

Dr. Roger Green, American Christianity, Session 19, The Social Gospel in America

© 2024 Roger Green and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Roger Green in his teaching on American Christianity. This is session 19, The Social Gospel in America.

A quick devotional today from someone that you may or may not be familiar with.

You've read about him, but his name is F.D. Maurice. Now, F.D. Maurice was doing in England what people like Rauschenbusch were doing in America a little later on in the social gospel movement. And F.D. Maurice was, this day, April 1st, this was the date of his, that he went to be with the Lord in 1872.

So, this is a day to remember F.D. Maurice. He was reared in a Unitarian home but found that very unsettling. And so, he became Church of England and actually became ordained in the Church of England.

And then, he was concerned for the rest of his life caring for the poor. Here is what he said about the meaning of the passion and death of Jesus Christ. He said I do not think we differ at all about Passion Week.

It is the violent effort at realization, as it is called, which I think is disappointing and mischievous. Just the remedy for the temptation to make it is the quiet, simple recognition of Christ as entering into our sufferings and the suffering of all we know. That is real.

It is not trying to wind ourselves to some conception of what he may pass through in his sufferings but apprehending by that which we have experienced what he must have passed through in his sufferings. So, a word, F.D. Maurice. He died a few years ago on this day, April 1st.

Okay. Where we should be in the lectures, we are about liberal theology in America and three strategies for; just a reminder, we gave an introduction and then three strategies for saving Christianity. So, remember what we talked about in the lecture? Protestant Christianity felt that Christianity in America was pretty much dissolving and pretty much not what it should be and didn't have the strength that it once had.

So, there are three strategies that various Protestant preachers, teachers, leaders, and writers developed to save Christianity. And the first one was deifying the historical process. In other words, the Bible shouldn't be taken as a doctrinal book.

It should be taken as a historical book, and you should understand that. That's what's really important about the Bible and about the Christian life. That's number one.

Number two, stressing the ethical. Life, not doctrine. So, doctrine is kind of out, but how do you live your life, especially modeling it after Jesus? That's important.

And then the certainty of religious feeling and not doctrine, not dogma, but religious feeling. What is religious feeling? And that's what really Christianity is all about. If we could just get people to experience some experience of God, then we've got the essence of Christianity.

This started with Friedrich Schleiermacher, who we mentioned. So, it was Schleiermacher who began all this in Europe, then that came over into America. But he's really important in all of this, religious feeling.

So, who's Schleiermacher's example of someone who relied totally on God and had an experience totally of God? Of course, that would be Jesus. He has become a great model and a great example of this. So those are three strategies.

Did they work? Well, time will tell, but let's see what happens with Protestantism as we go into the 20th century. Are there any questions about those three strategies? We understand why they're trying to do what they're trying to do, and we understand why they developed these theological kind of strategies to save Christianity. Okay, are we all set with that? Great.

So, we're going to move on now. You can see on page 15 now that two battle lines are drawn, and these battle lines will kind of determine what the shape of Christianity is going to be in the 20th century and then on whose side in terms of the battle lines. First of all, I will discuss the importance of Darwinism.

Darwinism published *Origin of Species* in 1859. So Darwin is very important to this kind of story, and he developed a theory of evolution. Now, he developed a theory of evolution by natural selection.

So, what is going to happen with Darwinism is that it is going to be critiqued from two sides. So, let's just scratch ours for just a minute. It's going to be critiqued from the more liberal side of Christianity that we've studied, and it's going to be critiqued from the more evangelical side of Christianity that we have looked at or look at further when we get into the 20th century.

So, first of all, let's just put our thinking caps on for just a minute. Darwinism would be critiqued from the more liberal side, especially deism. Why would it be critiqued by deism? What was there about deism and about their kind of theology that they would critique *Origin of Species* and Darwin's theory of evolution from below? What

does deism teach that would critique that, that would come after that? Anything? Kind of wheels spinning here.

How did, let me put it another way, how did deism understand the creation of the world? How did they understand how we got here? Or what theology did they use? Yeah, Matthew? Right. So, deism is God is the clockmaker God, and he wound up the clock, he got it going. But it is creation, however, from above.

It is God who created this. We did not evolve by some kind of a natural selection, you know, of the stronger overcomes, the weaker. That's not how we got here.

We got here by one God who created the world by the power of his word. And you would call, if you don't have this label down, you should put this label down. They had a theology of natural theology.

There was a natural theology embedded within deism. And that natural theology saw the world. Did they see it as ugly or beautiful? They saw the world as beautiful. They saw the world as designed by God, the creator.

So, they didn't see the world as coming about by some kind of evolution from below. So, deism would really, and more liberal Protestants would really find Darwinism, they would really critique Darwinism. Okay, now, in evangelicalism, the people on the evangelical, people who are more on the right, and the people who are more conservative, what would their critique be of Darwinism? What kind of thing would they have to say about Darwinism? What would be their theology that they would use to critique Darwinism? Yes, they would use the Bible and the seven-day creation as this is how the world was formed.

It's not from below, it is from above. But while the deists use natural theology to really attack Darwinism in a sense, the evangelicals or people who are more conservative would use a kind of revealed theology. God has revealed in his word, in the Bible, God has revealed to us how the world was created.

And we have it right from the beginning in Genesis. So, Darwinism is going to be critiqued from both sides when it comes to his theory of evolution. Now, stepping into this kind of battle line is a very important task, and his name is Charles Hodge.

And Charles Hodge is really from a biblical point of view. Charles Hodge really challenged Darwinism with a book called What is Darwinism? What is Darwinism? Now, the name of Charles Hodge is important, but also important is where he taught and where he had his influence. He was a teacher at Princeton Theological Seminary. And you can see the dates of Charles Hodge.

So basically, he's at Princeton Theological Seminary, 19th century. Okay, why is that important? That's important because Princeton and I'm not saying this just because I got a degree from Princeton, but Princeton was the bastion of orthodoxy in America in terms of seminaries. Princeton was a great seminary that held orthodoxy in America.

So, what is called Princeton Theology is really the theology that dominates in terms of, in the 19th century, the theology that dominates American Protestant life. So, it's Hodge, and it's speaking from Princeton, and he's challenging Darwinism and said, what is Darwinism? Okay, so in the book *What is Darwinism?* What is his basic answer to the question? His basic answer is that Darwinism is atheism. So, Hodge said you couldn't be a Christian and believe in Darwinism.

That would be impossible because Darwinism is atheism. So, he really took up the challenge. We say the battle lines are drawn here.

He really took up the challenge of Darwinism and really had a pretty strong answer against Darwin on that point. Now, there were, I have to just say, but there were other theologians who tried to take a middle ground. So there were theologians who believed in a kind of theistic evolution and believed that God did create, but he decided to create by evolution.

So, they took that middle ground, but they didn't have the voice that Hodge or Princeton Theology had. And so that's a pretty important answer to Darwinism that we get from Hodge and his book, *What is Darwinism?* Just because it was theologically orthodox in that case, did it define orthodoxy? Right. It defined it kind of defined, theologically defined what orthodoxy, what Christian, Protestant orthodoxy is all about.

These people were not only preachers or teachers at Princeton; they were writers. So, their material got out to the general public and to other Christians, and so forth. So that's why they were a powerhouse in the 19th century, kind of developing Protestant orthodoxy or holding the line on Protestant orthodoxy.

Okay. So, the battle lines are drawn. The first battle line was Darwinism, and that is drawn.

The second battle line, of course, is the battle for the Bible. And we've got that as number two in your outline there. Battle for the Bible.

Okay. The battle for the Bible started during the Reformation. So the battle for the Bible starts with the Reformation kind of battle cry, sola scriptura.

And sola scriptura is a battle cry against Roman Catholic understanding of developing doctrine from tradition and the Bible. So, in the medieval Roman Catholic world, doctrine is developed from tradition and also from the biblical text, but you don't have to have a biblical text to define a doctrine, though. So, the reformers came along, people like Luther and Calvin, and they came along with this sola scriptura battle cry, scriptures alone.

And by scriptures alone, what they meant primarily was scriptures alone for the development of the development of theology, sola scriptura. Okay. So, what happens now is the battle line, battle for the Bible, what happens is that the Bible now comes under attack in the 19th century.

There are a lot of people denying the validity or the authority of the Bible. It had already come under attack in the 18th century by people like the deists, and then in the 19th century with the Unitarian and so forth. So, it comes under attack.

So, there are people who are defending the Bible, and they're defending the Bible, saying the Bible is without error. So, there are no errors from Genesis to Revelation. All right.

Now, for some of the defenders, they meant that there were no errors, period. For others of the defenders, they meant that there might have been a mishap here or there in terms of the text, but there were no errors in terms of doctrine from Genesis to Revelation. So, there are going to be people who are going to defend the scriptures against the biblical criticism that was arising and becoming kind of so powerful.

Okay. Let me mention two of those defenders. First, we'll mention Archibald Alexander Hodge.

Oh, by the way, this is Schleiermacher, this picture, as we mentioned the other day. But we mentioned Archibald Alexander Hodge. Oh, it sounds like he might be related to Charles Hodge.

And so he was the son. And then we have Benjamin Warfield. Okay.

So, if you look at the dates of Hodge and Warfield, they do overlap a little bit, kind of a little tiny bit for a period of time. Then Hodge died in 86, and then Warfield lived till 1921. Okay.

Where do you suppose these two guys teach? Princeton Theological Seminary, of course. So, Princeton is still the champion of orthodoxy under Archibald Alexander Hodge and then under Benjamin Warfield, B.B. Warfield. So, they are developing the Princeton Theology, which is a theology of real orthodoxy.

And what they are doing then is defending the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Bible. The Bible is inerrant in what it teaches. It teaches without error.

And we are going to defend the Bible against all onslaughts of biblical criticism. We think that this is worth it; this is our sola scriptura day, in a sense. Okay.

What happens with all of this is you get a person coming along by the name of Charles A. Briggs. And he is very important to this story, Charles Briggs. All right.

Charles Briggs was a Presbyterian who taught at a Presbyterian seminary in New York City. So that's probably a seminary. Certainly, we haven't mentioned it, I don't think. But does anyone want to take a guess about what this Presbyterian seminary in New York City was named? Anybody? No? Not quite.

Union. It was named Union Theological Seminary in New York City. He was the teacher there at Union.

Now, I will say kind of in Briggs' defense, is it, maybe he doesn't need a, he certainly doesn't need me to defend him, but I will say in his defense when he was teaching biblical studies at Union, he did think that there were some errors in the Bible. But he thought that those errors were minuscule. He thought that those errors were, today, typological errors.

So, he didn't think that those errors really affected the doctrine of the Bible. So, I have to say that in Briggs' defense. However, there were people who were very nervous about what he was teaching because he seemed to be undermining the biblical text.

And so, he seemed to be not dealing with the biblical text as inerrant. And so Charles Briggs was brought to trial, and it's called the Briggs case. He was brought to trial within the Presbyterian church for teaching something that was not in, teaching things that the Bible wasn't, was not an error in some ways.

So, he's brought to trial, and he is found guilty of this. And they were afraid that he had opened the door a little too much by talking about errors in the Bible. So, what happens as a result of this is a split.

Briggs left Union Theological Seminary, left his own denomination, and left the Presbyterian church, but the seminary decided to leave the Presbyterian church as well. So, the seminary, from the time of the Briggs case and the Briggs trial, the seminary became an independent seminary, which it is still today. It's not supported by the Presbyterian church.

So, but now that's an important seminary to remember in terms of what we'll be talking about in the 20th century. So now we've got Union Theological Seminary kind of in our minds, we want to remember that for, for what happens from now on. So, okay.

So, the Briggs trial or the Briggs case opens up a lot of other trials. So, there are a lot of other trials and cases going on in seminaries and churches. And so, you've got major, major splits happening over the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Bible, not only with pastors and teachers but with seminaries as well.

Now, what happens here? I remember Hannah asked. We talked about this the other day, and I, boy, I wish I knew the answer to this, and I don't; I'm going to think this through a little myself here. And some of you need to help me think this through. But what happens is, in general, the Northern seminaries became liberal, and the Southern seminaries remain conservative over the issue of biblical inerrancy.

So, in general, you saw kind of a liberal creep in the Northern seminaries. And that's what some people were afraid of when teaching Briggs. They were afraid that he was opening the door this much; how much further was he going to, how much further is the door going to be open before the Bible is not authoritative at all? And that's what people were worried about.

Meanwhile, Southern seminaries and Southern churches remain more conservative on the issue. Now, the question is, why did this break, why did this break North and South? What was it culturally that it broke North and South? And my suspicion is that in the North, you had much more of a heterogeneous society. You had many more people from other traditions and so forth thinking through this stuff.

I don't know. If you fast forward to Bart Ehrman, do any of you talk about Bart Ehrman in classes or in the Intro to Biblical Studies class or course? Right. Any others of you, Bart Ehrman? If you fast forward to Bart Ehrman, you can kind of see why people were so worried because Bart Ehrman, a graduate of Wheaton College, but if you read his book like *Misquoting Jesus*, for example, you'll see that, well, I'll just put it this way.

He doesn't believe that the Bible is inherent in what it teaches. So, I'll just leave it at that. Okay.

So, there we are. There were two battle lines drawn, and people were going to take sides. And it's over Darwinism or over how the world was created, over how we understand God and his creation, and it's over the Bible.

What is the very nature of the Bible? Those are the two battle lines. Okay. Are there questions about that? Do you have any questions about that before we journey on here? Are you doing okay? All right.

We are now going to move to something you're very familiar with, lecture number 15 because you've read the book twice now, probably, maybe three times, because if you're reading a chapter a week, you've gone through this book. You know this book is cold. So, you won't mind me asking you some questions about Rauschenbusch.

So, Walter Rauschenbusch, well, I don't need that yet, but here's a picture of Walter Rauschenbusch. So, we're going to do three things here with Walter Rauschenbusch. We're going to do first of all, we are going to do, I want to give you some highlights of his life.

I will do that. I want to talk, secondly, about the theology of the social gospel. And then thirdly, I want to talk about the contributions of the social gospel to American Christianity.

Now, by giving the highlights of his life, this in no way, shape, or form means that you don't have to read the book. And in order to know that you've read the book really, really, really carefully, really well, on the final exam, I got a thousand questions from the book on the final, as well as essays on the final from the book. So I will know if you've read that book.

But I thought that it would be fun just to highlight some things about Rauschenbusch's life, kind of because it's hard to understand the ministry he entered into without understanding what he was all about in terms of his life and ministry. So, we'll start with his life. We'll start with some things that are kind of highlighted here.

So, okay, we start with Rochester, New York. Rochester, New York, the place of Rauschenbusch's birth, the place of much of his theological training, the place of his later life, and his death, Rochester, New York. So now, one person, one author has called Rochester, New York, the heart of the burnt-over district.

And remember what the burnt-over district was all about. It was out of Upper State, New York. The Millerites came out of there.

The Mormons came out of there. Finneyite revival came out of there. Now you've got the social gospel people starting to come out of there, as he's born in Rochester, New York.

So that is very, very important. Now, one author called Rochester, New York, the first American boomtown. So, Rochester, New York, when Rauschenbusch was born, Rochester, New York, was a very, very important place.

It really was a boomtown. And that's because of all of the trading, all of the industry that came up to Rochester, went up to Rochester and back down from Rochester to New York City and so forth. So, when we say he was born in Rochester, don't say, well, that's in the boondocks.

So, boy, he must have, no, that was in a flourishing city, especially during his later years. So, this is really, really important, the place of his birth. Okay.

There was a seminary there called Rochester Theological Seminary. That's where he was trained, at Rochester Theological Seminary. So that becomes very, very important.

So, this was a Baptist seminary, and he was trained; his father was a teacher, by the way, in the Baptist seminary. That's where he was trained and educated. Now the seminary itself, long story short, first of all, the family itself, and then the seminary itself.

The family itself was a German-speaking family. It was from a German background. You read about some of that background in the book.

You could probably tell me all about that background right now. But it's from a German-speaking family. The seminary was also a German-speaking seminary.

It was a bilingual seminary. Courses were taught in German and English because they were bilingual. So, the family, the church, the seminary, everything is bilingual.

Okay. Now, when you read the book, you'll see that Rauschenbusch made many trips back to Germany. So, it's like almost he was a dual citizen for a while between America and Germany, not only for family reasons but for educational reasons.

So that tells you that here's a man who is trained in both English and German, but here's a man who's going to understand not just the American scene, but he's going to understand German theology. And he's going to understand how to apply German theology, people like Schleiermacher, to the American kind of theological pastoral scene. So, here's a man who's very comfortable in two worlds.

That is very important in terms of the influence that he would have on American life and culture and on the American church. So, you do need to take note of that. He would write in English and German, speak in English and German, and so forth.

Okay. Another thing about Rauschenbusch, 1886 is an important date in his life. And why is that such an important date, 1886? Why is 1886 so important? Can you tell me from the first time you read the book, the second time you read the book, or the third time you read the book, 1886, why is it so important in his life? Does anybody want to take a guess here? Bless your hearts.

Yeah. He began his ministry in 1886. In 1886, he moved to New York City.

There was a German-speaking Baptist church in New York City that needed a pastor. He made the move to New York City to minister to that church. I've seen that church.

I've never actually been inside that church. But I've seen the facade of that church. And today, it is still called the Rauschenbusch Church.

So, he goes in 1886 to minister in that church. And he is there for 11 years. So, he's there from 1886 to 1897.

Okay. Now, the location of the church is really important. So, you need to notice this.

Well, you tell me, where was the church located? Where was the church located in New York City? It wasn't just, you know, anybody here? Okay. It was located on the east side of New York. So, I'm sorry, located on the west side of New York City in a place called, now this is going to give you some indication of the neighborhood.

But ironically, that title is still used today, even though the neighborhood has been a place called, anybody? A place called Hell's Kitchen. Hell's Kitchen. That's where he moved to.

Hell's Kitchen. It still goes by Hell's Kitchen today. So that would. Does that tell you something about the neighborhood, Hell's Kitchen? I'm going to minister in Hell's Kitchen.

So here's where he goes. And he's been there for 11 years and has this ministry in this Baptist church in Hell's Kitchen. Okay.

Now, what does he find among his parishioners in Hell's Kitchen? He finds, among his parishioners, he finds very hardworking people. Naturally, they're working in factories with fathers, mothers, children, and hardworking people, but people are barely able to eke out existence. People live in poverty and extreme poverty sometimes.

And so, he, this is something he never knew because he was reared in a very kind of middle-class, lovely home, lovely church, lovely seminary. This is something he had

never experienced in his own life. And he is very, it makes a very deep and a very lasting impression on him.

The extreme poverty, the misery of people, the hard labor that people had to go through all the time, and so forth. So now, so he is going to, he is going to kind of, he is going to kind of morph into something that's going to be very important. But before he does, we need to mention during these 11 years during these 11 years, and also for the rest of his life, actually, but during these 11 years, he considers himself to be an evangelical.

And that's going to be true for the rest of his life. He would not shy away from the term evangelical. All right.

And you'll notice that Evans calls him an evangelical. Evans labels him as evangelical. So, whatever happens in his ministry there at Hell's Kitchen, whatever happens, it will not, in a sense, detract from his evangelical roots and his evangelical beliefs and so forth.

Now, one example of this that we've already mentioned is he was a friend of Dwight L. Moody. So, you need to notice that friendship. He's a friend of Dwight L. Moody's, a great evangelical preacher at the time of Rauschenbusch.

He goes to Northfield. And remember what was happening at Northfield? He goes to Northfield sometimes for what? Why would he go to Northfield? Other than that, that was Moody's home. But what was happening in Northfield under the direction of Moody was some revival meetings, but there's something more important happening at Northfield.

What else is happening at Northfield? Moody is holding summer Bible conferences at Northfield. These are looking at the scriptures, especially the prophets, and seeing how that relates to the world in which we're living. So, the summer conferences were evangelical Bible conferences, and occasionally, Rauschenbusch would visit Moody and go to those summer Bible conferences.

So that becomes really, really important for whatever's going to happen in his life. Now, what we also want to take note of is that I have to give you a break. It's his Friday, after all.

But what we also wanted to take note of is that whatever's going to happen now in his life moving forward, he's going to remain a Baptist. So, in terms of denominational affiliation, he is going to stay Baptist. All right.

Now, this is because there's a theological reason for this. So, let's get this down, and then I'll give you a break. This is because Rauschenbusch was convinced that the

Baptists and the Methodists, so he wasn't Methodist but liked the Methodists, but he was convinced that the Baptists and the Methodists were the groups that most best held on to primitive Christianity or best expressed primitive Christianity.

And what do we mean by primitive Christianity? Just remind us what we mean by that. Christianity, the first century, the second century, the early church, the New Testament, early church Christianity. He felt that the Baptists and the Methodists best expressed primitive Christianity and what that was all about. And I have to say here, he was critical.

He was critical of hierarchical churches. He was critical of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy because he felt that hierarchical churches weren't an expression the best expression of primitive Christianity. He also felt that hierarchical, bureaucratic churches sometimes stood in the way of the development of the church in a democratic society.

So, he's living in a democratic society, a democratic world. The people ruled, and he loved Methodism and Baptist churches because that was true there. It's the best expression of primitive Christianity, while the hierarchical churches did not fit into a democratic society, in his opinion.

So, whatever was going to be done in the church in America was going to be done by Baptists and Methodists. So, okay, so Rauschenbusch. So, there's, so we, okay, so we got him kind of started here.

We'll continue with him in a couple of minutes, a couple of minutes, no, 10 seconds. You got 10 seconds. Walter Rauschenbusch, a few more kinds of things that you already know, but I'm just helping you to, I'm helping to emphasize them, but you already know them from the book.

Okay. Okay. Rotten Rauschenbusch.

He forms a group, and it is very important to take note of the group. And the group, you may see this, the group name again in your lifetime, and it's called the Brotherhood of the Kingdom. That's the name of the group, the Brotherhood of the Kingdom.

Okay. Now, the Brotherhood of the Kingdom is as that Rauschenbusch formed other Baptist preachers, pastors in the neighborhood, plus other sympathetic Christians in the neighborhood. And they're going to be concerned, and their focus is going to be on social concerns because we're dealing with people here who are in poverty and so forth.

They're going to be concerned socially for the life of these people, the people that they're ministering to. Okay. Now we need to take note of, this is very important, so you need to notice this.

This does not mean that Rauschenbusch and these people stop ministering to people spiritually. It doesn't mean that. So they were concerned with, and so here's a quotation: he and the other pastor still believed in spiritual life, sin, corruption, and the possibility of salvation, holiness, and eternal life.

So, he still believed and still preached, and so did they. People who belong to the Brotherhood of the Kingdom still believed and preached this gospel message. But they felt that that was not the end of the gospel message because the gospel also had something to say about social concerns for people, care for the poor, and justice for the poor. So, the Brotherhood of the Kingdom is formed to demonstrate that care and concern.

So here are two examples of what they labored for in their neighborhood. And the first one won't be a surprise, and the second one may be a surprise. But the two things that they labored for were better housing, and I mentioned the Lower East Side Tenement Museum that you're all going to visit someday whenever you're in New York City.

Better housing because the housing these people lived in was deplorable. And the second thing they worked for was, to us, we wouldn't think of this, I don't think, but better playgrounds for children. Why? Because what was the playground for the children? It was out on those very busy New York streets.

That was their playground. That's the only place they had to play. So you wouldn't think of Christians sitting around saying, boy, we've got to build some playgrounds for these kids so they won't be in danger when they're out there playing.

But for them, that was very important. And notice, by the way, the title, Brotherhood of the Kingdom, underlying kingdom in the title, is very important because Rauschenbusch's theology was a kingdom theology. So, Brotherhood of the Kingdom, the very name, is critical here.

So, he labored along with these other people for 11 years with this Brotherhood of the Kingdom. Now, after 11 years, he goes back home to Rochester in 1897. All right, you've read the biography.

What is the main reason why he, I mean, obviously, he's going to have a ministry back there in Rochester, New York, and he's going to go back to work at the seminary and so forth? But what is the main reason why he decides to go home? He's got a wife and family now and so forth. He's ministered there for 11 years.

He thought he would probably be there for the rest of his life. What is the major reason why he decided he had to go home? Someone who's read the biography tell me this. You will know this from reading the biography.

Anybody? Should I call a name? No, I won't do that. Anybody? No. The major reason was a physical reason.

Rauschenbusch was going deaf. And Rauschenbusch, this was a tragedy in his life. He was going deaf, and he felt he couldn't continue a pastoral ministry with his hearing impairment.

And so, he decided he would yield to a call from the seminary, from the Baptist seminary back home, and he would go back and teach there at the Baptist seminary. However, this tragedy, in a sense, in his life, turns out to be useful to God because he became much more influential than he would have been if he had stayed in New York City. Because when he got back home and when he was a seminary professor and even went out on speaking engagements, and you read in the book, but sometimes on the speaking engagements, he would have kind of not an interpreter with him, but he'd have someone with him who could help people understand what he was saying and answer if they had questions, she could say to him, here are the questions.

So, he did have help. But what happens is that during the years until he died, Rauschenbusch did an immense amount of writing, preaching, and teaching. He is extremely influential on American Christianity in a way that might not have been if it hadn't been for that impairment.

So, one author has called him the foremost molder of American Christian thought in his generation. So, Rauschenbusch is to the beginning of the 20th century, he is to the beginning of the 20th century what maybe Cotton Mather was earlier, or Edwards was in the 18th century, or Finney was in the 19th century. Now we have Rauschenbusch in the 20th century as a real molder of Christian thought, no doubt about that.

So, he goes back there and spends the rest of his life in that ministry and dies in Rochester, New York, in 1918, a very important date, by the way, because the First World War has just begun, just started when he dies. So now the other thing that he does when he's back home is he makes Rochester kind of like Calvin made Geneva, kind of an example city of how Christianity can influence on public policy. And he was very much appreciated at Rochester.

He never held a political office in Rochester, but he was very much appreciated for having a theological voice on public policy in the city of Rochester. So Rochester

became a really, really important place with Rauschenbusch as kind of a model of how Christianity can impact the broader culture and how in Christianity can bring social change and economic change and so forth. It is so very influential, and I always think of Calvin's Geneva as somewhat a little bit like that.

Okay, so first of all, just some things about his life. So you're going to have a lot of knowledge about his life, or you will know a lot about his life. I've heard Evan's lecture on the biography, so it was a privilege to hear the author's lecture.

But are there any questions about his life just thus far? We'll certainly get questions in those Friday sessions from the textbook, but anything that we've said about the life of Rauschenbusch so far? Yeah, he had a very good family life. He was married, had three or four children, a very good family life. We're going to see when we get to the contributions of the social gospel in Christianity in America; we'll see that he looked at the family as he had a very high opinion of family.

He looked at the family as kind of the bedrock of American democracy, and he also had that kind of family life. So, a very healthy family life with his wife, children, and so forth, yeah. And we'll actually talk a little more about that when we talk about the contribution of the social gospel.

Something else about Rauschenbusch? Can you think of anything else about him? Pretty remarkable guy, Walter Rauschenbusch was, no doubt. Go ahead, Aaron, and then I'll come on back over. Yeah, that's a good question.

I would say the greatest impact of his father was through his son because he was Walter's teacher, his professor, his mentor, his guide, and so forth. So, I would say that while he himself might not have had, I mean, he lived his whole life in Rochester and taught at the Baptist Seminary, but while he himself didn't have the kind of worldwide influence that his son had, he had an influence on Walter. So, coming into the second generation, that's really important.

I think the most important contribution that he made probably was through Walter. Yeah. It's after that he experiences pushback, and the reason for the pushback is that many people who were second-generation social gospelers didn't maintain the balance that Rauschenbusch did between evangelical Christianity and the social gospel movement.

They let go of the evangelical stuff, and they concentrated on the social gospel stuff. And so social gospel stuff in the second generation became pretty critical. He started to feel some of that in his lifetime, but not to what it would be later on.

Yeah. Something else about Walter Rauschenbusch. And by the way, he also traveled to England to meet William Booth, who was the founder of the Salvation Army, because they had a lot in common theologically, but also in terms of social ministry.

So, anything else about Rauschenbusch? Okay. Let's at least get started, the theology of, oh no, we're going to do his works here before we do the theology. So we'll do the works of Walter Rauschenbusch first, under A, under his lifetime here.

Okay. Yeah. Here we go.

I don't know why I did this exactly, but there it is. Okay. Rest in peace here.

I also wrote down the Brotherhood of the Kingdom. So if you want to see that, that's there. Okay.

And notice my little cartoon on the right. See someone laboring there. Did you see, I actually found that somewhere and put it in there.

That's pretty remarkable for me. For me, this is a step in, and this is a major step that I could find a cartoon like that, somebody laboring and everything next to Walter. So, all from Google.

So, okay. So, what about Walter Rauschenbusch himself? And then we'll get into theology. We're into his works here.

Okay. First of all, he wrote voluminously, and then he was, of course, translated. So, the first really, really, really important work is Christianity and the Social Crisis, which he wrote in 1907.

Christianity and the Social Crisis. This was a major book. And what he did in the book was he gave a history of the social gospel because by 1907, he had become known as the father of the social gospel.

So, the term social gospel was starting to be used by people. Do you remember we mentioned the name, Washington Gladden? Washington Gladden was a pastor in and he was starting to use the term social solutions.

So, that didn't kind of take, but the term social gospel took. He wrote this book in 1907 on Christianity and the Social Crisis. And this book gives a history of the social gospel.

So, okay. I'm going just to mention quickly five things about this book because you're not going to read this book until the summer. Then the summer you're going to read the book.

So, then you'll know, but you're not going to read it until this summer. So, I'm going to mention five things about this, which will help you understand Walter Rauschenbusch and help you understand as we move into the theology of the social gospel. History of the social gospel.

Number one in history for him is the Old Testament prophets. Remember the Old Testament prophets. And remember what concerned the prophets of the Old Testament.

They were concerned for the poor. They were concerned for the widows. They were concerned for the orphans.

They were concerned for the marginalized. That was for the Old Testament prophets, who showed us what a just world was going to be all about and what it should be all about. So, the Old Testament prophets are where the history starts.

And there's a lot there on the prophets. Okay. Number two, the second thing in the book, he then moves on to the social teachings of Jesus.

So, he shows Jesus' concern for the poor, Jesus' concern for the sick, Jesus' concern for the widows and orphans. So, he talks a lot about Jesus, of course, and the social names of Jesus. So that's number two in the book.

Okay. Number three in the book is since Jesus, since the first century, since Jesus, since the life and ministry of Jesus, there has been a major decline in these kinds of concerns by the church. Now, there were periods in history, of course, where that's not true.

But basically, when he looks at the history of the church, he says the social teachings of the church have been in great decline, and the church has not maintained its care for the poor, its care for the widows, its care for the orphans, its care for the sick. It's not maintained that. And so that's number three in the book, the decline of the social names in the church.

Okay. Number four in the book is the present crisis. What is the present crisis with which we're living? And of course, he had been in Hell's Kitchen for 11 years.

So, the present crisis in which we're living is the church has turned a blind eye to the needs of the poor. The church is not concerned, not caring. Right now, in the world in which we live, 1907, I'm writing from Rochester; I'm telling you, after 11 years in Hell's Kitchen, the church as a body does not concern itself for the poor.

And so he elaborates on that. So, okay. And then number five in the book.

Number five in the book is a quotation, the title of the chapter, but what to do, what to do. What are we going to do about this? And that was the challenge of Christianity and the social crisis. That was the challenge of the book.

Now, remember that when he writes this book, he's also teaching this stuff in Rochester, but he's also out a lot of places in the world, mainly the English world and German world, but a lot of places in the world, he's teaching this as well. So, this Christian and social crisis is becoming very well known. Okay.

So very important. You may see this book again in your lifetime, Christianity and the social crisis. Are there questions about the book? You see the five main areas of the book, and you're going to understand why he's so concerned with outlining social where the social gospel has been.

Okay. With that, let me just mention the second one, the theology for the social gospel. Okay.

Theology for the social gospel. All right. And just to say, with the theology of the social gospel, he's going to use a particular theme that he believes is central to the social gospel.

So he's going to develop a critical theme. We need to develop this theme if we're going to understand the social gospel. He wrote it in 1917.

So earlier, I said he died in 1918. I think I had mistakenly earlier said he died at the beginning of World War I. No, he lived through, almost lived through, World War I because World War I started in 1914. So that was my error.

He lived through the first three years of World War I, and he saw the devastation of World War I. Then, of course, he died in 1918, and that was the end of World War I. So, okay. Theology of the social gospel. We'll start that on Monday morning.

Have a great weekend, and we will see you on Monday morning.

This is Dr. Roger Green in his teaching on American Christianity. This is session 19, The Social Gospel in America.