the

personal virtue was constantly impaired by the wrong which

inhered in the social environment. Rauschenbusch was con-

vinced that, through Christian influence, the despotism of

the husband fortified by law, custom, and economic possession

had passed into equality between husband and wife; and chil-

dren had become the free companions of their parents as

selfish parental authority had come under the law of service.

This course of evolution, he believed, had come to a swift

culmination in his own generation; for, based on equal rights,

bound together by love and respect for individuality, and

governed under the law of mutual helpfulness, American family

life furnished a natural habitation for Christian life and

fellowship. There was no conflict of the Christian spirit
with the accepted laws of modern family life as
Rauschenbusch saw it. The conflict arose when the laws of
family life were transgressed. He explained that when he
speaks of the family as having been Christianized, he means
that the present family traditions as religion, custom,
public opinion, law and neighbourhood example have shaped
them, have become an ennobling and restraining force in the
life of all. He carefully insists that the fact that the
institution as such had been Christianised does not mean
that each individual in it automatically becomes a Christian
but that the Christianized nature of the family predisposes
the individuals living in it to be Christians.[54]

Rauschenbusch's national pride and ecclesiastical
background are as clearly evident as Maurice's are. But in
this case Rauschenbusch's concept of gradualness and his
own interpretation of the wholeness and sanctity of all life
come to the surface.

> . . . every christianized family leaves
> traditions in the hearts of its children
> which they will seek to realize in their
> own homes, and it sets the standard a little
> higher for all who come in contact with it.
> By such precedents public opinion and custom
> are formed, and ultimately law follows custom.
> So the ethical transformation of the family
> becomes more comprehensible only through the

persistent atmospheric pressure exerted
on countless families through many genera-
tions. ...
On the other hand, religion did not do
the work singlehanded. Social and economic
changes did their part.[55]

Is Rauschenbusch really saying anything different from

Maurice? Putting aside their ecclesiastical differences

which really centre, in this area, on the question of baptism,

is Rauschenbusch really saying anything different from

Maurice on the place of the family in the life of the nation?

Rauschenbusch went further than Maurice did. He feared

that, unless the rest of society was Christianized, the fam-

ily as it had been transformed by Christian influences would

not survive. Because the health of society rests on the

welfare of the home, he was deeply concerned about the effects

upon it of the industrial revolution and rapid urban growth.

He did not see or define the detrimental effects as they now

confront us in the nineteen seventies but it is significant

that he discerned them at the beginning of the century. He

warned that the vast disparity of wealth and power between

families, the enforced proximity of people, the increase in

the birthrate among the poor and ignorant accompanied by its

fall among the able and educated families, the absence of

adequate parental control and the denial of free access by

all citizens to the natural environment were detrimental to
the life of any society.[56] "If the home is the institution
of love, and if love is of God, then the forces that cripple
home life are an invasion of God's dominions."[57]

The Nation

Maurice used the word nation and state inter-
changeably. Rauschenbusch more frequently spoke of the State.
Here we shall use them interchangeably. History, Maurice
maintained, indicates that men require a national community
for the proper development of their faculties. The "savage"
(by which he means one who is completely independent, and he
wrote that no ideal savage actually exists) has little of the
feeling of dignity and self-respect.[58] Man's first advance
from individualism is in his understanding of the meaning of
the words, "I am a brother."[59] His next forward step is to
say, "I am a citizen."[60] The nation then grew out of the
family and at its beginning every organized nation places a
high regard on family relations which are inevitably present
in the national constitution. The tensions which arise be-
tween family relations and the national society make laws and
legislators necessary. Law, although it takes each man apart

from his fellows and addresses him as a "Thou" in fact

denounces those acts which impede union and fellowship.[61]

> . . . The Law denounces those acts which
> make union and fellowship impossible, those
> acts which result from the determination of
> men to live and act as if they were independent
> of each other, as if they might set up them-
> selves and make self-pleasing their end. The
> Law declares to each man that he is in fellow-
> ship, that he shall not do any act which is
> inconsistent with that position. That there-
> fore which is the great foe to family relation-
> ship, the desire for individuality, is the very
> thing which Law, even while it deals with men
> as distinct persons, is threatening and cursing.[62]

The Scriptures, Maurice wrote, also show that the

nation developed out of the family. The Old Testament is the

key to the meaning of national society. The revelation which

established Israel as a nation taught them to feel that an

Unseen Power had delivered and guided them, and by the Law

showed each man that he is related to God and to his brothers.

This covenant with God made it treason for men to choose the

objects of their worship. This worship of the One Being was

the bond of the commonwealth and if it was broken the covenant

was dissolved.[63] The prophets spoke in the context of a strong

national life. National life is and always has been neces-

sarily connected with personal distinctness. Maurice attrib-

uted the inability of his contemporaries to understand the

prophets to the fact that the person was lost sight of in the

multitude of individual atoms which make up the mass. According to him, Jewish history contains the divine specimen of a national life. The God of Israel is declared to be the God of all the nations of the earth and the Israelites were chosen to be witnesses of that fact. The Lord is the King of every nation as much as he was of the Jewish nation. Israel's covenant obliged her to look upon all kings as reigning in virtue of God's covenant and as representing him and responsible to him. This does not imply that Maurice believed monarchy to be the only form of constitutional government. In fact he believed that a monarchical form of government combined with elements of aristocratic and democratic forms was the best form of government (certainly for England) but the important truth for him was that the inherited forms of each nation were valid forms for that nation.[64]

The great truth which the Israelite covenant taught was that all officers of a nation, rulers, priests, prophets, and judges receive their appointments and commissions from God. They have no right to look upon themselves as possessing intrinsic power. They exercise their functions best when they act according to the will of God. They are deposed by God when they are unfaithful to this principle. To Maurice, every

nation exists under this condition.[65]   As far as Europe was

concerned, he was convinced that the choice lay between a

civilized Christian king maintaining the divine principle

upon which his kingdom had been established and willing

that principle should expand with the recognition of constitu-

tional order and popular liberty, and anarchy or universal

despotism.[66]   While Maurice's view of society was generally

speaking a static one he showed here and in other places

that he allowed for development. However static his con-

cept may have been, the principles he taught concerning the

use of power by rulers are of permanent validity. He states

clearly that theocracy does not mean that "the divine power

is transferred to certain visible kings, in whom it rests

absolutely and indefeasibly."[67]   Nor does it mean that "the

kingdom belongs to certain visible priests who claim the

homage due to God for themselves, and bring men into bondage

by the perversion of the truth which is alone able to set men

free."[68]   The fact is that national rulers and all who bear

authority have a greater responsibility than the average

citizen to demonstrate by their actions that the Kingdom be-

longs to God and that they are only his ministers to do his

will.

There is more than that involved in Maurice's con-
victions about human relationships. He looked to the
Pentecostal period at the band of disciples to find the
principle that must govern man's concern for his brother
in the world. The disciples, he wrote, "understood that
each upon whom the Lord bestowed superfluity, should hold
himself as a <u>steward</u>, and distribute his bounties."[69]
Maurice maintained that the words, "No man said that which
he had was his own", imply a permanent law.[70] He accepts
the position that property and distinctions of ranks are
sacred (both civil and ecclesiastical law ratify that asser-
tion). But to Maurice:

> Beneath all distinctions of property and
> rank lie the obligations of a common
> Creation, Redemption and Humanity . . .
> these are primary eternal bonds upon which
> all others depend; . . . all our doings
> must be witnesses of them.[71]

It is in the light of these convictions that Maurice's
views on government, socialism, co-operation, liberty, equality
and fraternity within a nation must be judged. It find it dif-
ficult to understand how Maurice continued to accept the class
structure in England in face of convictions such as these. I
believe it puzzled Ludlow also.

A nation then for Maurice exists in the acknowledging of the Righteous God. A nation becomes such when it recognizes a law. A law implies the recognition of a being who <u>ought</u> to be obeyed because he is righteous, and not merely who must be obeyed because he is powerful. Every nation when converted to Christianity "recognized the God of Righteousness as Him to whom its highest officer was responsible, and the only bond by which the parts are united to Him in obedience to each other in society; . . ."[72] It was in this sense that Maurice refused to speak of the national life as secular.

> I solemnly deny that a Nation is a secular thing . . . If by "secular" is meant that which belongs to the fashion of a particular age--that which shuts out the acknowledgement of the permanent and eternal--that, I grant, is hostile to Christian faith, that is the "evil world" against which we are to fight. But the greatest weapons which God has given us in our conflict with this enemy--whether it invites us to worship the conceits of our own age, or of some departed age--is the assurance that the Nation has lived, lives now, and will live in him, who was, and is, and is to come.[73]

Government

A government administers or executes the Law and develops loyalty in men. It is very necessary to recognize that Maurice laid great importance on the inherited forms of government in every nation. He discusses three forms of government--Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy. He believed that the order in England combined all three. He wrote, "In a society where each of these forms prevails I believe Loyalty in its strictest sense may exist; in each of them it is exposed to certain special dangers."[74] Loyalty demands a sense of reverence for law underlying attachment to a person. Loyalty may be most simply exercised towards one person as in a monarchy, but the danger there lies in the risk of exalting the person above the law; when this happens a crisis occurs which either reawakens the citizens to the original function of the monarch or ends in anarchy. Loyalty can also exist in aristocracies. The danger there lies in the claims which may be made of privilege. Privilege is the enemy of government; when therefore, government is in the hands of an aristocracy the citizen's act of loyalty is to insist that those who administer it shall have no exemptions from the burdens of other citizens and no

indulgences for their evil action. Similarly, Maurice

wrote, if loyalty is understood in this way, there should

be no reason why a democratic form of government should not

be a strictly loyal society.

> The members of such a society may confess
> the supremacy of Law over one and all;
> they may be loyal to the Judges who declare
> what the law is; to the particular Magis-
> trates who enforce it in any district; to
> the general Magistrate; whatever be his
> name, who is the acknowledged head of the
> Commonwealth. Such loyalty may be diffused
> through a Society. It may be a perpetual
> curb upon the lust of dominion and the
> lust of gain; a security that the interests
> of the present shall not cause the past or
> the future to be forgotten; a guarantee of
> history and letters."[75]

On the other hand democracy has its own special motives

to be disloyal. Maurice really feared democracy: "If the

multitude breaks through the cobwebs which bind it, where are

the spiders which can preserve or refit those cobwebs?"[76] He

feared that when the people became sovereign judges, magis-

trates and presidents would be deposed at the will of the

people and anarchy and despotism would easily result.[77]

Traditionally, Maurice has been represented as simply a monarch-

ist. For example, Michael Ramsey writes, "Politically this

law [subordination in the law of brotherhood] involved not

egalitarianism, still less democracy (which Maurice never

liked), but theocracy expressed through a monarchy with divine right; . . ."[78] Christensen makes a much more exaggerated statement:

> Monarchy and Aristocracy thus belonged to
> the Divine Order. To abolish them and
> introduce Democracy, which Maurice always
> understood as the government of self-will,
> was consequently tantamount to denying God
> and His constituted universe and robbing
> man of the witness of the unchangeable laws
> in God's dealings with mankind.[79]

Maurice's position was that it was false to affirm that monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy were equally adaptable to every country. Those who dispute about forms of government, he maintained, are not aware that the forms are determined for them and that their minds are moulded by the order under which they have grown up.[80] He cited the American Republic as an example. The republican form of government and its democratic institutions were the institutions which an American received from his forefathers. It is the proper form of government for him. There may be faults in the administration of such a government but the loyalty of the American consists in recognizing that his land would not be rightly administered upon some principle other than its own. His duty is to understand his country's form of government and endeavour to correct the faults and inconsistencies in its administration. As in fact they did, Maurice remarked,

by the abolition of slavery. The American is misled if he

thinks that democracy as such had proved itself to be the

only tolerable form of government for the universe. Similarly

the English people were not to set their country above other

nations:

> We are not to maintain that Nations are only
> good and true when they have a Sovereign and
> a House of Peers, and a House of Commons.
> But since this is the form of Government
> under which we have been nurtured, which has
> moulded the thoughts of us and our fathers,
> our loyalty to it will be the best security
> that we honour the institutions and desire
> the growth of every other Nation.[81]

> . . . a native who feels and suffers with
> his land, who is conscious of its sins as
> his own, who is in any manner called to
> struggle with them and bear witness against
> them, must know better than any foreigner
> can. ... the work of correcting and elevating
> the tone of the nation must devolve upon its
> own citizens, and . . . much inferior and
> less accomplished men and women among them
> [can] do what the most wise stranger would
> attempt in vain.[82]

Maurice really believed in a restricted form of monarchy as

the best form of government for England but this does not

mean it was the only form of government for all nations.

In this sense he was more open-minded in his views than

Rauschenbusch; the latter, as we shall see, regarded

democracy as the future universal government. To Maurice,

the union of nations, the fellowship of Christendom, the

meaning of humanity would be impossible without recognizing
national identities and national spirit. He believed that
God would teach men this by revealing to all men more than
they had known of him as the ground of humanity, the Creator
of the Universe.

Maurice began then with the acknowledgement of divine
sovereignty for all nations. For his own country, kings rule
by the grace of God. This is the first of political truths
historically and the first fundamentally; that is, it was
valid for the time it was asserted and developed and as
bequeathed by that time to all subsequent times. Constitu-
tional government had developed out of it in due time. The
distinct rights and privileges of each man in the nation
were latent in those two truths and necessarily developed out
of them as time progressed.[83] He believed that fraternity,
liberty and equality could be achieved within that framework.
As we saw in our consideration of the Christian Socialist
movement in England, he based his hopes primarily on the
education of the citizens in the truths of the Christian
faith and by associations in which men in all spheres of
human activity treated each other as brothers. His Christian
Socialism was really the application of the principles of
brotherhood and co-operation between men of all political,

social and theological persuasions for the welfare of the

nation. As Ramsey puts it:

> Maurice was not concerned to sketch a vision
> of a Christian realm, or to plan a Christian
> political programme: . . . He sought rather
> to discover the Christian foundation of man's
> life in society; to say what the foundation
> is; and to do certain things without delay
> when his perception of the foundation demanded
> them. Do the will, and learn more of the
> doctrine.[84]

Such was his concept of socialism. And here, as elsewhere,

his faith in humanity shines through the particular social

structure of his country.

The nation or state was equally important in the

thought of Rauschenbusch. He wrote that ideally the state

is the organization of the people for their larger common

interests, but in actual fact all States have been organized

by some section of the people to protect their special inter-

ests against the rest. Ideally also the chief function of the

state should be the maintenance of justice but history reveals

that most states had made it their chief business to maintain

the status quo. This led him to believe that tensions were

always inevitable between the State and the Church because

the State is the representative of conditions as they are

and the Church ideally is the representative of things as

they ought to be.[85] In this area there is a considerable

difference between Rauschenbusch and Maurice in their con-

cepts of how the State and Church should be related.

"What I mean by the union of Church and State,"

Maurice wrote, "is the co-operation of spirit with law; the

abandonment of the attempt to put one for the other, or to

dispense with either."[86] God uses different and opposite

instruments in the education of the land. Maurice's basic

principle was "that the State is not . . . a vulgar earthly

institution, . . . but a sacred divine institution bearing

a witness for law and justice which the Church under no con-

dition has borne or can bear."[87] The Church on the other

hand is a "human and divine polity" to which man as man

belongs, which concerns the relation of his spirit to a uni-

versal and uniting Spirit.[88] Each is indispensable to the

right action of the other.

He maintained that the State, as the asserter of law

should always be by its very nature conservative of individ-

ual rights and individual possessions--property. The Church,

on the other hand, is bound to be by its nature communist in

principle. It is compelled to recognize individual rights

and possessions but that is not its special work nor the

chief object of human existence. The Church is "bound to say

to every man, 'What you have is <u>not</u> your own. You are only trusted with it that you may do with it what is right that you should do.'"[89] The union of the Church and the State, then, of bodies existing for opposite ends, each necessary to the other, was precisely that which should accomplish the fusion of Communism with the principles of Conservatism and property. "A Church without a State must proclaim Proudhon's doctrine if it is consistent with itself; a State without a Church is merely supported by Jew brokers and must ultimately become only a stock exchange."[90] Dissolution of the union of Church and State would lead to one or other of those two ends or rather to a struggle of two opposing and in separation equally destructive and godless principles. He saw it as the Church's obligation to understand her own foundation fully and to work out the Communism which is implied in her existence. The Church of England, he said, had for a long time regarded herself as a witness for the principle of property, merely as a second State instituted to embody and protect it and this had led to subservience to the State. Reformation was therefore needed in the Church and such a Reformation would involve:

> <u>theologically</u> the reassertion of these truths
> in their fullness . . .; <u>socially</u> the asser-
> tion on the ground of these truths of an
> actual living community under Christ in which

> no man has a right to call anything that
> he has his own but in which there is
> spiritual fellowship and practical co-
> operation; <u>nationally</u> the assertion of a
> union, grounded not on alliances and
> compromises but on the constitutions of
> things, between the Universal Community
> and the State of which the principle is
> Personal Distinction and the symbol
> Property. For this I desire to labour in
> all ways, . . .[91]

Rauschenbusch argued that those who held such a view

of Church-State co-operation were right in insisting that the

Church is to benefit not only the small circle of the elect

but all men and the entire community. But they were wrong in

thinking that this could be done by admitting infants into

the Church by baptism. The Church must never be made co-

extensive with the State. "It is too clamorous a fact that

church and world are not circles with an equal radius and

that they will not coincide."[92] He advocated a separation of

the organizations and an interpenetration of influences. But

to accomplish this the Church must be independent of the

State,

> neither oppressed by its commands nor bribed
> by its support. And it must as a body
> abstain from all attempts to control the
> machinery of government or to fill its offices.
> On the other hand, it is free to influence the
> ethical conceptions of the people and to
> stimulate the people to righteous actions.[93]

He believed that under the American form of government this was possible.

Unlike Maurice, Rauschenbusch believed that fraternity, liberty and equality were impossible within a monarchical structure. He cited the absence of a king and an hereditary nobility as one of the great advances of the American Republic. He wrote, "Democracy stands for the co-operative idea applied to politics; monarchy and aristocracy represent in statecraft the same ideals and methods which corporations represent in business."[94] In spite of Rauschenbusch's rejection of monarchy the real difference between Maurice and himself with regard to the administration of government was, as Maurice once told Ludlow, that monarchy was the starting point for him and he regarded democracy as historically developed out of it yet not abolishing or absorbing it into itself. Rauschenbusch on the other hand, like Ludlow, began with democracy and recognized a democratically elected Head of State--the President.[95]

The fact is, that both Maurice and Rauschenbusch accepted the inherited forms of government in their nations as the proper forms. This confirms Maurice's view that those who dispute over forms of government forget that forms are

determined for them and fashion their own concepts of what

governments should be. His principle that no country can

determine for another what its form of government should be

may well have something to say to us in our Western Democ-

racies when we presume to determine for the rising nations

in Africa and Asia what form of government they should

choose. To some degree also, both Maurice and Rauschenbusch

looked upon their respective nations as realms within which

the Kingdom of God either existed or was possible.

Rauschenbusch tended to regard democracy as the summit of

the evolutionary process. He wrote that democracy was not

the equivalent of Christianity, but in politics it is the ex-

pression and method of the Christian spirit. It had made its

most permanent achievements in the younger Anglo-Saxon group

of nations and was the conquering tendency in modern polit-

ical life. These were the nations which to Rauschenbusch

seemed headed for the Kingdom of God. He clarifies this by

saying that while there was no thoroughly Christian social

order, Christianity had been tried in the social life of

these nations and large domains of them had come under the

sway of Christ's law in their spirit and fundamental structure,

while large portions still remained unchristianized and there-

fore the sources of great misery. Western civilization

then was neither Christian nor unchristian but semi-Christian.[96]

The State, like the family, was one of those areas which had been transformed by the Christian spirit. He points out that Christianizing a State does not mean putting the name of Christ into the Constitution of a nation or establishing a theocracy ruled by the Church. It means bringing the social order into harmony with the ethical convictions which are identified with Christ. As we saw in the case of the family, Rauschenbusch believed that a fairly definite body of moral convictions had taken shape in the modern western world which expressed men's collective consciences--"our working religion."[97] This power in Western civilization, he believed, was directly traceable to Jesus' influence in history.

The fundamental redemption of the State occurred when official privilege was thrust out of the constitution and theory of government, and was based on the principle of personal liberty and equal rights. Only by comparison with the past could the decisive moral change in the political system be recognized because there had been a time when inequality and privilege had been sanctioned by law and public opinion.

This was no longer the case and in spite of the frequent

resistance of the Church as an institution, Christianity

had been primarily responsible for the rise of political

democracy. Rauschenbusch found evidence for this assump-

tion in the fact that successful political democracy came

first and was most durable in nations where radical and

pure forms of Christianity had gained a footing and in-

fluence; that is, in Protestant countries where a free type

of religion ranged men of distinctly Christian character on

the side of popular liberty and equality; ". . . by the

favour of Providence and by our political and economic baby-

hood the principles of liberty and equality got a solid foot-

ing in our traditions."[98]

Rauschenbusch's concepts of man and of gradual growth

led him to insert two precautions. (i) Even a Christian

social order cannot mean perfection, for men are sinful.

> Every child is born a kicking little egotist
> and has by its own mistakes and sins to co-
> ordinate itself with the social life of every
> successive group which it enters.[99]

The most just society would therefore unknowingly inflict

injury and wrong. Perfection must be demanded though not

expected. (ii) The law of growth is essential to life and

makes static perfection impossible. The structure of society

can never be static. It is necessarily a slow historical
growth and men will always have to labour to rid it of
antiquated and harmful customs and institutions brought down
from the past.

Rauschenbusch's Christian socialism bore a closer
resemblance to modern radical socialist thought than Maurice's
mild and comprehensive view did. Yet to my mind the con-
clusions at which Rauschenbusch arrived were logical devel-
opments from the principles which Maurice claimed to be
fundamental Christian principles. Unquestionably
Rauschenbusch came under the influence of modern European
and American Socialism but in his writings his concept of
Christian Socialism was based on his understanding of the
demands of a Christian economic order and his observations
of history and of certain institutions in society.[100]

He believed that Christianity itself was a strain
of higher social life derived from Israel, in which the love
of freedom and justice was kept alive through all disaster.
This social passion had been intensified through the in-
fluence of Jesus.[101] Rauschenbusch therefore claimed that
justice, collective property rights, democracy, approximate
equality and co-operation were demands of a Christian social

and economic order. They were not only of Christian origin,

for all communities (Israel and the Aryan races) which had

made distinguished and permanent contributions to mankind

had preserved and developed these essential elements.[102]

Private property was of comparatively recent origin, prima-

rily due to the influence of Roman law and in the early

days Rome's strength lay in communal ownership; in fact,

Latifundia _perdidere_ _Romam_. The American national homestead

system was also initially like the primitive commune in

allotting to every one a sufficient portion of land for the

support of the family. The element of injustice arose when

the free lands were exhausted. Here Rauschenbusch is blind

to the dispossession of the native people who apparently held

a view of the land and its resources that was similar to him.

They were living by his hope that the claim to exclusive

property rights in land and natural resources would one day

be abolished as slavery had been.

Church history, Rauschenbusch claimed, shows that

Christianity had always protested against society on the

basis of the same principles which modern Socialism asserted.

By way of example he asserted that the Church Fathers were

practically unanimous in their belief that the despotic State

and private property resulted from the Fall and were not wise

institutions of God. He found a later example in the

Church's resistance to the economic tendencies which had

brought about the rise of capitalism; in spite of his dis-

like of certain aspects of medieval asceticism, he wrote

that twentieth century Socialism was merely seeking to

establish on a world-wide scale some of the essential Chris-

tian principles of the monastic societies: the abolition of

rank, the duty of work, the combination of manual and spirit-

ual labour and fraternal property rights.[103]

The most valuable institutions in modern life--the

family, the school, the church and the State are essentially

communistic in nature and were becoming increasingly so in

modern life.[104] Rauschenbusch was convinced that no nation

could allow its natural resources of wealth to be owned by

a limited and diminishing class without suffering political

enslavement and poverty. "'The abolition of private property

in land in the interest of society is a necessity.'"[105]

> Socialism is one of the chief powers
> of the coming age. Its fundamental
> aims are righteous, not because they
> are socialistic, but because they are
> human. They were part of the mission
> of Christianity before the name of
> Socialism had been spoken. God had to
> raise up Socialism because the organized
> Church was too blind, or too slow, to

realize God's ends. The Socialist
parties, their technical terms, and
their fighting dogmas will pass away
into ancient history when their work
is done. The only thing that will last
and the only thing that matters is the
Reign of God in humanity, and the Reign
of God is vaster and higher than Social-
ism.[106]

The Church

We stated earlier that Maurice believed that the third

positive fact of human existence is that men are members of

a universal society. He was convinced that the universal

society and the national societies could not, according to

the scheme of Providence, be separated from one another.

"When they are brought together into conjunction, that form

of character which is intended for each nation is gradually

developed in it by means of the spiritual body."[107] He

believed that the Church is God's universal family--the all-

embracing community which God has prepared before the founda-

tion of the world. Every national family is God's universal

family in miniature. As we shall see, the nation and the

church were very closely linked in many different ways in

the thought of Maurice and in this area there is great dis-

parity between his thought and that of Rauschenbusch.

As usual, Maurice begins with an examination of "positive facts". He maintains that in the process of time men's minds awoke to something more comprehensive than either the family or the nation. At first this awakening manifested itself in empire building. Great Asiatic powers and afterwards Greece and Rome swallowed up tribes and king- doms into themselves and established a rule based on force. He writes: "a great universal polity was established in the world, and the national life, the family life, of Rome perished at the moment in which she was established."[108] Maurice dreaded empires as much as he feared democracies. He said that the wish for fellowship with other nations ex- pressed in empires was "a true wish inverted";[109] for forma- tion of national societies was part of God's great scheme for developing more fully the nature and character of Christ's Kingdom. In modern times, history had shown that the English nation had a divine calling to resist any power (he cited Spain, France and Russia) which attempted to break down national boundaries and establish a universal empire. When one considers British empire building we realize how biased Maurice was at this point. The demand for national freedom and independence of former British colonies in the twentieth century shows this all too clearly: yet this very demand of

emergent nations validates the principle of the importance

of national identity. In fairness to Maurice, however,

British colonial policy often condoned by the Church of

England in the colonies was not the hearty Christian one

Maurice believed it to be. Yet as a citizen of a former

British colony I firmly believe that had his principles been

followed the agonies of the latter part of the twentieth

century might have been avoided in India, Africa and Ireland.

> But if there be a sympathy between the
> Catholic and National principle, if they
> cannot really exist apart, why may we not
> begin to speak to the national sympathies
> of Irishmen; to speak to them as members
> of an Irish Catholic Church; to declare
> that every Irishman ought to look upon
> himself as a member of such a Church, and
> not any other Church, Saxon or Romish;
> . . .[110]

> Would that the supporters of Indian missions
> [had replied to the accusations of the
> merchant-emperors]--No; it is your godless-
> ness and rapacity which endanger their faith;
> you are making them infidels while you pretend
> to indulge their superstitions; we go to save
> their faith by delivering them from their
> superstitions and your example; we go, that
> England may not perish in that day when we
> shall be called to give account of the crimes
> which you have committed.[111]

His position was that the Church achieved what all

empires aspired after but could not achieve,

> [I have maintained,] upon the authority of
> Scripture, that the Catholic Church is
> emphatically a kingdom for mankind, a

> kingdom grounded upon the union which has
> been established in Christ between God and
> man. I have maintained that it grew out
> of a family and a nation, of which social
> states it proved itself to be the proper
> and only foundation.[112]

Maurice speaks of the Church as the spiritual and universal society and as the highest part of the spiritual constitution of which the nation and family are lower and subordinate parts. As noted before, it was established "before all worlds". It was manifested as the true and everlasting kingdom when Christ died, rose and ascended. To Maurice it was revealed to be the common property and inheritance of men by certain forms and ordinances. It is an actual reality for all who will enter into it and enjoy it. He believed that the Catholic Church had established itself in the East and the West, and is acknowledged by God as his Kingdom upon earth. It had suffered from all human systems, Romish and Protestant, but it would eventually manifest itself as something entirely distinct from them all.[113]

The English Church, that is, the Church of England (Maurice deliberately avoided the term the established Church) was the national church of England. This raises two questions: (i) What is the relationship of the English Church to other national Churches? (ii) What is the relationship

of the Church of England to other Churches in England?

The answer to the former is simple. In his own words:

> The greatest and deepest desire that I am
> conscious of, is that of bringing all men
> to the feeling that there can be but one
> Church--though that Church may exist in a
> number of different nations--though it may
> be quite right that in some subordinate
> particulars it should be modified by the
> character of those nations--though it is,
> I believe, actually demanded by its
> constitution, that it should recognize and
> sustain the distinct government of each of
> those nations.[114]

The latter question is a vast and complicated issue and

beyond our present investigation. Here we shall only mention

certain basic facts as they pertain to Maurice's social

thought.

He looked upon the English Church as one branch of

the true Church. He regarded "every _system_, [in it]

whether called Evangelical, Liberal, Catholic, or purely

Anglican," as expressions of notions of the church and as

destructive as the different sects which had broken with the

English Church.[115] He regarded the Church of England as the

witness in his land against the Sect principles of "forming

churches" which to him was destroying the English and Amer-

ican nations; for as long as men thought they could form

churches they could not be witnesses for a Humanity and for

a Son of Man. "We cannot believe that we do not choose Him, but that He chooses us and sends us to bear witness of His Father and of Him. Everything seems to me involved in this difference."[116] He admitted that the English Church was in a very corrupt and evil condition and warned that the sect feeling, the sect habit, was undermining it. The business of all who belonged to it was to repent of their sectarianism and to call their brothers to repent, to show that all men have a ground on which all may stand together. He expected and desired to assist in bringing about a deep and searching reformation of the church.[117]

The fact that God had claimed all men in Christ as his sons, was to Maurice, the _articulus stantis aut cadentis eeclesiae_. It follows then that Churchmen are members of a body to which men as men belong forming one fellowship in a real and living Head. Maurice said that the Church was not like a corporation bound together by certain professions of opinion.[118] It must either fulfil the witness of a redemption for mankind or be cut off. Furthermore belief in individual salvation becomes untenable when it is separated from the salvation which Christ wrought for all. The Church of England, therefore, bore witness for human union, which no sect bears.[119]

> I prize the Church of England very greatly,
> because it . . . testifies for that unity
> in Christ with the whole family in heaven
> and earth which we by our acts and words
> are seeking to destroy.
> . . . The Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the
> Ten Commandments (yes, the Ten Command-
> ments in spite of all modern theories to
> the contrary), seem to me the true witnesses
> of a universal fellowship, as well as of a
> national fellowship; the Sacraments, the
> pledges of its reality through all ages past
> and to come. But God must be first, not the
> Church . . .[120]

There are many contrasts between Maurice and

Rauschenbusch in their concepts of the Church. Rauschenbusch

begins his consideration of the Church from the Old Testament.

The prophets, he said, expected the purified and glorified

nation as the seat of God's manifestation. This expecta-

tion had been fulfilled in the church.

> The historic personality of Jesus, the
> all-pervading Spirit of God touching the
> spirits of men, and living men in whom
> these two forces have wrought a change
> and found a dwelling-place--these are the
> revolutionary forces working in humanity
> toward the reign of God on earth.[121]

Jesus sought to duplicate himself in his disciples by choosing

men who had repented and who by faith in him had opened their

souls to all impressions coming from him. Jesus patiently

planted his ideas in their minds and made them his companions

and friends. He wanted to be their Shepherd and desired his

life to be in them as the sap of the vine runs through the

branches (John 15). "In a great measure he succeeded.

. . . They loved him. They found the chief good of their

lives in him."[122]   As they lived over again his life they

continued his work according to the measure of his life in

each of them. Since their time there had been a long series

of Christ-like lives on earth--men who had provided for those

in need, resisted injustice and sought truth. Rauschenbusch's

affirmation that these included "men in the church and men

outside of the church" in this context and in the light of

his view of man strikes me as inconsistent.[123]   But he makes

it and says that their chief characteristic was that whether

consciously or unconsciously they were revolutionists who

tried to overthrow the throne of Satan and to make the world

a habitation of God. "Every such life furnished a fulcrum

for God's lever, a conservative influence to preserve what-

ever purity and justice had already been gained" as well as

a basis for future good.[124]

But not only did Jesus unite men to himself, he also

bound them to one another. He founded a community--the

Church--and created in it a corporate feeling which differ-

entiated it from the mass of men in the world. He gave it

its own laws and established the rudiments of an internal

organization. This community continued after Christ's
resurrection for the apostles regarded the Church as the new
theocratic society and as a coherent organism (1 Peter
2:9-10; Ephesians 2:22; I Corinthians 3:16; 12:12-30).
Christ's purpose then was the establishment and extension of
the Kingdom of God and the regeneration of human society.
The Church would be both the realization of the Kingdom
within its own limits and the instrument of extending it.
Christ reigns within it, his Spirit is its governing force
and through it he extends his dominion over the world. A
society or Kingdom was essential because Christ's purpose
was not merely individual but social salvation. Rauschenbusch
explains that if the Church is to have saving power, it must
embody Christ. Its saving qualities depend on whether or
not it has translated the personal life of Christ into the
social life of its group and thus brings it to bear on the
individual.

> If Christ is not in the Church, how does
> it differ from "the world"? It will
> assimilate its members, but it will not
> make them persons bearing the family like-
> ness of the first-born son of God.[125]

> The saving power of the Church does not rest
> on its institutional character, or its
> continuity, its ordination, its ministry,
> or its doctrine. It rests on the presence
> of the Kingdom of God within her. . . .

> The Church is a perpetuation of the
> past; the Kingdom is the power of the
> coming age. Unless the Church is
> vitalized by the ever nascent forces of
> the Kingdom within her, she deadens
> instead of begetting.[126]

Rauschenbusch clearly had a very different concept
of the nature of the Church than Maurice, yet they were at
one in the belief of its fundamental purpose--to knit
together mankind under the Headship of Christ. Rauschenbusch
writes:

> Sociology today has no image to represent
> a true society more perfect than that by
> which Paul expressed the nature of the
> Christian church: a body with many mem-
> bers. Paul formulated the theory, Christ
> created the fact.
> . . . .
> Paul uses the illustration mainly to teach
> the dependence of all members on Christ
> the Head, and their interdependence on one
> another.[127]

The Function of the Church

In spite of the differences in their respective con-
cepts of the nature of the Church, Maurice and Rauschenbusch
were at one in their concepts of the function of the church
as the teacher and conscience of the nation. Maurice said
that because the Church assumes that all civil duties and

relations grow out of the primary duties and relations of
the family and regards the highest ecclesiastical duties
and relations to be connected with ordinary social duties,
it should be the instrument of building up and sanctifying
the domestic life of every nation.[128] It does this chiefly
by asserting that Christ, the Head of every man, is the
ground of a universal fellowship among men. In this way
it brings men to understand that it is possible for them
as men to find their brotherhood in Christ.[129] The Church's
function therefore is to proclaim to men their spiritual con-
dition and the dignity of their nature and so to release
them from bondage to things. Furthermore it is the Church's
duty to make men understand the movements of society around
them and to unravel the different theories which have been
invented to explain these movements.[130]

Maurice spoke of the Church as the living and con-
tinuous witness to the truth that the love of God, of which
the Bible speaks, is forever the same and that God's love
will overcome all evil and establish righteousness throughout
the universe. Therefore it is the duty of the Church to be a
witness to the sanctity "of all professions and occupations,
the bond of all classes, the instrument of reforming abuses,
the admonisher of the rich, the friend of the poor, the

asserter of the glory of that humanity which Christ bears--
We are to blame, and God will call us to account as unfaith-
ful stewards of His treasures."[131]

Rauschenbusch held that the first function of the
Church, like that of every other organization, was to main-
tain and strengthen its own peculiar life. It does this by
the nurture of its new members. "The visible brotherhood
stands in the place of the visible Christ."[132] It also
stimulates the growth of its members by enabling them to
obtain an insight into truth and wisdom which they could not
reach unaided. These insights can direct the members in
their daily lives. The Church also replenishes the faith
of its members in the invisible realities which their con-
tact with the world constantly diminishes; for the Church,
even though it is itself tarnished by worldly standards,
generally maintains a higher standard than that prevailing
in the world. In this connection we should note that when
Rauschenbusch spoke of the Church as one of the areas of
society which had been Christianized he meant in many ways
what Maurice meant by the need for reformation in the church
(e.g., the elimination of the selfish commercial spirit and
the restoration of the law of service). Of course
Rauschenbusch included in the process of Christianizing the

Church the elimination of aspects of Church order to which Maurice would never have assented.[133]

To Rauschenbusch a true religious community should be small enough to encourage personal acquaintance, homogeneous enough for all members to be intelligible to each other and holy enough to represent God. In this way it could exercise a great influence on the moral life of its members by establishing an ideal and effective force upon the conscience of each member.

He regarded growth as the second function of the Church. The danger here was that proselytizing often took the place of true discipling, but he believed that missionary zeal was an indication of life and that the Church would be safe if, in its endeavours to increase its membership, it kept its moral demands high above those prevailing in the world. The Church for Rauschenbusch was a picked company of soldiers whose efficiency depends on quality rather than on numbers.[134]

Finally, Rauschenbusch writes, "Least of all was the Church formed merely for its own sake."[135] Jesus founded a society which was to lead in the thick of the world a life

higher than that of the world and stimulate the ideal

aspirations which God has implanted in every human being.

It must act as the leaven in the world. Quoting Neander's

Das Leben Jesu Christi, Rauschenbusch wrote: "The aim

toward which history is moving is that Christianity become

the world-governing principle."[136]

Rauschenbusch saw three possibilities before the

Church. It could flee out of the world. This would be dis-

obedience to Christ's command and sheer cowardice. It could

commit "suicide" by becoming like the world. It could make

the world like itself. This would involve conflict till

final victory was won but it would be in accordance with

Christ's purpose. "All his frequent sayings about taking up

the cross, forsaking property and family, incurring suffer-

ing and death have no sense unless the Church is to impinge

upon the world and suffer from its angry reaction."[137]

Rauschenbusch showed that all three possibilities had occurred

in the past but that the third had been the most frequent,

especially when the Church was most alive. In spite of the

conservative and reactionary influences exercised on social

and political progress by "varied ecclesiastical machines and

salaried hierarchies" the spirit and life of Christianity had

inspired men and swayed the nations of the earth.[138]

Rauschenbusch laid great stress upon the prophetic

function of the Church. Because it is in contact with God,

it generally possesses a clear ethical judgement and strong

moral courage; therefore it is to be the teacher of society.

With the rise of democracy the people had become sovereign.

This meant that the moral education of the people would

shape the future of mankind. That task of moral education

is the rightful province of the Church. While nations are

moved by currents of thought and feeling which sweep them,

the Church is to be different: an enlightened spiritual

community, spread through all the nation, deaf to party

cries, alive to the voice of right. In this way it would

be a nation's conscience, ". . . enlightened enough not to

be hoodwinked by ecclesiasticism of any sort," strong enough

to resist materialistic tendencies and to "stimulate the

idealism and devotion to duty latent in men."[139] This again

raises the question of Rauschenbusch's consistency in his

doctrine of man to which we have so frequently referred.

Rauschenbusch's conviction was that all general ideas which

are to become powerful realities in society must first be

accepted by individual men who then, by action and reaction

with others, spread their ideas and gain recognition for

them. He therefore laid great emphasis on the Church's duty

to increase such centres of power and to stimulate them

by association with like-minded people so that they could

fulfil the prophetic office of the church.

About the inter-relationships of these three basic

human institutions, Family, Nation, Church, Maurice and

Rauschenbusch had a great deal to say. By different methods,

Maurice would have affirmed that the Church had a duty to

nourish and sustain its members, increase its membership

and fulfil its prophetic role. It is significant that both

Maurice and Rauschenbusch sought for safeguards and checks

in a democratic system. Maurice who feared the sovereignty

of the people desired to restrain it by a monarch and a

House of Lords along with the education of the people in

Christian truths. Rauschenbusch who delighted in the idea

of the sovereignty of the people realized the need for moral

restraints which he believed only the Church could provide.

Olive Brose has recently written of Maurice:

> From his understanding of man as image,
> related to God only as a mirror, it
> followed that man was to be responsive,
> obedient to God's will, and governed by
> Him. . . . it also meant a belief that
> God governed man as His image through social
> institutions. And this turned out to be the

> hoary institutions of the family,
> patriarchal in structure; the nation,
> monarchical in form; and the church,
> universal in scope.
>
> . . . The question in the socio-
> political sphere is always one of means,
> and the social institutions Maurice chose--
> or claimed God chose--have been historically
> those associated with tradition, domination,
> or the status quo.[140]

This is a fair assessment of Maurice's position though I

would qualify "monarchical in form" with the words "for

England." Mrs. Brose goes on to point out that historic-

ally those who have sought realization of a radical faith

in concrete social life have either undertaken some form

of social action to eradicate abuses and achieve radical

change in the structure of society through social, economic

or political means, or have established some form of

community or communities with ideals often diametrically

opposed to those of the larger society.

> In either case, such men have been aware
> of the demonic element in existing social
> structures and have sought their utopias
> by a change of structure. Maurice, on
> the contrary, while very aware of the
> demonic in all of life, saw its influence
> as that which perverted or destroyed
> the divinely given relationships of God's
> Order. And so he called for a return to
> an original, undistorted type of relation-
> ship of family, society, nation, and
> universal church.[141]

It is indeed difficult to understand how Maurice with his views on the Church as the conscience of the nation and his conviction that the Church is by its nature "communist" could continue to uphold the status quo with its rigid class structure, wide disparities of wealth and with the nation's natural wealth in the hands of a landed aristocracy. Rauschenbusch seems far more consistent in his demand for a radical reconstruction of society. Yet it is significant that like Maurice he, an advocate of radical social reconstruction, recognized the importance of the traditional institutions of the family, the nation and the church. Rauschenbusch's views of the democratized family are certainly closer to the realities of our time. There are those who, in the face of the present breakdown of family life and the possibility of selective reproduction, would question the future validity of the family as an institution of society even though they have not yet put forward a viable alternative. Those of us who live in communities where the family unit was deliberately destroyed and marriage among slaves discouraged know the evil consequences of the absence of the family as an institution in the nation and the tendency, even the eagerness, to establish some pattern of a family life to replace that which was destroyed. Perhaps it is in fact, as Maurice thought, part of a divine order in the world.

Time has shown that neither the family, nation nor
church were as "Christianized" as Rauschenbusch believed them
to have become. Yet here again with regard to the nation and
the church, we may well ask whether Maurice and Rauschenbusch,
in their different ways, were not both right in the importance
they placed on those two institutions. One could argue that
there is no place for the nation in the Global Village and
that the great wars and the little ones of our century seem
to tell us that the nation is of demonic rather than of
divine origin. Yet have these wars not resulted from the
actions of the powerful nations of the earth in asserting
their strength over the independence of their weaker
brothers? Furthermore the search for national identity today
among smaller regional groups and former colonies of the
powerful nations indicates that the concept of independent
nations is not as outmoded as we are sometimes prone to
believe.

Rauschenbusch's idea of the way in which the church
should influence the nation seems more relevant to our present
situation. I am not speaking here of the structure but the
function of the church. Maurice's idea of a national church
is perhaps outmoded, yet here again the indications are that
if the Christian community is to influence the nation it does

this best by speaking with a united voice. How can it speak to a divided nation if it stands divided itself? The same applies to its place in a divided world. In spite of Maurice's insistence upon the ministry and sacraments as signs of the universal society he was right in at least two respects: The shape the Church takes will be determined by national circumstances and the Church of the future might be something entirely different from what "Catholic, Evangelical, Romish or Protestant systems" have portrayed. In his own situation Rauschenbusch was led, through his social involvement in inter-denominational enterprises, to see that the Church was more than just the sum of the Churches.

Olive Brose is right when she writes that in the past the institutional Church has been as infected with the spirit of domination as the nation. Fortunately this appears far less likely in our times. On a purely practical level, there is always a need for prophets who challenge the existing values of their own societies; and the Church, even in our time, has provided such persons. The kind of comparatively simple things that Maurice and his friends, as well as Rauschenbusch and his associates, undertook, still have their place. Do not the efforts of Martin Luther King and his associates, or the efforts of men like Trevor Huddleston

and Michael Scott say something vitally important to us
about the Church's role in society?

In summary then there are differences between
Maurice and Rauschenbusch in many areas. They differed in
their respective emphases on the goodness or evil in man,
the patriarchal or democratic nature of the family, the
hierarchical or egalitarian structure of the nation and the
ontological or covenant nature of the Church. But that which
is common between them can provide us with a theology of
society for our times. Both men believed that God reigns
in the affairs of men and speaks to men through the events
of history. Both asked the question: "What is God saying to
us in the events of life?" Both asked the question: "What is
man?" They saw that man is by nature a social being who needs
to find his brother. They saw it as the Church's obligation
to proclaim, in word and in action, the Bible's message of
our common humanity and of God's involvement in it.

It is obvious from the last few pages that I am a
citizen of the Third World and I am aware that my observa-
tions are coloured by my background; they may well be

meaningless to citizens of advanced technological and what

appear to be increasingly depersonalized nations. My exper-

ience in North America leaves me with the impression that

there is here a marked absence of the conviction that God

rules in the world and an indifference towards, if not

contempt for the Church which we in our poverty and un-

sophistication have not yet experienced.

During my study of Maurice and Rauschenbusch in

this environment, I have frequently wondered what meaning

the theocratic concepts of Maurice and Rauschenbusch could

have in nations such as this, if my impressions are correct.

On the other hand in some of the poorer nations, where the

Church, in spite of many errors, has played a significant

role--certainly this is true in my own nation--the hope of

a Christian society is still alive, and vigorous Church

leadership is still expected by the majority of the citizens,

a fact recognised by leaders of the State. The following are

extracts from The Daily Gleaner in its coverage of a recent

election campaign in my own country. One political party

included this in a paid advertisement.

> We thought man should have faith in God,
> Follow God, and hail God, not man.
> That is what we have been taught by the
> Church.[142]

The leader of that party said that the Church's rebuke of

some of his party's campaign methods was perhaps the chief

cause of his defeat.

The leader of the other party which won the election

made the following statements.

> As the Government, we will seek your advice.
> We will go to the Parliament of the People.
> We will ask the Teachers' Associations and
> the Church to help us to reconstruct our
> educational system.
> . . . .
> Apart from this very real suffering which
> is today the lot of so many people, our
> country has become bitterly divided. On
> all sides, there is evidence of moral decline.
> Our task is to re-unite our country, to inspire
> a new sense of moral purpose. In this, the
> role of the Church will be vital. For the best
> time in our Nation's life was the time when the
> Church and State respected each other's
> independence and co-operated to achieve impor-
> tant national goals.
> We believe in the need for us to be brought
> together, motivated to pool all our talents
> to good ends. We look once more to the
> ppiritual wealth of the Church, through whose
> influence Jamaica was able to move peacefully
> from Colonialism to Self-Government, and
> ultimately to full Independence in 1962.[143]

When he was elected his promise to the people included:

> I would like to develop a relationship with
> the churches which would seek to improve the
> moral climate in Jamaica and to establish a
> oontinuing consultation with the leaders of
> the churches, so that they can maintain their
> important role in Jamaican society.[144]

Now all this could be dismissed as merely political
shrewdness. Yet even if it is merely this, it suggests that
there is still faith in God and his Kingdom among the people
of a nation which politicians may exploit. I have been told
that the feeling of the absence of God and indifference to
the Church will come to the poorer nations as they become
better educated and industrialized and move into the techno-
logical era. On the contrary, my comparison of the thought
of Maurice and Rauschenbusch leaves me with the conviction
that if the principles they proclaimed are applied among the
underdeveloped nations of the world it may help them to avoid
not only the indifference to God and his Kingdom that more
"developed" nations are now experiencing but might save them
from the tragedies of an industrialized technological
society. They may even have something of value to show to
the more advanced nations and the Churches within them: Ex
paupertate lux.

We assumed in the Introduction that there was a need
for a theology of social concern. That assumption was based
on the fact that the Churches have shown a social awareness
in the utterances of the World Council of Churches and the
Second Vatican Council. My examination of Maurice's work in

England and Rauschenbusch's labours in the Social Gospel

Movement in America has led me to believe that we in our

time need to look at our situation as they examined theirs

and to relate our Christian faith to our contemporary

situation. Their experiments will not always be relevant

to many parts of the world--although some of them would seem

to be relevant in mine--but the principles they unearthed can

be of continuing value to us all.

My comparison of the thought of Frederick D. Maurice

and Walter Rauschenbusch has therefore led me to the conclu-

sion that there is a social message inherent in the Christian

Gospel. Membership of the Church and fidelity to the

Scriptures involve not merely social and political concern

but involvement. There is no choice for the Christian. The

degree of involvement and the expression of concern will depend

largely on individuals and circumstances. Tempora mutantur et

nos mutamur in illis. If we accept the prophetic teaching of

the Old Testament and Jesus' teaching on the Kingdom of God on

earth as Maurice and Rauschenbusch did, concern with social

and political issues must become a Christian obligation. The

problem is, however, as both Maurice and Rauschenbusch saw

clearly, that, more frequently than not, Christians nurtured

in another-worldly and individualistic interpretation of

the Christian faith fail to see the link. The remarkable

fact is that Maurice who generally speaking took a

literalist view of the Scriptures and Rauschenbusch schooled

in the historical-critical school came to such fundamentally

similar views of God and his Kingdom on earth. This may

have something to tell us about the message of the Bible

which communicates itself regardless of our methods of

critical analysis.

Casserley's assessment of Maurice, is to my mind

equally true of Rauschenbusch in spite of the difference in

their methods.

> Certainly he speaks in a real sense out
> of the Bible, but he speaks always of the
> things of his own time to the people of
> his own time, always as a prophet of God,
> and never as a mere scholarly scribe,
> interpreting the grammatical subtleties
> and verbal archaisms of an ancient and
> holy book. . . .
> They show us on the contrary, what the world
> looks like, and how the problems of con-
> temporary life appear, to a man whose mind
> has been _informed_ by the Bible, who has
> derived from the Bible . . . the categories
> of judgment and standards of value which he
> brings with him to the interpretation of
> every contemporary reality that claims his
> attention.[145]

Both these men then, though of different eccle-
siastical traditions, often revealing wide disparities in
their theological outlook, coming from dissimilar socio-
political structures, largely agree on what is basic to man
as a social being. This suggests to me that the way for-
ward is through genuine dialogue amongst Christians of all
traditions and between Christian and non-Christian peoples.
Here I believe Maurice was right in at least two respects:
He would associate with men as men, in dialogue and in ac-
tion, provided the action did not contradict his fundamental
principles. Rauschenbusch's readiness to acknowledge the
virtues and defects of Marxist theory imply that he stood
on similar ground. Again Maurice was right when he insisted
that only a native can decide what form of government is
proper for his land. The tragedy has been that the powerful
nations of the world in their "discoveries" and conquests of
new lands have ignored the social forms existing among the
native peoples and sought to establish societies patterned
on their "homeland."

There are many defects in the views of both Maurice
and Rauschenbusch. Perhaps the chief defect in Maurice is
his method of examining "positive facts" to which he believed
the Bible testified. This argument could be used to justify

institutions such as slavery, which Maurice himself rejected;
as well as those of the family, nation and church which both
Rauschenbusch and himself sanctioned. Rauschenbusch, like
Maurice, tended to equate Anglo-Saxon culture with a
Christian--albeit imperfectly Christian--social order. He
was blind to the cruelties inflicted on the aboriginal in-
habitants of his own country and of the indignities suffered
by their descendants. Nevertheless these defects do not
diminish the value of the contributions they made.

Standing in the nineteenth century and the early
part of the twentieth, Maurice and Rauschenbusch respectively
saw clearly that there are certain principles which were
present in the message of the gospel concerning man in his
relationship to his social and natural environment which they
regarded to be of permanent validity and essential to the
well-being of human society. My observations of trends in
human society in the later part of the twentieth century
lead me to the conviction that the principles they unearthed
are not merely Christian principles but essential human laws.
This is confirmed in positive and negative ways. Positively
the inter-dependence of all men and nations is far more
evident today than it was in the Victorian Age or even in

Rauschenbusch's day. Arguments about economic and techno-
logical advancement in the more developed nations are
generally put forward to account for the wide disparity be-
tween the affluent and poor nations of the world. The present
impoverishment, deprivation, suffering and consequent bitter-
ness and alienation of the dispossessed individuals, races
and nations have resulted primarily from the failure of the
more "civilized" and powerful nations to treat their fellow-
men as brothers.

Consequently the poor who make up the vast majority
of the population in the under-developed nations are bitter
and disillusioned. As Dr. George Beckford, lecturer in
Economics at the University of the West Indies said recently,
". . . capitalist nations were able to organize the resources
of the colonies, and in so doing expand themselves at the
colonies' expense."[146] What is true between nations is also
true within nations. Both Maurice and Rauschenbusch were con-
vinced that mankind is a family in which men must relate to
each other as brothers. Consequently co-operation was man's
duty. On a far wider scale than they ever dreamed of this is
still God's truth.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1.   See Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 326;
        Kingdom of Christ, Vol. I, pp. 223, 228-229.

2.   Olive J. Brose, _Frederick Denison Maurice_:
        Rebellious Conformist (Ohio: University Press,
        1971), p. 179.

3.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 242.

4.   _Ibid_., pp. 242-243.

5.   Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II, p. 32.

6.   Maurice, _St. John_, p. 31.

7.   Maurice, _The Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the_
        Old Testament (1890), p. 66, quoted in Vidler,
        F.D. Maurice, p. 52.

8.   Maurice, _Lord's Prayer_, pp. 48-49.

9.   _Ibid_., p. 49; Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 230;
        Vol. II, p. 560.

10.   Maurice, _The Religions of the World and Their_
        Relations to Christianity: Boyle Lectures.
        4th ed. (1861), p. 220, quoted in Vidler,
        F.D. Maurice, p. 54.

11.   Maurice, _The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven_:
        a course of lectures on the Gospel of St.Luke
        (1893) p. 124, quoted in Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_,
        p. 55. Cf. Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's_
        Prayer, p. 331; _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II,
        p. 33.

12.   Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II, pp. 213-214.

13.   Ibid., p. 33. Cf. Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer, p. 335.

14.   Maurice, Lord's Prayer, pp. 94-99.

15.   Ibid., p. 92.

16.   Maurice, Life, Vol. II, p. 572. Cf. Maurice, Lord's Prayer, p. 91.

17.   Maurice, Kingdom of Christ, Vol. II, p. 33.

18.   Maurice, Lord's Prayer, p. 91. Cf. Kingdom of Christ, Vol. II, p. 24.

19.   See Lincoln Inn Sermons, IV, p. 9, quoted in Vidler, F.D. Maurice, p. 55.

20.   Maurice, The Prayer Book, p. 78.

21.   Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, p. 282.

22.   Ibid.

23.   Ibid., p. 283.

24.   Ibid.

25.   Maurice, Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer, p. 328.

26.   Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, p. 279. Cf. Rauschenbusch, Kingdom, pp. 279.285.

27.   Rauschenbusch, Social Crisis, pp. 279-286.

28.   Ibid., p. 284.

29.   Ibid.

30.   Ibid., p. 286.

31.   Ibid.

32.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 281.

33.   _Supra_, Ch. II, p. 151.

34.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, pp. 279-280.

35.   _Ibid_., p. 280.

36.   _Ibid_., p. 281.

37.   _Ibid_., p. 284.

38.   _Ibid_., p. 151.

39.   _Ibid_., p. 284.

40.   Maurice, _Social Morality_, p. 16.

41.   _Ibid_., p. 17. Cf. _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II, pp. 230, 233, 236.

42.   Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_, p. 162.

43.   Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I, p. 230.

44.   _Ibid_.

45.   _Ibid_.

46.   _Ibid_., p. 239.

47.   _Ibid_., p. 240.

48.   Maurice, _Social Morality_, p. 43.

49.   Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_, p. 163.

50.   Maurice, _Social Morality_, p. 59.

51.   Rauschenbusch, _Social Order_, p. 262.

52.   Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, p. 271.

53.   See _Ibid_., pp. 271-279;   Rauschenbusch, _Social_
        Order, pp. 262-271.

54.   Rauschenbusch, _Social Order_, pp. 128-134.

55.   _Ibid_., p. 135.

56.   See Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, pp. 271-279;
        Social Order, pp. 263-271.

57.   Rauschenbusch, _Social Order_, p. 270.

58.   Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I, p. 234.

59.   _Ibid_.

60.   _Ibid_.

61.   _Ibid_., p. 235.   Cf. Maurice, _Social Morality_,
        pp. 124-125.

62.   Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I, p. 235.

63.   _Ibid_., Vol. I, pp. 241-242; Vol. II, p. 223.

64.   See Maurice, _Social Morality_, pp. 154-164.

65.   See Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. I,
        pp. 241-244;   Vol. II, p. 224.

66.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 487.

67.   Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 391.
        Cf. Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II,
        pp. 226-227.

68.   Maurice, _Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer_, p. 391.

69.   _Ibid_., p. 339.

70.   _Ibid_.

71.   _Ibid._, p. 340.

72.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 141-142.

73.   Maurice, _The Ground and Object of the Hope for Mankind_, (1868), pp. 45 ff., quoted in Vidler _F.D. Maurice_, p. 164.

74.   Maurice, _Social Morality_, pp. 154-155.

75.   _Ibid._, p. 158.

76.   _Ibid._

77.   _Ibid._, pp. 158-159.

78.   Ramsey, _op. cit._, p. 47.

79.   Christensen, _op. cit._, pp. 302-303.

80.   Maurice, _Social Morality_, pp. 160-161.

81.   _Ibid._, p.170.

82.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 252.

83.   _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 485.

84.   Ramsey, _op. cit._, p. 47. Cf. Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_, p. 177.

85.   Rauschenbusch, _Social Crisis_, p. 186.

86.   Maurice, _Life_, Vol. II, p. 585.

87.   _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 586.

88.   _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 586. Cf. p. 489.

89.   _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 586.

90.   _Ibid._, Vol. II, p. 9.

91. *Ibid*., Vol. II, pp. 9-10.

92. Rauschenbusch, *Kingdom*, p. 162.

93. *Ibid*., p. 168. Cf. Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 207, 380.

94. Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, p. 152.

95. Maurice, *Life*, Vol. II, p. 128.

96. Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, Part III, Chap. I.

97. *Ibid*., p. 125.

98. *Ibid*., pp. 150-151.

99. *Ibid*., p. 126.

100. *Ibid*., pp. 275, 375; Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 213-220.

101. Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, p. 379.

102. *Ibid*., p. 383; Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, p. 221.

103. Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, pp. 378-381.

104. Rauschenbusch, *Social Crisis*, pp. 390-391.

105. *Ibid*., p. 230.

106. Rauschenbusch, *Social Order*, p. 405.

107. Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*, Vol. II, p. 277.

108. *Ibid*., Vol. I, p. 237; Cf. *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 525, 618.

109. Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*, Vol. I, p. 246.

110. _Ibid_., Vol. II, p. 325.

111. _Ibid_., p. 328.

112. _Ibid_., Vol. I, pp. 268-269. Cf. Vol. II, p. 254;
Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 524.

113. See Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, pp. 306-307.

114. _Three Letters to the Rev. W. Palmer_, (1842) p. 51,
quoted in Vidler, _F.D. Maurice_, p. 175.
Cf. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 166.

115. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 306.

116. _Ibid_., Vol. II, p. 300.

117. _Ibid_., Vol. II, p. 317. See also p. 300, Vol. I,
pp. 166, 324.

118. _Ibid_., Vol. II, pp. 324-325.

119. _Ibid_., p. 443. Cf. p. 357.

120. _Ibid_., pp. 524-525.

121. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 149.

122. _Ibid_., p. 150.

123. _Ibid_., p. 151.

124. _Ibid_. Cf. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, p. 125.

125. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, p. 128.

126. _Ibid_., pp. 129-130. Cf. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_,
p. 161.

127. Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 174.

128. Maurice, _Kingdom of Christ_, Vol. II, p. 254.

129. Maurice, _Life_, Vol. I, p. 258.

130.   _Ibid._, Vol. I, p. 333;   Vol. II, p. 119.

131.   _Ibid._, Vol. II, pp. 227-228.

132.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 132.

133.   Rauschenbusch, _Social Order_, pp. 136-142.

134.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, pp. 157-159.

135.   _Ibid._, p. 160.

136.   Neander, _Das Leben Jesu Christi_, pp. 136-137,
        quoted in Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 160.
        Cf. Rauschenbusch, _Theology_, pp. 119, 121.

137.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, p. 161.

138.   _Ibid._, p. 161.   See also Rauschenbusch,
        Social Crisis, pp. 93-142, _Social Order_,
        pp. 40-41.

139.   Rauschenbusch, _Kingdom_, pp. 170-171.

140.   Brose, _op. cit._, p. 175.

141.   _Ibid._, p. 176.

142.   "Political Advertisement," _The Daily Gleaner_,
        February 25, 1972, p. 24.

143.   "Jamaica Needs a Moral and Spiritual Rebirth
        to heal the Nation's Ills," _The Sunday Gleaner_,
        February 27, 1972, p. 44.

144.   "Manley hopes 'to heal some of the bitter divisions,'"
        The Daily Gleaner, March 1, 1972, p. 1.

145.   Casserley, _op. cit._, pp. 77-78.

146.   "Perspectives on Poverty and Social Change in a
        Colonial Situation," reported under caption "The
        Causes of Poverty in the West Indies," _The Sunday
        Gleaner_, February 27, 1972, p. 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abell, Aaron. The Urban Impact on American Protestantism
        1865-1900. Hamden: Archon, 1962.

Beach, Waldo and Niebuhr, H. Richard. Christian Ethics:
        Sources of the Living Tradition. New York: The
        Ronald Press Company, 1955.

Beer, Max. History of British Socialism. London: G.
        Bell and Sons, 1929.

Binyon, Gilbert C. The Christian Socialist Movement in
        England: An Introduction to the Study of its
        History. London: Society for Promoting Christian
        Knowledge, 1931.

Brose, Olive J. Frederick Denison Maurice: Rebellious
        Conformist. Ohio: University Press, 1971.

Casserley, J.V. Langmead. The Retreat From Christianity
        in the Modern World. London: Longman's Green and
        Co., 1952.

Christensen, Torben. Origin and History of Christian
        Socialism 1848-54. Denmark: Universitetsforlaget
        I Aarhus, 1962.

Craig, Robert. Social Concern in the Thought of William
        Temple. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1963.

Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert. "A New Assessment of F. D.
        Maurice's 'The Kingdom of Christ'." Church
        Quarterly Review. Vol. IV, No. 1 (July, 1971),
        pp. 38-49.

Dombrowski, James. The Early Days of Christian Socialism
        in America. New York: Columbia University Press,
        1936.

Gabriel, Ralph H. The Course of American Democratic Thought: An Intellectual History Since 1815. New York: The Ronald Press, 1940.

George, Henry. Progress and Poverty, An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth: The Remedy. New York: Doubleday Page and Company, MCMXIV.

Handy, Robert T. ed., The Social Gospel in America: Gladden, Ely, Rauschenbusch. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Hanson, R.P.C. ed. The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, Vol. II, Historical Theology. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969.

Hopkins, C. Howard. Review of The Righteousness of the Kingdom by Walter Rauschenbusch, edited and introduced by Max L. Stackhouse, in Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, Winter, 1969; pp. 211-213.

_____. The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915. A Yale Paperbound. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Jones, Peter d'A. The Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914: Religion, Class and Social Conscience in Late-Victorian England. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Kingsley, Charles. His Letters and Memories of His Life. Edited by his wife. New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Company, 1877.

Landis, Benson, Y. ed. A Rauschenbusch Reader: The Kingdom of God and the Social Gospel. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Masterman, N.C. John Malcolm Ludlow: The Builder of Christian Socialism. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.

Maurice, Frederick. ed. The Life of Frederick Denison
      Maurice: Chiefly Told In His Own Letters. Vols.
      I and II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,
      1884.

Maurice, Frederick D. The Gospel of St.John: A Series
      of Discourses. Cambridge: MacMillan and Co.,
      1857.

_____. The Kingdom of Christ: or Hints on the
      Principles, Ordinances and Constitution of the
      Catholic Church in Letters to a Member of the
      Society of Friends. Vols. I and II. London:
      James Clarke and Co. Ltd., 1959.

_____. Learning and Working. London: Oxford University
      Press, 1968.

*_____. The Lord's Prayer: Nine Sermons Preached in
      the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn. Cambridge: MacMillan
      and Co., 1861.

*_____. The Prayer Book. London: James Clarke and
      Co. Ltd., 1966.

*_____. The Prayer Book considered especially in
      reference to the Romish System, Nineteen Sermons
      preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn and The
      Lord's Prayer, Nine Sermons preached in the Chapel
      of Lincoln's Inn February, March and April, 1848.
      London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1902.

_____. The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament.
      Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1853.

_____. Social Morality. London: MacMillan and Co.,
      1872.

May, Henry F. Protestant Churches and Industrial America.
      Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

---

* Availability of books has made reference to all three
  editions necessary.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. Harper Torch-
　　books. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

_____. *The Kingdom of God in America*. Chicago:
　　Willett, Clark and Company, 1937.

Ramsey, A. Michael. *F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of
　　Modern Theology*. Cambridge: University Press,
　　1951.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. *Christianity and the Social
　　Crisis*. Edited by Robert D. Cross. Harper
　　Torchbooks. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

_____. *Christianizing the Social Order*. New York:
　　The MacMillan Company, 1921.

_____. *The Righteousness of the Kingdom*. Edited and
　　introduced by Max L. Stackhouse. Nashville:
　　Abingdon Press, 1968.

_____. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. Apex
　　Books. New York: Abingdon Press, 1945.

Raven, Charles E. *Christian Socialism 1848-1854*. London:
　　MacMillan and Co. Limited, 1920.

Reckitt, Maurice B. *Maurice to Temple: A Century of the
　　Social Movement in the Church of England*. London:
　　Faber and Faber Limited, 1946.

Sharpe, Dores R. *Walter Rauschenbusch*. New York: The
　　MacMillan Company, 1942.

The Daily Gleaner. (Kingston, Jamaica), February 25,
　　1972, p. 24. February 27, 1972, pp. 27 and 44.
　　March 1, 1972, p. 1.

Vidler, Alec R. *F.D. Maurice and Company: Nineteenth
　　Century Studies*. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd.,
　　1966.

_____. *The Church in an Age of Revolution 1789 to the
　　Present Day. The Pelican History of the Church*, Vol. 5.
　　London: Penguin Books, 1961.

Woodworth, Arthur V. *Christian Socialism in England*. London:
　　Swan Soonenschein and Co., Ltd., 1903.

VITA

John Ingram McNab was born in St. Ann's Bay,

Jamaica (7th September 1932). He was trained for the

ministry of the Church at St. Peter's Theological College,

Kingston, Jamaica (1953-1956) and after ordination spent

two years in residence at the Montreal Diocesan College

(1957-1959). He received the B.D. degree as an external

student of London University in 1958 and the S.T.M. degree

from McGill University in 1963.

As a priest in the Anglican diocese of Jamaica he

has served in two parishes and taught at a Secondary School,

St. Peter's Theological College and the United Theological

College of the West Indies. He is presently on leave from

his post as lecturer in Christian Ethics and warden of

Anglican students at the United Theological College of the

West Indies.

He returned to McGill in 1969 and completed the

course requirements for the Ph.D. in 1970. During 1969-1971

he served as a teaching assistant in the Faculty of Religious

Studies at McGill.