# FAITHFUL REPUBLIC

Religion
and
Politics
in
Modern
America

Edited by

**Andrew Preston**
**Bruce J. Schulman**
**Julian E. Zelizer**

# FAITHFUL REPUBLIC

POLITICS AND CULTURE IN MODERN AMERICA

Series Editors:
Margot Canaday, Glenda Gilmore, Michael Kazin,
Stephen Pitti, Thomas J. Sugrue

Volumes in the series narrate and analyze political and social change
in the broadest dimensions from 1865 to the present, including ideas
about the ways people have sought and wielded power in the public
sphere and the language and institutions of politics at all levels—local,
national, and transnational. The series is motivated by a desire to
reverse the fragmentation of modern U.S. history and to encourage
synthetic perspectives on social movements and the state, on gender,
race, and labor, and on intellectual history and popular culture.

# FAITHFUL REPUBLIC

Religion and Politics in Modern America

Edited by

Andrew Preston, Bruce J. Schulman,
and Julian E. Zelizer

PENN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

PHILADELPHIA

*In honor of Tony Badger, a great collaborator
and a special friend*

# CONTENTS

Chapter 8. More than Megachurches: Liberal Religion
and Politics in the Suburbs

    *Lily Geismer*

Chapter 9. Knute Gingrich, All American? White Evangelicals, U.S.
Catholics, and the Religious Genealogy of Political Realignment

    *Bethany Moreton*

*Andrew Preston, Bruce J. Schulman, and Julian E. Zelizer*

The mingling of religion and politics has formed a defining feature of American public life ever since the founding of the United States as a nation. This potent, sometimes explosive mixture has been remarkably pervasive, especially given the limitations the Constitution placed on the extent to which religious faith can participate as a function of government. The only guidance the Constitution offered on religion's standing in politics came in Article VI, which prohibited the use of religious tests to determine if someone is eligible for national office. The Bill of Rights addressed religion more directly—the first sentence of the First Amendment guaranteed religious liberty through the establishment and free exercise clauses—but did so briefly, in only sixteen words. Legally, then, religion received no official role in national governance, and certainly no endorsement or encouragement.

Politically, however, religion has always been prominent in American public life. "Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports," declared George Washington in his farewell address of 1796. "The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them." Washington was a child of the Enlightenment and by no means an orthodox Protestant. Nonetheless, it seemed obvious to him that a healthy republic depended upon virtue, that virtue depended upon morality, and that morality depended on religion. According to Washington, in other words, democratic self-government could not exist without religion. "Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure," he concluded, "reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."[1]

Not everyone shared Washington's vision of a religious republic. Thomas

Jefferson, a deist and humanist who denied the divinity of Jesus and harbored suspicion toward institutional religion, sought to limit the place of faith in government as much as possible. His most famous contribution to this debate, an 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptist Association of Connecticut, contains one of the earliest reference to "a wall of separation between Church and State."[2] Jefferson reiterated his position before a national audience three years later, in his second inaugural address: "In matters of religion I have considered that its free exercise is placed by the Constitution independent of the powers of the General Government. I have therefore undertaken on no occasion to prescribe the religious exercises suited to it, but have left them, as the Constitution found them, under the direction and discipline of the church or state authorities acknowledged by the several religious societies."[3] In contrast to George Washington, Jefferson did not believe that democracy relied on religion, and certainly not the fervent Christianity that prevailed in the early republic, particularly New England. As Jefferson explained to his attorney general, his views on the rigorous separation of church and state "will give great offence to the New England clergy, but the advocate of religious freedom is to expect neither peace nor forgiveness from them."[4]

On the surface, Washington and Jefferson's positions seem to be irreconcilable. On one hand, the first president implied that democracy cannot function without religion; on the other, the third president ostensibly claimed that democracy cannot function with it. Yet their views coincided more than they appear, and that underlying similarity helps explain the perseverance and prevalence of religion in American politics. Most important, neither president believed that the federal government should actively help or hinder religion; government must instead remain neutral. But beyond that basic stricture, both Washington and Jefferson subscribed to an idea that scholars now call the religious marketplace.[5] According to this theory, based on Adam Smith's ideas about commerce in *The Wealth of Nations* and applied by many of the American Founders to matters of faith, religion operated in a manner analogous to a capitalist market: both functioned best when free from government constraints and manipulation. Just as a monopoly was bad for capitalism, an official church was bad for religion. In this sense, the First Amendment safeguarded church from state as much as it protected government from religious interference.[6] In religion, as in governance and economics, this quintessentially American (and, not coincidentally, Protestant) principle was grounded in the assumption that liberty was best preserved when power was dispersed. Churches would flourish when forced to

compete and innovate, and thereby check and balance one another. Moreover, religion remained an unavoidable fact of the people's lives, for better (Washington) or worse (Jefferson). Attempts to regulate it, whether through an established church, executive power, or congressional legislation, could end up only as undemocratic curbs on fundamental individual freedom. Thus the healthiest relationship between church and state was separation, so both could flourish independently. Unorthodox though his religion was, Jefferson certainly understood this, which is why he (together with James Madison) drafted the Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom for Virginia.[7] Staunch Anglican though he was, so too did Washington.

Both Washington and Jefferson realized that while the Constitution and Bill of Rights could separate the institutions of church and state, they could not keep politics free of religion. The separation of church and state forms only one part of this historic relationship. Just as important, and underexamined, has been the ongoing interaction between religion and politics, including partisanship, institutions, political ideology, and movement activism. Religion has always played an important role in shaping the nation's political culture, while religions have sometimes developed in response to political change. This intermingling remains as evident today as it was two centuries ago. During the 1800 election campaign, a bitter feud erupted over whether Jefferson's irreligion made him unfit to be president, but in the twenty-first century such arguments about a candidate's faith are no longer novel, despite the proscription on religious tests. The last three presidential elections highlighted the importance that Americans attach to religion: in 2012, unease about Mitt Romney's Mormonism persisted among liberals and conservatives alike; in 2008, controversial liberation theology sermons by Reverend Jeremiah Wright threatened to undermine Barack Obama's candidacy (while a small minority of Americans doubted whether Obama was even a Christian); and in 2004, while Archbishop Raymond Cardinal Burke of Saint Louis vowed not to give communion to Democrat John Kerry over his tolerance of abortion rights, Republican George W. Bush aggressively courted white Protestant evangelicals and conservative Catholics and rode their support to victory.

In fact, rarely have religion and politics ever been truly separate, and it is not difficult to see why. To a great extent politics is the product of culture, and religion is an important form of culture. More directly, religious Americans contribute to national debates on ethics, morals, economics, the size and proper role of government, and foreign affairs. Either individually or

collectively, they bring their influence to bear on the political process by making their views known to politicians and government officials—many of whom are themselves religious, or at least conversant with the history, values, and prerogatives of religious communities. As long as the United States is a religious nation, religion will play a political role. Observers going back to Alexis de Tocqueville have pointed this out, and there is little to indicate that this essential part of the American national character has changed.

At the same time, religion is not static; it is constantly evolving and taking new shape based on the specific contests that it inhabits. The political world surrounding religious leaders and congregants can exert an extremely powerful influence on what takes place in the pulpit. Over time, the substance of religion and the context of politics assume a dialectical relationship that has great influence on each. Religious leaders started to take a more aggressive role in tackling political questions in response to changes in government. During the 1930s, some religious leaders incorporated a defense of the welfare state into the theological arguments they shared with constituents, just as the civil rights cause became integral to Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism in the 1950s and 1960s. Political conservatism shaped other religious leaders in the 1950s, who embraced arguments about communism and the risks of strong government, just as the Moral Majority in the 1970s focused on issues such as abortion and government regulation as part of their regular dialogue.

Since Tocqueville traveled through antebellum America, religion has been an indispensable part of American public life—if anything, as David Domke and Kevin Coe have argued, religion is perhaps more central to American politics than ever before.[8] Not surprisingly, then, scholars are now rethinking this complicated, fraught relationship. Recent work demonstrates this enduring religious influence on politics even as it complicates our conventional understanding of it. Amanda Porterfield, for example, has illustrated that the politics of the early republic were deeply affected by an aggressive Protestant campaign against incipient forms of secularism, such as deism and agnosticism, that had become increasingly popular and threatened the Protestant domination of public life.[9] Harry S. Stout has shown that the political and military history of the Civil War is incomplete without a consideration of religion.[10] Religious figures who never held elected office, such as the genial Presbyterian Billy Graham or the fiery Pentecostal Aimee Semple McPherson, had a profoundly important political presence that reverberated throughout the twentieth century, as Steven Miller's and Matthew

Avery Sutton's biographies reveal.[11] Mark Noll, Edward Blum, and Paul Harvey argue that the bitter history of racial politics, which has been at the heart of much of American history, cannot be fully appreciated without considering its religious dimensions.[12] Similarly, whether it is through David Hollinger's study of the social sciences, Andrew Heinze's analysis of psychology, Jeremi Suri's reading of geopolitics, or Jonathan Freedman's account of different forms of popular music, scholars have traced the difficult but ultimately successful process of Jewish assimilation in the twentieth century.[13] Our understanding of U.S. foreign policy in the Cold War, a field long dominated by realist assumptions, has been enhanced by a torrent of revisionist investigations into the role of religion.[14] As this small but indicative sample of recent scholarship shows, religion has played an integral part in shaping various aspects of American political history.

This is not to say that American religion has been monolithic and consensual, or free of conflict or contestation—far from it. Church and state may have been separate, but until well into the twentieth century Protestantism enjoyed an almost complete cultural and political hegemony enforced through the subjugation, sometimes violent but nearly always coercive, of other faiths (including other Christian faiths, such as Catholicism and Mormonism). Often these conflicts played out in the church or synagogue, but just as often they erupted in the political arena.[15] Even within Protestantism, divisions between modernists and fundamentalists, or liberals and conservatives, stimulated political debate over foreign policy, civil rights, sexual mores, and identity politics.

Nor can we assume that all Americans have been religious. Some nations are extremely devout, and religion and politics are deeply intertwined; others, most notably in Western Europe, have marginalized religion to the extent that its political influence is rare, negligible, and unimportant. The United States is unusual in that it is both a deeply religious nation and a thoroughly secular one; faith and secularism have blended in American society in productive and unpredictable ways.[16]

Yet secularism thrives in the United States, and in recent decades has thrived as never before.[17] The strict separation of church and state as it is now construed is in fact a relatively recent development.[18] It dates back not to Thomas Jefferson, but to post–World War II disputes about the proper role of religion in education.[19] The construction of Jefferson's wall began only in 1947, when the Supreme Court's decision in *Everson v. Board of Education* codified Jefferson's strict separationism as legal doctrine for the first time,

and was more or less complete by the early 1960s, with the Court's decisions in the *Engel v. Vitale* (1962) and *Abington School District v. Schempp* (1963) cases on, respectively, prayer and Bible reading in public schools. That process of separating church from state, which effectively meant the privatization of religion, did not augur well for religious observance. Though they have left an indelible cultural imprint, the forms of traditional institutional religion that long dominated American public life, particularly the mainline Protestant churches, have declined rapidly since the 1960s.[20] In this "restructuring of American religion," attitudes toward faith either hardened into more conservative and devout forms of worship or withered away into a more secular strain of liberalism.[21] Both the secular left and the Religious Right then radicalized, leaving little in the way of a common middle ground. Whereas evangelical and Pentecostal churches have boomed in recent decades, recent polling shows that the fastest growing religious groups are nonbelievers and those who identify as "spiritual but not religious."[22] If religious adherence persists (and intensifies) among many Americans, it has died for many others. Thus if there is still a religious influence on American public life, it is complex, multifaceted, and fiercely disputed.

Nonetheless, few would dispute that religion, and with it a religious presence in politics and public life, endures. After all, around the same time the Supreme Court constructed Jefferson's wall of separation, Congress instituted the National Day of Prayer, codified "In God We Trust" as the national motto, and inserted "under God" into the Pledge of Allegiance. It is thus incumbent upon historians to integrate both religion and secularization into their analyses of American politics, culture, and society. Yet for a long time, American historiography had what Jon Butler called a "religion problem": religious history was for the most part cordoned off from the rest of American history; church history was somehow not political, social, or cultural history (though it did enjoy very close ties to intellectual history).[23] Compounding the problem was the fact that religion was mostly ignored in many subfields of American history, such as foreign relations and civil rights.[24] Closely related disciplines, such as American studies and international relations theory, also had their own religion problem.[25]

If American history once had a religion problem, however, that is no longer the case. Scholars of U.S. history now try to integrate religion into their understanding of the nation. Religious historians have strived to connect their work to broader narratives about American history, while the recently revitalized field of political history has also worked hard to connect political

leaders and institutions to larger societal trends so as to avoid an insular analysis of their subject. While there is still much work to be done,[26] historians are navigating an important historiographical turn that is bringing these two subjects closer together.

This religious turn in American history, reflected in the chapters in this book, is marked by several common characteristics. First, and perhaps foremost, historians are taking religion seriously as a discrete category of historical analysis and are treating religion as they would any other subject rather than using scholarship as a platform to demonize or lionize religious faith. This is in marked contrast to the battles waged by popular writers and public intellectuals over the validity of religion itself. Second, rather than simply assuming, a priori, that religion plays some sort of a role in American history, historians are thoroughly investigating the ways in which religion features in American political, cultural, economic, social, and diplomatic history. Third, the new history is seeking to complicate conventional wisdom about familiar but politically contentious topics such as secularization; pluralism, assimilation, diversity, and tolerance; the separation of church and state; how religion shapes voting behavior; and how it has influenced foreign policy. Fourth, in tandem with nearly all subfields of American history, religious historians are seeking to transform their work into something less parochial, by making it more comparative, international, and transnational. Fifth, and perhaps most analogous to political history, religious historians are seeking to balance a newer and fresh focus on social history methods and subjects—such as "lived religion," civil society, grassroots movements, popular culture, and minorities—with a desire to preserve what was best about the more traditional emphasis on churches, institutions, and elites.[27]

There are of course many good overviews of the relationship between American politics and American religion, just as there is now a vast literature on specific religious aspects of political history.[28] What makes this book unusual is that it provides an overview since the Civil War through a variety of detailed empirical case studies—meant to be indicative and representative rather than definitive and comprehensive. They range from explorations of how religion unexpectedly influenced political economy (as in the chapter by Darren Dochuk) to the complex connections between religious leaders and conservatism and liberalism (for example, in the chapters by Lily Geismer, Alison Collis Greene, Bethany Moreton, and Molly Worthen) to the particular political and social contexts within which religious coalitions took form (detailed in the chapters by Lila Corwin Berman, Edward J. Blum, Matthew

S. Hedstrom, and David Mislin). Written by a new generation of historians, the chapters in *Faithful Republic* blend church history and lived religion and use the fusion to fashion an innovative kind of political history.

By adopting this approach, we hope to illustrate the textured richness that has helped give shape to religion and politics and America while also preserving the wide-angle lens of a broad survey. For this reason, we have also defined "political history" as broadly and inclusively as possible, to include ideology, economics, political culture, and social movements as well as high politics. Our individual chapters demonstrate the complexities of historical change over time, but they do so under the same rubric of tracing a religious influence on American public life. Overall, then, we hope that the diversity of the chapters reveals the pervasiveness of religion in American political history.

# "Against the Foes That Destroy the Family, Protestants and Catholics Can Stand Together": Divorce and Christian Ecumenism

*David Mislin*

"In one respect," mused the author of an 1882 article, "the Roman Catholic Church has proved itself the conservator of the family. By a consistent and stringent discipline it has always maintained the sacredness of the marriage bond." In and of itself, such a claim was not unusual in nineteenth-century America. Roman Catholics frequently asserted that their tradition's prohibition of divorce left them better equipped than Protestants to prevent the dissolution of the nuclear family. In this instance, however, it was not a Roman Catholic making the argument; it was a Protestant, and a Protestant clergyman at that. The Congregationalist minister Washington Gladden hoped that his article in the popular *Century* magazine would serve as a call to action against the increasing divorce rate in the United States, which Gladden viewed as a perilous threat to the nation's overall moral health. But he also identified an additional benefit to be found in Protestants' enthusiastic efforts to curtail the rising tide of divorces. "Such explicit testimony and energetic action," he observed, might not only "avert the evils now assailing the peace and security of our homes," but also "convince our Roman Catholic brethren that Protestantism is not the foe of the Christian family."[1]

Nor was Gladden, who was one of the most outspoken Protestant critics of Gilded Age anti-Catholicism, unique in believing that Catholics might well have a point when they accused members of his own tradition of allowing the collapse of the family.[2] Another prominent Protestant, retired Yale University

president Theodore Dwight Woolsey, lauded his Catholic neighbors for their views about divorce. "We are not Catholics, but we admire their firmness in standing by an express precept of Christ," he declared.[3] The editors of the *Century*, which communicated the sentiments of the overwhelmingly Protestant establishment class to readers throughout the United States, concurred. They noted that in "matters of discipline, vitally affecting the life of the family and of society," the Catholic Church stood on the "high ground," and Catholic "doctrine and practice respecting divorce" were in fact "closer to the law of the New Testament" than the teachings of Protestant churches. "In contending against the foes that destroy the family," there was no hindrance to common action, and thus, they proclaimed, "Protestants and Catholics can stand together."[4]

During the closing decades of the nineteenth century, a rapidly rising divorce rate convinced many Americans that the family was indeed being destroyed. Nearly one million divorces were granted between 1887 and 1906, a near tripling of the rate during the previous twenty-year period. This increase significantly outpaced the growth of the nation's population.[5] Historians have offered numerous explanations of this phenomenon, including the overall social upheaval caused by rapid urbanization and industrialization, the increasing tolerance of divorce (especially in western states and territories), and louder calls from feminists for the right of women to leave unhappy marriages. Moreover, a growing number of states eased the burden on women by recognizing the more general category of "cruelty" as grounds to end a marriage, rather than limiting divorce to less ambiguous circumstances such as spousal abandonment.[6]

No matter the cause, the apparent willingness of so many Americans to end their marriages worried Protestants and Catholics alike. Leaders from both traditions joined forces to combat the perceived moral danger of rampant divorce. In 1879, a coalition of Protestant and Catholic reform organizations united to amend Connecticut's liberal divorce laws, thereby making it more difficult for couples to end their marriages. The New England Divorce Reform League, organized by Theodore Dwight Woolsey as part of this campaign, quickly emerged as a force in the wider political discussion of marriage and divorce. Within a few years, the organization proved so successful that it removed "New England" from its name and became known, more accurately given the scope of its work, as the National Divorce Reform League (NDRL). The renamed group's 1885 annual report heralded the ecumenical nature of its membership, noting that among its many affiliated clergy and

laity were "distinguished representatives of all leading bodies, (including Catholic)."[7] Similar cooperation took place with some frequency for the better part of three decades, such as during the 1890s, when Protestants enthusiastically endorsed efforts by the Roman Catholic bishop of North Dakota to curb the permissive divorce laws in that recently admitted state.[8]

These combined efforts by Catholics and Protestants to fight divorce—and the broader rhetoric of common endeavor surrounding the issue—constitute an important turning point in the history of the relationship between the two major branches of Christianity in the United States. In the late nineteenth century, nationally prominent Protestant and Catholic Americans became willing to set aside centuries of disagreement about issues of belief and practice in order to unite around a political and social cause. Identifying such instances of cooperation provides an important corrective to a historical narrative that focuses almost exclusively on anti-Catholic sentiment during this period and suggests that Protestants and Catholics had little sense of shared purpose.[9]

The religious leaders who came together tended to represent the theologically liberal wings of their respective churches, and liberals were more favorably disposed than conservatives to ecumenical cooperation. To be sure, there remained many Americans with more conservative religious outlooks, Catholic and Protestant alike, who saw little reason to bridge the divide between the traditions. But the preponderance of theological liberals in their ranks does not provide an excuse for overlooking or minimizing these ecumenical enterprises. The 1880s and 1890s witnessed both the rise of liberals to prominence in Protestant denominations and the apogee of liberal Catholicism in the United States. Many of the nation's most respected Catholic and Protestant leaders—the people who occupied the most prestigious pulpits, taught at leading seminaries and divinity schools, and published their sermons, lectures, and essays in books and popular journals like the *Century* and the *North American Review*—were theological liberals.[10]

More than any other issue, divorce offered a vehicle for ecumenically oriented Catholics and Protestants to cooperate as equals. As both Gladden and Woolsey conceded, American Protestants could not claim the same moral high ground in discussions of divorce that they believed they held on other high-profile social issues, such as temperance reform, where the stereotype of the lazy, drunken Catholic immigrant continued to persist. When it came to marriage, Catholics had seemingly proved much more capable of preventing divorce and preserving the family.

For cooperative endeavors to succeed, members of both traditions needed to adjust their views on both religious and political issues. This essay examines precisely how the intellectual foundation for this common work developed. For their part, Protestants affirmed that families were the fundamental unit of society and, in rhetoric that closely resembled long-standing Catholic critiques of Protestantism, criticized the historical individualism of their tradition. Meanwhile, many American Catholics abandoned their suspicion of government efforts to regulate morality and joined Protestants in championing efforts by states to curtail seemingly permissive divorce statutes. For members of both traditions, these ecumenical endeavors signaled major revisions of their worldview. They provided Protestants an impetus to abandon the individual-centered nature of their religious thought. These enterprises likewise inspired many Catholics to set aside long-standing suspicions of state authority as they adopted the view that government represented a better mechanism for preserving morality than their own institutions did. Most significantly, they demonstrated to Catholics and Protestants alike that it was possible to undertake a common effort for political and social change without engaging in theological disputes.

\*   \*   \*

The shared endeavor by Protestants and Catholics to combat divorce would have amounted to naught were it not for a fundamental point of agreement: members of both groups believed that the family constituted the foundational unit of a healthy, functioning society. Gladden frequently championed such views. "The monogamous family . . . is the structural unit of modern society," he wrote in one of his many books that offered a Christian response to contemporary social issues.[11] By "breaking up homes and weakening the bonds of the family, which is the very foundation of society," he elaborated in a later volume, divorce was "making great havoc in society."[12] Gladden's fellow Congregationalist minister, Newman Smyth, imbued the family with a religious purpose as well as a social one. In his *Christian Ethics*, a major treatise of late nineteenth-century liberal theology that was recommended by the NDRL, Smyth declared that "the most effective and purest ethical as well as religious influences must always find their abiding place and power in the Christian home." He also described "the Christian family" as one of the "great redemptive forces of the world." By calling the family a "means of grace," Smyth bestowed on it a sacramental function, and thereby suggested

that the spread of divorce would by necessity obstruct the development of Christianity in American communities.[13]

It therefore made sense for organizations like the NDRL to cast their antidivorce message in terms of saving the family. Samuel Dike, its secretary and most outspoken proponent, described the organization's mission to "promote an improvement in public sentiment and legislation on the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce."[14] He identified the weakening of marital ties as the root of a host of social ills. NDRL research, he claimed, showed that divorce led to an increase of illegitimate births and—in a thinly veiled reference to abortion—other "connected evils." These in turn "contributed much more to the causes of crime, insanity and poverty than is suspected by most people."[15] The popular weekly periodical *Outlook*, edited by the Protestant clergyman Lyman Abbott, championed the work of the NDRL and affirmed its assertions about the correlation between stable families and a healthy society. Abbott and his fellow editors cited the organization's report on the importance of the home in ensuring temperance, preventing crime, and encouraging education and personal uplift. They averred that "the student of sociology" was increasingly "led . . . back to the base of society in the Family."[16]

While Protestants and Catholics remained severely divided over many aspects of Christian teaching, the view of the family as fulfilling an essential function for society offered a crucial point of agreement. John Ireland, the bishop (and later archbishop) of Saint Paul, Minnesota, and a leading voice for the so-called Americanist wing of the church that saw little inherent tension between Catholicism and modern American culture, cited Gladden's article on divorce as evidence of Protestant-Catholic agreement. Although Ireland vehemently disputed some of Gladden's assertions (primarily about morality in the Catholic countries of Europe), he lauded the Congregationalist for admitting "the truth of history" that the Catholic Church had long served as the most ardent defender of marriage. It did so, Ireland declared, because it firmly held to the belief that the family represented "the great constitutive factor in human society."[17] Like Protestants, Ireland emphasized a larger social purpose to marriage. It existed so that parents would "bring up children in the practice of the virtues that fit them for their duties as citizens of earth and heirs of heaven."[18] Central to his understanding of marriage was the expectation that it provided the basis for the morality of the entire society.

Other Catholics were even more explicit in making such a case. Ireland's

fellow bishop, John Lancaster Spalding, called the family "the basis of our civilization" and "the stronghold of all that is best in our social life."[19] The Catholic press drove the point home. Articles in the widely read *Catholic World* frequently stressed the role of the family as "the corner-stone of society," "the corner-stone of our social fabric," "the foundation of society," and the institution on which sat "the whole structure of civil society."[20] The language varied, but the message was clear: divorce caused the demise of the family, which in turn signaled a grave moral threat to the United States.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

That Protestants should join Catholics in affirming the importance of the family was not, in some respects, a novel development. For over a generation the leading voices of American Protestantism had idealized the middle-class home and family as a primary site of religious development.[21] But the emphasis on the family that emerged in discussions of divorce during the 1880s and 1890s was not simply the extension of a Victorian domestic fantasy. It constituted one element of a broader critique of individualism that emerged within Protestant circles during the late nineteenth century. Simply put, many Protestant Americans began to question the emphasis on the individual that had long represented the heart of their tradition. It was also an assessment that echoed a central Catholic argument against Protestantism.

Ever since the Reformation, Roman Catholics had criticized what they perceived to be the excessive individualism found in Protestant churches; in the nineteenth-century United States, they frequently invoked this argument in discussions of marriage and divorce. "At the door of Protestantism we have to lay much of the present deplorable condition of the moral world," Ireland declared, believing that Protestantism "dealt a death blow, by its principles and practice, to the indissolubility of the marriage contract."[22] The bishop's main critique centered on the right of private judgment that stood at the heart of Protestant doctrine. He argued that such teaching led individuals to evaluate Christian moral teaching for themselves, especially teachings related to marriage and the family.

Other Catholics shared Ireland's views. Frequent *Catholic World* contributor Augustine Hewit, despite his praise for Theodore Dwight Woolsey's efforts, nevertheless blamed Protestantism for undercutting the "moral law of Christianity" and replacing it with "mere opinion," thereby rendering it impossible for religious institutions to resist divorce with any authority.[23] George

Searle, another essayist, observed that "the absence of any authoritative teaching outside the Catholic Church" had combined with "the principle of private judgment" to leave Protestant churches unable to secure claims of moral authority against individuals who saw nothing wrong with divorce and wished to use legislative power to give legal justification to their views.[24] Cardinal James Gibbons, who essentially served as the head of the Catholic Church in the United States, railed against historical Protestantism. In the *North American Review*, he wrote that modern divorce could be traced back to the Reformation and the decision to remove marriage from the list of sacraments.[25] The Catholic consensus was clear: Protestantism was built on the faulty foundation of excessive individualism, which now manifested itself in the destruction of American families.

In a rhetorical move that made cooperation with Roman Catholics possible, many Protestants chose not to combat such assertions about individualism run amok. They instead joined their Catholic neighbors in claiming that excessive individualistic tendencies had characterized Protestantism throughout its history and now wrought deleterious effects on the American family. Gladden frequently accused Protestant individualism of causing unintended and worrisome consequences. "The doctrine of individual rights and responsibilities has been pushed to absurd and dangerous extremes," he warned. "In the exaltation of the individual, modern society has greatly weakened the family bond." Gladden insisted that concepts like "mutual obligation" and "fidelity" were ignored in favor of "personal liberty," and he lamented that " 'individuality' is one of those good things of which it is quite possible to have too much."[26] Congregationalist minister and NDRL member George Harris, who also served as editor of the widely read theological journal *Andover Review*, likewise insisted that while the Catholic Church had been guilty of "abuse, or at least a misapprehension of Christianity" in its emphasis on "the organization above the individual," Protestants had proved equally guilty of not living "according to Christianity" when they focused on "the freedom and final salvation of the individual above the welfare of society."[27]

Harris's fellow NDRL member Samuel Dike was even more blunt in his indictment of Protestantism: "in making the Individual the centre of effort," he wrote, "the Family has fallen into neglect or been obscured under the conceptions of individualism."[28] Indeed, Dike, himself a clergyman, articulated the Roman Catholic argument against Protestants better than most Catholics did. He acknowledged that the Reformation had bred individualistic

thinking in matters of morality; American churches, with their "voluntary system," had then carried it to an extreme. "In many of these churches," he complained, "nothing is heard or seen from one year's end to another's that is not an emphasis on the Individual. The family as such is quite overlooked."[29] The institutions responsible for training Protestant clergy were largely responsible for the state of affairs. For most of the nineteenth century, he argued, "scarcely a lecture in college, university or theological seminary was devoted to the family or any of its incidents."[30]

But this line of argument received its greatest endorsement from Lyman Abbott, who presented it to a national audience in the *Outlook*. In an era when even the most religiously liberal Americans had few nice things to say about medieval Catholicism, Abbott lauded the "unconscious sagacity" of the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. The problem, he declared, had arisen when Reformation-era Protestants ceased to consider marriage a sacrament. That decision resulted in a gradual trajectory to the present, when marriage had become "a civil contract," which "may be dissolved by the mutual agreement of the parties."[31]

Meanwhile, as Protestants like Abbott, Gladden, and the NDRL leadership came to believe that the emphasis on individualism in their religious teaching had inspired the rise in divorce, American Catholics looked askance at the apparent rise of individualistic thinking about moral issues in their own communities. Catholics remained adamant that historically they had been stronger guardians of morality than any Protestant denomination, but they increasingly feared that an individualistic view of morals would take hold in their churches as well. By the 1880s and 1890s, Catholics realized that they could no longer claim, as they had two decades earlier, that when it came to divorce "the Catholic community is so completely free from its contagion."[32] George Searle expressed concern that Catholics might come to embrace the idea that marriage was not a permanent union. He noted that already "Catholics can be found who will venture on marriage with persons who have been divorced, under the impression, as it would seem, that marriages outside the church are not really joined by God."[33] This was just the sort of individualistic rule making that Catholics had long decried among Protestants. And with Catholics already inventing their own guidelines about remarriage, it seemed unlikely that they could be prevented from diverging further from church teaching in other aspects of marriage and divorce. The excessive individualism for which Catholics had criticized

Protestantism—and about which Protestants had come to express deep anxieties—now seemed to be taking root within American Catholicism.

                              *    *    *

The similar positions that many Protestants and Catholics found themselves adopting on questions of individualism, the family, and marriage provide half of the explanation for why Americans from both traditions set aside long-standing differences in order to oppose divorce. The other half of the explanation rests in their common assessment of the solution to the perceived crisis. By the end of the nineteenth century, prominent voices representing Catholicism and Protestantism were willing to countenance a degree of state power over moral issues and believed that political institutions offered the best means for bringing America's divorce rate under control. As the Protestant theologian Harris bluntly declared, "this is an instance in which law may do much for morals and happiness."[34] While Protestants had even greater faith in the state on this issue than others, the expectation that government could play a role in solving a social problem was not a dramatic development for Protestants, who had long been willing to allow government oversight of morality. Among Catholics, who for much of the nineteenth century had been extremely suspicious of efforts by Protestant-dominated state institutions to impose a Protestant-tinged moral code, it constituted a larger shift of strategy.[35] Nevertheless, the degree to which both Catholics and Protestants proved willing to cede leadership on the divorce issue to government institutions marked a critical point of agreement among members of both traditions.

In part, this development reflected a simple desire to hold state governments responsible for their own actions in passing laws that lowered the bar for ending a marriage. If legislatures had created the problem of rampant divorce, the argument went, let them fix it. Protestants and Catholics generally identified the same problems with divorce law as it existed at the end of the century: more and more types of marital woes had become recognized grounds for divorce; divorces were allowed with greater rapidity; prohibitions of remarriage had been tempered; and few restrictions were in place to prevent an individual from moving from a state with strict laws to one with lenient policies to expedite the attainment of a quick divorce.[36]

Religious leaders crossed confessional boundaries and engaged in dialogue with one another about such laws. The Protestant Woolsey wrote that

when the state "allows the marriage tie to be dissolved on slight grounds, *the Christian church cannot in any of its forms recede.*" In response, the Catholic Hewit affirmed the former Yale president's assertion and stressed the importance of people like Woolsey who belonged to the "better, sounder, and more virtuous part of the community" that sought to maintain monogamous marriage as the law of the land.[37] This exchange highlighted that virtue had come to be seen as determined by one's stand on moral issues in the public sphere, not by one's religious affiliation.

Of course, simply denouncing laws did little to change them. But Protestant and Catholic Americans not only agreed that the law needed to be changed; they came together to support specific legislative remedies by which they hoped to turn back the tide of divorce. In many respects, this was the easy solution. Passing restrictive legislation was far less onerous than combating the deep-seated individualism that characterized American religious communities. But the decision to effect change through government action was a crucial point of Protestant-Catholic unanimity. Leaders in both traditions realized that moral suasion, even by churches and religiously affiliated reform organizations like the NDRL, no longer had the power to effect meaningful change in society. Preserving the family necessitated compelling state institutions to act.

As long-standing outsiders in nineteenth-century American public life, Catholics were more accustomed than Protestants to standing outside the channels of cultural and political authority. But Catholic leaders realized that in the present circumstance, they were unable to continue as moral custodians of their communities. George Searle insisted that the immediate solution to the problem of divorce would come through legislative changes rather than by the actions of religious institutions. He admitted that this meant ceding authority, at least temporarily, to the state. Searle acknowledged that Catholics in theory could not endorse government involvement in marriage because it impinged on the role of the church. Nevertheless, he conceded, "any law which makes legal divorce less easy will make things easier for us," and he encouraged his coreligionists to support any legislative changes that mitigated the pernicious effects of existing divorce law.[38]

To be sure, American Catholics continued to idealize a world in which their religious institutions possessed sole authority over issues of marriage and divorce. But they acknowledged that such a reality was unlikely ever to exist in the United States. James Gibbons admitted that a restoration of the "old order" in which marriage was the sole purview of the church was at best

a hope for the distant future. Until then, the cardinal from Baltimore insisted, Catholics needed to stop wasting energy bewailing their tradition's inability to control people's behavior and instead work to enact meaningful policy changes. "If divorce cannot be legislated out of existence," he wrote, offering a litany of points on which existing laws might be revised, "let, at least, its power for evil be diminished."[39] George Searle likewise embraced "uniform national legislation" of divorce, which he predicted would be "a great boon." In an acknowledgment of the disappointment felt by Catholics in their inability to sustain moral suasion, Searle admitted that Catholics did not share the abiding faith in government often expressed by Protestants. Thus, he noted, such laws would not be "so complete and satisfying" to his fellow Catholics as they would be "to our Protestant fellow-citizens."[40] Nevertheless, they were a necessity.

For their part, Protestants cheered Catholics' newfound focus on policy. In a far cry from the hitherto common claim that Catholicism did not represent true Christianity, Woolsey affirmed Catholics for their firm commitment to Christian principles and for "seeking to change law rather than to let things go down the stream."[41] Like the Catholics he lauded, Woolsey believed that in contemporary American society, government exercised greater control over morality than religious institutions could hope to do. Despite the historical connection between the family and issues of religion and morality, he insisted that "religion alone, even when its precepts are clear and admitted by all, is not competent to settle all the questions that grow out of marriage, the family, and the kindred," and the organized modern state had a crucial stake in dictating the laws of marriage and divorce.[42] Even someone like Gladden, who could declare that any effort to curtail divorce "by stringent and sweeping laws would be worse than useless" could nevertheless—in the very same article—advance a list of legislative remedies that he believed would significantly improve the condition of America's families.[43]

\*   \*   \*

During the 1890s and early 1900s, prominent American Catholics and Protestants offered enthusiastic endorsements of social action as a vehicle for bridging the divide between their two traditions. The Catholic John Spalding described the ideal priest who, "in striving to promote good-will and Christian charity, by co-operating with his fellows in worthy enterprises, whether or not their creed is his own—in all this he works with God for the welfare of

men."[44] His fellow bishop Ireland likewise noted that "the fields of action for common well-doing are numerous, where all members of the community may unite in action without smallest peril to one's particular religious faith, and in those fields Catholics should ever be the quickest and most earnest workers."[45] For their part, Protestants were no less effusive in proclaiming that the differences that separated them from Catholics would not stand in the way of common action on social issues. Following one ecumenical conference organized by Protestants in the mid-1890s, one participant observed the consensus of attendees that "the most important forces against vice and crime and sin . . . are the forces of the Catholic Church and those of the Protestant Churches," provided that they could work together.[46] Gladden included Catholics in his suggestion that it was not necessary for a "doctrinal platform" to be "agreed upon" before "neighboring churches come together to consider the work lying at their doors."[47] Such an outlook could contribute to the view of Harris that when considered in light of the "principle of universal brotherhood differences of Protestant and Catholic polity diminish into insignificance."[48]

These attitudes resulted in no small measure from the cooperation on divorce that occurred during the late nineteenth century. In his article that praised Woolsey, Hewit believed that Protestants and Catholics needed to transcend denominational barriers for the benefit of society. It was necessary for "members of separate religious societies" to join together "to counteract the influences which demoralize the sentiments and practice of the people."[49] Discussions surrounding divorce had convinced Hewit that American morality would be secured only through the mutual efforts of all of the nation's Christians, and this attitude informed discussions of other social issues.

The cooperation between Catholics and Protestants around divorce proved short-lived, in part because divorce itself ceased to be a pressing issue after the first decade of the twentieth century. As Americans grew accustomed to a higher rate of ended marriages, the efforts by clergy to restrict divorce seemed ever more quixotic. Moreover, the strategy that had brought Protestants and Catholics together—lobbying government for stricter laws—fell into disfavor as social scientists demonstrated with greater certainty that restrictive legislation did not curb divorce.[50] Religious leaders continued to lament the high divorce rate, often in rhetoric as heated as that of earlier decades, but with each passing year they seemed increasingly powerless to do anything about it.

A greater obstacle to continued cooperation was the changing relationship

between Catholic and Protestant leaders. After the papal condemnation of Americanism in 1899, Catholics in the United States shied away from efforts to prove that their tradition could be easily reconciled with modern American culture and the beliefs of their non-Catholic neighbors.[51] They began to emphasize rather than downplay the theological differences that separated their understanding of marriage from that of Protestants. Protestants in turn retrenched and defended their views on marriage. Nevertheless, the impermanence of common efforts by Catholics and Protestants to effect change to the nation's divorce laws should not obscure the significance of such a project. For over two decades, the issue provided a crucial platform for shared political action in the interest of social change. It thus offered a means of overcoming the division between Protestantism and Catholicism that had long characterized American life. Moreover, this response to divorce had even more lasting significance: it provided a template for ecumenical action in the public sphere in the interest of traditional morality that would become all the more common as the twentieth century progressed.

# American Jewish Politics *Is* Urban Politics

*Lila Corwin Berman*

To write about Jewish politics, one must consider Jewish space. This is perhaps true for any group of people—the places from which politics emerge matter. But the formulation holds particular significance for Jews, a group with a long history of spatial constraints, internally and externally imposed. On first blush, the common epithets for Jews undermine their connection to place: the Wandering Jew or the People of the Book. Yet in both cases, one describing an ongoing journey and implying an eventual landed end, and the other equating a quasi-national identity ("people") with a textual center, Jewish identity is rendered with reference to space. Indeed, much of Jewish law and practice has long focused on how Jews might gain control of the space around them and might, in some fashion, colonize it as Jewish space, even when non-Jews often controlled the terms of that space. Historically, Jewish politics developed in the effort to reckon with power structures that defined where Jews could and could not make their space. Some of those power structures existed outside of the Jewish community, while others resided within it, in the form of rabbinic law and multiple interpretations of it. Jewish politics, as such, is characterized by the contestations of Jews and non-Jews over space.[1]

When we turn our attention to modern Jewish politics, we can refine our formulation: to write about Jewish politics, one must consider *urban* Jewish space. Demographically, the case is simple to make. From the 1800s to the 1930s, the global Jewish population became almost entirely urban. Although many Jews lived in urban pockets before then, such a thorough urbanization

would have been impossible in earlier centuries when cities were much smaller and preindustrial economies could have never supported a high concentration of people in such confined spaces. By modern times no other group among the diversity of urban dwellers in the West had become as fully the embodiment of "urban" as Jews.[2] While that status may have communicated the cosmopolitan nature of modern Jewish identity, it also carried with it the anxiety that Westerners felt about modernity. In nationalist European discourse and nativist American pronouncements, the Jew emerged as the ideal type of the urban and modern exploiter.[3]

For historians of modern Jewish life, however, the Jewish-urban equation has tended to be a starting point for weaving Jews into dominant historical narratives. (In scholarship on the development of political Zionism, especially in Palestine and Israel, the role of the city has been less crucial, though still relevant, to the shape of the historiography.[4]) Since cities were understood as the productive centers of the modern turn, Jewish urban dwellers could be figured as critical actors in the process of modernization. It is no accident that the rise of truly historical scholarship about the Jewish people occurred in the mid-nineteenth century, when urbanized European Jewish intellectuals sought to harness Jewish history to an evolutionary understanding of modernity. The Jewish past, in the hands of these early historians of Jewish life, helped establish the modern nature of the Jewish present.[5]

In the United States, the earliest studies of American Jewish life that gained scholarly attention focused on city space. The vast majority of American Jews lived in cities, so this was not surprising. But historians had bigger plans for city space. The city did not simply provide a setting for their narratives; it also promised to reveal Jewish patterns as consonant with and even formative of broader trends in American life. An American-Jewish synthesis emerged from the cityscape. Moses Rischin's 1962 *The Promised City*, for example, was as much a book about Jews as it was about New York City's expansion into "the most ethnically diverse of the nation's cities."[6] Over a decade later, Irving Howe, a critic and not a professional historian, wrote *World of Our Fathers*, a book that gained broad national interest and similarly conferred value to Jews' experiences through their role in the city, New York City. In both seminal and field-defining books, the space of the city grounded the importance of the topic. In describing the city context, the two books also prescribed what the city ought to be. Historians of American Jews purported to study Jewish labor activism, radicalism, secularism, intellectualism, and

spirituality in the name of better illuminating the power of the American city and in an effort to extrapolate from Jewish experience the true meaning of one of the grandest American experiments yet: modern urbanism.[7]

For the purposes of this essay, I posit a simple thesis: American-Jewish politics is urban politics.[8] By this I mean that the formation of American-Jewish political thought cannot be separated from the urban context of Jewish life. The space of the American city suggested a resolution to the modern Jewish question: how can one be part of a peoplehood, a nation, and humanity all at once? Spatial features of American cities enabled Jews to enter civic space, while still inhabiting places that felt particularly Jewish. In their American urban environments, Jews believed they found some success in balancing the particular (or the private or parochial or distinctive) with the universal (or the public or cosmopolitan or civic).

Feminist geographer Doreen Massey has written, "[It] may be useful to think of places, not as areas on maps, but as constantly shifting articulations of social relations through time."[9] Indeed, twentieth-century urban sociology and urban planning drew attention to the binary tensions that characterized relationships constituted in city space: between diversity and unity, between private and public, between anonymity and surveillance, between interaction and atomization, and between men and women. The tensions embedded in city space structured people's lives, enabling individuals and groups to experience new freedoms in moving between them, and yet asserting new regulations imposed by them.[10] Prominent midcentury sociologists understood these tensions as rooted in the essential nature of cities, and thus they did not discern the force of laws and policies in mediating how groups and individuals experienced urban space. Here, I argue that the opportunities and constraints that cities provided Jews reflected specific structural features of American life that enforced hierarchical modes, especially as defined by race and class.

A few qualifications are in order. First, all urban politics is not Jewish politics. One could easily find urban political expressions that bear little relationship to Jewish political patterns, and therefore the converse of my formulation is not necessarily true. Also, my postulation that Jewish politics is urban politics hinges as much on rhetoric as it does on behavior. In many cases, Jews described their political consciousness and obligations to themselves through an urban framework, but they did not necessarily act according to their own rhetorical terms. Related, I am certainly not talking about every political experience that every Jewish person had. The term "Jewish

politics" is as imprecise as any other categorical statement about a varied group of people. Yet the term is useful for at least two reasons. First, historical actors used the term often as a language of prescription, that is, Jews ought to behave or think a certain way. Second at stake in the very term "Jewish politics" is a power struggle among Jews and between Jews and non-Jews over who has the authority to define the future of civic life in the United States and whose experiences best reflect or move toward that future.

By placing a historically situated urban frame around the topic of Jewish politics, I consider politics and Jewishness in formation and not as stable singular or compound entities. In that vein, and as a way of using space to organize my argument about space and politics, I proceed according to three overlapping spatial categories: home, neighborhood, and city. No two American cities were the same, but here I focus, with a clear northeastern and midwestern bias, on the ways in common that Jews experienced them.

## Home

Literary scholar Barbara Mann notes a particular "burden placed upon the language of home" throughout Jewish history. The terminology of home, she observes, indicates both a "physical structure and the more abstract notion of belonging and rootedness."[11] Yet on both counts—the physical and the metaphysical—Jews throughout their diasporic history have struggled to build homes. A group with practices and traditions that set them apart from other city dwellers, Jews were invested in maintaining a distinction between the home and the street, especially when they believed that the private realm of the home offered immediate protection. But in the American city, Jews perceived strategic value, in terms of individual power and group security, in breaching the boundaries between home and the outside world. Indeed, the way in which Jews became "at home" in America was through their ability to claim public urban spaces as home.[12]

For immigrants and other people whose lives are marked by mobility, one of the complications of home is defining it in motion: is one's home where one lived in the past, where one lives in the present, or where one is going? And yet one of the central characteristics of modernity and, indeed, of success in it is mobility. Thus, the idea of a stable home and the idea of modernity appear in tension.

Early twentieth-century urban sociologists pinpointed mobility as one of

the most formative forces shaping American cities and society. Scholars such as Robert Park, the eminent University of Chicago sociologist, and his student Louis Wirth proposed a set of rules that governed how groups moved through space and became modern Americans. The pace of mobility, they posited, could be directly correlated to the pace of assimilation into American life.[13] Their theory became the grounding of almost every study of immigrant life and urbanism for decades to come. For example, in the late 1970s, social historian Thomas Kessner compared Jewish and Italian immigrants in New York City and concluded that Jews' ability and desire to move quickly from one residential space to another accounted for their faster entry into the "golden door" of American opportunity.[14] Ironically, Jews often received high marks for their rapid mobility, even as sociologists remarked upon their enduring ethnic cohesion or propinquity. Jews moved frequently, but they also tended to stick together. So while the physical space of their homes shifted, their neighbors remained steadfast. The ability to move freely through space and yet feel rooted in space—to a home—constituted a freedom that many Jews perceived as uniquely American.[15]

Jews tended to think about their movement as a function of American freedom and, thus, as a hallmark of American citizenship. Few were positioned to see the political and economic structures that made urban mobility accessible for them and less so for other groups of people, but many experienced how the privilege of mobility translated into more privilege and power. For example, Jews did not purchase homes nearly as often as their non-Jewish immigrant neighbors, and these relatively low rates of home ownership offered Jews a pathway toward capital accumulation.[16] In 1972, assessing Jews' relationship with cities in the pages of *Commentary*, an intellectual Jewish journal, sociologist Marshall Sklare observed, "And true to the urban perspective, Jews tended to regard real estate as a commodity to be traded rather than as an economic good to be consumed."[17] With other economic channels closed to them, Jews used real estate as a means toward gaining power. Most basically, by not tying up their liquidity in homes, Jews had more available capital to invest in other goods and services, including education, than did other immigrant groups. Beyond this, they also capitalized on their own needs for new housing options that could meet specific ethnic demands.

Writing about interwar New York City, historian Deborah Dash Moore explains, "[T]he bonds of ethnicity supported ethnically separate construction industries catering to an ethnically distinct housing market."[18] Jewish builders understood that Jews moving to a new part of the city would want

more amenities to confirm their higher status but would also likely want or feel compelled to live among other Jews. Jewish banks and investors financed Jewish builders who constructed homes for Jews in cities and, eventually, suburbs across the country. Jews in the real estate industry traded on the emotional value of home: one should live in a space that reflected something of one's true self, and Jewish builders could best build for Jews. Yet the wealth generated from these real estate ventures enabled Jewish developers access to new worlds of power well beyond the Jewish home.[19]

In multiple ways, urban home space served as a channel toward civic or public space and power. Twentieth-century urban dwellers, Jewish and non-Jewish, experienced the expansion of public spaces (schools, parks, movie theaters, etc.). These public spaces contested the authority of private space, and opened up new opportunities for the private to bleed into the public. The physical layout of cities challenged the separation of public and private: urban homes were often stacked on top of each other or crowded closely next to one another. Yet urban reformers, planners, and policy makers all maintained fealty to the idea of a necessary separation between the public and private.

Women, in particular, felt the possibilities of new freedoms and the weights of new constraints. Cities offered them unprecedented public spaces from which to exercise power and experiment with new ideas; at the same time, authority figures pronounced the lapse of privacy a threat to womanhood, families, and the nation. Jewish leaders who sought acceptance into a middle-class American milieu charged women with guarding the privacy of the home, though women had long played a productive role in the home economy, especially if their husbands devoted their lives to religious study.[20]

In her seminal article about a kosher meat boycott, modern Jewish historian Paula Hyman drew scholars' attention to the public role that women and their homes played in urban Jewish life. In the early twentieth century, Jewish women in several neighborhoods in New York City organized public protests against what they perceived as unfair price gouging among kosher butchers. As Hyman described it, "Lower East Side housewives, milling in the street, began to call for a strike against the butchers," and the next day "thousands of women streamed through the streets . . . breaking into butcher shops, flinging meat into the streets, and declaring a boycott."[21] In breaching the boundary between the home space and street space, these women asserted the power that their role of consumers and their social connections to one another carried. They succeeded in driving down the price of kosher meat

because their homes played a part in the Jewish marketplace and the public life of the city. By shuttling between the home (the private) and the street (the public), they strategically gained power for their cause, but, it must be noted, they did not dissolve the boundary between the two realms.

The exigencies of labor similarly demanded a revision of gender relationships in the home and in public life, but did not dissolve the tension between men and women or home and public. As Susan Glenn argues in her book *Daughters of the Shtetl*, most immigrant Jewish families in the early twentieth century could not survive on solely males' wages. Having imbibed norms from European and American middle-class life that made it anathema for wives to work outside of the home, these families found it much more acceptable to send children, whether male or female, into the workforce. Glenn and others explain that Jews, much like members of other ethnic groups, tended to congregate in industries with coethnics. The familiar, the parochial, and the private eased young laborers' forays into public worlds away from home. Young laborers also brought with them ideals fostered at home. For example, Glenn points out that young Jewish women tended to support union activities and socialist ideology to a far greater extent than their Italian peers. She explains that "the cultural boundaries of the immigrant family" accounted, in part, for the disparity. Jewish families, many of whom had come from urban or semiurban settings in Europe, tended to give their daughters greater freedom within and outside of the home than Italian immigrants who had more limited urban experiences and who kept a closer watch on their daughters' activities.[22]

Young single Jewish women emerged as vocal labor leaders, organizing strikes and protests to fight for fair wages and safe working conditions. Yet a particular attentiveness to home space often wove into their activism. Annelise Orleck's collective biography of four Jewish women who were labor activists in the early twentieth century reveals that working-class housewives played critical roles in the labor movement. Rent strikes, similar to the kosher meat boycott that Hyman chronicled, placed the realm of the home in relationship to wage labor. Price hikes without wage increases disrupted the home economy, and the home economy could be harnessed to disrupt the market economy. Even if only one (Clara Lemlich) of the four women Orleck writes about married—and even she never became a housewife—"all four would argue that the working-class movement must include not only factory workers but also housewives."[23]

Jewish urban homes spanned the divide between public and private space. As Jews moved their homes through cities, they often realized the

thinness of the line separating what happened on the street from what hap-
pened in their homes. The force of the city did not stop at the doorstep of the
home. Although Jews who wished to retain a distinctive commitment to Jew-
ish life valued the privacy of the home for allowing ritual life to happen un-
observed, they also did not sequester Jewish life and ideals from their public
life.

The public articulation of Jewish ideals and values emerged as a striking
feature of Jewish political life in emancipated countries and, especially, the
United States. In an article about the language of Jewish politics, historian
Dan Diner asks, "How impregnated are the notions and concepts of Jewish
political language by the impact of the Jewish sacred?"[24] His answer is a great
deal; no matter how secular, Jews tended to call upon certain religious pre-
cepts as mandating political action. Historian Melissa Klapper, for example,
writes about Jewish women peace activism in the interwar period and notes,
"Even the least ritually observant Jewish women typically drew on religious
themes in explaining their attitudes toward peace."[25] Women may have had a
special proclivity toward this language since it justified public behavior at
times when Jewish and American norms dictated a more private role for
women. Nonetheless, men also drew upon sacred Jewish texts and vocabu-
lary to explain their public and nonsectarian political work. Sociologist Shaul
Kelner, examining Jews' activism on behalf of Soviet Jewry in the 1970s and
1980s, observes that Jews "enacted and thereby advocated the idea that an
authentic American Jewish politics was one that unapologetically invoked
Judaic ritual forms."[26] To be certain, the historical context of this political
movement differed greatly from that of the interwar peace movement. Yet
there is a consistency of Jewish reliance on the language of Jewish ritual,
prayer, and text to animate their political behavior.[27]

From the physical and conceptual space of the Jewish home emerged new
modes of Jewish power and political consciousness tied directly to experi-
ences of urbanism. In modern American cities, the home remained in ten-
sion with the public sphere, even as each bled into the other. In American
cities, where the public sphere was ever widening, through new institutions,
new work patterns, and new forms of activism, the space of the home was
often pulled into a public politics, whether with cries to police that space
better and avoid the taints of the public or efforts to gain more power through
or for the home. The ongoing, yet shifting, tension between the private and
the public mirrored long-standing concerns about what it meant to live as a
Jew in modernity and the extent to which universal, one might say public,

concerns should trump distinctive or private ones. In the urban neighborhoods that Jews called their own, they sought to shift the boundaries between the universal and the distinctive in a way that would not dissolve the division but would present new opportunities for Jewish empowerment in the United States.

## Neighborhood

In examining interwar New York City, historian Eli Lederhendler suggests that Jews shuttled between two ideal spaces in the city: a cosmopolitan democracy and an "ingathering" of Jewish people.[28] Even in cities with much smaller Jewish populations, Jewish neighborhoods provided a haven from the larger space of the city, and the city, writ large, might offer a release from the intimacy of the neighborhood. Thus, by occupying these two realms, a Jew could live a fully emancipated life without ceding his or her particularistic identity.

I suggest, however, that the binary between the cosmopolitan city and the particularist Jewish space occludes a reality of interpenetration or intersectionality that was formative of Jewish political thought. As we have seen, the urban Jewish home, in its movability, its permeability, and its commodification, disrupted neat divisions between private life and public space. Jewish neighborhood space similarly tugged at these lines and refashioned the division between what we might call Jewish particularlism (akin to the private, but expressed often as ethnic insularity) and cosmopolitanism (akin to the public or civic, channeled often through fealty to universalism). In its rhetorical power, human composition, and reflection of economic and political policies, the Jewish neighborhood simultaneously asserted boundaries while creating spaces of exchange and tension among Jews and with non-Jews.

Early twentieth-century sociologists perceived the neighborhood as the bedrock of urban identity. By studying the urban neighborhood, they believed they could better apprehend the forces of social conflict, harmony, and progress. Although sociologists understood neighborhoods in interaction with one another, they also designated each neighborhood as an independent ecosystem. In an essay included in a 1925 volume about the city, sociologist Robert Park explained, "In the course of time every section and quarter of the city takes on something of the character and qualities of its inhabitants. . . . The effect of this is to convert what was at first a mere geographical

expression into a neighborhood, that is to say, a locality with sentiments, traditions, and a history of its own. . . . [T]he life of every locality moves on with a certain momentum of its own, more or less independent of the larger circle of life and interests about it."[29]

Popular discourse on urban neighborhoods tended to confirm the scholarly perspective that neighborhoods constituted their own realities. Cities throughout the United States were carved up with the rather blunt tool of neighborhood names. These names invoked street boundaries, main business thoroughfares, physical landmarks, or other real or imagined topographical features, for example, Dexter-Davison (both streets) in Detroit or Strawberry Mansion (a historical mansion) in Philadelphia, Squirrel Hill (the historical name of the slope) in Pittsburgh, or Lawndale (developers' exaggeration of small green spaces and their ploy to attract middle-class people) in Chicago.

City inhabitants relied on neighborhood names as shorthand that could reveal ethnic, religious, racial economic, and political information about the people who dwelled within them. Non-Jews might invoke neighborhood names to isolate Jewish life and express difference and inferiority in spatial terms. Reflecting the confounding causality common in antisemitic pronouncements, a non-Jew could assert that Jews lived in their own part of town because they were incapable of living with non-Jews, whether this spatial situation came about because non-Jews refused to live with Jews or because Jews had chosen to settle alongside other Jews. Jews also traded in the vocabulary of the Jewish neighborhood, linguistically asserting a particularity and distinctiveness to their geographic space.[30]

Residents' and outsiders' assumptions about the distinctiveness of urban neighborhood space, however, rarely matched the neighborhood's human composition. Five hundred thousand Jews, for example, lived on the Lower East Side of New York City in 1910. The Jewish population of this one neighborhood was five times higher than the total Jewish population in any other American city.[31] Even the densely populated Jewish Lower East Side was far from a place of cloistered Jewish life. Instead, it played home to a diversity of other ethnic and national groups, and the same was true for almost every neighborhood in which Jews lived. Indeed, it was rare that Jews composed more than half of the inhabitants of any neighborhood termed Jewish.

Detroit, a city I have explored in recent research, illustrates the tension alive in the rhetoric and composition of Jewish neighborhood space, and how it shaped a Jewish political consciousness. By the mid-1930s, Detroit was

the fourth largest American city and the sixth largest Jewish city, with a population of seventy-one thousand Jews.[32] The majority of those Jews lived in two contiguous neighborhoods: Twelfth Street and Dexter-Davison.[33] These neighborhoods were northwest of the city center and the first Jewish settlements in the city. In the interwar and immediate postwar years, Jewish residents considered Twelfth Street and Dexter-Davison Jewish neighborhoods and called them such. A number of factors confirmed this sense. The blocks in the heart of the neighborhoods housed, at various times, exclusively Jewish families, and Jews tended to know where other Jews lived. The institutions in the neighborhood also reflected Jewish life: synagogues, community centers, Hebrew school buildings, and Jewish bakeries and stores lined the streets. And, most important, local public schools, especially the neighborhood elementary schools, had very large and sometimes exclusively Jewish student bodies.[34]

Still, nearly as many white ethnic Catholics (Greeks and Poles predominantly) as Jews inhabited the neighborhood space, and large Catholic institutions loomed over the neighborhood. The fact that many Catholic families sent their children to parochial schools enabled these two groups to share geographic space and only occasionally share perceptual space. In the 1950s, Jews in Detroit moved even farther north and west in the city to a neighborhood that quickly became known as a Jewish one, despite the fact that the newly built synagogue stood next to a Congregational church.

To focus on the religious geography of Jewish neighborhoods is to offer just one example of the diversity that abounded in so-called Jewish spaces. Another lens through which to understand the multiple claims on Jewish space is that of race. It is a well-known, though still underexplored, story that the patterns of urban black settlement often followed on the heels of Jewish settlement patterns.[35] In most American cities at particular moments in history, Jews and blacks shared residential and commercial space. In some cases, this reflected broader patterns of black employment; in middle-class and upper-middle-class white neighborhoods, including Jewish ones, black people entered neighborhood space as employees, often as domestic workers.[36] In their capacity as employees, black people did not cause Jews to reevaluate the language or space of their neighborhood. However, when black families moved into these same neighborhoods, the rhetorical shorthand of the Jewish neighborhood exhibited clear strain. A healthy population of white Catholics in a Jewish neighborhood simply did not challenge Jews' perception of

their neighborhood the way that an influx in the neighborhood's nonwhite population did.

Sociological discourse and popular sentiment about the early to mid-twentieth-century urban neighborhood tended to ignore the ways in which structural forces such as laws and economic policies determined a neighborhood's shape as much as the residents who inhabited it and the words they used to describe it.[37] In a 2010 symposium on Jews and American cities, esteemed urban historian Robert Fishman puzzled over how it was that the interwar and midcentury Jewish neighborhoods in cities such as Newark, New Jersey, and Philadelphia, which seemed to represent "the best of Jewish urbanism" ("moderate densities, mixed income, a mixture of housing types"), were not "strong enough to welcome the first black middle-class families." He revealed that it "haunts" him to contemplate that the moment of contact was "so disastrous" for Jews and American cities.[38] Yet the only way that these midcentury Jewish urban neighborhoods thrived was through the structural support of laws and policies that afforded privileges to whites without offering the same opportunities to nonwhites.

Interwar and midcentury urban neighborhoods offered Jews a way of seeing the world without having to account for the structural realities that sustained white ethnic neighborhoods with good city services and federal dollars. Jews could believe that cities protected the particular or distinctive spaces of group life while ushering all individuals, no matter their group affiliation, into a diverse and cosmopolitan canopy.[39] Left-wing Jews, many of whom in the 1920s and 1930s had sought to make common cause with black leftists, were concerned with the structures of capitalism and American politics that cradled certain people and disenfranchised others.[40] Ironically by the postwar period, when still assumed Jewish spaces suffered because of damages related to large structural forces—such as exploitative lending practices and federal codes that degraded neighborhoods that were too black— few mainstream Jewish organizations and Jewish leaders believed in or felt comfortable expressing leftist critiques of American capitalist democracy. Instead, they tended to express concerns about the "culture" of black families that thwarted black success in America and that introduced criminality, urban blight, and overcrowding into Jewish neighborhoods.[41]

Jews, similar to other white ethnics and to urban sociologists, had assumed that neighborhoods carried their own realities, structured by the people who inhabited them. What diversity existed in their neighborhoods did

not matter until it appeared to threaten the reality of their neighborhoods, and then Jewish leaders and residents tended to blame individuals, including blockbusting real estate agents, and not the larger economic forces for disrupting their neighborhoods. Furthermore, Jews themselves often profited from selling or renting homes to blacks in Jewish neighborhood under circumstances that fleeced black families of their resources and that made integration, which some Jews purported to support, an unlikely outcome.[42]

Even as urban Jewish neighborhoods disappeared, the ideal of that space remained important to Jews' consciousness of themselves and the opportunities that they maintained the United States offered—and should offer—groups and individuals. In its ideal (and idealized) form, the Jewish neighborhood had balanced the particular and the universal and had offered a space for Jews to feel Jewish without having to cede entrance into the civic realm of city life. From the space of the Jewish urban neighborhood, many Jews believed they had experienced the fruits of a liberal political vision, where collective identity could exist but rights and privileges would be conferred solely upon individuals.[43]

If in the thirties, forties, and fifties some Jews perceived the space of the urban neighborhood as offering a visible way to balance universal concerns and particular loyalties, the swift dismantling of Jewish urban neighborhoods throughout the postwar period laid bare just how precarious and illusory that balance was. From their urban neighborhoods, Jews had constructed their liberalism through electoral politics and through their support of the reforms offered by New Deal legislation and early civil rights activism. At the heart of this midcentury Jewish liberalism rested Jews' belief in a government responsible for and capable of creating a world where all individuals could thrive, without having to renounce their group identities. Yet by the early 1960s, the tensions in Jewish urban life ran high. In that decade, black leaders offered a more vocal denunciation of individual-based liberalism than ever before and exposed, in particular, the inequity in Jewish-black relationships. Adding to the disparagement of the kind of liberalism to which many Jews subscribed was President Johnson's War on Poverty programs and his suggestion that only through programs that considered race and class as reason for beneficial treatment could the inequalities of American democracy be redressed.[44] Finally, within Jewish communal life in the 1960s, establishment Jewish leaders worried about rising rates of intermarriage and the specter of assimilation and wondered if the balance between the individual and the

collective in Jewish life had tipped perilously toward individual freedom and away from collective obligation.[45]

Jews across the country, especially in the Northeast and Midwest, moved away from their urban neighborhoods to suburban neighborhoods throughout the 1950s and 1960s. Most did not leave because they became less liberal; and most did not leave because they were racist, as individuals. Still, the faltering of liberal politics and the deeply entrenched presence of racist ideology in policies and laws all contributed to the massive movement of Jews away from urban neighborhoods and toward suburbs.[46]

Many Jews, even as they left their urban neighborhoods, remained urban oriented in their politics. Their American political identities had been forged in city homes and neighborhoods, and their sense of what mattered when it came to questions of power and social progress continued to be tied to urban spaces—to cities—even if no longer to specific urban homes or neighborhoods.

## City

"New York is a Jewish city," observed sociologist Nathan Glazer in an essay in 1993.[47] This statement was far from earth-shattering, as the equivalence between New York City and Jews had long been fodder for comedians from Lenny Bruce to Woody Allen. The sentiment is overly simplistic both because it is not true and because it feels so obvious. Still, it holds up for a laugh or a scholarly nod. Over the twentieth century, the very word "Jew" became a synecdoche for an entire city and for the city that defined itself as the quintessential city. The implication—and it is sort of comical—is that a small, particular, idiosyncratic group of people could stand in for a large, diverse, cosmopolitan place. Different, now, from Jews inhabiting homes or neighborhoods that blurred private, particular places with public, civic, or cosmopolitan spaces, this observation of Jewish synecdoche claims to erase the tension. Either Jewish distinctiveness has been engulfed within the space of the cosmopolitan city; thus the Jews are New York City. Or the cosmopolitan city, at its core, must be a very distinctive, particular place; thus New York City is the Jews.

For the purpose of understanding the formation of Jewish politics, we must understand how self-conscious Jews have been in aligning themselves with American cities and not just their particular homes or neighborhoods within them. Certainly, non-Jews have also voiced the equivalence between

Jews and urbanism. Yet I believe that the effort to equate Jewishness and urbanism is itself a Jewish political project. It reveals Jews' ideological commitment to urban life and the expectation that cities more so than other sorts of places could better accommodate diversity by weaving it into the tapestry of civic life.

In the postwar period, one might have guessed that Jews would stop identifying with cities because they moved away from them in such overwhelming numbers and so rapidly. But despite the vigor of Jews' movement away from cities, this simply was not the case. Even a cursory glimpse of the agenda of major Jewish institutions from the 1950s through the 1970s evinces the centrality of urban space to Jewish political self-definition. The National Community Relations Advisory Council (renamed in the 1960s National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council), the Council of Jewish Federations, the American Jewish Committee and Congress, and the denominational bodies of the Reform and Conservative movements all maintained urban-directed missions in these years. In the midst of urban uprisings throughout the 1960s, these organizations appeared to strengthen their resolve to involve Jews in the task of solving urban woes. Rabbis sermonized from their pulpits that Jews had a responsibility to work toward making cities better places, no matter that these sermons were often delivered to suburban Jews attending suburban synagogues. And Jewish leaders in countless communal organizations devoted funds and energy to urban issues, often keeping meticulous count of urban initiatives to share with funders and constituents.[48]

Concern for the city—increasingly an abstract space and not the place of lived Jewish experience—fueled Jewish liberal politics in the 1960s and beyond. Whether New York City or Detroit or Philadelphia or wherever else, the existence of the city confirmed for Jews that the hopes of balancing the universal and the particular, the cosmopolitan and parochial, the public and the private would not be dashed. Suburbs became critical places of Jewish political mobilization, and many Jews rested their political sites on suburban matters.[49] But the orientation of their political activism remained urban directed. Lest their be any confusion, Jews' urban-oriented politics was not selfless politics (which politics is selfless?). Even if Jews did not themselves live in urban homes or urban neighborhoods, they still believed that cities—and specifically city spaces—animated their version of the American liberal promise to balance between individual freedom and group protections.

To examine the countervailing trend of conservatism or neoconservatism

among American Jews that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s is only to appre-
hend better the grasp that the idea of the urban had on Jewish politics. In a
1973 article in *Commentary*, longtime detractor of Jewish liberalism Milton
Himmelfarb famously griped, "Although American Jews had come economi-
cally to resemble the Episcopalians, the most prosperous of all white groups,
their voting behavior continued to be most like the voting behavior of one of
the least prosperous of all groups, the Puerto Ricans."[50] He meant to draw
attention to the ways in which Jews, by their own volition, were not ascend-
ing to the political behavior and attendant rewards that their upward mobil-
ity allowed. Matters of urban space, however, lurked behind his comparison.
Readers of *Commentary* in the 1970s would have almost instantly recognized
Puerto Ricans as an urban and inner-city population. In their 1963 book *Be-
yond the Melting Pot*, Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan had clas-
sified Puerto Ricans, 8 percent of New York City's population, as paradigmatic
of an ethnic group that would neither melt into nor succeed in America.[51]
Episcopalians inhabited the bucolic suburbs, Puerto Ricans the gritty city.
And what about Jews? Would they occupy the suburbs, yet imagine them-
selves somehow of the city? Yes, answered another commentator, explaining,
"Jews continued disproportionately to support the same liberal candidates
who were, more appropriately, favored by Negroes and the other urban
poor."[52]

Yet even those Jews who rejected a liberal vision of the city tended to lo-
cate their political center in cities and explain that their way of thinking
would ultimately redound more benefit to cities than would the liberals' way.
That many of the most outspoken neoconservatives emerged from a cadre of
New York–born intellectuals helps explain this group's fixation on urban
space. Liberals, according to one neoconservative writer, were "caught in the
dilemma of believing in equal rights for Negroes and even working for them,
while at the same time attempting to escape from the real and fancied disad-
vantages of desegregation."[53] The failure of Jewish liberalism according to its
Jewish critics was that it did not demand parity between rhetoric and behav-
ior, and thus on both fronts—what Jews said they did and what they did—it
failed. Instead, neoconservative Jews suggested a politics that they believed
was more consistent with Jewish power and that used Jewish power to restore
order to places, like American cities, that suffered from disorder. Whether
supporting Jewish militancy as a response to urban black power politics or
disparaging urban social welfare and affirmative action programs as demean-
ing to individual merit, Jewish conservatives trained their eyes to the city

space that they believed had spiraled into decay at the hands of liberal ineffi-
ciency and feel-goodism. Similar to Jewish liberals, Jewish neoconservatives
believed in the redemptory power of cities to offer opportunities to individu-
als and freedoms to groups, though they diverged over the role that the gov-
ernment or the state should play in generating opportunity.[54]

Even as Jews left cities, the city still mattered to the way that Jews framed
their political identities. To be certain, some Jews cared deeply about the
urban neighborhoods or homes from their pasts, visiting them on journeys
back into the city or tours of once-Jewish urban space.[55] For postwar Jews
who left cities, however, city space did not function only as the setting for
nostalgia. Rather the city remained the focus of Jewish political concern be-
cause many believed Jewish life hinged upon the maintenance of strong and
stable urban centers, whether or not Jews lived in them. This brand of remote
(or geographically distant) space-based politics faced serious limitations.
Jews who no longer lived in cities also did not pay city taxes or vote in city
elections. They may have had a long tradition of caring about and being
shaped by places far from where they lived, yet after several decades of re-
move from urban life, one could fairly wonder if it still made sense to charac-
terize Jewish politics as fundamentally urban.

## Back to the City Politics

Jews who settled in American cities at the end of the nineteenth century and
beginning of the twentieth tended to experience them as spaces that could
help mediate between the universal and the particular. From their homes and
neighborhoods, many Jews encountered new forms of diversity and saw how
different kinds of people still occupied certain shared spaces, whether physi-
cal or conceptual. Yet throughout the century, cities did not remain fixed
places, instead they were almost constantly being destroyed and recreated.[56]
And city dwellers, depending on their race, religion, class, and nationality,
often had very different experiences from one another. Jewish politics, I have
argued, was formed in the generative (and degenerative) process of city life.
Even lacking a physical attachment, many Jews still remained invested in ur-
banism. Yet would this investment wane the way that Jews' attachment to
Bialystok or Warsaw or the Old World had faded? History would instruct
that the answer was surely yes unless something markedly changed about
urban life and Jewish life.

On the heels of the first decade of the twenty-first century, several changes that would reconnect the physical space of Jewish life to city space appeared to be gaining in significance. In economic terms, Jewish wealth, especially capital generated from real estate development, became growingly concentrated in urban projects and zones. In generational terms, younger Jews, when measured by Jewish agencies and fund-raising organizations, appeared attracted to cities for jobs, for recreation, and for spiritual fulfillment. And in cultural and communal terms, Jewish institutions focused more energy on city space than they had since the 1960s.

In the first decade of 2000, over a dozen Jewish organizations made urban justice and sustainability their central missions;[57] twenty-five Moishe Houses (Jewish communal living homes) were established in cities across the country;[58] urban synagogues sprung up or were revitalized in cities where few Jews had thought to go, let alone pray, for many decades; Jews helped plant farms on abandoned city lots; they moved into neighborhoods that their grandparents had left; and they established businesses on streets that their parents had pronounced as irredeemably dangerous. Many of these ventures received funding from wealthy Jewish philanthropists (many of whom had grown their wealth from suburban investments) and benefited from federal and state economic policies that subsidized urban life for educated middle-class people. In other words, Jews' urban lives remained tangled in webs of economic and political structures that offered opportunity to them, whether because of the color of the skin, the level of their education, the money in their pockets, or their connections to power. Poor or uneducated Jews or those who lacked access to channels of power, it should be noted, rarely benefited from these privileges.

From the end of the nineteenth century through at least the beginning of the twenty-first century, Jewish politics could not be understood without locating it in the American city. Jews pushed cities toward contradictory ends. They sought spaces that were cosmopolitan and offered broad acceptance, yet they also desired privacy and the right to enact rituals, collective identities, and ethnic life as they wished. Cities in the United States offered them exactly this. Jews wished to be embraced as part of the diversity of city space, but they also did not want diversity to undermine the unity of American purpose and responsibility (whatever it might have been) in which they hoped to share. They asserted their connection to the people who lived close to their homes or shared their neighborhood space or lived in cities to which they felt a deep attachment, yet many Jews, whether knowingly or not, built their own

success on the backs of those urban individuals with less opportunity or privilege.

Such were the strains that sculpted Jewish politics and tied it directly to urban space in the United States. To put it simply, Jews gained power in the United States in cities, and they learned how to exercise it in cities, whether in the pursuit of more power or a different distribution of power. To recognize the spatial dimensions of Jewish politics is to open new terrain from which to explore the forces, experiences, and ideologies constitutive of American political behavior. Furthermore, in understanding the urban dimensions of Jewish politics, we can also initiate new comparisons between Jews and other ethnic, racial, and religious groups whose worlds were shaped by similar spatial patterns.[59]

---

# Fighting for the Fundamentals:
# Lyman Stewart and the
# Protestant Politics of Oil

*Darren Dochuk*

One of the profoundest turns in American Protestantism transpired in the resort community of Kuling, China, a favorite conference site for foreign missionaries. It began in 1920 with the sojourn of William H. G. Thomas and Charles G. Trumbull. Thomas was an Oxford-trained seminarian who preached the doctrines of premillennialism and biblical inerrancy, Trumbull the editor of the *Sunday School Times*, a centerpiece in the crusade against liberal thinking. Both men believed that mainline Protestants had abdicated their authority in Christendom by embracing historicist teachings that denied the supernatural dimensions of Scripture, a Social Gospel that attended to economics at the cost of evangelism, and a postmillennialist eschatology that said humanity could be perfected before Christ's return. As far as they were concerned, Scripture taught something different: that Christ would return suddenly to a sinful humanity and that the only way to prepare for this end was to convert individuals to the immutable truths of the New Testament; this is why they traveled to China. Afraid that liberalism had eroded Christian witness there, Thomas and Trumbull determined to set things right. In Kuling they led several meetings and implored listeners to fight for the fundamentals of their faith. The convention drew large audiences from China's biggest missions agencies, and both men left Asia satisfied that they had stared down the liberal leviathan.[1]

Once back in North America they used the pulpit and popular media to

awaken conservatives to the leviathan's global advance. Thomas made the biggest splash. In January 1921, he delivered a dire warning to the Presbyterian Social Union in Philadelphia about the inroads of modernism abroad. A few months later, his comments framed an article, "Modernism in China," that rocked the Protestant status quo through its wide distribution in the *Princeton Theological Review* and *Sunday School Times*. Thomas used this opportunity to chart liberal theological trends in China and beseech conservatives to roll them back. China's missionaries were "divided into two camps," he explained, between those who undermined and those who upheld the "truth." Anticipating naysayers who stressed his role in hardening divisions, Thomas emphasized that he was merely a messenger and that such pointless talk distracted people from the real issue: Asia was slipping away from Christ.[2]

Confronted with charges of apostasy, liberal Protestants recruited Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the progressive First Presbyterian Church in New York City, to fend off the fundamentalist onslaught. In 1921, Fosdick traveled to Kuling to mend animosities that had been mounting since Thomas and Trumbull's visit the year before. There, twice daily for an entire week, he spoke to a thousand people who sat silent, ready to pounce in defense of their doctrine. Fosdick would recall this as one of the most "strained and difficult" circumstances he had ever encountered; "it was like walking a tightrope" and the "tension was terrific." With poise, he championed the virtues of a culturally inclusive faith that made room for change and closed his final sermon by invoking unity: "The task to which we are called is enormously difficult. God help us so to fulfill it and to preach the Master to the life of our generation in the terms of our generation, as he ought to be preached—Lord of our life and God of our salvation." Fosdick wanted to win his liberal Protestant friends "peace with honor," and he did, for the time being.[3]

An appeasing diplomat abroad, Fosdick became a zealous field general once he returned to American soil. In May 1922, he delivered a sermon titled "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?," which quickly made its way into print. Fosdick used his stinging sermon to draw a line in the sand between the "intellectually hospitable, open-minded, liberty-loving, tolerant" people who followed his creed and the intolerant fundamentalists who traded in "tiddledywinks and peccadilloes of religion." "The present world situation smells to heaven!" he proclaimed, and "now, in the presence of colossal problems, which must be solved in Christ's name and for Christ's sake, the Fundamentalists propose to drive out from the Christian churches all the consecrated

souls who do not agree with their theory of inspiration. What immeasurable folly!" Fosdick's last shot was the sharpest. In answer to his homily's central question he emphatically declared that fundamentalists *would not* win the war because right thinking and a generous spirit promised to prevail. Meant to inspire tolerance, Fosdick's homily instead exacerbated hostilities. "If ever a sermon failed to achieve its object," he would later admit, "mine did." "It was a plea for good will, but what came of it was an explosion of ill will . . . making headline news of a controversy that went the limit of truculence." His words also lacked foresight. By the time his ministry waned during the Cold War years it was more than apparent that fundamentalists had plenty of fight left in them, and that liberalism's victory was far from a sure thing.[4]

The "Battle of Kuling" and the fundamentalist-modernist controversy it engendered warrant attention for their theological dynamics, which church historians have explained, but they also deserve inspection for a hidden dimension every bit as crucial to the evolution of Protestant politics in America's Century: petroleum. As much as doctrinal wrangling animated the Kuling clash, opposing interests in U.S. petroleum fueled it. Fosdick, Thomas, and Trumbull in fact waged a proxy war on behalf of oilmen with different faith and fuel values. Behind Fosdick's mission stood the "majors"—eastern oilmen who used combination to impose their will on industry. Though enamored of crude's potential for the modern age, the majors feared the chaos this resource provoked and set out to order its corporate logic, enforce central control, and apply scientific rationalism to its pursuit. In church as in business they saw human progress as obtainable through coordinated action by informed people in tune with the times. Fosdick's foes spoke for independent producers. Enraptured by oil's founding rule of capture, which legitimized anyone's uninhibited pursuit of crude, they mythologized the self-made oil hunter as the antidote to the dehumanizing machinations of the secular, monopolistic age. At the same time they built their small companies they funded modest religious institutions that celebrated wildcat capitalism and held to a hard-and-fast theology of fundamentalism that gave individuals the last say in all things spiritual, corporate, and political. On separate terms but with shared intensity, then, these warring petro-patriarchs recruited their evangelists, reached out to their faith communities, and employed a language of millennial expectation to secure their right to a prosperous future. The collateral damage was a permanently broken Protestant church.[5]

A glimpse at the background to Kuling's standoff coupled with

investigation of its principal architect—oilman Lyman Stewart—reveal the scope of this alignment. First the glimpse. It was J. H. Blackstone, a missionary with the Stewart Evangelistic Fund, who invited Thomas and Trumbull to China. Blackstone worried that China's growing anti-imperialism threatened the Western missionary enterprise. Making matters worse, in his mind, was that liberal Protestants seemed to be downplaying the protest as an innocuous "birth pang of democracy" and facilitating Chinese nationalists' embrace of a less dogmatic Protestantism in hopes of sustaining some level of Christian influence in a modern China. For conservatives, this acquiescence seemed dangerous because it allowed Chinese citizens to think that Christianity was simply a "disposable set of western ideals." China's turmoil, they charged, required a different response: a "simple, unadorned gospel" stripped of any attachment to broader programs of modernization. Blackstone preached this message on behalf of his agency, which was funded by the Union Oil Company, run by brothers Lyman and Milton Stewart. The Stewarts were independents and staunch Presbyterians who viewed liberal Protestantism in the same way they viewed major oil companies: as devilishly exploitative. So they decided to take their fight, already fierce at home, to foreign soil.[6]

Their enemy abroad was the same one they faced at home: the Rockefellers. Fosdick was John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s emissary, sent to China on behalf of the Federal Council of Churches (FCC) and Standard Oil. The two men had met ten years earlier through the mediation of Frederick T. Gates, a minister and head of the Rockefeller Foundation. Besides occupying a seat on the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, Fosdick would serve the oil family another way as pastor of Junior's Riverside Church. "No minister could have had a better partner than he has been," the pastor would later write. "He [Rockefeller] has been a devoted believer in the interdenominational policy of the church, and his breadth of view and inclusiveness of spirit have been a constant inspiration and support." It was out of such respect that Fosdick visited China; Standard was present the whole way. Prior to his departure, Rockefeller wrote letters of introduction to his corporate managers in China. He also supplied the travel funds, so as to guarantee that FCC-aligned missionaries could hear Fosdick's case for a culturally sensitive, internationalist church. "I believe you can render most important service just at this time," Junior told his ambassador, "and I count it a privilege to be a partner with you in the enterprise." The oilman, like his spiritual mentor, believed that sectarianism "was baneful at home" but utterly ruinous on the mission field.

The thought of "seeing an American Dutch Reformed Chinese," Fosdick quipped, was pitiful, and Rockefeller—witnessed in his generosity—clearly agreed.[7]

Distilled to its immediate essence, the Battle of Kuling thus pitted Union Oil's fundamentalist warriors against Standard Oil's paladins of liberal Protestantism, but the struggle was in fact more personal and protracted than this glimpse suggests. At root it stemmed from the eventful life of an evangelical wildcatter who was passionately committed to defending the old-time gospel and winning souls to Christ, enchanted with the hunt for a natural resource he found miraculous, and most of all desperate to thwart the efforts of Standard to monopolize his business and his church. Lyman Stewart's life story is indeed testament to the raw, existential politics of oil's first generation, and the enduring effect that these discordant experiences would have on U.S. petroleum and Protestantism in the twentieth century.

Stewart's strong convictions were the product of his early life in Pennsylvania. He was born in 1840 to a family of tanners and Scotch Presbyterians, and he quickly came to personify his kin's pietistic values and curiosity with crude. While riding horseback through the Venango Valley to purchase hides for his father, the teen kept a lookout for "mysterious seeps" of a gooey substance known as "rock oil." Stewart would soon hone this innate skill into a profession as a "seep geologist," but at the time his hobby was merely a distraction from hard work. This changed, however, when Edwin L. Drake, a sojourning jack-of-all-trades, relocated to the Allegheny town of Titusville, built a makeshift derrick, and in 1859 struck oil. Almost instantaneously men just like him began flocking to the area in search of an ancient substance that boasted fantastic possibilities for the modern era. Stewart caught the oil fever sweeping Titusville, located just a few miles from his home, though it would take him a few years to join the rush to drill. Two other firestorms consumed him in the early 1860s. One was the Civil War, which sent him to Gettysburg as a Union soldier. The second was revival. At the very moment of petroleum's birth, Stewart committed himself to a "higher" Christian life of service as a missionary, which eventually precipitated his short trip to Titusville to make some quick money; crude's cash, he thought, would get him to his destination—the mission field—sooner.[8]

Oil soon became an end rather than a means. Imbued with the persistence of the good missionary he dreamed of becoming, Stewart started building his own petroleum empire in hopes it would allow him to further Christ's kingdom. While by day he hunted new drill sites, in the evenings and

on Sunday—a day he reserved for worship—he devoted himself to preaching to Titusville's multitude of roughnecks and furthering reforms that would clean up their immoral behavior. His was a losing battle, on all counts. While Stewart struggled as a church leader to impose control on his community, he also rode the volatile cycles of speculation that characterized his business. By the mid-1870s he had already amassed and lost multiple fortunes. It was amid the repeating crises that he encountered his lifelong foe: the Rockefeller family.

His antagonist—John D. Rockefeller, Sr.—was just beginning to assert himself in hopes of limiting the excesses of the petroleum industry. Oil's sanctioned "rule of capture" granted wildcatters subsurface mineral rights, with no heed to property boundaries that existed above ground. Any crude that an individual siphoned from subterranean pools was his to keep, even if it was under his neighbor's property. This was the liberating part of the bargain. But the rule of capture did not protect this driller from the crowding that would immediately ensue, the dark side of the equation. Along Oil Creek, jungles of derricks were erected as soon as someone struck black gold, leading to overproduction, rapid price declines, and a waste of natural resources. The instability infuriated Rockefeller and inspired his quest for control through corporate combinations such as the South Improvement Company. In 1872, small producers who thought this arrangement an affront to the rule of capture's laissez-faire principles vigorously protested the emerging Standard juggernaut. Stewart led the countercharge and helped convince Pennsylvania legislators to reject the South Improvement Company's charter. Rockefeller, of course, would continue to commandeer the region's resources through vertical integration and corporate takeovers, leaving Stewart powerless. This experience—a familiar one in the annals of Gilded Age business—"kindled in Stewart a hatred of Standard . . . that lasted his entire life."[9]

Furious that Rockefeller was beating him and his brother-partner Milton (and the Presbyterian parishioners who had invested in his company) into submission, Lyman decided on an alternative path that appealed to many embattled wildcatters: he went west. Of the oil hunters' wanderlust Ida Tarbell aptly wrote, "Fortune was running fleet-footed across the country, and at her garment men clutched. They loved the chase almost as they did success." Tarbell knew what she was talking about since her own father's experience with Rockefeller mirrored Stewart's, but unlike Tarbell's parents who stayed in Pennsylvania to endure, Stewart decided to practice his trade somewhere else—California. Once there he began scouting for subsurface pools, a

difficult proposition in California's complex geological formations but one that he was sure would pay dividends. Stewart's nose for oil (he claimed to identify pools by smell) put him at an advantage, and soon he was able to construct a viable company that quickly became known for its daring innovation. But progress was slow, and in 1890, in a gasp for survival in California's cutthroat oil business, the Stewart brothers and Thomas Bard acquired three smaller companies and forged a larger entity that they hoped would be more competitive—Union Oil.[10]

Under Stewart's leadership Union finally achieved a level of welcomed albeit tenuous stability. External pressures certainly continued to mount, and dissent threatened unity inside executive ranks. More of a politician than oilman, Bard wanted Union to pick winnable fights and focus on extraction alone, leaving refining and distribution to partnering companies. Stewart, in contrast, believed that Union needed to integrate so as to "control the oil from the well to the customer" and not be "dependent upon others." He stopped short of advocating the conquest of rivals, which he saw as monopolistic and immoral, but not all of Standard's ways were wrong, he conceded; to compete with the majors, Union needed to play the game smartly. Differing opinions led to an uncomfortable struggle for power between Bard and Stewart, with the latter winning the day. Once past this trial, Stewart was able to look forward to the twentieth century as a time to excel—economically and spiritually. Stewart's optimism matched the confidence of southwestern independents in the first decades of the twentieth century, who after historic strikes in Los Angeles and Texas came to believe that they were guardians of the nation's lifeblood. They rushed to shore up their newfound authority. With broad political ambition they set out to "democratize" oil by forestalling Standard Oil's reach, advocating free markets, limited government, and local control, and forming lobbies to protect these interests.[11]

Stewart assumed leadership of this multipronged agenda. He was not always so bold, especially when Standard was involved. Standard initially shied away from California, offering the region's small producers the chance to establish themselves, but Rockefeller's philosophy changed once it became evident that oil's epicenter had migrated west. At first word that Standard was coming many California oilers sought a profitable peace by selling out. Even the Stewarts toyed with this idea. Realizing that Standard's arrival would expose their young company's vulnerability, they approached their competitor to ask if it would be interested in purchasing company shares. Standard refused the offer, saying it wanted all of Union or none of it. The Stewarts tried

to sell Union holdings to Standard on a follow-up query, but failed again. This time Standard wanted to pay the asking price with its own company stock, and the Stewarts refused, declaring in moralistic terms that they wanted "no dividends from [Standard's] ill gotten gains." Privately, Lyman admitted his own sense of guilt: "It seems as though the Almighty has put the stamp of His approval upon our operations and I believe it is just punishment for our entering into arrangement with such a set of wicked monopolists." This last failed maneuver left the Stewarts more determined than ever. Having already fled the beast once, they realized that escape a second time was unlikely, and so they decided to struggle to the death.[12]

They banked their survival on nimble maneuvering in politics. Lyman Stewart took it upon himself at this time to lobby on behalf of independents. Even though he and Bard went separate ways, the two gentlemen continued to be cordial and united in their campaign to limit Standard's expansion in California through political action. In one case, Bard, who had direct ties to California governor H. H. Markham and state senator E. H. Heacock, successfully petitioned the state to reject Standard's call for higher kerosene testing standards. Standard hoped that more rigorous testing would destabilize those smaller companies that could not abide by more sophisticated and costly processes of refining, thus guaranteeing its hegemony in western kerosene. Heacock, Markham, and Bard defeated the kerosene bill and also managed to get a related bill passed, strengthening smaller oil producers' access to pipelines.[13]

Stewart helped sustain these legislative drives throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century. At each attempt by the federal and state governments to restrict the ability of the oil producer to compete in an open domestic and foreign markets, Stewart was ready with a response. While in one moment he actively petitioned for less regulation of private lands and mineral resources, in the next he demanded that government maintain heavy duties and tariffs to protect the small, western oil producer from the threat of exported oil. He also aided independents' most important political maneuver at the time: destroying the Standard trust. As antimonopoly feelings began to reach a boiling point in popular opinion, Union and the Stewarts stoked the tension. Behind the scenes, Lyman maintained correspondence with Ida Tarbell, supplying the muckraker with firsthand facts to strengthen her case against the Rockefellers. Tarbell's "History of the Standard Oil Company," first published in *McLure's Magazine* as a call for government reform of petroleum, pleased Stewart. "I have read Miss Tarbell's first chapter in the

history of the Standard Oil Company," he wrote Milton in 1901, "and I see that she has laid a good foundation for establishing the fact that the Standard Oil Company did not build up the oil business but were simply parasites feeding upon an industry already established."[14]

Stewart did more than help stir up public sentiment; he also assisted the federal antitrust suit that split the Standard empire apart. By 1905, Washington was committed to a complete investigation of the oil industry and Standard's dominance therein. James R. Garfield, the commissioner of corporations, was placed in charge, and his cross-country inquiry eventually brought him to California. The California inquest took nine months to complete and involved testimony from vital members of the Golden State's oil establishment. The testimonies painted a picture of collusion between Standard and the railroads, and in general of Standard's predatory style. Stewart happily testified to Standard's questionable strategies. He also helped in an unintended way. Having acquired copies of formal contracts outlining Union's previous failed dealings with Standard, government lawyers argued that Standard had pursued business agreements with leading California oil producers that were designed to destroy competition. Stewart shied away when asked for more documentation of his back-and-forth with Standard. Fearing reprisal from the giant corporation, he insisted that he would not hand over other contracts unless subpoenaed, which never occurred. But both his deliberate and inadvertent support of the government's case helped bring down a judgment that he and his fellow independents cheered: deemed in violation of trust laws, Standard would be dismantled.[15]

This did not mean Stewart's battle with the Rockefellers was over. It was at this moment, in fact, that he shifted his focus to a religious counterassault. Stewart's love of oil began to wane as he ventured deeper into the antitrust case against Standard. Disgusted with big business, disillusioned with bureaucrats, he became convinced that petroleum was corrupt to the core. While oil's executives made backroom deals with politicians that mocked rules of fair play, in the company towns he built for his workers he encountered the same sins he had witnessed in Titusville decades before. To be sure, he kept fighting on all of these plains. In the upper echelon he continued to press for a politics that leveled the corporate playing field, and in the lower he imposed stricter decency laws on Union camps. Yet his dismay did not abate until he decided to reconnect with the theology of his youth and gear his vocation to evangelistic causes. He would finally be that missionary he always wanted to be, though a missionary in executive clothing. With the help of his

brother, Lyman began erecting a philanthropic apparatus that could rival the Rockefellers'.

Through the Stewart Evangelist Fund he did so in different realms. First, he commissioned a series of articles urgently defending Protestant orthodoxy and fully funded their mass distribution. Released during World War I, *The Fundamentals*, as they were titled, found a way into homes, seminaries, churches, and missionary bases where the battle between fundamentalism and modernism was intensifying. Three million volumes were issued before the end of World War I. *The Fundamentals*' stunning statistical success paled next to its symbolic impact. With words as his weapon Stewart essentially established the parameters of a movement that would take American Protestantism by storm. Besides bankrolling this theological treatise, he also constructed a cathedral—the Church of the Open Door in Los Angeles—and a school, Biola (Bible Institute of Los Angeles). Whereas the former became the West Coast's epicenter of revivalism, prophecy, and missionary recruitment, the latter served as a training site for thousands of young men and women eager to evangelize the most remote parts of the globe. They set off into these parts imbued with their patron's sense of service. "Recognizing the fact that we are the Lord's stewards, and that soon we must give an account of our stewardship," Stewart would say, "it has been my purpose to have the means which the Lord has entrusted to me transmuted into living gospel truth, as far as possible, during my lifetime."[16]

Stewart's philanthropy only grew in impressiveness during the early 1920s, in part because it assumed fresh urgency. Eighty years old, Stewart recognized his time was short, but his charitable impulse was also shaped by his understanding of capitalism and the end-times: in his mind, money was to be made and spent in the immediate to convert souls and minister to the saints here and now, before Christ's impending return. As Brendan Pietsch explains, Stewart's financial plan simply "demanded expenditure for the kingdom, not stockpiling for the world." Because of this open-pocket policy, Union executive Robert Watchorn observed, Stewart "was always hard up for cash," but he never let this state of stress prohibit him from giving freely. And in the early 1920s he indeed gave freely. By then he had received ten thousand individual appeals for money and granted many of the wishes. Personal gifts aside, he also funneled funds into missionary enterprises operating in U.S. and British cities and in the inhospitable rural terrains of the Global South and East. Stewart was particularly supportive of the Central American Mission, which grew out of his interest in South America and his determination

to "give the WORD OF GOD to Spanish-speaking and other Roman Catholics peoples." Always aware of China's import to global Christianity, the Stewart brothers meanwhile ensured that a conservative missionary agency called Bible Union of China pursued an aggressive outreach agenda there. Lyman monitored the process so as to guarantee that fundamentals of the faith were upheld. William H. G. Thomas, Charles G. Trumbull, and J. H. Blackstone satisfied his standards and, with his blessing, waged spiritual warfare in Kuling.[17]

Even as he entered his last years focused on these widespread initiatives, Stewart's sense of petroleum politics, and disdain for Standard Oil, remained sharp. By this point Union possessed eight hundred thousand acres of land, produced more than eighteen million barrels of oil per year, and oversaw a vast grid of wells, pipelines, refineries, and service stations. Though he still saw himself as an independent oilman, Stewart in truth owned a company that boasted a scale of integration enjoyed by most "midmajors" in the industry. Union's expanding ambitions lent Stewart's missionary work additional meaning. South America was a key frontier for his company, and Stewart knew that petroleum exploration and recovery south of the Mexican-American border would happen only after opinions of the foreign capitalist softened there. Stewart intuitively recognized the benefit of having missionaries on the ground selling a gospel of Christian democracy and free markets, and though never voiced in such explicit terms, his efforts to turn foreign hearts toward God also came with intent to prepare them for the coming of black gold. China's oil-producing possibilities and burgeoning market potentials were just as attractive to U.S. petroleum companies, especially those like Union that were based on the Pacific Coast and turned toward Asia.[18]

The problem is that the Rockefellers and Standard Oil had their sights set on these distant lands as well, a factor that exaggerated the angst in Stewart's philanthropy. China was always considered special in the Rockefellers' plan. "Oil for the lamps of China" was one of Standard's first marketing ploys, signifying the company's appreciation of the untapped demand for kerosene that existed in the Asian country. By the 1920s, Socony-Vacuum (one of Standard's successor companies) managed an expansive advertising enterprise that connected the Great Wall in the country's north to Hainan Island in its south. Through the advanced work of Frederick Gates and the Rockefeller Foundation, Standard profits also made their way into China in the form of an ambitious philanthropic blitz. As David Rockefeller recalls of his father's (Junior's) China thrust, "economic development efforts in the Yangtze Valley

to the restoration of the Ming Tombs near Nanjing, public health and medi-
cal education, and even an effort to reform the Chinese Customs Service" all
felt the touch of U.S. oil's first family, as did the Peking Union Medical Col-
lege, which essentially gave the country a viable public health system. The
Rockefellers changed *and were changed by* China's encounter with modernity.
Junior's Protestant faith was never the same after his visit to China in 1921.
Though determined to hang on to his Baptist orthodoxy, Junior felt it slip-
ping away as he observed the desperate needs of the Chinese people. His son
remembers the endpoint of this Asian sojourn and spiritual journey: "Father
was persuaded that while American philanthropy had an important role to
play in the modernization of China, traditional American missionary work
had become outmoded and irrelevant to the needs of the country. The les-
sons drawn by each of my parents had not only an enduring impact on them
but also on the lives of my brothers and me." By 1921, Rockefeller had jetti-
soned the faith of yesteryear for the progressive thinking of the future, and
the liberal Protestants who aided him were comfortable in this trajectory.[19]

Stewart was most definitely not and in his last months of life he continued
to slam secularized philanthropies like the Rockefellers' and spread his anti–
big business populism in the corporate sector. The latter effort grew out of
necessity. The ever-stretched Union Oil entered the 1920s susceptible to take-
over by stockholders. Percy Rockefeller (Junior's cousin) and his Wall Street
associates were among those who tried to force Union into their possession.
In May 1921, another major—British-owned Royal Dutch Shell—came close
to achieving this end. After acquiring a one-fourth interest in Union Oil of
California, Shell brokers announced that Union Oil of Delaware would ratify
a plan to merge with their conglomerate. This news set off a political firestorm.
While the U.S. Senate introduced a resolution for federal investigation of "the
attempt of foreign interests to take over a big American oil company," the
Navy expressed concern with the potential loss of "an important Pacific Coast
oil source." Loyal Union stockholders rallied to stave off the "Shell grab" while
Stewart fanned the anti-Shell sentiment. With the aid of newspapermen and
politicians he compelled Californians to fight "the forces of Royal Dutch Shell
combination"—that "motley aggregation recruited from many races . . .
manned by a regiment of Rothschilds and equipped by a plentiful supply of
ammunition from the British treasury"—and "get aboard the Union Oil Asso-
ciates' bandwagon." After eighteen months of intense wrangling, Union Oil
Associates (longtime California stockholders) gained the necessary shares to

offset Shell's maneuvers, and on March 22 1922, the *Los Angeles Examiner* declared victory: "Union Oil Saved from Foreign Control."[20]

Having left the comforts of retirement to fight this last battle, Stewart retreated again to the quiets of home and church. One year later, at the age of eighty-three, he died of complications from a pneumonia that was exacerbated by his contest with Shell. Seven weeks later Milton Stewart passed away. As company boilerplate offered in response to the two brothers' sudden passing, "Thus the mild-mannered, evangelical, picturesque brothers, who had helped launch the Oil Age on its way sixty years before . . . passed from the scene, leaving a younger generation of oil men, with a new outlook, at Union's helm." An editor of *Petroleum World* offered a similar appraisal of Lyman Stewart's life.

> Eighty-three years old when his gentle soul was called, his name was known wherever oil was spoken of and his three-score years of square dealing in business and kind personal interest in all around him had earned the friendship and respect of thousands. Long recognized as the father of oil in the Pacific Coast region, long given the honored title of "dean of western oil men," consulted by the oldest and the wisest and held in respectful awe by the younger element, Lyman Stewart had been the outstanding figure in California oil for forty years.

A proud wildcatter to the end, Stewart lived a life, colleagues everywhere proclaimed, that was testament to the strength of the self-made man, the fortitude of the true servant of Christ, and the founding virtues of the business that had allowed him to give so much. Stewart, they noted with glowing praise, was both producer and product of "America capitalism's purest endeavor."[21]

By the time of his death, Stewart had helped fashion a comprehensive crusade for the fundamentals of Protestantism and petroleum that fused the interests of faith, finance, and politics. Much like the Rockefellers', none of Stewart's ventures drew hard-and-fast lines between these realms; ambition and struggle in one meant ambition and struggle in all. And like the Rockefellers, Stewart was never shy about blending his entrepreneurial lust for oil with an insatiable quest for moral and political influence. To be sure, his enchantment with oil was not unfiltered. As witnessed throughout his life,

Stewart always feared the excesses that crude created. From his first exposure to oil culture in Titusville to his encounters with "vice" at his company towns in the 1910s, Stewart always saw petroleum as a potential burden. Still, in his final estimation, oil's potential in the advancement of Christ's kingdom was too great to ignore, or surrender to the liberals and secularists he saw represented by Standard Oil's founding family. And so he fashioned a ministry that would spread the message of wildcat capitalism and Christianity across the globe.

In doing so, Stewart helped turn evangelicalism into a vertically integrated, multinational endeavor whose momentum could not be reversed by the Rockefellers and Fosdicks of the Protestant world. His labor toward this end should serve as a reminder of the flexible power of this faith community in the twentieth century. Stewart's life and the backstory to the Battle of Kuling in fact offer a number of insights worthy of consideration by historians as they continue to map out enduring ties between religion and politics. Stewart's life, first of all, is testament to the importance of topography in connecting these realms. Too often the tale of the fundamentalist-modernist debate, and the longer saga of conservative ascendancy, is accounted for in a vacuum unattached to place. Yet environment matters, deeply. The product of the oil patch, Stewart's faith and politics were molded by the natural environment he inhabited, the natural resources he encountered, and the experience of distance—physical, cultural, economic, political—that separated him from the moral geographies of the Rockefellers' eastern core. The movement he helped build was shaped by these same forces. This suggests a second point: his was a vocation dictated by the economics of his place. Historians have done much lately to reemphasize the indelible union of Christianity and commerce in the modern moment, and the centrality of money to evangelicalism's sustained influence. While this is certainly true, Stewart's sprawling operation also suggests that different faith communities often draw their political authority from different economic sectors. Stewart and his petroleum company and philanthropy were products of the extractive industry and the frontier culture of speculation that grew up around it. His theology (a call to save souls before Christ's sudden return), sense of capital (a mandate to make and spend cash quickly), corporate strategy (an incessant drive for new pools), and politics (a need to protect access to crude) were dictated by his attachment to the volatile, high-risk, boom-bust realities of his economic location. Unlike the Rockefellers he did not enjoy the luxuries of time and patience, or certainty of a future that would play out his way.

He did, however, enjoy some dominion over his soil, pointing to two final illustrative truths. Stewart's proximity to oil extraction placed him on the front line of theological and political battles about the environment. Throughout his career he intensified his politicking whenever he sensed that big oil, Washington bureaucrats, or Wall Street financiers were undermining his rule of capture. Though certainly geared to the politics of the social, Stewart's fundamentalism also drove him to fight regulations of land and subsurface wealth. His politics, in other words, extended well beyond the range of concerns historians usually associate with the religious right, and impacted policies about land use and energy as much as temperance and the Sabbath. His legacy of widespread political concern lives on in present-day evangelicalism. So too does his legacy of global awareness. Besides fleshing out corporate Christianity's staying power in the twentieth century, historians have also made significant strides in their treatment of U.S. religion and politics as international phenomena. Thanks to their efforts, any substantive handling of the God factor in America must now incorporate a view to the world. The Battle of Kuling and the tensions it represented between fundamentalists and modernists, the Stewarts and Rockefellers, confirm the necessity of this global vision, for all of these agents were consumed by a quest for crude and embroiled in its attending power plays that stretched well beyond national borders or the parameters of any one nation's history.

It would be left up to subsequent generations of independent oilmen to carry this quest forward into the second half of the twentieth century. Even as Stewart passed from the scene, other evangelical wildcatters were assuming the burden of leadership, men like Sunoco's chief executive J. Howard Pew, who would continue to champion Stewart's faith and fuel values, strike out against the Rockefellers and FCC, and help forge a popular front that could roll back secularization and an enlarged state. Fifty years after Stewart's death Pew and his allies would sell their message of wildcat capitalism and Christianity to a receptive American public and in the guise of an oil patch Republicanism assume authority at the highest levels of government. In the process they would deliver a decisive answer to Harry Emerson Fosdick's proverbial question "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" Yes.

# A "Divine Revelation"?
# Southern Churches Respond to the New Deal

*Alison Collis Greene*

Inauguration Day of 1933 dawned with a cloudy chill. President-elect Franklin Roosevelt and his family began the morning with a brief prayer service at Saint John's Protestant Episcopal Church. The damp gray lingered as Roosevelt rode beside President Hoover to the Capitol. Just before Roosevelt took the oath of office, a southern admirer later wrote to him, "the clouds were especially heavy." But "when you came and put your hand on [the Bible] when you were taking the oath, the sun broke through the clouds and gave a ray of light through upon you. I said then, and I still say, that the Supreme Power above blessed your administration."[1]

Roosevelt took the oath of office on no ordinary King James, but on a 247-year-old Dutch family Bible opened to 1 Corinthians 13. This much-used passage extolling the virtues of charity would have been familiar to Protestants everywhere. It set the tone for an inaugural address packed with so many scriptural allusions that the National Bible Press distributed a reference chart mapping Roosevelt's words to relevant verses.[2] "We are stricken by no plague of locusts," Roosevelt said. He blamed the Great Depression on "unscrupulous money changers" who had destroyed the nation's economy and then "fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization." Echoing the revivalist language of contemporary clergy, the president declared, "These dark days will be worth all they cost us if they teach us that our true destiny is not to be ministered unto but to minister to ourselves and to our fellow

men." Roosevelt laid out a few general principles he planned to pursue in coming days, and he linked them to "old and precious moral values." He asked "the blessing of God" on the nation, and concluded, "May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come."[3]

Roosevelt continued to invoke religious themes as he worked with Congress to enact a torrent of legislation in 1933, but he waited two more years before he asked American religious leaders what they thought of the New Deal. In September 1935, Roosevelt's administration sent a personal letter to every American clergyperson. Roosevelt asked for written responses about local conditions and specific thoughts about the newly established Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Social Security Act.[4]

Tens of thousands of letters arrived in reply. Those missives, along with commentary from religious leaders throughout Roosevelt's first term in office, show that American clergy in general and southern clergy in particular believed churches were essential to both inspiring and shaping the New Deal. Southern believers offered detailed critiques of the New Deal's successes and failures. More significantly, southern clergy linked the New Deal as a whole, and the Social Security Act in particular, to long-held religious mandates. Even as they worried that the state might usurp what remained of their authority over welfare and reform, southern churchgoers declared the New Deal a religious achievement. This declaration spanned lines of race, class, and religious tradition to represent a moment of remarkable religious unity in a fractious region. Sometimes the visions differed: white southern clergy expected to shape the New Deal in the image of Jim Crow capitalism, while black religious leaders hoped that Roosevelt's programs would undercut it. Catholic and Jewish clergy showed more enthusiasm for legislation favorable to organized labor, while Protestants celebrated the emerging social welfare state. For all their differences, these southerners overwhelmingly agreed that the New Deal aligned the values of the state with those of the church.[5]

Historians have debated Roosevelt's personal religiosity and examined the relationship between the New Deal and the Christian left.[6] They have discussed Roosevelt's most famous religious critics and demonstrated that his programs provided a rallying point for the Christian right.[7] But if FDR was the Antichrist in the minds of some Americans, as historian Matthew Sutton recently argued, he was virtually the Second Coming for many others. As a woman from Tennessee wrote to Eleanor Roosevelt, "I pray God he may stay in office till Jesus comes again. . . . Surely he is God's child to have been spared

and brought to this day, to try to help the world in these trying last days."[8] To many of his Christian supporters, Roosevelt was not just a political hero but also a sacred figure.

Yet the deeper connections between mainstream American Christianity and the New Deal remain unexplored, particularly in the South—the region most deeply involved in crafting that decade's legislation. Southern religious leaders recognized that Roosevelt's programs shifted to the federal government much of the responsibility for welfare and reform that once rested with the church and local governments. Some objected. But many more clamored for New Deal programs, and they applauded their arrival as a religious victory. Even a middle-of-the-road southern Methodist could rejoice, "Our government is actually attempting to try out some of these things for which the Christian church has been contending for a quarter of a century."[9]

The enthusiasm for the New Deal extended beyond those religious leaders historically associated with the Social Gospel to include conservative and even fundamentalist southerners whose churches proved unwilling or unable to address the growing need around them. The clergy who wrote to Roosevelt their assessments of the New Deal ranged from the region's religious elites— bishops and denominational figureheads—to bivocational farmer-preachers in tiny country churches. Most were white, some were black, and almost all were male. They do not represent the average southern churchperson, but they do represent a group of Americans since characterized as most hostile to the expanding welfare state. Yet in the early 1930s, they were among its most enthusiastic proponents.

That southern clergy supported the New Deal in large numbers is not surprising. The South voted overwhelmingly for Roosevelt in four straight presidential elections. Ira Katznelson has shown that throughout the 1930s southern Democrats in Congress cast far more votes with the president than against him, even as they limited the egalitarian possibilities of New Deal programs. Nor is it unusual that clergy would use the language of religion to talk politics. It is remarkable, however, that southern religious leaders celebrated the twentieth century's most transformative decade of federal legislation as a product and a champion of their churches' work, particularly given their later rejection of New Deal liberalism.[10]

Southern clergy had reason to be optimistic that they could shape the relationship between the church and the nascent welfare state. Between the end of the Civil War and the start of the Great Depression, southern churches expanded their social influence and charitable reach. Even as they distanced

themselves from the theology of the Social Gospel, the region's ecumenical religious organizations and denominations established orphanages, hospitals, schools, retirement homes, and settlement houses. Led by women's societies deeply invested the southern progressive movement, black and white churches alike called for new public initiatives, from prohibition to prison reform to child labor legislation. They joined with municipal and state officials to create and administer reform schools for adolescents and distribute charity to selected veterans, widows, and orphans. Southern reformers sought to combine the power of the church and the state to ameliorate the problems of an increasingly urban, industrial South.[11]

These cooperative efforts varied across the South, from relatively comprehensive programs with significant public contributions in Richmond, Virginia, to largely voluntary but coordinated programs in Memphis, Tennessee, to piecemeal, informal aid in the mountains and Deep South. Jim Crow capitalism defined the limits of southern aid, both private and public. Whites controlled the public sphere and largely helped each other, while African American churches and fraternal orders sought to create security among black southerners. One common thread unified these programs across the South: they were utterly inadequate to meet even the most pressing needs in the best of years in this poorest part of the nation. Malnutrition, poverty, and disease shaped the daily lives of thousands of southerners even as the nation prospered.[12]

The Great Depression wiped out what little support poor southerners could find. Entire cities—and the state of Arkansas—declared bankruptcy. Religious aid organizations and the community chests that often connected them had neither the infrastructure nor the assets to meet the growing need around them. A drought parched the Appalachians and the Delta, banks failed across the region, and farmers in Arkansas rioted for food. Meanwhile, southern denominations ran out of money, laid off employees, and slashed funding for schools, hospitals, orphanages, and missions. In 1931, for instance, Southern Baptists announced that denominational revenues had fallen 25 percent since 1928 and continued to plummet. The president of the convention admitted, "We are putting off the Lord's cause while we try to settle with our other creditors." Southern aid had been a patchwork effort in the best of times; in this, the worst of times, it was utterly inadequate. Surrounded by suffering that they could not alleviate, many religious leaders demanded that the federal government intervene.[13]

Roosevelt's landslide win in 1932 signified as much an indictment of Herbert Hoover's failure to marshal the power of the federal government to

address the Depression as an embrace of his opponent's promise to bring sweeping change. Roosevelt won 57 percent of the popular vote nationwide and trounced Hoover in the solid South, where seven states gave the Democrat 80 percent or more of ballots cast. Among the holdouts were those black Republicans who still found a way to the polls and a minority of white temperance movement veterans and clergy who voted for Hoover solely because Roosevelt had vowed to end Prohibition. Even some of those skeptics—outnumbered by their colleagues and parishioners—decided to reserve judgment until the new president took office.[14]

Church leaders quickly responded to the president's agenda. Even as some Protestants condemned Roosevelt's use of a tax on legalized alcohol to help fund the first New Deal, others joined their more enthusiastic Catholic counterparts in applauding the relief and recovery programs the president pushed through Congress and signed into law in his first hundred days.[15]

The National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA), passed in June 1933, proved of particular interest to religious southerners. In this region of low wages and segregated work, many applauded the bill's move to regulate hours and wages through the National Recovery Administration (NRA), its provisions for unionization, and its establishment of the Public Works Administration to create jobs and build the nation's infrastructure. Reformers had worked across political lines for decades to defend workers' rights, an effort codified by Protestant leaders in the Federal Council of Churches' 1908 Social Creed of the Churches.[16]

Religious leaders took note of the similarities between the NIRA and their own calls for reform, and many also took credit. "The Blue Eagle is now perched on my door," a Louisiana Methodist announced. "I have signed up for the war against the depression." If the Blue Eagle was a Roosevelt original, this Methodist challenged his audience to look to the church for the roots of the New Deal: "Have you noticed that the NRA program includes three or four items for which the Protestant churches of the Federal Council have been contending for twenty-five years?"[17] Catholics were still more enthusiastic, joining a southern priest who applauded the president's "great cause of economic recovery by social justice" and called for unified Catholic support. "The plan and program and principles of the President for the establishment of economic health and social justice," he argued, "are the same as those advocated for the last two generations by the Popes." The clergy exulted that the federal government had finally thrown its weight behind religious mandates.[18]

Southern liberals hoped the New Deal would prod more churches to support economic and social justice. Vanderbilt social ethics professor Alva Taylor declared NIRA "the greatest opportunity the churches and ministers have ever had to Christianize the social order," although he worried that the churches were not up to the challenge. A mentor to many of the South's most outspoken Protestant leftists, Taylor argued that a Christian social order should hold labor sacred and provide safe conditions and a family wage to each worker. More willing to criticize the church than some of his peers, Taylor distinguished between the broader religious underpinnings of the New Deal and the average member of the clergy, whom he deemed the "worst laggards" in supporting the NRA. The clergy, he feared, responded more to the needs of business than to the "common workers" whom Taylor hoped the NRA would serve most directly.[19]

Taylor's concerns notwithstanding, many conservative southern Protestants supported the program as well, in part because its exclusion of agricultural workers and its accommodation of lower wages in the South upheld the strictures of Jim Crow. At the same time, southern white Protestants gnashed their teeth over Roosevelt's efforts to end Prohibition. As the Twenty-First Amendment came up for a vote in Arkansas (a vote that sailed right through) in June 1933, a Little Rock Southern Baptist and fierce defender of Prohibition paused in the midst of a call for "faith in God and a sober America" to clarify, "We should whole-heartedly assist and co-operate with our virile president for a new deal. In all things he is right, except in the repeal of the 18th Amendment." It is striking that this minister encouraged churchgoers to "assist and co-operate" with the New Deal even as they rallied to defeat one of the measures intended to finance it. Such rhetoric reflected the widespread belief among clergy that the churches had an active role to play in the creation and implementation of the president's new programs. They could critique portions of the New Deal and still remain supportive of its larger aims.[20]

The conversation surrounding the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), established in May 1933, illustrates this point. FERA provided grants to each state to put toward employment relief and direct aid for the suffering, in whatever form city and state aid administrators saw fit.[21] While some clergy complained that FERA's relief program would create chronic dependency, religious leaders just as often expressed hope that the government could salvage charitable operations that the churches had abandoned.

For instance, the superintendent of the Southern Baptist hospital in Arkansas wished only that the New Deal were more comprehensive. He

expressed outrage over "the great number of charity patients dying because they can not get into hospitals for the necessary care and attention." Although he had lobbied within the denomination for funds for his poor patients, the superintendent was more optimistic about the federal government's willingness to help. He likely recognized the precedent for cooperative action between church and state. Only public agencies could distribute FERA funds. But existing religious and private aid organizations offered the personnel necessary for such administration, and many—including, for instance, Catholic Charities—applied for and received designation as public agencies. Thus, boundaries between state and religious work blurred even in the New Deal state. Reformers like this hospital superintendent could hardly be blamed for believing that the New Deal might even save the churches from their own failures.[22]

Not all southerners trusted that the churches could keep pace with the federal government in its expansion of services, but even those linked the New Deal to Christian ideals. Mississippi Southern Baptist Plautus Lipsey asked with concern, "Must the government do our religious work for us?" Lipsey spoke appreciatively of state-funded education and public charities but warned, "More and more there has been a tendency to depend upon the state for relief of the burdened, and for the preservation and protection of morals." Lipsey advocated with uncharacteristic enthusiasm for a renewed emphasis on religious charity. "Any church ought to consider itself discredited," he proclaimed, "which permits some other organization to provide for its dependents."[23]

Lipsey feared that when the church relinquished charitable work to the state, it gave up moral authority as well. Religious charity and local public welfare in the South generally came with strings attached, its providers expecting that recipients show their gratitude by showing up for church or behaving as their benefactors demanded. Southern benevolence differentiated between those who deserved help and those who did not, and it nearly always hewed to Jim Crow lines. As the federal government took a more central role in individual lives, conservatives like Lipsey worried, then the church would lose an important means of moral coercion and social control.[24]

If southern clergy believed their president had borrowed from the churches—for better or worse—in framing the programs of the first New Deal, then the round of legislation passed in 1935 assured them that they were right. While the first New Deal focused primarily on aid to businesses and farm owners, the Second New Deal devised new safety nets for vulnerable

citizens. The Resettlement Administration aided displaced farmers, the Rural Electrification Administration brought electricity to the countryside, the National Labor Relations Act supported organized labor, the Emergency Relief Act created the WPA, and the Social Security Act set up a mandatory federal contribution program for retirement and disability funds. Each of these programs drew a response from American churchgoers, but Roosevelt deemed the last two to be most important and relevant for the clergy.[25]

The personal letters the Roosevelt administration sent to the clergy in September 1935 focused on the "high purposes" of the Social Security Act and the "vitally important" WPA. The president asked clergy for their "counsel and advice" regarding both programs, as well as about the needs of their own communities. "Tell me where you feel our government can better serve our people," the letter requested before appealing for cooperation: "We can solve our many problems, but no one man or single group can do it, - we shall have to work together for the common end of better spiritual and material conditions for the American people." Roosevelt thus drew a direct line between the work of the church and that of the state, even as he ignored the way the new federal programs reshaped the relationship between the two.[26]

Roosevelt asked for feedback about the WPA and Social Security not only because the president deemed them the centerpiece of his second cascade of proposed legislation, but also because these programs most closely adhered to work churches had once claimed as their own. The WPA fell in line with Protestant preoccupations with what Roosevelt termed "the joy and moral stimulation of work," and focused on restoring a wage earner to every family. No program overlapped more with efforts traditionally run through churches than Social Security. In addition to providing unemployment insurance and old age benefits, the program made provisions for dependent children and for the blind—populations deemed worthy of help by even the most curmudgeonly Christians.

Roosevelt's letter created a minor uproar. A number of clergy took to the newspapers to accuse the president of politicking. Soon, reports emerged that Roosevelt's letter mirrored one that Wisconsin governor Philip La Follette had sent to his state's clergy the preceding March. This outcry only increased the letter's visibility to the clergy, however, and even many left off the mailing list replied. The barrage of letters that soon arrived in Washington provide remarkable insight into the religious response to the New Deal.

The Social Security Act received the most, and the most enthusiastic, feedback. More than twelve thousand clergy replied to Roosevelt's letter

within a month. Most of them specifically discussed Social Security, and 75 percent of those who did expressed unconditional approval of the measure.[27] In a country with resources "so abundant that there is no need for any honest citizen to go hungry, or face his family with chagrin," rejoiced a minister from a conservative southern tradition, "[t]he greatest benefit of this measure will be spiritual. What people want primarily is security. When they have that there will be manifest a new sense of neighborliness and charity." For this minister, the spiritual value of the New Deal dwarfed its economic mission: "Your administration will be judged ultimately by its moral achievements, or failures, rather than by any economic ones."[28] Another southern minister echoed that sentiment, declaring, "My impression, Mr. President, is that under your wise compassionate leadership there is more real religion in our government at the present hour than at any time in its history."[29]

The notion that the state had absorbed long-standing church teachings proved almost intoxicating. Over and over, clergy concurred with the Methodist leader who announced, "The main principles of the New Deal legislation are in close harmony with the principles of the Christian religion."[30] Even Roosevelt's speeches "had the note and the ring of the Old Time Prophet of God, rather than the smooth sayings of the Politician." The president resembled a modern-day Moses, some clergy suggested, and others observed that seemingly secular programs like the NRA made the most sense when studied "in the light of the Parables of Jesus." Religious leaders even found "perfect harmony, between [Roosevelt's] outline and the pictures Jesus gave of the Kingdom of God 1900 years ago."[31]

Such enthusiasm was not limited to southern Christians. A Mississippi rabbi concluded that Social Security measures were "conceived and drawn up in the spirit of Israel's ancient prophets, those eloquent and fearless protagonists of social justice and righteousness." For southern clergy across the religious and political spectrum, federal protections for the elderly and dependent represented the realization of age-old religious principles. As they saw it, Roosevelt was the first president to take seriously churches' teachings and put them into practice.[32]

While the passage of Social Security seemed evidence enough to some that Roosevelt had built the New Deal on a religious foundation, many clergy found it more difficult to link federal works programs to religious teachings. Even those who approved the WPA's passage and intent spoke only vaguely of its "inestimable blessing and benefit" to local people—perhaps in part because the program was very new. One Mississippian regarded the agency as a

realization of the Sermon on the Mount, because federal work "actually put the daily bread into many mouths" and "helped to inspire hope and confidence during one of our most trying crises." Still, relatively few clergy linked the WPA directly to biblical precedent.[33]

Indeed, many southern clergy expressed at least some reservations about the administration of works programs and other New Deal efforts, even when they approved of their purpose. The Civil Works Administration and other programs the WPA replaced played out differently in different places. Although clergy generally approved of the notion of putting people to work, they worried about the administrators who handed out jobs. Roosevelt believed that local control was necessary to ensure southern support for the New Deal, but local administrators played favorites, and they often excluded African Americans altogether.[34] One Arkansas minister worried, "Our people of the upper and middle classes have been benefited, but others, the lower classes, the workers—on plantations and elsewhere, have not yet felt the helping hand of the Government as much as they should."[35] Another agreed, warning, "There is still suffering among the working class of people that the ones in better financial condition do not know anything about."[36] When churches controlled the administration of charity and reform, some suggested, the outcome was fairer.

Even in the Depression's darkest days, a few clergy frankly admitted that they did not believe much in charity or a social safety net to begin with, no matter what the source. One retired minister declared of the entire New Deal, "I see nothing but wreck and ruin and destruction in the end." He conceded, "We do not have as charitable spirit as we might," but he deplored the use of his tax dollars to support those in need. "It looks like from your New Deal that I made a mistake by being educated, industrious, saving and economizing," the man of God complained. Instead, "if I had refused an education, been dull, lazy, wasteful, and a spendthrift . . . the New Deal would come along my way."[37] Clergy like this one, who denied any need for structural change and insisted that anyone who was poor deserved their lot, began to regain power by the end of the decade.

The clergy most skeptical of the New Deal argued that the Depression represented divine punishment, and thus that only the church could save the nation. "Sin is a disease of the inner man, and no man made Government can cure him," explained another minister, "and until he is right spiritually our Government will be constantly embarrassed."[38] These clergy argued that only individual salvation would create proper conditions for recovery. That the

New Deal represented the realization of many of the goals of liberal Christianity only rubbed salt in the wound for some fundamentalists and conservatives.[39]

In general, however, the critiques of New Deal work programs were not just jabs at Roosevelt or expressions of resentment at the expanded state. Indeed, the most detailed, reflective critiques of the WPA in particular and the New Deal in general were from clergy who generally approved of Roosevelt's administration. Concerns about corrupt oversight and unintended consequences demonstrate the degree to which southern clergy took ownership of the New Deal. They wanted Roosevelt's programs to operate smoothly and efficiently, and they did not hesitate to suggest where they believed he had gone wrong and how they might help correct the course.

"The helpless should not be thrown wholly on public charity," suggested one minister, "but allow the people to have the growing helpfulness of aiding each other." Indeed, "every one asking aid should be given some work and his rewards graded by the amount and efficiency and the work done." After all, "things are passing, but character is eternal. If we build permanently we must build in character." Lest the president wonder who might do this distribution and grading of labor, the minister suggested that "as the greatest teacher of moral and religious truths," the church, "can be of much aid to the state."[40]

Because they believed strongly that the New Deal built on a religious foundation and that they possessed hard-earned expertise on how social welfare programs should operate and who should be left out of them, white southern religious leaders demanded a role in shaping and administering them. In part, such demands reflected religious leaders' growing recognition that the New Deal marked a shift in power from the church to the federal government. They sought to reclaim some of that power by demanding the church's inclusion at the administrative level. Churches had cooperated with municipal and state relief, and many were unhappy with the more limited role they played in distributing New Deal aid.

Given their predilection for bickering and name-calling in other circumstances, the white clergy who wrote to Roosevelt displayed remarkable faith in the ability of their fellow men of the cloth to evaluate and meet the needs of people around them. A Tennessee Methodist suggested that they might even do this work voluntarily: "To me it would be a good idea for the relief to be administered through the churches with out any cost to the government."[41] Another southern minister proposed that each county in his state appoint "three men who are loyal devout Christians" to evaluate all applications for

aid.[42] For many white ministers, as with most southerners who favored local administration of New Deal programs, holding the reins of relief meant maintaining white supremacy in the region. It also meant holding on to the power to determine who needed and deserved help, and on what terms that help would be provided. Many clergy argued that they had always best served this function, and that that the president should respect their wisdom in such matters.[43]

Most of the ministers who suggested that they be included in the distribution of relief funds emphasized their potential value to the government, but one Tennessee minister stressed the government's debt to the church. "Is it not a truth that most of the suffering people of the nation are not church goers?" asked E. B. Rucker, pastor of five rural churches. Thus, Rucker argued, "to get folks to attend church and believing in the teaching of the Bible will put them in an attitude to take the help you may give them and get on their feet." He proposed that each pastor inventory his own churches and apportion aid and advice as he saw fit. "I don't see why any pastor would not want to be the angel of mercy to bring your help to his parish," Rucker pointed out. For emphasis, Rucker repeated that, although the funding would come from the federal government, "You are not to [administer] it, but the pastors . . . reaching them and being the agent in driving the wolf from their doors, will give the preacher a grip that will tie him on to their hearts." Rucker volunteered his own services to Roosevelt, noting with some embarrassment that his family was "a little short" and that he would require help with "expenses."[44]

Clergy like Rucker rarely acknowledged that the church had very recently claimed a primary role not only in distributing, but also in raising aid dollars, and that it had essentially abandoned that role in the early years of the Depression. But they did seem to believe that the New Deal could offer an ideal solution to their problems: the state would provide the money for aid and the church would hand it out. Thus, the burden of fund-raising would no longer rest with the church, but the church would retain the power to disburse those funds and thereby cement the loyalty of those in need.

For African American ministers in the South, the motivation was often different. White southern religious leaders wanted to retain power, and they also fought to preserve Jim Crow in federal policy. Black religious leaders worried that the racist administration of relief would deprive their membership of help. They had reason to worry. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 had privileged farm owners over farm workers, southern politicians

ensured that the Social Security Act did not include the domestic or agricultural workers who made up a majority of black southerners, and the local administrators of the public works programs often reserved skilled positions for whites only. Unequal though they were, New Deal programs included African Americans more than any white southern efforts ever had.[45]

Black clergy expressed hope that Roosevelt would set right the injustices of local New Deal administrators. J. E. Adams, a minister in the Arkansas Delta, lamented, "thousand of my peoples will Never get any benefit." Adams chose his words carefully, not directly accusing white aid administrators of ignoring African Americans but advising Roosevelt that it would be best to put aid meant for them "in the hands of the colored clergymen." He hoped that "it was possible that you could [point] are [our] deal direct from the white house to my peoples through The church." Particularly concerned about rural people and plantation workers, Adams argued, "no one are able to see these conditions in the community, and look after them better Then the ministers." Some black ministers, like their white counterparts, may have made such proposals from selfish as well as unselfish motives. But many wrote as much on behalf of all African Americans in their communities as on behalf of their churches, desperate for the New Deal to be, in Adams's words, "are deal," too.[46]

Black or white, clergy who believed the New Deal itself to be an extension of religious teachings outnumbered those who demanded an active role in administering it. Yet when some southern religious leaders began to fear that the New Deal did not enhance but rather threatened their authority, they responded with outrage. Some found it unfair that New Deal labor and funds constructed new schools, community buildings, and theaters but generally left churches untouched. They were incensed by the "millions of dollars furnished by our government to build pleasure houses and health resorts and *not one cent* for religion." By cutting the churches out of the New Deal, they believed, Roosevelt was "robbing God of what belongs to him."[47]

By the late 1930s, even positive assessments of the relationship of church to state under the New Deal took on a defensive tone. "There can be no question that the vast majority of the American public are sympathetic with President Roosevelt's concern for the average man and his interest in the forgotten man," one Southern Baptist reminded his colleagues, "and they are ready to back him up in his efforts to secure such legislation as will give equal justice and fair opportunity to all." This clergyman blamed "those who control the capital and wealth of the country" for spreading misinformation about

Roosevelt before launching a defense of federal power, broadly conceived. "There are two things which must always work for better people and better conditions," he argued. "They are the law and the Gospel."[48]

While such positive assessments remained widespread, both religious defenses of and religious attacks against the New Deal grew more urgent by the end of the decade. As they resumed work they had abandoned when the Depression began, churches discovered that their relationship to the needy had changed more dramatically than they had anticipated. Although federal programs rarely overlapped with religious ones, the New Deal as a whole established the federal government as Americans' primary source of support in desperate times. Thus, the New Deal forced a renegotiation both of the relationship between church and state and the relationship between the church and the citizenry.[49]

Southern Baptists, protesting now that the New Deal violated the separation of church and state and threatened racial segregation, took the lead in a campaign against programs they had once deemed Christian. In 1936, the convention created a Committee on Public Relations to "demand just rights that are being threatened" by the federal government. Rather than sharing the churches' burden, they complained, new federal agencies "are creating for us and for all other evangelical bodies problems that they have never before faced."[50] In particular, the Baptists worried that if they allowed their students to accept funding from the National Youth Administration work-study programs, the government could then limit Christian colleges' control over whom they admitted or what they taught.[51]

Even the Social Security Act irked Baptists, who struggled to persuade clergy and churches to participate in the denominational retirement program. Both Southern and National Baptists bemoaned the absence of a safety net for retired and elderly church workers, but they applauded the Social Security Act's exemption of churches from the obligation to pay into mandatory retirement.[52] In 1939, they successfully campaigned against a congressional proposal to eliminate that exemption. Left out of the administration of the New Deal, Southern Baptists now insisted that they not be subject to it either. No longer did they deem the New Deal the fulfillment of religious principles—it was now a threat to religious freedom.[53]

Even the large proportion of southern clergy who continued to support Roosevelt and the New Deal rarely linked Christian teachings and the expanded federal state by the late 1930s. Christian underpinnings or not, New Deal programs were a government operation. Yet religious leaders' initial

responses to the New Deal order reveal a relationship between the church and the modern welfare state more complicated than scholars of the Christian right have portrayed. Years before southern religious leaders played a pivotal role in the backlash against the New Deal order, they took credit for helping to usher it in. Decades later, few clergy would remember that they had once shared the sentiment of an Arkansas clergyman who deemed the social safety net created by the New Deal nothing less than a "Divine Revelation."[54]

# The Rise of Spiritual Cosmopolitanism:
# Liberal Protestants and Cultural Politics

*Matthew S. Hedstrom*

In the fall of 2013, the New Age mind-body physician and spiritual entrepreneur Deepak Chopra led a crowd of hundreds in a session of guided meditation from the steps of Thomas Jefferson's nineteenth-century temple to reason. The Rotunda at the University of Virginia, which Jefferson modeled on the Roman Pantheon, served as the first library of the nation's first fully secular university, and endures as the central symbol of its Enlightenment heritage. Yet on a warm fall afternoon Chopra stood, back to the Rotunda, encouraging his audience to ponder the findings of neuroscience, attend to their breath and hearts, and experience "transcendence" in the renunciation of ego. The event most certainly would have dismayed Jefferson, who valued intellectual and religious openness but personally eschewed the mystical. Rather, Unitarianism was the faith of Jefferson's old age, a religion of reason ideally matched, he thought, to the Enlightenment ideals of the new university and indeed the new republic itself. In June 1822, as he was supervising the construction of his university, Jefferson in fact famously predicted, in a letter, "there is not a young man now living in the United States who will not die an Unitarian." In a generation, America would fulfill its republican destiny, and released from inherited tyranny and superstition, its citizens would live as truly free persons. We would be a nation of yeoman Unitarians.

Jefferson was spectacularly wrong in this assertion, a point historians of religion have typically made by noting the revivals then under way, revivals that brought evangelicalism to social and cultural dominance. Yet from the

perspective of the early twenty-first century—from the perspective of the mystics and meditators kneeling before Jefferson's Rotunda—another religious development from the early nineteenth century gains new salience. Indeed, while the spare, rational liberalism of Jeffersonian Unitarianism has never attracted more than a tiny percentage of Americans, its exuberant, romantic, mystical twin, Emersonian transcendentalism, has had a surprisingly broad and enduring religious legacy, one on full display during Chopra's exercises at Jefferson's university.

From the 1830s and 1840s onward, perhaps the most significant aspect of transcendentalism's legacy has been its spiritual omnivorism, its pragmatic willingness to embrace, adapt, and consume beliefs and practices from around the globe. From Emerson's and Thoreau's halting attempts to read the Vedas to the full-fledged religious universalism of second-generation transcendentalist Thomas Wentworth Higginson to the much-heralded 1893 World's Parliament of Religion in Chicago, post-Protestant spiritual cosmopolitanism grew into a powerful cultural force among an American liberal vanguard. This nineteenth-century story has been well documented by religious historians such as Leigh Schmidt and others.[1] Schmidt places the transcendental emphasis on mystical experience—on direct, unmediated experience of the divine—at the heart of his account of spiritual cosmopolitanism in the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century this mystical cosmopolitan legacy was picked up by mainstream liberal Protestants in the so-called mainline denominations, and by century's end had become a defining feature of the religious lives of millions of ordinary Americans.

The facts themselves are clear enough. "The religious beliefs and practices of Americans do not fit neatly into conventional categories," began, rather dryly, a 2009 Pew Forum report on religion in the United States. Titled "Many Americans Mix Multiple Faiths: Eastern, New Age Beliefs Widespread," the report, based on a representative survey of the American population, continued, "Large numbers of Americans engage in multiple religious practices, mixing elements of diverse traditions. . . . Many also blend Christianity with Eastern or New Age beliefs such as reincarnation, astrology and the presence of spiritual energy in physical objects." The report further detailed that 24 percent of Americans believed in reincarnation, 24 percent regularly or occasionally attended religious services of other faiths, 23 percent engaged in yoga "as a spiritual practice," and fully 49 percent "have had a religious or mystical experience, defined as a 'moment of sudden religious insight or awakening.'" The findings shocked many in the news media, especially given that more than 75

percent of Americans in a similar survey identified as Christian.[2] A follow-up study released in 2012 revealed that one-fifth of all Americans, and fully one-third of those under age thirty, were religiously unaffiliated, a category that typically does not indicate atheism or agnosticism but rather the mix-and-match eclecticism found in the previous study and commonly described as "spiritual but not religious."[3]

The sociologist Christian Smith, echoing earlier work by Jay Demerath, has described this late twentieth- and twenty-first-century religious environment as evidence of the cultural victory of liberal Protestantism. "Liberal Protestantism's organizational decline," Smith has written regarding the much-noted demographic decline of mainline Protestantism, "has been accompanied by and is in part arguably the consequence of the fact that liberal Protestantism has won a decisive, larger cultural victory."[4] As Demerath puts it, the values of liberal Protestantism "may have been culturally centripetal to the American experience but structurally centrifugal to some of the key religious organizations within it."[5] The "cultural victory" thesis offers a tantalizing tale for historians of American religion. According to its proponents, the values and sensibilities of liberal Protestantism—especially interfaith openness, social toleration, respect for civil and human rights, and psychological and mystical spiritualities—gained steady ground in the twentieth century, and particularly since the Second World War, even as the institutional power and demographic presence of the Protestant mainline declined. In many ways, then, mainstream Protestantism in the twentieth century absorbed and even promoted the spirit of nineteenth-century Emersonianism.[6]

As tantalizing as this tale is, it presents stark challenges to historians who seek to understand the processes of cultural and religious change. How did that cultural victory happen? And, as a secondary question, what happened to liberal Protestantism as a result? Though these questions are sweeping in scale, two twentieth-century case studies can help bring them into sharper focus: the story of missionary Frank Laubach, and the reading programs of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Frank Laubach provides a remarkable example of an awakened religious cosmopolitanism—what philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah calls a benign universalism that acknowledges a shared humanity while celebrating authentic difference—and of the way this broadened outlook allowed for the sublimation of religious energies into social and cultural work.[7] The wartime reading campaign of the National Conference of Christians and Jews provides an instance of liberal Protestants, Catholics, and Jews endeavoring to make the same religious sensibilities that

animated Laubach a national imperative. To the extent that they succeeded they facilitated their own decline, since the benign universalism of ecumenical Protestantism allowed religious liberals to channel their religious impulses into cultural endeavors outside the institutional church. For two centuries religious liberalism in the United States has encompassed both Jeffersonian rationalism and Emersonian mysticism, often in uneasy coexistence. In the mid-twentieth century, increasingly cosmopolitan liberal Protestants embraced their Emersonian heritage, and used their considerable cultural capital to bring mystical liberalism to the mainstream. Midcentury Protestants, in other words, made a Deepak Chopra meditation at Mr. Jefferson's University possible; this essay seeks to explain, in a small way, how that happened.

## Frank Laubach, Missionary of Literacy

"This week a new and to me marvelous experience has come out of my loneliness," the American missionary to the Philippines Frank Laubach wrote to his father in the spring of 1930.[8] For months Laubach had been undergoing a spiritual upheaval, a process of heightened mystical awareness he called his "reconversion." "I am trying to be utterly free from everybody, free from my own self, but completely enslaved to the will of God," he explained.[9] When the spirit moved most powerfully, he wrote, "It was as though some deep artesian well had been struck in my soul and strength came forth."[10]

Laubach's awakening arose out of deep despondency—he had come to regard his evangelization efforts a failure—but fifteen years earlier he had arrived in the Philippines full of hope. His path to the mission field typified the ambition of many liberal Protestants of his generation, abounding with optimism and self-assurance, and riding the crest of America's new global power. Born in 1884 to devout Baptist parents, Laubach made a public confession of faith in the local Methodist church at age ten.[11] After college at Princeton, he engaged in settlement house work in New York for two years before returning to school, studying first theology at Union Theological Seminary, and then sociology at Columbia, from which he received a Ph.D. in 1915. During these years of higher education, Laubach exchanged the fundamentalism of his father for a liberal theology more suited to a man of his training. He still burned with the evangelical desire to bring Christianity to the far corners of the world, now only amplified by the intellectual and imperial swagger of pre–Great War liberalism.

By 1930, however, the swagger was gone, and Laubach, like American Protestantism itself, was in crisis. His efforts to teach the local people to read had met with some success, but his religious message had fallen flat. This failure—and the ensuing crisis of faith and purpose and identity—turned him first to praying, and ultimately to the insight that changed his life. "You feel superior to them because you are white," he later recalled realizing, and because he was American and Christian and educated too.[12] This sense of superiority had ruined his missionary enterprise, he now felt, and only a complete spiritual reorientation offered a path out of this moral morass. He read furiously in the classics of Christian contemplative literature, but even more radically asked a local religious leader if together they could study the Qur'an. A letter home soon after this breakthrough shared the startling news: "Mohammed is helping me," he told his father. "I have no more intention of giving up Christianity and becoming a Mohammedan than I had twenty years ago, but I find myself richer for the Islamic experience of God. Islam stresses the *will* of God. . . . Submission is the first and last duty of man. This is exactly what I have been needing in my Christian life."[13] The submission to God he found in Islam undermined his racial and imperial pride, and launched Laubach on the path to reconversion.

This initial account of Laubach's "Islamic experience of God" appeared in *Letters by a Modern Mystic*, a collection of his letters home published in 1937. But other descriptions of his new religious sensibilities proved too provocative for publication. In an unpublished passage of a letter he sent later that summer, Laubach revealed the true extent of his indebtedness to Islam:

> This entire philosophy of life which I have adopted in the past few months would have been impossible to acquire without the Moros, and the loneliness of my life here, and the fresh approach to God through the Moslem religion. Do not imagine that I am becoming a Moslem—dear no! But it challenges my religion splendidly, searchingly! Am I as earnest as Mohamad was? Do I know God as well as he did? One cannot ask these questions of Jesus so easily, just because we hold Jesus up so high that almost nobody tries to equal Him. . . . I am determined to try to be as sincere in my quest as Mohamad was, and as the best Mohamadans I find are.[14]

Laubach's awakening, sparked by his encounter with Islam, revolutionized his religious outlook. Gone was the hubris of his early missionary zeal,

replaced by the humbler mystic's search for the presence of God. "They must see God in me, and I must see God in them," Laubach told his father. "Not to change the name of their religion, but to take their hand and say, 'Come, let us look for God.'"[15]

The life of Frank Laubach illustrates in many ways the history of liberal religion in the twentieth century. Most obviously, Laubach's story provides a dramatic instance of mysticism facilitating spiritual cosmopolitanism. Leigh Schmidt has observed that the mystical impulse arising from liberal Christianity in the late nineteenth century allowed adherents to "negotiate the intensification of religious diversity and to see it not as a threat to the solidity of Christian identity but as an opportunity for self-exploration and cross-cultural understanding." In this way, despite modern mystics' inarguable naïveté "about an underlying sameness and ecumenical harmony," Schmidt contends, mysticism for religious liberals nevertheless became a meaningful "means of interreligious engagement—a sympathetic meeting point in an increasingly global encounter of religions."

Laubach's mystical cosmopolitanism reached beyond devotional life, and became, more expansively, the basis for a global ethics of peace and justice for the poor. He began to speak out against racial discrimination in the United States and South Africa, and worked in a variety of antipoverty and antiwar campaigns. Yet Laubach is remembered not for his devotional writings or his politics as such, because this missionary soon found his true calling: he became the world's greatest evangelist of literacy. In 1935 he established the World Literacy Committee, an organization that worked through religious bodies, including the Federal Council of Churches in the United States, to promote literacy. After the war, governments and other secular entities began to express interest in Laubach's increasingly prolific literacy work, and in 1955, to facilitate this cooperation, he launched Laubach Literacy, Inc., a secular nonprofit organization. Laubach's literacy campaign, in this new incarnation, collaborated with UNESCO, USAID, and the Peace Corps, as well as national and local governments around the world. All told, from 1930 until his death in 1970, Laubach personally visited more than a hundred countries, aided in the development of reading primers for 312 languages, and, according to his *New York Times* obituary, directly or indirectly contributed to a hundred million people learning to read.[16]

Laubach's transition from Congregational missionary to coordinator of secular literacy campaigns mirrored similar developments across midcentury Protestantism, as religious liberals increasingly devoted their energies

to social and cultural endeavors. While historian David Hollinger rightly fo-
cuses on civil rights work as a critical site for this liberal religious embrace of
secular activism, religious liberals also embarked on cultural programs with
profound civic consequences.[17] Laubach's literacy campaign, in fact, drew on
a specific and important strand of liberal religious cultural work. During
Laubach's formative years, liberal Protestants in the United States established
a variety of reading programs, such as Religious Book Week, the Religious
Book Club, and the Religious Books Round Table of the American Library
Association, which merged religious and cultural evangelism. The struc-
tures, practices, and content of this middlebrow reading culture, built in the
decades before World War II, made possible the drive toward widespread
spiritual cosmopolitanism that marked the war and postwar periods. The
reading program of the National Conference of Christians and Jews—the
subject of my second example—leveraged the liberal religious orientation of
interwar reading efforts to promote interfaith exchange as an important
component of modern American spirituality. No longer the domain of cul-
tural elites like Frank Laubach, spiritual cosmopolitanism after the war be-
came a part of ordinary religious life for more and more middle-class
Americans.

Hollinger helpfully connects the liberal embrace of social and cultural
work, exemplified by middlebrow reading campaigns, to the rise of evangeli-
calism after World War II. The differences between liberal and evangelical
Protestants, he writes, "hardened during the 1940s and after as a result of the
discomfort felt especially by fundamentalists with how far the 'mainstream
liberals' had pushed their program of cooperation across denominational
lines and of alliances with non-Protestant, non-Christian, and eventually
secular parties."[18] Billy Graham, at age thirty-one, launched his astonishingly
successful career as an evangelist in 1949 with an eight-week crusade in Los
Angeles that marked the resurgence of evangelicalism in American public
life. But we must be careful not to assume, Hollinger asserts, that evangelical-
ism flourished in the postwar period because it won some imaginary, head-
to-head contest for American hearts and minds against liberal or ecumenical
Protestantism. "Our narrative of modern American religious history," he
writes, "will be deficient so long as we suppose that ecumenical Protestant-
ism declined because it had less to offer the United States than did its evan-
gelical rival. Much of what ecumenical Protestantism offered now lies beyond
the churches, and hence we have been slow to see it."[19] We must look outside
church life, into culture, markets, social activism, and politics, in other words,

if we want to see much of the vitality of religious liberalism in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

## Spiritual Cosmopolitanism Goes Mainstream

The philosopher Charles Taylor argues that the secularization of public life in the democratic West has been primarily a response to diversity.[20] When we think of the social and political challenges presented by religious diversity in the United States, we tend to focus on the national founding, or on Catholicism or Mormonism in the nineteenth century, or on the exploding diversity of the post-1965 period. Often overlooked are the critical years around World War II, an era that witnessed an emerging ethos of religious cosmopolitanism in the United States.

The story of Frank Laubach demonstrates, in microcosm, the role of reading and print culture in the emergence of ecumenical and even universalist religious sensibilities in the twentieth century, but it was in the era of World War II that this liberal religious reading culture found its mass public. Liberal Protestants, beginning in the 1920s, organized book clubs, reading programs in public libraries, book marketing campaigns, and other strategies to encourage the wide reading of the right kind of religious books—meaning, of course, their kind of religious books—and in the process helped promote the theologically modern religious liberalism that became the basis for both interfaith civic cooperation and interfaith spiritualities. Drawing on the virtues of reasonableness, compromise, consensus, and civic-mindedness that informed both theological and political liberalism—virtues given new exigency by the crisis of war with European fascism—these reading campaigns promoted spiritual cosmopolitanism—often but not exclusively expressed as "Judeo-Christianity"—as both a civic and an individual virtue.

The major religious reading campaign conducted during the war years was spearheaded by an interfaith organization, the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ). Founded in 1927 as a spin-off from the Federal Council of Churches, it quickly grew into the nation's most significant interfaith enterprise.[21] The NCCJ's reading programs, beginning with its first Religious Book Week in 1943, were massive undertakings. The NCCJ coordinated with the Council on Books in Wartime to distribute thousands of book lists, posters, and bookmarks to schools, colleges, libraries, and bookstores. Press releases were sent to major newspapers across the country. Book week

promoters arranged for special displays in bookstores; museums and archives exhibited rare volumes of religious significance. Members of Congress, governors, and mayors regularly issued official proclamations of support. The chief of chaplains of the War Department also lent his support.[22] The International Ladies' Garment Workers Union supplied free kits of Religious Book Week materials to its chapters and libraries. The National Conference also developed a variety of short radio advertisements that ran on stations across the country.[23] And librarians across the country, mostly public librarians, held readings and panel discussions, erected displays, recommended books to patrons, and even lobbied local religious and civic leaders to support the campaign. Religious Book Week, in other words, was very big and very public.

Rather than taper off with the end of the war, calls for national spiritual unity only heightened with the start of Cold War hostilities, as the nation now faced the menace of atheistic communism, and radio spots reflected this continued sense of urgency. In a one-minute radio ad for Religious Book Week in 1948, the announcer noted, "Our country was founded on the principle that God created all men equal. Our rights are inalienable because God made them so. What a pity if Americans were to become religiously illiterate." Gaining religious knowledge might not be easy, this public service announcement told Americans, "but then nothing worthwhile is—Atomic energy, music, the UN, baseball."[24]

The NCCJ printed its approved book list in pamphlet form, subdivided into eight separate lists: an adult list of forty titles, and a young people's list of ten titles, for Protestants, for Catholics, and for Jews, each chosen by a distinct committee, and two final "Good-Will Lists"—again consisting of forty titles for adults and ten for juveniles—chosen by a committee of representatives from each of the traditions. The National Conference's approach to book selection drew heavily on the conventions of middlebrow culture, especially the simultaneous focus on accessibility and enrichment.

Religious Book Week, however, was not simply a literary exercise in reading for the sake of reading; the NCCJ's Religious Book Week aimed to transform readers spiritually through encounters with books. Central to the book week project was the clear understanding that a thriving pluralistic democracy required not just better informed citizens, but better formed citizens, citizens with spiritual and moral as well as intellectual maturity and sophistication. Such citizens were needed now more than ever in this fight for the survival of democracy against powerful fascist foes. The centerpiece of the

Religious Book Week endeavor, therefore, was the Good-Will List, the list compiled by representatives from the three faith traditions and designed to be read by members of all. The Good-Will Lists featured heavy doses of social scientific investigations of racial and religious intolerance, and histories chronicling the contributions of each group to Western civilization, especially to American democracy. In all, the Good-Will Lists promoted a vision of religious life in the United States deeply rooted in the liberal commitments to tolerance and dispassionate scientific inquiry. The Good-Will reading list of the NCCJ embodied the same utopian aspirations that Jürgen Habermas has ascribed to the bourgeois public sphere—it would serve as a site of a shared, civic-minded, reasoned national exchange about the most pressing matters of the day.

As the accounts of Frank Laubach and the NCCJ suggest, reading and book culture served as a critical conduit for the wide dissemination of liberal religious values and sensibilities. Reading in particular facilitated spiritual cosmopolitanism for midcentury, middle-class Americans, just as it had for Henry David Thoreau struggling with the Vedas a century earlier. By the 1940s, however, massive religious and political resources had been brought to bear to make such reading available to more than just a cultural elite. Ordinary Americans, in schools, public libraries, the military, and their neighborhood bookstore, were increasing encouraged to read across the lines of faith, for both civic and spiritual reasons.

Such a story runs counter to commonplace narratives of American political and religious life that stress the rise of a religious right since the 1960s.[25] Certainly, the growth of evangelical megachurches, the influence of advocacy groups such as Moral Majority, and the electoral influence of evangelical constituencies merit the careful scholarly attention they have received. Yet a focus on ecclesial and political institutions alone obscures the underlying cultural dynamics that cut against the conservative grain. Religious liberals coordinated massive, nationwide cultural programs during much of the twentieth century—especially reading programs, which exerted significant if underacknowledged religious influence. While many liberal churches and denominations are indeed in significant demographic decline from their midcentury heyday, an examination of religious reading and publishing programs not only demonstrates the powerful cultural force of liberalism in the mid-twentieth century, but also suggests new ways of seeing the cultural imprint of liberal religion in our own times.

Despite the significance of the "cultural victory" thesis, most scholarly

work on religious liberalism until very recently has focused on Protestant churches and seminaries. Generations of scholars have exhaustively chronicled the intellectual history of Protestant liberalism—its Enlightenment roots; its romantic flowering in the transcendental movement; its embrace of history, Darwinian biology, and psychology; its postmillennial faith in progress and human nature; its Social Gospel activism—while failing to see that over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries liberalism's seeds found fertile ground not only in churches but all across the American landscape.[26]

Liberal elites were the victims of their own success, as their drive for a universal spiritual language and true pluralism—a drive rooted, at its core, in their own sense of Christian ethics as much as in their desire to stay culturally relevant—made their grasp on power, centralized and hierarchical as it was, increasingly untenable. The cultural victory of liberal Protestantism actually contributed to its institutional decline, partly because religious individualism naturally resists institutionalization. But even more, as religious liberals embraced the notion of redeeming the entire culture, they found increasingly meaningful outlets for their religious energies outside the churches, both in social activism and in cultural programs such as reading promotion. The story of Frank Laubach offers a compelling example of reading promotion as a sublimated form of religious mission; in the Religious Book Week of the NCCJ spiritual cosmopolitanism became a national enterprise.

Even as liberal Protestant institutions and leaders failed to hold their privileged place in the national discourse, the spiritual vocabularies and sensibilities liberals promoted gained ever wider currency and legitimacy. When Deepak Chopra blends the vocabularies of science, psychology, and mysticism into a neo-Emersonian universalism, he speaks the language of our national spiritual vernacular. Majorities of young Americans, according to recent studies, agree that many religions are true, that it is acceptable to pick and choose religious beliefs, and that one can beneficially practice religions other than one's own.[27] These young cosmopolitans not only are transforming American religious life, but have become a critical component of the Democratic Party coalition. Students seeking transcendence may not have been Jefferson's vision for his enlightened university, but they increasingly appear to be the future of his party and republic.

# "A Third Force":
# The Civil Rights Ministry of Congressman
# Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.

*Edward J. Blum*

Six years before captivating the nation at the March on Washington in 1963 with his "I Have a Dream" speech, Martin Luther King, Jr. had been in the capital for the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom. In his somber baritone, King urged the American government to "Give Us the Ballot." With this "sacred right," "we will no longer plead to the federal government for the passage of an anti-lynching law." With the ballot, "we will no longer have to worry the federal government about our basic rights." With the ballot, African Americans could do for themselves, rather than have the federal government do for them.[1]

King's mixture of religion and politics, however, was not what most intrigued one group of attending New Yorkers. Ramona Garrett, Wilhelmina Plummer, and their friends were piqued by the speech of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., the pastor of the nation's largest Protestant church since 1937 and the congressman from Harlem who had been elected by "the ballot" since 1944. "Reverend Powell," as they referred to him, had caused quite a stir when he called for "a new non-partisan political movement of Negro people, that would be led by the clergy." Powell had labeled it a "third force," an obvious nod to French political struggles of the 1930s and the emergence of the Troisième Force political party that stood between the communists and the Gaullists. The New Yorkers of 1957 were "anxious" to know what King thought of the proposal.[2]

"I am not sure what Rev. Adam Powell meant by the phrase 'a third force,'" King replied. "I have not had the opportunity to talk with him on the matter." If Powell intended a "spur" to Republicans and Democrats, then King was in "hearty agreement" with his "good friend Dr. Powell."[3]

Powell never spoke of "a spur." He had invoked "a force." Billed for the event by his political identity as "Rep. Powell," he told the Prayer Pilgrimage crowd that this was a profound moment for the nation and the world. "Black Africa and brown Asia and white Europe" watched with disgust the "bi-partisan double-dealing, double-talking hypocrites" in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. He shouted in a quick pace as he pumped his right fist, "it's time for we Negroes to bring a third force into the American political scene."[4]

This force resided within an identity deeper than party affiliations or racial designations. "Before I was a Democrat," Powell explained, "I was a Negro, and before I was a Negro I was a child of God." From this standpoint, Powell described a third force beyond the Republican and the Democratic Parties that would be "non-partisan but definitely political; a force that will be non-racial but at the same time led by our Negro clergy who have given the greatest spiritual witness of any group of Christians in this century in the United States." This force "will be nondenominational, inviting men of all faiths. It must be a force housed only in the churches, led only by the clergy, powered through prayer, and bringing about direct mass action through the unity of the people." The force would not be aligned with either political party, but would act politically. It would not be segregated, but would be led by black ministers. It would be ecumenical and interreligious, but would meet in churches.[5]

As brilliant as bewildering, the message sparked as many question as answers. Americans seemed unsure how to explain it and Powell. Was it a sermon by "Reverend Powell" or a speech by "Representative Powell"? If he was bringing together religion and politics, which was bearing upon the other? Unlike Garrett and Plummer who referred to Powell as "Reverend," others gave extra emphasis to his political nature and his plans. Pilgrimage organizers routinely referred to him as "Representative" or "Congressman," while one white journalist from Poughkeepsie, New York, complained that Powell's speech was "frankly political" and "a disappointment to all." Less despondent, *Jet* magazine reported that Powell "came up with the surprise of the day. He called for a 'third force' . . . which many reporters and observers took as a hint for the establishment of a third party." "But Powell merely called it 'a force,'" *Jet* concluded, and "left it hanging right there."[6]

Powell never operationalized his "third force." He neither created an organization for it, nor drafted a public document to advance it. But his "third force" and responses to it signaled how the broad integration of religion and politics could also compel fine-tuned separations of them. In the capital and throughout his career, Powell mixed religion and politics (and also church and state) so conspicuously that he forced himself and others to reconsider how they understood both concepts and the relationship between the two. It was not simply that religion and politics went hand in hand. Rather, through his sermons, speeches, published works, and public activities, Powell simultaneously combined and separated the religious and the political.

His efforts and responses to him exposed how religion and politics in the twentieth century were flexible, porous, and contested categories. Notions of what was deemed "religious" and what was rendered "political" shaped one another, forced complicated issues into discrete containers, and provided avenues to rework or redirect social problems. Powell gave expression to and became a focal point of the ways he and many other Americans drafted together and parsed out the concepts of religion and politics in order to make change, influence individuals, society, and politicians, and articulate their perspectives on national, international, and supranational issues.[7]

The broad joining, fine distinguishing, and overall redefining of what was religious, what was political, how they interacted, and how they transformed one another influenced everything from the seemingly smallest and most idiosyncratic of details, including how to refer to Powell, to the biggest of political struggles, including World War II, the Cold War, the civil rights crusades, and black power. Three sites in particular show these points: Powell's private and public writings and sermons, the 1956 National Deliverance Day to support the Montgomery Bus Boycott, and responses to Powell during his legal and congressional troubles of the 1960s.

Finally, these texts, movements, and moments reveal that Powell held fast to another power beyond the constructed, co-constituting, and co-differentiating categories of religion and politics. That force for Powell was a God who transcended the world, invaded it, and worked with and through humans. Powell ended his Prayer Pilgrimage speech not with a call for a new party, but with his voice admonishing the crowd to hear an active and engaged God. "I tell you if Eisenhower doesn't speak, God still speaks. If Nixon won't speak, God still speaks. If Lyndon Johnson won't speak, God still speaks. . . . There is a God, who rules above with a hand of power and a heart of love, and if we're right he'll fight our battle and we'll be free some day."

Throughout Powell's influential and stormy career, and especially when the domains of religion and politics troubled him, it was this God to whom he returned.[8]

## Reverend and Representative

As head pastor of Abyssinian Baptist Church, the largest Protestant church in the United States from 1937 to his death in 1972 and as the congressional representative from New York's Twenty-Second District from 1944 to the late 1960s, Powell had no shortage of outlets to articulate his visions of religion and politics. He preached to more than ten thousand in Harlem on most Sundays. His "Soapbox" articles were published in New York City newspapers and beyond. He sent telegrams (that were taken seriously) to Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. In 1961, he became chair of the House's Education and Labor Committee, one of the most vital committees for civil rights legislation and for implementing the policies of the Great Society and the War on Poverty.[9]

Powell offered his perspectives on religion and politics most prominently in three published works and one recorded album of sermons: *Marching Blacks*, released in 1945 just after he had entered Congress; *Keep the Faith, Baby!*, a collection of sermons published in 1967 and a record album of the same name distributed in the same year; and *Adam by Adam*, his 1971 autobiography. In them, Powell linked the personal to the political, the mystical to the ecumenical, the local to the global, and the false religion of white Christianity to the genuine faith of the civil rights movement.

Powell integrated and separated his ministerial and congressional identities in ways big and small. "I speak today as the minster of this historic church," he began one sermon at Abyssinian, "and as one of the community leaders, and in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the House of Representatives of the United States."[10] At other times, his congressional identity had no explicit relevance to his sermons. Moreover, Powell regularly used two distinct letterheads during the 1960s. One carried the heading "The Abyssinian Baptist Church" and presented him as "Adam Clayton Powell, Minister." Another was for the "Committee on Education and Labor." It listed him as "Adam C. Powell, New York, Chairman."[11]

Powell's identity could be parsed on paper, and rhetorically he could distinguish himself in multiple categories, but these selves and their domains

often overlapped. Powell and his coworkers used congressional letterhead and paid for phone calls with congressional funds to discuss church business, and at other times they selected church letterhead for political discussions.[12] Powell had no qualms about injecting political and diplomatic perspectives into his sermons. In April 1960, for instance, he preached on "What We Must Do About Africa." Responding to brutal violence in South Africa, Powell instructed his church to demand that Douglas Dillon, undersecretary of state, resign. Powell also declared that the United States should cease all loans to South Africa and that the public should boycott South African diamonds.[13]

Powell's merged worlds of religion and politics bound the local, national, and international. In 1954, when the emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie, planned on visiting the United States, Powell hectored President Eisenhower's secretary to the cabinet to include Abyssinian Church in the visit. The State Department obliged. "We should encourage friendly Democrats," Eisenhower's secretary opined. Two years later, during the 1956 presidential election, the Democrat Powell was friendly enough to endorse the Republican Eisenhower. Emperor Selassie embodied a mixture of religion and politics himself. He was the head of Ethiopia and, for the new Rastafarian movement, the returned biblical messiah. His subsequent state-supported visit to Abyssinian stood as one of Powell's most treasured memories for the rest of his life.[14]

The State Department did not encourage Powell, however, the following year when he traveled to Indonesia for the Bandung Conference, where twenty-nine nations from Africa and Asia sent delegates to discuss economic cooperation and anticolonialism. Although Powell had urged Eisenhower to send an American team to observe this historic meeting that represented more than half of the world's population, the government balked, forcing Powell to go without state recognition. He returned to the United States a hero, though, because he had helped deflect communist attempts to use the conference to indict American racism abroad and at home. Years later, Powell remembered the trip in 1971 not simply as a nexus point of the Cold War and anticolonialism. Echoing *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (1965), Powell depicted his journey as a conversion experience. The trip was "a pilgrimage to a new Mecca. I was one of the pilgrims and I went because I had to. Divine compulsion had been lain upon me." There, he witnessed people of "every color, creed, belief, and disbelief" working together. It transformed him from a nationalist to an "internationalist." It "made me over into an entirely new man."[15]

When it came to religion, politics, the nation, and race relations, Powell spoke in terms of broad categories and hoped for global constituencies. According to Powell, the "white Christianity" that supported slavery in the past and colonialism and Jim Crow in the present was not true religion at all. Powell viewed American foreign policy and white Christianity as separately and jointly harmful to both religion and politics. "Next to our foreign policy no institution in our American life is more hypocritical and therefore does more to hurt the cause of God and the cause of democracy than our so-called Christian church," Powell wrote in his autobiography.[16]

Powell tied the foreign to the domestic with two particular examples: when Dr. Gaganvihari Mehta, ambassador from India, was denied lunch at an airport in Houston, Texas, and when Komla Agbeli Gbedemah, the finance minister for Ghana, was refused a glass of orange juice at a restaurant in Delaware. Rather than approach these events in economic terms and cast them as unjust business practices involving managers, workers, and consumers, Powell presented them as Christian concerns. "These acts were performed by those who belong to churches," Powell bemoaned. "These were the deacons, the Sunday School teachers, the good white Christians who went to their good white churches and worshiped their good white God, and yet would not allow the man from India and the man from Africa and the little boys and girls to come inside." Placed within the sphere of Christianity, the actions of these individuals could then be judged by the words of Christ: "When I was hungry You fed me, and Dr. Mehta is not allowed to eat; when I was thirsty You gave me drink, and Howard Johnson's would not serve a glass of orange juice."[17]

White supremacy not only led white Christians to betray Christ, but also revealed that there was no "religion" or "God" in them. "Today's church has come upon evil days," Powell wrote in 1945. "It can no longer bring to bear the weight of integrity against an unethical system."[18] Decades later, Powell called racialized church practices, such as segregation, "anthropomorphism." "There is never any religion in which man makes God in his own image," he continued. "Where there is anthropomorphism there is no God." The social and political actions of white Christians had cosmic consequences for the nation. "Therefore the voice of God is silent."[19]

Powell redefined white Christianity as neither Christian nor religious, and he claimed that the outcome was the muteness of God in the nation's life. In contrast, Powell envisioned a salvific role for African American in the domains of both religion and politics. "The first duty of the blacks . . . is to

Christianize religion," he explained in *Marching Blacks*. To accomplish this, black "religionists" must "refuse to be divided by the age-old antagonisms of the white church—Protestant vs. Catholic, denomination vs. denomination." Powell hoped for a broad ecumenicalism where the "paramount standard" would be neither church nor creed, but an affirmative answer to the question, "Is he going my way?"[20]

In 1945, Powell imagined a new "Protestantism" that seemed to presage his third force concept in several ways. It would draw its inspiration and leadership from nonwhite people and transform the nation's politics and the world's faith. It "will be a Protestantism of protest" that will "cut across all existing lines of communion. It will not think, or move in terms of faith or denomination. It will be a religion of one faith, one people, and one world, and not a provincial ecclesiasticism." This newly defined Protestantism will "recognize goodness in all religions of the earth, and will not strive to place Christianity on a competitive basis but on a cooperative one. This is the religion of the new man the world over, black and white, brown and yellow." The new Protestantism and new men it created were crucial to the salvation of democracy. "The purification of religion," he followed, "must go hand in hand with the purification of political democracy."[21] It would take a new Protestant coalition to put religion into Christianity and democracy into American politics.

Powell wanted to harness what historian Curtis Evans would decades later term the "burden of black religion" to make political change.[22] Titling the seventh chapter of *Marching Blacks* "The Black Man's Burden," Powell insisted that since "whites think that 'blacks have a soul,' let us capitalize on this form of religious mummery." Black Christianity would prove that the faith could still bring justice and bear prophetic witness. "Let us hold up the example of a pure, practicing, seven-day-a-week religion," Powell continued, "instead of pomp, circumstance, and quackery before the religious conscience of America until it is forced to follow our way."[23] Years later, he preached that "the black man has got to be the missionary to white man" and "save the white man's soul." Powell also urged that this perspective be put into U.S. foreign relations. "[A]rmed with the Christian spirit," he preached, "Negro leaders must be in the front ranks of international relations to apply the imperative of Christian spirit."[24]

Powell was neither the first nor the last African American to attempt to delineate between the (un)religion of white supremacy and that of genuine Christianity. Before the Civil War, Frederick Douglass explained that he

loved the "pure, peaceable, and impartial Christianity of Christ: I therefore hate the corrupt, slaveholding, woman-whipping, cradle-plundering, partial and hypocritical Christianity of this land." Many other prominent African Americans made similar juxtapositions in the early twentieth century, and then black liberation theologians of the 1960s like James Cone and J. Deotis Roberts energized these perspectives with new theological tools and at meetings sponsored by Powell himself.[25]

He was also far from the only one in the federal government linking and separating religion and politics. In the middle of the 1950s, President Eisenhower endorsed "In God We Trust" as the new national motto, and Congress legislated the phrase onto the nation's currency. It also inserted the phrase "under God" into the pledge of allegiance. In the early 1960s, however, the Supreme Court ruled against state-sponsored prayer in public schools. "God" was permissible on coinage, as the national motto, and in pledge of allegiance, but could not be addressed in formal prayers in public schools. By the early 1970s, many Americans seemed to wonder not how but if religion and politics should connect. In response, a physician from North Carolina compiled an edited volume, *Politics and Religion Can Mix!*, that featured more than twenty governors and senators, including Jimmy Carter, Strom Thurmond, and George Wallace, who agreed with the title.[26]

Powell's conjoining, separating, and redefining of religion and politics led to several innovative approaches. In March 1957 after the escalation of violence following *Brown v. Board of Education* and the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Powell seized on the attention to God in political discussions, the World War II background, and the Cold War context when he wrote to President Eisenhower hoping he would "speak a word calling for all Americans to stand together and to continue to develop harmonious relations North and South, black and white, Jew and gentile, Protestant and Catholic." Powell cast the violence of the age in international and religious terms. "Not behind the iron curtain, but within the United States, men of God are being arrested, houses of worship are being bombed, and American citizens are continually meeting with physical violence," Powell explained. Not just one but two of Franklin Roosevelt's Four Freedoms seemed violated: freedom from fear and freedom of worship.[27]

Characterizing these issues as ones of religious freedom, and not simply as problems of racial injustice, and placing them within an international context was an ingenious strategy. For decades, African Americans and their supporters had pursued federal laws against racial violence. Time and again,

however, antilynching bills failed to receive either congressional approval or presidential backing. In the Cold War atmosphere, however, Powell joined well-established American concerns for the protection of religious leaders and missionaries with the current pitting of American democratic godliness against communist autocratic atheism. By defining the problem as one of religion, Powell endeavored to compel government action through the state.[28]

For all of his explicit and implicit linking of religion and politics, Powell nonetheless expressed strong opinions about their separate domains and distinct powers. Powell was well aware of the "God is dead" movement among young theologians in the 1960s, and he recognized that scholars of his age were debating the question "What is religion?" He voiced his response to both the claim and the question in sermons like "Do You Really Believe in God?" Scholars, he preached, wondered if religion is "a species of poetry? . . . Is it a variety or shared experience? Is it ethical culture? Is it insight into a man's nature?"[29]

For Powell, they were asking the wrong questions. The issue was not what religion is, but whether God is. "People are dead," Powell preached, not God.[30] He told his congregants to let "the scholars in our schools of higher religious instruction argue about the religion of God." For the people, a broad ecumenicalism should replace traditional boundaries. "The question should no longer be: Shall I be religious? Shall I be a Jew? Shall I be a Catholic? Shall I be a Protestant?" But instead, "The question to be asked first is: Do I believe in God?" For Powell and his people, there was but one answer: "I believe."[31]

Powell was clear on numerous occasions that his intent was not to have politics influence his religion, but vice versa. He preached that ultimate power and authority rested not with the government or its laws, but with God. "There are men today who argue that politics should be kept out of the church," he told his congregation. "We are not putting politics in the church, we are putting religion into politics."[32] Even as Powell became the most powerful African American in the government in the early 1960s, he held fast to the primacy of God's authority. In a four-page, handwritten memo from May 17, 1963, he listed eighteen points for his agenda. The thirteenth was clear: "Defy law of man when in conflict with law of God."[33]

Power, authority, and change came from God, and Powell's deep and abiding sense of God was as a presence who transcended the world and acted upon it through humans. Powell invoked an ecumenical and personal approach to God. He encouraged his listeners to "keep faith in God . . . whatever God you believe in . . . whoever your God is." One truly encountered

God not through them, but as an individual and through personal experience. "I am a mystic," he penned in his autobiography. "I have touched the intangible . . . heard the inaudible . . . and seen the invisible." God manifested God's self through humans. "God has no other hands than our hands," he preached on his recorded album. "God has no other feet than our feet . . . no other tongue than our tongue."[34]

During the middle of the twentieth century and through sermons, speeches, manifestos and memos, Powell cast a vision for the complicated "third force" he had articulated at the Prayer Pilgrimage. It was a new religion that had potent political power. It could overrun white supremacy, bring genuine democracy to the United States, and protect the world from the evils of American white supremacy and communist autocracy. While religion and politics mixed and merged in his efforts, he also endeavored to separate and redefine them. Above and beyond human creations and contraptions, however, there was God, and it was God who was the ultimate power who could shape the world.

## National Deliverance Day

In Harlem, Powell and his congregation at Abyssinian experienced the new Protestantism he hoped would rise after World War II and the third force he described at the Prayer Pilgrimage. The church was led by African Americans. It sought to influence politics. It was, in his description, "a social gospel institution" that offered housing, classes, job training, and rooms for people of just about any persuasion.[35] In the 1960s, moreover, it became an important meeting ground for black Protestants and black Muslims. "When other congregations wouldn't permit Malcolm [X] to hold church services in their churches, Adam would let him use Abyssinian," one of Powell's associates recalled. "The people who attended were mostly from Abyssinian, and he would just talk to them and tell them what he believed in."[36]

But Powell was never content with his ideas or himself remaining in Harlem. In 1956, one year before the Prayer Pilgrimage, he engineered a nationwide day of observance to draw public attention to the Montgomery Bus Boycott and to raise defense funds for those who had recently been arrested in Alabama. His proposed National Deliverance Day was set for March 28, and he asked Americans to set aside an hour during their work day, find a place to congregate, and pray for justice. With it Powell highlighted his

approach to ecumenicalism, civil rights, and personal spirituality. It served as a moment for him and others to enact new religious-political alliances. The day and commentary on it called for Americans to perform and reflect upon the new ecumenicalism that had been rising during the century and to criticize those religious leaders and groups who refused to support civil rights struggles.

As in the rest of his work, Powell wanted to harness individual and intimate belief for political power. Before the event, his organization distributed small posters "of prayer and protest." They instructed individuals, especially those who did not have a group to join for the occasion, to "seek some quiet place for prayer during the day." A church, auditorium, or even home would suffice. When there, "Remain silent and quiet. Sit, pray, meditate, read. / Let no one provoke you to defend your witness."[37] The personal prayers were intended to provoke others, though. Powell hoped that the overall collective expression would compel President Eisenhower to feel the force and speak in favor of the bus boycotters.[38]

Along with the personal and political, Powell hoped the event would be an exercise in coalition building. "[T]he meetings," he told reporters, "are to be interracial, interfaith and interdenominational."[39] "Members of all races and faiths in the nation will be urged to join with Negroes in a 'national day of prayer,'" explained an article from the Associated Press after Powell had made the plans public. Powell told the press that "ministers in the South, North, East, and West" had pledged to back the event and that "he had already received the support of rabbinical leaders."[40]

While Powell pushed for the event to be an "interfaith" affair, media coverage tended to fixate on Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The Associated Press's story from March 28 featured quotations from a Protestant minister, a Catholic priest, and a Jewish rabbi. Each one discussed racial problems as national, rather than sectional. "Right here in Boston," preached Episcopal bishop Norman B. Nash, "in matters of housing, education, employment and church membership, . . . there is a responsibility for each of us to acknowledge." Roman Catholic Archbishop Henry J. O'Brien explained to a prayer meeting, "It must be remembered that the causes of racial tension and conflicts are to be found within all men, and no one group of people or section is solely guilty or guiltless." Rabbi Joseph S. Shubow exclaimed that "the shame of segregation in the South . . . is proof that the struggle for freedom is never completely won."[41]

The emphasis on the Protestant-Catholic-Jew triad, or what historian

Kevin M. Schultz has called "tri-faith America," was not new. Locating African Americans and their drives for civil rights as central to it, however, was. As Schultz has demonstrated, in the first half of the twentieth century, a variety of organizations and individuals endeavored to unite these three traditions. Yet by and large, the Protestant-Catholic-Jew alliance (or at least mutual acceptance) was premised upon whiteness (or at least non-blackness). It maintained momentum by keeping itself disentangled from discussions of rights for African Americans. For Powell, the Deliverance Day was an opportunity both to include African Americans and to put tri-faith America to work for the black freedom struggle.[42]

As an interfaith and tri-faith event, the Deliverance Day seemed to unite some more than others. Improving black-Jewish relations had long been crucial to Powell. Since he came of age during the Great Depression and World War II, his religious politics were animated by vehement opposition to anti-Semitism. "Anti-Semitism is a deadly virus in the American bloodstream," he wrote in 1945. "It is almost as deadly as anti-blackism. In some sections it is deadlier." He expressed frustration that earlier attempts to unite black Protestants and American Jews had borne little fruit. "Brotherhood Months, Race Relations Days, Inter-Faith Services, and all the folderol of the Christian church did not scratch the surface" in creating real accord between them.[43]

The Deliverance Day seemed to resonate with many Jewish Americans. A case in point came from Cincinnati. More than 150 rabbinical students and faculty of the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion signed a petition declaring "our solidarity with our Negro fellow citizens, who will be observing March 28th as a national 'Deliverance Day of Prayer.'" They believed the arrests in Montgomery to be "an illegal attempt to subvert an effective and praiseworthy endeavor by the Negroes of Montgomery to assert their rights as American citizens." The rabbinical students and faculty noted that the prayer day was set during Passover, "the season of our freedom," and felt "especially close to our Negro fellow citizens, who still struggle against the vestiges of slavery." Mixing sacred history with claims to American citizenship, these Jewish Americans saw in the bus boycott and the prayer day opportunities for new solidarities.[44]

Powell also encouraged Catholic participation, but had far less to say about it or against anti-Catholicism. During the planning stages, for instance, Powell told reporters that "he did not expect the Catholic Church to take active part in the campaign." He never explained why, but in his sermons and other writings, Powell was far more likely to denounce anti-Semitism than he

was to hammer anti-Catholicism. Four years later, in fact, after John F. Kennedy was elected president and many Americans were heralding it as a victory over religious prejudice, Powell warned all Catholics "if there is any anti-Protestant or anti-Negro prejudice on the part of our fellow Roman Catholics, it should be dropped now."[45]

Interfaith and tri-faith expressions for the Deliverance Day, however, did not work solely to advance new alliances. They also could be used to accentuate differences. An editorial in Baltimore's *Afro-American*, "Come Back Home, Billy!," exemplified this by pillorying white evangelical Christians who failed to stand against Jim Crow. Referring to the current moment as the "darkest hour for Christianity in American in the 20th Century," this author declared, "The Christian Church is morally bound to make a frontal attack upon the ramparts of racial segregation and mob violence in the light of Christian principles."[46]

As the editorial's title indicated, the focus was superstar evangelist Billy Graham. "Among the foremost Christian leaders who should be in the forefront of the 'National Deliverance Day of Prayer' is the globe-trotting North Carolina–born evangelist, Billy Graham," claimed the author. Yet Graham was nowhere to be found. He had been "last heard from in Korea." The author asked the National Council of Churches, which had voiced its support for the event, to request that Graham return "by the fastest means possible." Only by first addressing domestic issues could Graham then reach the world. The article made civil rights an issue of comparative religions. Why would individuals in Asia and the Pacific—the "brown and yellow races"—renounce "the brotherhood teachings of Mohammed, Buddha, Confucius and Shinto" in favor of the "Christianity your white brethren in Dixie are practicing"? How could Graham explain political failure in the realm of civil rights when President Eisenhower had become "a Presbyterian after he entered the White House" and Congress, "which is predominately Protestant," could not stop "mob violence and persecution against colored Christians in the South"?[47]

While there was nothing unique in criticizing white Christians and calling them back from the mission field, a fascinating wrinkle in this piece was the hope that Graham could be influenced by the National Council of Churches (NCC). More than ten years earlier, Graham's evangelical allies had created their own organization, the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), in direct opposition to the NCC's predecessor the Federal Council of Churches. Graham and others in the NAE expressed great displeasure with

the political and social agendas of the FCC and NCC. By 1957, Graham had acknowledged that the "racial problem" in America was one of its "greatest black eyes," but he was still far more comfortable working with white moderates than he was with civil rights activists.[48]

Although Graham did not lend his fame to the event and although Powell would not reach the height of his governmental power until the 1960s, the National Deliverance Day was one of his proudest moments. Powell promoted the day and the press covered it in ways that made it look like the "third force" was possible. An ecumenical and interracial coalition had united, at least for an hour. It was under the leadership of African Americans, and it endeavored to use prayer to make political change. One year later, when Powell stood beneath the Lincoln Memorial for the Prayer Pilgrimage, perhaps he remembered the National Deliverance Day as an expression of what the "third force" could look like and achieve.

## Powell as a Religious and Political Problem for the Preacher King

In the sixteen years from the National Deliverance Day to his death, Powell was dogged by scandal. He was investigated and tried for tax fraud and libel. He was scorned for congressional absenteeism and accused of misusing federal funds, including keeping his wife on his congressional payroll long after she had stopped working for him and for gallivanting around Europe and the Caribbean with congressional funds and with women by his side. His adamant support for "black power," a phrase he used in 1966 at the same time Stokely Carmichael was making it known, generated grave concern for many Americans. Powell became front-page news in 1967. He was once again re-elected in 1966, but his congressional colleagues voted to exclude him. Powell's case went to the Supreme Court, where he won the battle but lost the war. He was allowed back into the House, but without the precious privileges of his seniority. It was not only the IRS, the FBI, and Congress who were watching Powell closely. Reporters and cameramen brought Powell's world of booze, beauties, and black power to readers and viewers throughout the land.[49]

All of this took an increasing toll on Powell and posed serious problems for civil rights leaders. Powell was their congressman. He had state power

unparalleled among African Americans. Moreover, just as Powell had brought religion and politics together so intimately, he became a symbol whereby other Americans could articulate their perspectives on the intersections of and differences between religion and politics, or at least ministers and the government. Perhaps no one heard more about this than the man who replaced Powell for many as the symbol of civil rights, the man whom evangelical Jerry Falwell used in 1965 to articulate his own conception of the divide between religion and politics in his sermon "Ministers and Marches": Martin Luther King, Jr.[50]

King received dozens of letters about Powell. At first a trickle in the late 1950s and early 1960s, they came by the droves after 1966 as Powell fought the House of Representatives to retain his position and as he openly called for "black power." Some handwritten, some typed, the letters were mailed from all over the country. Paul Anderson from San Francisco put it most simply in his one-sentence letter: "I would like to know what association, if any, you have had with Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of New York."[51] In response, King and his associates worked hard to determine how to support Powell without alienating his many detractors. They held fast to Powell publicly even after Powell threatened to leak a story that King was having a sexual relationship with Bayard Rustin.[52]

King backed Powell by accentuating his role as a politician and minimizing his identity as a pastor. This was in line with Powell's own defense in 1967 that he was simply behaving as other congressmen did.[53] "Congressman Powell is a complex man," King explained in five-page typed letter to Rabbi Julius Rosenthal of Scarsdale, New York, who had expressed concern that Powell and King had formed an "association." "He is not the simple incarnation of evil so much of the press has painted." "Regrettably," whites and blacks viewed Powell quite differently. The vast majority of African Americans respected Powell for the thirty years he had fought their battles. "[W]hen their deprivations were ignored by the press, government and white majority, he was a lonely but powerful spokesman for them."

King stressed the political every way he could. "Congressman Powell," King penned, "fights in the fashion of the professional politician and many of his white colleagues conduct themselves in precisely the same fashion, yet they are not scorned and reviled as is he." Later in the letter, King once again asserted that we must "appreciate that although he may dramatically use the politicians' weapons—he is not singular." Powell was a politician acting with political tools in a political structure.

All told in the letter, King referred to Powell as "Congressman" eight times and not once as a minister. Even more, King made it seem strange that Powell was at his own church. Rosenthal had expressed his worries after seeing that King had preached the sermon for Abyssinian's 157th anniversary. Explaining why they were both present, King wrote, "It so happens that he was present that Sunday and the press naturally overplayed our appearance together." Powell was there most Sundays. He was the church's pastor.[54]

Many white Americans refused King's parsing and instead judged Powell in terms of their own considerations of the categories and links between religion and politics. Since Powell was both a congressman and a pastor, and since he had injected religious concerns so forthrightly into political, social, and economic matters, many Americans took Powell to task for his seeming violations and King for failing to chastise him. In their attacks and corrections, they did as Powell had: they simultaneously wove together religion and politics as they tried to define them separately.

Time and again in 1967 and 1968, writers to King denounced Powell for failing to live up to Judeo-Christian texts and standards. Rabbi I. Usher Kirshblum from Queens, New York, sent King an article he had published in his local community newsletter titled "If I Were a Negro." Kirshblum maintained that Harlemites should vote against Powell and reject his religious leadership. "I could never pray in a church where he is a Minister," the rabbi maintained, "nor listen to his very eloquent and dramatic sermons for I could never respect a man of the Cloth who treats the Ten Commandments so lightly." To Kirshblum, Powell's congressional indiscretions invalidated his spiritual leadership. "I could never regard him as my spiritual guide."[55]

A number of Americans wondered how he could even bear the label of minister. One wrote to King, "when a guy does such things as he did with the Tax payers money I do not see how he can even be called a Minister of the Gospel." Another writer excoriated King for "telling us that Powell was no worse than anyone else in Congress." She mentioned that Powell "was shown at Bimini 'with an exotic dancer on one arm, a drink in the other hand and humming hym[n]s.' . . . Now if you think such a man qualified to be a minister of a great congregation your ignorance of progress is abysmal."[56]

Not all writers, however, were convinced that his array of wrongdoing merited political or legal sanction. One from Gainesville, Florida, stated that she was "disappointed" in King's support for Powell "who has shown himself to be a bad citizen and utterly blasphemous in the ways he proclaims himself a 'poor parish priest.'" That said, this writer added a handwritten script on

the side, noting that she felt it "improper" that Powell was stripped of his seat in Congress and his standing on committees.[57]

For some, King's unyielding support for Powell led to questions about his own Christian leadership. "You are supposed to be a decent and religious man," read another handwritten letter. "Can't you try to *act* like one? Or do you and other blacks actually admire and represent that kind of conduct." Another writer, who less than one week before King was assassinated warned "don't be surprised . . . that you get a 45 cal. slug right in the middle," asked, "Dr. King—as a so called minister of the gospel—surely you can't approve of Adam Clayton Powell—now can you?"[58]

Several letter writers used the same kind of logic Powell had in order to denounce him. Actions he deemed political, such as the use of congressional funds, they rendered Christian. Behaviors he regarded as private, such as marital infidelity, they rendered religious. Reverend Richard U. Smith of Bethesda, Maryland, sent copies of his anti-Powell letter to a who's who of the civil rights movement: King, John Conyers, A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young Jr., James Forman, and Stokely Carmichael. Smith believed it was clear that Powell's behavior "disqualifies him from serving in Congress." The Constitution, however, was not the basis for Smith's opinion, for it "sets legal requirements only." It failed to "state moral requirements." But the Constitution "is not the last word; there is a higher moral law which must be obeyed if America is to serve its high destiny." According to this "higher moral law," Powell was a fraud. His "posing as a preacher while living contrary to this profession" was despicable. If Congress had had the chance to vote on moral issues, and not purely legal processes, perhaps "the vote in Congress . . . would have been near unanimous."[59]

The letters came by the dozens. "Puzzled" and "disturbed" by King's unwillingness to denounce Powell, writers explained why they would no longer support the Southern Christian Leadership Conference financially and how standing by Powell was fueling the "white backlash." What they shared with Powell was that they too were linking religion and politics while also distinguishing between them. Powell, King, and their associates attempted to circumscribe the terrain of debate by emphasizing the political nature of the Powell problem. But just as Powell never let politicians or the political system hide from religious perspectives, many Americans would not let him or his allies do so either. The third force of broadly mixing religion and politics while finely defining and separating them, it appeared, could be as much a trap as it was a key.

In the years after his death, Powell became most known among scholars for his civil rights work in Congress, his womanizing and financial misappropriations, and his behind-the-scenes homophobic arm-twisting of King. Charles Hamilton authored the most complete Powell biography and subtitled it *The Political Biography of an American Dilemma*. In his acknowledgments, Hamilton described Powell as "the congressman" and paid such little attention to Powell's religious life that the book's table of contents contained a typographical error when it spelled "Baptist" as "Bapist."[60]

But in life neither Powell nor King abandoned one another, the value of their ministry, or the God in which they kept the faith. Amid his mounting difficulties in the early 1960s, Powell sat down to explain his strategy to himself. In a handwritten memo, he listed eighteen key points. "So called Negro org. must be *black* led," was the first one. Whites must "*follow* black leadership." Nonviolence was crucial, but "more important" it must be "grounded in Christian principles." Finally, "Black clergy must take the lead in getting black people off their knees. In Chicago, where is your Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Shuttlesworth, Leon Sullivan, and, yes, your Adam Clayton Powell." He was still committed to the ideas of the third force and to thinking of himself within the canopy of the "black clergy."[61]

Five years later and three months before he was assassinated in Memphis, King wrote to Powell at a moment of deep frustration for both men. King offered to fly wherever Powell needed to meet. He encouraged Powell to look beyond the present troubles and find light in the dark times. King summoned poetic words from his Prayer Pilgrimage speech, "Give Us the Ballot," that day in 1957 when Powell had called for a "third force." King's first was from poet William Cullen Bryant: "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." The second was from James Russell Lowell: "behind the dim Unknown, Standeth God within the shadow, Keeping watch above His own." The third did not come from the Pilgrimage speech. King quoted from Psalm 30. "Weeping may tarry for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." King counseled Powell to hold fast to faith. "With this faith we will be able to adjourn the councils of despair and bring new light into the dark chambers of pessimism."[62]

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. was one of the most powerful Christian leaders and congressmen in the United States of the twentieth century. For three decades, he preached to tens of thousands each Sunday, pressed his fellow representatives to legislate for the rights and dignities of oppressed minorities, and cast a vision for integrating religion and politics as he tried to separate and distinguish them as well. His "third force" may have confused King and

others, but both men agreed that another force, one beyond the human-made and malleable categories of religion and politics, had the power to guide them and to save religion and politics within the nation and the world. That force was God, a power that Powell insisted was by his side because he always made sure to "keep the faith, baby."

# The Theological Origins of the Christian Right

*Molly Worthen*

Scholars and journalists sling the term "the Christian Right" with such confidence that even a conscientious reader may be forgiven for concluding that there must be a consensus on what, precisely, the phrase means. But the matter of definition is not so simple. The Christian Right is, depending on whom you ask, a "new Christian political coalition" of church leaders, politicians, media gurus, and lay organizers; a network of political action groups that "advocate 'taking dominion' over political parties"; or a "despotic movement" that "understands the ills of American society even as it exploits these ills to plunge us into tyranny."[1] Observers have told the story of this highly charged but slippery subject in many different ways: as a narrative of transcontinental political organization; as a backlash against the cultural upheavals of the 1960s; as a conspiracy of backroom deals; as a series of plucky grassroots efforts to transform local communities; or, even, as not a movement at all, but an incoherent and shifting slice of American public opinion.[2]

There is, however, a striking omission among these various methods. Rarely—if ever—have observers described the rise of the Christian Right as a theological story. Their books do not dwell for very long on particular points of dogma, worship practices, or the arcane corners of American Protestantism's intellectual genealogy. Indeed, scholars often treat doctrine as a hurdle that the Christian Right had to overcome, a source of awkward disagreement for leaders who hoped to craft an alliance between such theologically diverse groups as fundamentalists, evangelicals, Pentecostals, Catholics, Mormons, and a handful of conservative Jews. Ralph Reed, first director of the Christian

Coalition, preferred to gloss over these differences by calling his constituents simply "people of faith."[3]

There is no denying that representatives of the Christian Right quote the Bible frequently. But over the course of the movement's history, many observers have dismissed these proof texts as a sanctimonious varnish on anticommunism, racism, and patriarchy. With the striking exception of evangelicals' premillennialist views of the end times—to which some of the most materialist scholars give perhaps too much credit for shaping American foreign policy—most commentators see a thin theology, little more than sacred bunting draped over a political platform.

Religious ideas and language do, on occasion, function as masks and metaphors for worldly things. Yet historians have overlooked the explanatory power of "old-fashioned," classical theology: systematic doctrine, claims about God and man, and intellectual traditions stretching back centuries. A closer look at crucial moments in the history of the Christian Right reveals three dimensions of this story that we cannot explain without the help of this kind of theology.

The first is the most obvious, and that is the clash between the Bible and modern science, particularly in the public school classroom. Second, the language that activists used to rally conservative Protestants to the antiabortion cause—with remarkable success—is a theological language that long predates *Roe v. Wade*. Finally, there is the story behind the movement's organizational icon, the Moral Majority. The Moral Majority's chief symbolic triumph, its testament to evangelicals' alliance with Roman Catholics, was more than a marriage of political convenience. It grew from earlier transformations in the intellectual life and worship practices of both communities. The Christian Right's influence stems not only from Capitol Hill lobbying or savvy organizing among the grassroots, but from a potent public theology decades in the making.

## In the Beginning Was the Word

In the late 1950s, when John Whitcomb set out to write a book that would persuade Christians once and for all that God created the earth and its creatures in six 24-hour days, he was taking up arms in an old battle. For nearly a century conservative Christians had labored to defend a literal reading of the Genesis story against Darwinian incursions. By the 1920s, full-fledged warfare

had broken out between modernist Christians who embraced evolution and fundamentalist Protestants who lobbied school boards, state legislatures, and textbook publishers to keep any lessons about "monkey ancestry" out of public schools.[4] Yet in the wake of the Scopes Trial—a judicial victory for fundamentalists, but a cultural defeat at the hands of jeering journalists—the doctrine of a literal, six-day creation, or "young-earth creationism," seemed to fade from public view, while more moderate theories of biblical interpretation gained popularity among evangelicals. Whitcomb turned the tide in 1961, when he and coauthor Henry M. Morris published *The Genesis Flood*.

Although the "Christian Right" would not become a popular catchphrase for another two decades, the movement's early activists gained political savvy and laid important organizational groundwork through local battles over public school curricula and textbooks during the 1960s.[5] *The Genesis Flood* was an early and widely read summons to defend the Bible from Darwinian science lessons. Morris, a hydraulic engineer, lent the endeavor scientific gravitas, but the book was Whitcomb's brainchild. A graduate of Princeton and Grace Theological Seminary in Indiana, Whitcomb stayed on at the seminary to teach Old Testament and theology courses. Preaching young-earth creationism became his life's work. *The Genesis Flood* began with the declaration that "the Bible is the infallible word of God" and argued that faith in an inerrant Bible allowed no room for compromise with evolutionary theory.[6] Evangelicals and fundamentalists thrilled at the book's aura of scientific respectability—Morris nimbly deployed geological jargon in his section of the book, asserting gaps and contradictions in mainstream historical geology to argue that "it is not the facts of geology, but only certain interpretations of those facts, that are at variance with Scripture."[7] Readers rallied to the authors' call to reject modern scientists' "conformist thinking" and judge for themselves the "theological and scientific basis for a literal acceptance of the Biblical account."[8] *The Genesis Flood* would go through forty-eight printings and sell three hundred thousand copies.[9]

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the once-marginal dogma of young-earth creationism won over legions of conservative Protestants. The materialistic doctrine of evolution, they believed, was partly to blame for the deterioration of the God-given social order: "a century of evolutionary philosophy, with its seeds of naturalism and atheism, has yielded the bitter fruits of violence, nonmoralism, and despair," Henry Morris wrote nearly a quarter century after his book's publication.[10] Creationists launched a constellation of local and state efforts to control the content of public school education.[11]

Their conviction hinged on the idea of biblical inerrancy. This doctrine became the conservative evangelical shibboleth in the culture wars: its power extended beyond the evolution debates to the Christian Right's defense of traditional gender roles, sexuality, and even some criticisms of social welfare programs (Jesus said, after all, that "the poor you shall always have with you"). This seems, at first, to be a simple point. Is sophisticated theology really necessary to understand conservatives' claim that God created the earth in six days, or that Paul's decrees about the submission of women apply for all time? The doctrine of inerrancy, however, is not as straightforward as it appears. The basic idea is very old. But inerrancy as John Whitcomb and many other activists of the Christian Right have understood it has a more recent origin. It is not a history that all evangelical Protestants share.

In the seventeenth century, some conservative Protestant theologians—primarily those in the Reformed tradition who followed the teachings of John Calvin, Huldrych Zwingli, and their colleagues—found themselves hemmed in by intellectual challenges on both sides. Theologians of the Catholic Counter-Reformation critiqued Protestantism using the logic of scholastic theology, while at the same time philosophers and scientists of the Enlightenment debunked Christ's miracles. Embattled Protestants, caught in the middle, responded by trying to out-rationalize both the scientists and the schoolmen. They developed a highly logical method of argument based on the techniques of both the medieval scholastics and the Enlightenment philosophes.

These ancestors of modern evangelicals took as their starting point the principle that God is perfect and unchanging. It followed, logically, that his revelation must be fixed and flawless too—not just in matters pertaining to salvation, but in every scientific and historical fact, from the scope of the flood to the minute details of ancient Israel's politics. This doctrine of inerrancy matured into its most elaborate form in the mid-nineteenth century at Princeton Theological Seminary. Theologians there fought back against Darwin's impertinent theories and German romantics' claims that God was mankind's own self-projection: they argued that the Bible was a perfect and wholly sufficient text for modern humanity. Charles Hodge, the seminary's principal from 1851 until 1878, called the Bible a God-given "storehouse of facts." Guided by "those laws of belief which God has impressed upon our nature," the theologian must "arrange and harmonize" these facts just as a scientist infers the laws of nature by collecting data from the material world. Hodge admitted that Scripture seemed to contain minor discrepancies, but

these were only superficial, each like a "speck of sandstone" that in no way blemished the marble of the Parthenon.[12]

Hodge and his colleagues did not speak for all conservative Protestants. Historically, evangelicals have had many different ways of understanding the Bible's authority. The Wesleyan tradition instructed believers to understand Christ himself, rather than Scripture, as God's highest revelation, and to read the Bible with the aid of human reason, church tradition, and personal religious experience. Most Anabaptists lacked a systematic doctrine of biblical inspiration, but they emphasized the task of the Christian community to collectively discern God's meaning. However, as some Protestant church leaders and educators began to embrace modernist theology and alter their reading of the Bible to accommodate scientific discovery, conservatives found themselves on the defensive. Princeton's unequivocal defense of an errorless Bible began to appeal to a wide array of conservative Protestants (in the first pages of *The Genesis Flood*, Whitcomb and Morris explained what "verbal inerrancy" meant to them with a lengthy quotation from one of Princeton's titans, Benjamin B. Warfield).[13] The scholars at Princeton had been subtle in how they interpreted this doctrine in response to challenges like the theory of evolution. Nuance, however, was a casualty of the fundamentalist-modernist battles. Although defenders of inerrancy continued to acknowledge "apparent discrepancies" and make no apologies for typos in copies of the "original autographs" of Scripture, by the second half of the twentieth century many evangelicals had embraced a simplistic and polemical version of inerrancy. Inerrancy was not just a bullet point on a list of doctrines, but a bulwark to protect the Bible's authority in all of modern life.

## The Christian Worldview

Inerrancy, however, was a word better suited to the pulpit or the seminary classroom than to school board meetings or the corridors of Capitol Hill. Biblical inerrancy alone would not make for an effective public theology that could win a hearing in secular debates. By the time the first wave of conservative evangelical political organization peaked in the 1990s, activists, educators, and ordinary laypeople used shorthand that implied something more. They spoke of standing up not only for the Bible's authority, but for the "Christian worldview."

Watergate felon turned born-again activist Charles Colson proclaimed

his goal to "equip believers to present Christianity as a total worldview and life system, and to seize the opportunity of the new millennium to be nothing less than God's agents in building a new Christian culture."[14] A group called the Christian Worldview Library sold curriculum supplies to evangelical homeschoolers and sponsored lectures and conferences around the Midwest, calling on Christians to protest sex and drug education and the distribution of condoms in schools.[15] In Dallas, a "Christian research organization" named Probe Ministries ran "Mind Games" conferences meant to prepare Christian college students for the culture wars on secular campuses by training them to defend the "Christian worldview" that "begins and ends with Jesus' death on the cross and resurrection."[16] This was not a catchphrase limited to activists or the evangelical elite: "There are too many people in our society today who have no memory of our country when the Christian worldview, which historically provided the moral undergirding of this nation, did influence the laws and legislators, and our homes and neighborhoods too," read a typical letter to the editor (this one to the *Columbus Dispatch*) in 1989. "That was before the forces of humanism and nihilism controlled the courts and education."[17]

It is tempting to dismiss "the Christian worldview" as a shallow slogan for a familiar political platform. Most scholars have done so. The phrase was a handy mantra, but it also encapsulated a powerful set of ideas with an intellectual genealogy that has come to shape the way many evangelicals express their opinions about public life—and how they put those opinions into action.

The story of the Christian worldview begins where the tale of inerrancy left off. Princeton Theological Seminary did not remain the think tank of inerrancy forever: moderates gained control of the school in the 1920s. Conservatives left and founded a rival institution, Westminster Theological Seminary, which upheld the banner of inerrancy. Cornelius Van Til, a Dutch émigré and professor of theology who fled from Princeton to Westminster, honed his homeland's strain of Calvinist theology—drawing, in particular, on the ideas of the theologian and politician Abraham Kuyper—into a method of defending the Bible called presuppositionalism. This is a long word for a simple idea. This theory called for believers to pay close attention to presuppositions: the assumptions that shape a person's worldview. Van Til taught that no assumptions are neutral, and the human mind can comprehend reality accurately only if its founding assumption is the inerrant truth of the Bible.[18] This is, in its essence, an embellished version of Augustine's old

adage, *credo ut intelligam*: I believe in order to understand. Van Til rejected the Enlightenment distinction between values and objective, neutral facts. Instead, he argued that all people have a world-and-life view, a *Weltanschauung*, that constrains their field of vision and shapes their interpretation of reality. Creationist crusader John Whitcomb agreed: "Our conclusions must unavoidably be colored by our Biblical presuppositions, and this we plainly acknowledge," he wrote in the introduction to *The Genesis Flood.* "But uniformitarian scholarship [that assumes the universal application of natural law and denies the miraculous] is no less bound by *its* own presuppositions and these are quite as dogmatic as those of our own!"[19]

Van Til and other presuppositionalist theologians—particularly the Wheaton College philosopher Gordon Clark—attracted precocious students in the 1930s: young conservatives who had come of age in the aftermath of the fundamentalist-modernist crisis and were looking for a new way to defend orthodoxy against the challenges of modern thought. These self-described "neo-evangelicals" hoped to give old-time religion a makeover, to preach a thinking man's fundamentalism. They placed inerrancy at the center of the Christian world-and-life view. They argued that Christian assumptions had implications for every sphere of life, from education and politics to economics.

These two claims—the Bible is scientifically and historically inerrant, and Christianity is not just a faith, but a particular kind of worldview—emerged from a fairly small corner of the Protestant world. And yet within two generations, these ideas had saturated a wide spectrum of evangelical communities ranging from Nazarenes to Pentecostals.[20] They came to permeate the polemics of the Christian Right. How did this happen?

The neo-evangelical intellectuals never became national celebrities (Billy Graham was their world-famous, but far less philosophical, standard bearer). However, they laid the cornerstones for the promotion of this new public theology by founding new institutions, such as the National Association of Evangelicals (1943), Fuller Theological Seminary (1947), and the magazine *Christianity Today* (1956). As they began to write and preach about the collapse of the West's Christian *Weltanschauung* and the need for revival, broader trends in Western political and intellectual life helped this buzzword resonate: most informed English speakers had encountered the strange German term in the media's coverage of Adolf Hitler's blustery speeches celebrating the "Nazi *Weltanschauung.*"[21] The word gained new traction during the Cold War, when Marxism-Leninism and Maoism emerged as sophisticated

world-and-life views, pseudo-religions with sacred texts, rituals, and plans of salvation. Other conservatives, particularly Roman Catholics, wrote darkly of the need to defend their own worldview and expose the bankruptcy of liberalism, a "whole *Weltanschauung* . . . that denies the mysterious ravages of original sin, the relevance of divine redemption, the subordination of matter to spirit."[22] By the late 1960s, no less a watchdog of the zeitgeist than J. Edgar Hoover joined in with an essay published under his name in *Christianity Today:* "The New Left is a *mood*, a *philosophy of life*, a *Weltanschauung*, a way of looking at *self, country*, and the *universe*. And in this mood lies its tragedy—and its danger! . . . Why have they rejected the values of our Judaic-Christian civilization?"[23]

The evangelical theologians who spoke of the "Christian worldview" were not just using the parochial vocabulary of Reformed theology. They were in tune with their age. But worldview speak did more than provide a language for lamenting the decline of Christendom and defending the Bible as "a storehouse of facts." It had political consequences. The "Christian worldview" helped transform the fight against legalized abortion from a relatively apolitical "Catholic issue" into an evangelical obsession and flagship cause of the culture wars.


## *Roe* and the Grand Narrative of the Christian Right

Francis Schaeffer, now remembered as a pioneer of the evangelical pro-life movement, did not begin his career in politics. Born in 1912 to working-class, secular parents in Germantown, Pennsylvania, Schaeffer converted to Christianity as a teenager after reading the Bible on his own. He concluded that Scripture offered rational answers to life's questions, and felt the grip of the Spirit upon him soon afterward at a local tent revival. After college he attended Westminster Theological Seminary, where he studied with Van Til and mastered presuppositionalist apologetics (he finished his degree at Faith Theological Seminary, a more staunchly fundamentalist school, founded by Carl McIntire). After a decade spent pastoring Presbyterian churches in the Northeast and Saint Louis, McIntire's Independent Board of Foreign Missions sent Schaeffer and his family to Switzerland, where they were to bring the gospel to faithless postwar Europe.

In the Alps near Geneva, Schaeffer founded a distinctive ministry called L'Abri—French for "shelter"—that welcomed curious backpackers, hippies,

and other wanderers. Schaeffer did not budge from his conservative theology, but he abandoned the principle of separation from unbelievers in favor of engaging with his visitors, who ranged from burned-out British atheists to American evangelical college kids out to see the world and agonize over existential questions. Schaeffer called L'Abri "a place where we have been able to preach the Gospel to twentieth-century men."[24] In 1965, Schaeffer's friends brought him back to America for his first major lecture tour. During his years in Europe, partly thanks to the tutelage of a Dutch art historian named Hans Rookmaaker, Schaeffer had come to think of himself as a cultural prophet with a duty to alert fellow believers to the imminent collapse of Western civilization—and the saving power of their Christian worldview.

Dressed in Swiss hiking knickers and knee socks, with thinning, unkempt hair and a goatee, Schaeffer drew curious crowds in college lecture halls and churches across the country. He captivated audiences with a grandiose account of the West's slide into ruin that began roughly with Thomas Aquinas's theological missteps, gained momentum after Soren Kierkegaard's leap of faith, and cascaded into the twentieth century's welter of world war, vulgar and bewildering art, and sexual hedonism.[25] Gene Edward Veith, who was a graduate student in English when he first encountered Schaeffer's ideas, credited the wandering philosopher-evangelist with shaping him as a scholar and teacher. "I started teaching a course in Literature and Religion in which I could pursue some of my new interests in the relationship between faith and art," he wrote. "Schaeffer, I suspect, had a similar impact on hundreds of college students . . . Schaeffer showed that orthodox Christianity, uncompromised and undiluted, is strong enough to challenge secularist thought in its own territory."[26]

In the early years of his speaking and writing career (an editor helped him transcribe his lectures into book form), Schaeffer's message was a call to cultural engagement rather than a command to take political action. Then, in 1973, the Supreme Court declared abortion legal, and he saw at close hand the barbaric end that he had long predicted for godless America. *Roe v. Wade* radicalized him. Encouraged by his politically minded son Frank, Schaeffer focused his ministry on mobilizing evangelical Protestants to act on an issue then widely considered a Catholic concern.[27] In 1975, Francis and his wife Edith worked with Presbyterian surgeon (and Ronald Reagan's future surgeon general) C. Everett Koop to organize the Christian Action Council, which founded hundreds of crisis pregnancy centers devoted to discouraging women from abortion.[28] Over the next four years, Schaeffer and his son made

two multi-part documentaries with companion books, *How Should We Then Live?* (1976) and *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* (1979). At the end of his life, he was still lamenting his fellow believers' failure to grasp the horrific consequences of modern America's drift into moral relativism and pop culture's worship of individual liberty above all else. "As evangelical, Bible-believing Christians we have not done well in understanding this," he wrote in 1984. "The world spirit of our age rolls on and on claiming to be autonomous and crushing all that we cherish in its path. Sixty years ago could we have imagined that unborn children would be killed by the millions here in our own country?"[29]

His films, books, and lectures inspired activists who would become leaders in the pro-life movement and the nascent Christian Right. Randall Terry, who founded the radical pro-life protest group Operation Rescue, called Schaeffer "the greatest modern Christian philosopher."[30] Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and Tim LaHaye admired him as a man of ideas, a public intellectual who helped Christians understand that hot-button issues like abortion were symptoms of deeper cultural crisis. "God gave me my instructions regarding taking the Christian worldview to the public square. . . . My late mentor, Dr. Francis Schaeffer, gave me great encouragement in this regard," Falwell later wrote.[31]

Just as important, Schaeffer energized average Christians. Gene Veith recalled leading a discussion of *How Should We Then Live?* at a small church in Oklahoma, where members suddenly understood "how modern ways of thinking and everyday problems have their origin in the past and how they themselves are part of a dynamic Western culture."[32] His popular appeal spanned denominational boundaries. Wesleyan Holiness evangelicals and Anabaptists gravitated toward his message.[33] Southern Baptist churchmen mailed one another copies of his lectures.[34] Schools ranging from Wheaton College to the Moody Bible Institute invited him to speak and screened his films.[35] By the 1970s, the influential college ministry InterVarsity Christian Fellowship had come to rely "heavily on Dr. Schaeffer's apologetic" (he began referring to himself as "Doctor" after receiving an honorary degree from Highland College, a small Christian school in California, in 1954).[36] By the time Schaeffer died of cancer in 1984, he had published more than twenty books and pamphlets that sold over two million copies. Ten years later, a study by *Christianity Today* revealed that readers ranked him as the fifth most influential theologian, ahead of John Calvin.[37]

Schaeffer rallied evangelicals to the pro-life cause by teaching them the

language of presuppositionalism. He translated Van Til's scholarly jargon into an accessible political theology based on the simple claim that biblical presuppositions must frame every aspect of a Christian's life. Opposition to abortion was not a single-issue campaign, but one component of the obligation to defend the authority of the inerrant Bible in every sphere of private and public life. "The primary battle is a spiritual battle . . . [but] the spiritual battle has its counterpart in the visible world, in the minds of men and women, and in every area of human culture," he wrote.[38] Schaeffer urged his audiences to be suspicious of secular liberals' assertions that the Supreme Court's ban on prayer and Bible reading in public schools created an ideologically neutral classroom: the real truth was that the assumptions of atheistic materialism now ruled American public education. There was no such thing as neutrality. "People have presuppositions, and they will live more consistently on the basis of these presuppositions than even they themselves may realize," Schaeffer wrote. "Most people catch their presuppositions from their family and surrounding society the way a child catches measles. But people with more understanding realize that their presuppositions should be chosen after a careful consideration of what world view is true."[39]

American evangelicals began to cite their Christian worldview in the battles over sexual education and censorship. They expanded on John Whitcomb's argument in favor of creationism to demand equal classroom time for lessons in "intelligent design," which they insisted was not religion at all but merely an alternative worldview, a scientific model that deserved a place in every biology class.[40] Activists like Charles Colson—a passionate disciple of Schaeffer—urged Christians to realize that atheistic intellectuals had duped them into betraying the gospel:

In past centuries, the secular world has asserted a dichotomy between science and religion, between fact and value, between objective knowledge and subjective feeling. As a result, Christians often think in terms of the same false dichotomy, allowing our belief system to be reduced to little more than private feelings and experience, completely divorced from objective facts. . . . Genuine Christianity is a way of seeing and comprehending *all* reality. It is a worldview. . . . First, it enables us to make sense of the world we live in and thus order our lives more rationally. Second, it enables us to understand forces hostile to our faith, equipping us to evangelize and to defend Christian truth as God's instruments for transforming culture.[41]

The ideology of the Christian worldview fed the polarization of culture-war-era politics. Many conservatives grew all the more convinced that compromise with secular liberals was impossible: they could not parley with someone whose assumptions contradicted their own. Colson dismissed debates over abortion and public education as mere "skirmishes." "The real war is a cosmic struggle between worldviews—between the Christian worldview and the various secular and spiritual worldviews arrayed against it," he wrote.[42] Reformed presuppositionalism complemented the growing influence of the theology of spiritual warfare that was also gaining ground among American evangelicals. Spiritual warfare—a strain of Pentecostal teaching that had gone mainstream by the 1970s—cast everything from national elections to the local school board meeting as a battle between God's angels and Satan's forces of evil. "God has overthrown the enemy in the birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus," wrote John Wimber, a popular California preacher, wrote in 1985. "The war is not over, but the aftermath is assured, the Church being called as God's army—continually assaulting the citadels of Satan, bringing in the rule of God."[43]

Schaeffer convinced many evangelicals that their calling to defend the authority of Scripture was not just a supernatural contest against Satan's minions: it was a this-worldly battle for Western civilization. During the 1960s and 1970s, leftist intellectuals came to view the Cold War, Vietnam, and white resistance to the civil rights movement as indictments of Western culture, proof that Western ideals had mutated into a perverse apologia for exploitation and empire. They called for toppling the traditional canon from its pedestal in American universities and promoted the study of history, politics, art, and literature from the vantage point of nonwhite, non-Western peoples.[44] Conservative evangelicals were eager to step into the breach, to take custody of a cultural heritage rejected by liberal elites. "We must come out of this intellectual and spiritual tailspin and chart an intelligent course," Ed McAteer, a Southern Baptist and conservative activist, wrote in 1980. "We can do this only by understanding ourselves and our traditions."[45]

By the 1990s, homeschooling parents and private Christian educators had begun trumpeting the benefits of a classical curriculum heavy in Greek, Latin, logic, rhetoric, and ancient philosophy, modeled on the eighteenth-century education of the Founding Fathers. They lauded the "the intellectual rigors, emphasis on logic and presentation skills and worldview training that classical education comprises," wrote Michael Farris, the president of the Home School Legal Defense Association and father of ten homeschooled

children. Farris would go on to found Patrick Henry College, an evangelical liberal arts college outside of Washington, DC, that combines a classical curriculum with preparation for political activism.[46]

Worldview thinking, shorn of its narrow Reformed roots, provided a simple and seductive ideology that persuaded evangelicals to join the pro-life movement while also broadening their vision of the conservative cause far beyond debates over family values to encompass two millennia of civilization. Conservative evangelicals saw eye to eye with other conservatives on a host of discrete political issues, but Schaeffer and likeminded activists encouraged a more fundamental intellectual alliance with other wings of American conservatism in the emerging New Right.

## The Catholic Connection

If these first two turning points in the rise of the Christian Right—the popularization of young-earth creationism and evangelical mobilization to overturn *Roe*—were matters of ideology, the third was, on its face, a matter of political strategy. The Christian Right could never have achieved widespread influence if it remained a narrowly Protestant movement. Its success owes much to the partnership between evangelicals and Roman Catholics, an alliance that Jerry Falwell and Catholic activist Paul Weyrich announced to the world when they founded the Moral Majority in the spring of 1979. Scholars usually explain this conquest of fierce mutual suspicion by pointing to political pragmatism. Evangelicals and Catholics realized that, despite their longstanding theological disputes and violent history, they shared a common horror at the secularization and liberalization of American society—the enemy of my enemy, as the saying goes, is suddenly my friend. However, culture-war realpolitik is not the full story. Evangelicals' political collaboration with Catholics followed more than twenty years of subtler theological developments. The charismatic and liturgical renewal movements—as well as evangelicals' growing admiration for Rome's intellectual tradition—made the Moral Majority possible.

Beginning in the late 1950s, Christians who had never before spoken in tongues or experienced divine healing found themselves blessed by the Holy Spirit. The first signs of charismatic renewal appeared in America in 1956, when a group of Lutheran ministers spoke in tongues at a Minneapolis meeting of the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International, a Pentecostal

organization.[47] Over the following years the revival spread through Episcopalian parishes in Illinois, California, Louisiana, and Toronto.[48] In 1967 a Presbyterian pastor in Oklahoma founded a "Charismatic Communion" of "Spirit-Filled Presbyterian Ministers."[49] That same year, the revival reached Roman Catholics when faculty and students at Duquesne University near Pittsburgh reported their "baptism in the Spirit."

The charismatic renewal movement assumed global proportions, sweeping through churches on all inhabited continents. In the United States, evangelicals and Catholics who had long been skeptical of one another's piety now began to observe each other with new sympathy—and even worship together at ecumenical revivals and conferences. Broader cultural and ecclesiastical developments had paved the way for this détente: the GI Bill and postwar boom had helped white American Catholics join the middle class, while new waves of immigrants had replaced Catholics of European descent as targets of white Protestant resentment. The reforms of Vatican II moderated Rome's antagonism toward "separated brethren" and intrigued Protestants by permitting the celebration of Mass in the vernacular and emphasizing lay participation. The charismatic renewal movement translated these structural and doctrinal changes into lived religious experience.

The Catholic hierarchy observed charismatic renewal warily at first, but soon embraced the revival and permitted a series of dialogues with Pentecostals.[50] The National Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee, based at the University of Notre Dame, welcomed Protestants at its massive charismatic conferences and offered financial support for renewal efforts in Protestant churches.[51] "Evangelicals tend to look hopefully at new stirrings and alignments within this ancient Church," wrote Arthur Glasser, dean of Fuller Theological Seminary's School of World Mission, in 1973. "They have increasingly been finding Catholic brethren of like faith and similar evangelistic commitment within the charismatic movement."[52]

If some evangelicals observed Catholic charismatic renewal with a degree of smugness—assuming that, once touched by the Spirit, Catholics would desert Rome for the true faith—the reality was that evangelicals themselves had begun to dabble in Catholic worship and tradition. A zeal for the prayers and rituals of the ancient church began to spread through mainline Protestant denominations in the 1940s.[53] Evangelicals were late adopters of liturgical renewal, and ambivalent at first. The Baptist *Watchman-Examiner* watched with concern as Baptist pastors, who had long favored a suit and tie in the pulpit, donned clerical robes: "Baptist services are becoming more

formal and adorned, and less and less spontaneous. We could not be vital, so we became artistic."[54] "Tradition to him [the evangelical] means corruption and infidelity that must be avoided like the plague," the editors of *Christianity Today* wrote in 1964. "Yet, since he lives in the world of the 1960s, he has to face the problem. . . . Is his flat denial of tradition proper, and is it in accord with the facts, even of his own Christian faith?"[55]

As early as the 1930s, a small number of Protestants in France, the United Kingdom, and other scattered places had begun to experiment with monastic life and contemplative prayer. By the middle of the 1960s, these practices had come to intrigue even Southern Baptists and fundamentalists at Moody Bible Institute.[56] The director of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research at Saint John's Abbey in Minnesota began recruiting evangelicals to study liturgical renewal there.[57] By the time that the Christian Right attracted journalists' attention as a force in national politics, contemplative prayer based on the Catholic tradition was a mainstream evangelical phenomenon. Evangelical Quaker Richard Foster's 1978 book, *Celebration of Discipline*, packaged meditative prayer, fasting, and ritual for a mass evangelical audience and sold over a million copies over the next three decades.

Very few evangelicals went so far as to convert to Catholicism. Many made a point of emulating Celtic monks, Franciscans, and other rebels who challenged the Roman yoke. But their new appreciation for Catholic history and worship was unmistakable. By no means did this warming toward Rome eradicate all anti-Catholic sentiment, but it radically altered the views of many evangelical laypeople as well as elites, and complemented a long-standing—if somewhat grudging—admiration among evangelical scholars for the Catholic intellectual tradition.[58]

Evangelical leaders had envied Catholics' intellectual clout since at least the 1940s.[59] By the 1970s, many recognized that their movement's scholarship and political advocacy had earned only a shadow of the mainstream respect that Catholic institutions and thinkers enjoyed. During the 1980s and 1990s, while secular observers marveled at the political collaboration between evangelicals and Catholics, the intellectual bridges connecting these communities multiplied. When the parent company of *Christianity Today* launched a think tank in 1985, the organizers recruited Catholic intellectual Michael Novak.[60] The University of Notre Dame tapped a number of prominent evangelical historians, philosophers, and social scientists to join its faculty and hosted a Pew program devoted to funding evangelical academics.[61] Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus, a Lutheran convert to Catholicism, masterminded a

series of meetings among leading evangelical and Catholic thinkers called Evangelicals and Catholics Together, culminating in a joint manifesto of shared intellectual and social commitments in 1994.

Evangelicals admired Catholics' deployment of their church's natural law tradition to oppose same-sex marriage and abortion—a line of argument that secular liberals seemed to tolerate far more respectfully than they did evangelicals' quotation of Scripture. The evangelical historian George Marsden urged his colleagues in Christian education to develop a strategy "equivalent to Catholic natural law arguments . . . their having a religious *source* does not automatically exclude one's views from acceptance in the academy so long as one argues for them on other, more widely accessible grounds."[62] Michael Cromartie, the vice president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center who played a leading role in dialogue between evangelicals and Catholics, wrote that natural law offers a "common moral grammar" that had the potential to persuade religious and secular people alike.[63] During the 2012 presidential election, conservative evangelicals' support for former Pennsylvania senator Rick Santorum—a Catholic who homeschools his children and decries gay marriage by asserting that the "promise of natural law is that we will be the happiest, and freest, when we follow the law built into our nature as men and women"—demonstrated how far this intellectual and political alliance had come.[64]

The rise of the Christian Right is a deeply theological story. This brief survey of the intellectual developments behind three watershed moments— the galvanization of the creationist campaign to ban Darwin from public schools, the evangelical embrace of the antiabortion cause, and evangelical and Catholic collaboration to form a national alliance of conservative religious leaders—suggests that the politics of the late twentieth century rest on a theological bedrock that is generations (even centuries) deep. The success of conservative Christian activists in national politics reflects more than a backlash against the civil rights movement, an aftershock of Cold War anti-communism, or a fusion of knee-jerk reflexes against the decline of white Anglo-Saxon Protestant cultural power. The Christian Right has always been a movement whose language, leaders, and alliances reflect doctrinal traditions and revivals that are spiritual as well as political. Its story is a chapter in Western intellectual history that reflects as much continuity with the past as disruption—and a path by which some ideas came to conquer others and shape a culture.

# More than Megachurches:
# Liberal Religion and Politics in the Suburbs

*Lily Geismer*

In 1970 Catholic priest and Democrat Father Robert Drinan launched a campaign to represent Massachusetts's Third District in the U.S. House of Representatives. At first blush, the priest appeared unlikely to win the district, which included many of the most affluent and liberal suburbs along the Route 128 highway that encircled Boston and was a central node in the nation's growing high-tech economy. Drinan publicly contended that his "campaign was a manifestation of his priesthood," stating repeatedly, "a priest is a mediator who preaches moral values."[1] For Drinan, such values included strong opposition to the Vietnam War, support for the legalization of birth control and abortion, and other social justice causes and thereby galvanized a grassroots following of liberal suburbanites from a variety of religious affiliations. Proudly wielding signs with messages declaring, "Our Father who art in Congress," these dedicated supporters helped Drinan become the first priest ever elected to the House of Representatives.[2]

Drinan's candidacy is notable not simply because he represented one of the few national politicians to don a clerical collar. The story of the Drinan campaign and its supporters also counters many of the conventional narratives about the relationship between religion and suburban politics. In the past decade political historians have heeded Jon Butler's admonition to make religion in the study of the twentieth century more than a "jack-in-the-box."[3] This inquiry has led to several pivotal works that have greatly enhanced understandings of postwar American politics.[4] Yet, like the resurgence of

attention to conservatism as a whole, these studies have shifted political history's gaze too far to the right, the Sunbelt, and the megachurch. The focus on Christian conservatives in the Sunbelt has left the unintended impression that suburban residents who were not habitual watchers of the *700 Club*, canvassing for Barry Goldwater, or at a church-sponsored rally to oppose the Equal Rights Amendment or gay rights were either nonreligious or politically apathetic or constructed a rigid separation between their political and religious activities and views. In doing so, the literature has created a distorted view of suburban political culture that does not fully respond to Butler's call to address the strength of religious institutions in shaping suburban life, or the full dimensions of the connections between religion and politics since World War II.[5]

The vibrancy of religious activity in the Route 128 area provides a new vantage from which to understand both the contours of postwar suburban political culture and continuities and changes in liberalism and the Democratic Party since World War II. Networks of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups in the Boston suburbs contributed to a series of landmark political campaigns for passage of pioneering legislation surrounding a variety of liberal causes, including civil rights, fair housing, opposition to the Vietnam War, gay rights, and the election of politicians like Drinan. Suburban liberal religious institutions and their members promoted their own version of moral and family-based values and politics that was as much steeped in their suburban-centered worldview as that of their right-wing counterparts. Many members of this constituency based their home-purchasing decisions on finding a vibrant and liberally oriented religious community in which to raise their children. A commitment to religious ideals and involvement in campaigns for causes such as fair housing, peace, and same-sex marriage complemented the economic concerns and class identity of liberal residents on the Route 128 corridor. At the same time, the suburban settings and economic priorities of their congregants influenced the involvement of liberal churches and synagogues in the political sphere, pushing them ever further away from addressing issues of economic inequality and toward causes related to individual quality of life and rights.

The new literature on evangelical Christians, especially those residing in the suburbs, has exploded the rigid binary political historians have traditionally drawn between the realms of cultural and economic issues. The works of Bethany Moreton, Darren Dochuk, and Daniel K. Williams have very convincingly illustrated the processes through which Christian ideals and free

market principles became fundamentally intertwined in the worldview of evangelicals at the grassroots and the platform of policies of the Republican Party at the national level. This fusing of religious and economic priorities, however, was not exclusive to evangelical conservatives. Judeo-Christian principles of tolerance and equality interacted with and encouraged liberal and suburban-centered ideas of individualism as well as the structural and ideological boundaries that all too often constricted the creation of full socioeconomic equality. Suburbanization, therefore, shaped the politics and agenda of liberal religious institutions in fundamental ways.

## Route 128's Postwar Religious Revival

The rise of suburbanization and the growth of religion went hand in hand in postwar American society. Many clergy and social critics initially predicted that suburbanization, with its emphasis on consumption and dispersed social arrangements, would lead to the decline of organized religion. In fact, the opposite occurred. The nation's reorientation toward the suburbs, created by the combination of generous federal subsidies for white, middle-class, single-family home ownership and defense-driven capital growth, fueled a simultaneous "religious revival."[6] In the decade immediately following World War II, new church membership outpaced population growth. Americans spent over four billion dollars on church construction, and more people belonged to a church or synagogue than ever before in American history.[7] The Route 128 area outside Boston proved the nexus of these economic, spatial, and social transformations.

During the two decades after World War II, a new generation of executives, engineers, and professors with ties to the area's postindustrial corporations and academic institutions moved to Route 128 suburbs like Concord, Lexington, and Newton that offered easy access to Boston, Cambridge, and corporate headquarters or outposts of businesses along the roadway.[8] Sociologist Paula Leventman, who conducted a study of engineers in these suburbs, found that many "professionals were drawn to the Boston area, as much, perhaps by the kinds of residential communities."[9] Many of these white-collar residents were from New England, had attended college or graduate school in metropolitan Boston, and decided to stay and had means to purchase homes in physically attractive and affluent suburbs with superior public schools and services.[10] The religious institutions of these suburbs also made the

communities attractive to a specific subset of newcomers looking to live and raise their children in places with open-minded and progressive values. The pattern of religious growth around metropolitan Boston deviated from Sunbelt areas such as Orange County, where postwar population shifts led to a boom of evangelical Protestants, especially Southern Baptists, who had a proclivity toward fundamentalist, strict moralist, and antiliberal ideas. Instead, most suburban professionals who moved to the affluent enclaves along Route 128 were more inclined toward less rigid doctrines that preached about tolerance, compassion, and collective action.[11]

Religion had shaped the values and civic life of places like Concord and Lexington since the colonial period. But by the 1950s, in addition to well-established Protestant churches, the suburbs included a wider range of options including several Jewish and Catholic institutions, which further solidified the communities' reputations and identities as open-minded and diverse (at least religiously). Clergy like Monsignor George Casey of St. Brigid's Church in Lexington, Reverend Dana McLean Greeley, a Lexington native, president of the American Unitarian Association, and later pastor at the First Parish Church in Concord, and Rabbi Albert Gordon of Temple Emmanuel in Newton played a leading national role in their respective dominations, which both bolstered the prominence of the congregations and served as an important linchpin connecting local activities to national causes and concerns.[12] The growth of religious institutions and suburban political activism, therefore, proved mutually reinforcing. As liberally minded people opted to live in places with a progressive religious culture, it further enhanced these churches and synagogues and their local and national reputations.

The Boston area had served as a center of Unitarianism since the revolutionary era, and the religion remained directly embedded in the growth of many of the area's key figures, movements, and institutions. The Unitarians had taken over the former Puritan parishes in places like Concord and Lexington beginning in the nineteenth century, but these churches flourished after World War II especially following the national organization's merger with the New England–based Universalist Church in 1961. Unitarian Universalism's commitment to difference of opinion, and long-standing belief in Emersonian ideals of self-reliance and freedom proved appealing to the postwar generation of Route 128 transplants.[13] The religion's academic roots and emphasis on rationality, progress, and faith in science also directly complemented the professional worldview of this cohort of new residents, particularly those steeped in the values of universities like Harvard and MIT.[14]

Reverend Dana McLean Greeley sermonized that "religion and science should not be rivals; they should be partners."[15] In addition, Unitarian Universalism's inclusive values served as a middle ground for many married couples raised in different religious traditions, which made it popular with many newcomers and further fostered the interfaith culture of the Route 128 suburbs.[16]

The rise in Jewish residents and institutions also contributed to the area's reputation for tolerance and interfaith infrastructure. The Route 128 area experienced the broader national "exodus" of Jewish people and institutions toward the suburbs after World War II.[17] Newton's Jewish population doubled in size in the immediate postwar period, reaching 6,028 families and 21,700 people by 1958. Between July 1, 1954 and December 31, 1955 alone, Jewish buyers purchased 35 percent of homes in Newton.[18] Levels of religious observance dictated the suburban settlement patterns of many Jewish families in the Boston area. Most observant families opted to live in Brookline and Newton, both of which had large concentrations of Jewish residents, synagogues, religious schools, and kosher grocery stores. Less observant Jews often chose to live in communities such as Lexington or Concord that had a tradition of progressive values, but not necessarily an established Jewish community.[19]

The patterns of Catholic worship also highlighted several larger spatial and political trends. Belying the often-repeated suggestion that Catholics either remained in cities to stay by their parishes or commuted back into the city on Sunday, the suburbs of Boston experienced a flood of new church construction in the decade and a half following World War II, the majority of which the Archdiocese of Boston proudly declared occurred "in small historic communities in the midst of which no church steeple bore the cross."[20] In Lexington, one such community, the membership patterns revealed a spectrum of worship practices and politics. Many liberal-leaning newcomers gravitated to St. Brigid's Church, which sat just off the Battle Green and preached a message that combined the community's revolutionary tradition with the values of the Jesuit order. More devout and doctrinal Catholics in Lexington tended to go to Church of the Sacred Heart in East Lexington. One resident tellingly reduced the distinction between St. Brigid's and Sacred Heart "to the liberal versus the conservatives."[21]

This type of dichotomous split became replicated throughout suburban Boston and showed how religious institutions helped to cluster ideologically like-minded people, a prerequisite for grassroots mobilization for social and political causes. Many new residents developed personal and political

connections through their involvement in organized religion. Norma McGavern-Norland recalled that growing up in New York City, "I had never been involved even with a church before." But upon moving to Lexington, the minister at the First Parish Church convinced her that participating in the church would be a good way to meet people and perform organized community service.[22] The positive experiences inspired her to participate in the League of Women Voters and later several other liberal causes and groups. McGavern-Norland's experience reflected a common pattern and challenges the assumption of social critics that suburban churches bred complacency and apathy about political issues.

For many of the postindustrial professionals and their families, churches and synagogues served as sites for socializing and meeting people in their communities who shared their values.[23] The array of different activities, most segmented by age group, became so extensive at Hancock Congregational Church in Lexington that residents jokingly renamed the religious institution "The Hancock Country Club."[24] Several temples and churches revised traditions and began hosting activities more in line with the suburban lifestyle such as couples clubs, brotherhoods, sisterhoods, and PTAs. By the early 1960s, the Hancock Congregational Church also featured around ten groups of married couples who met regularly at one another's houses to study Scripture and discuss its message for modern times.[25]

Route 128 suburbs like Lexington also developed a well-established interfaith network and tradition of cross-denominational collaboration, which was instrumental in the development of liberal activism. The clergy in the communities met frequently and were in regular dialogue, and they encouraged their parishioners to do the same. In places like Brookline and Newton, members of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish congregations came together for weekly informal discussions on issues such as civil rights and other liberal issues.[26] These activities revealed not only the common values of these various congregations, but also the ways in which their commitment to principles of antiprejudice, equality, and community aligned with many of the core tenets of postwar liberalism.

## Religion, Liberal Politics, and Suburban Activism

The principles of the faiths popular in the Route 128 suburbs especially connected with and enhanced postwar liberalism's emphasis on individualism and

individual rights. While notions of individualism had long been at the center of liberal thought and philosophy, the politics of the New Deal state, especially its emphasis on home ownership, fortified it.[27] The growth liberal agenda of the New Deal and the racially exclusionary and class entitlements it provided fostered a sense of meritocratic individualism in white suburban residents across the political spectrum, including many self-identified liberals.[28] The economic prosperity of the postwar era simultaneously pushed the national liberal political agenda toward advancing the power of the state to protect individual rights and away from a focus on reforming the structures of capitalism.[29] Liberal religious institutions like the National Council of Churches and its counterparts such as the National Council of Christian and Jews and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations shared this outlook and promoted a similar set of principles about the responsibility of both government and clergy to provide justice and individual rights to all Americans.[30]

The increasing popularity of psychology in the 1940s and 1950s injected an emphasis on the self and individualism deeper into both liberal religion and politics. Psychoanalytic theories proved especially important to liberal ideas about race and racism during the postwar period. Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*, which presented racism as the product of personal prejudice and moral deficiencies rather than state-sponsored policy, influenced this mode of thought, leading its followers to advocate for government policies that created "equal opportunity" and "individual rights" rather than those that might eradicate the structural underpinnings of racial segregation and economic inequity.[31] The abiding suburban liberal faith in individualism, therefore, came to encompass both a commitment to ending racial and social inequality and the benefits from government-subsidized and race- and class-specific entitlements provided by home ownership.

The teachings of religious institutions in the liberal interfaith tradition further reflected and fostered this duality. Throughout the 1950s, clergy throughout the suburbs preached about the importance of racial and religious equity, which enhanced liberal support for ideas about equal opportunity. At the same time, ministers and rabbis put more of an emphasis on the therapeutic dimensions of religious life, and many began to engage more with psychoanalytic theories of self and community.[32] Many suburban religious leaders realized the importance of counseling services for suburban residents who found themselves disoriented and isolated in a new community and the other changes of postwar society and life.[33] This focus on psychological and personal development, nevertheless, nurtured the broader sense

of individualism within congregants and their approach to political issues. Thus, these religious institutions enhanced many of the class-based tensions embedded in postwar liberalism, which would have important implications for the development of social activism in the suburbs.

The issues of fair housing and civil rights underscored the direct influence of local religious institutions and the individualist ideology they nurtured. Throughout the 1950s, the American Friends Service Committee sought to raise attention to the issue of residential discrimination, and the New England regional office hired a paid staff member to enlist religious leaders from other denominations in the cause.[34] At the end of the decade, several churches and synagogues throughout the Route 128 area sponsored events where community members heard firsthand accounts from African American families about the difficulties they confronted in the suburban housing market. The stories motivated many white self-identified liberals to take action and create local fair housing committees.[35] Lexington boasted one of the largest and most active committees sustained by its cross-faith roots. In the early 1960s, Rev. Thomas MacLeod of St. Brigid's and Rev. Landon Lindsay, the pastor of Lexington United Methodist Church, each served as the committee's chair and encouraged their parishioners to get involved.[36] One Boston reporter described "religious leaders of all three major faiths" as the "driving force behind" the housing movement, which by the mid-1960s included thirty-five hundred members and reached thirty-seven communities with the greatest concentration and activity in the Route 128 suburbs.[37] The movement also worked within the formal channels of the government for the passage of legislation, which ensured that Massachusetts had the most extensive fair housing laws in the nation by 1963.

Judeo-Christian principles directly informed the fair housing movement's understanding of residential integration. The movement's interpretation of discrimination based on individual prejudice, commitment to one-on-one interaction, and being a "good neighbor" drew inspiration from the broad interfaith ideals of tolerance, charity, and equality.[38] The movement's principles and the laws its followers worked to enact privileged individual opportunity and legal equality and did little to alter the problems of racial segregation and exclusionary zoning in the suburbs or change the living conditions for the vast majority of African Americans in metropolitan Boston. The religious ideals of individual understanding did not challenge but magnified forms of exclusivity and individualism at the heart of suburban political culture. Ultimately, religious ideas and infrastructure made fair

housing activism possible, but reinforced key limits upon the extent of its ability to challenge entrenched spatial and economic structures.

This form of religiously inflected suburban activism would have more of a long-lasting political impact on the antiwar movement where it did not directly confront the structures of suburban entitlements and exclusion. In the late 1950s and early 1960s religious ideas and institutions played important roles in drawing attention to the political issues of peace and nuclear disarmament, which gradually evolved into a sustained movement in opposition to the Vietnam War.[39] Reverend John Wells, the popular Unitarian pastor at the First Parish Church in Lexington, symbolizes the important position of religious leaders and institutions in fostering grassroots suburban antiwar politics. He integrated his antiwar position into both his message from the pulpit and his own political activism chairing the local committee of a broader suburban-based movement to stop the construction of an antiballistic missile system north of Boston.[40] Wells encouraged his parishioners to get involved in the 1969 Vietnam Moratorium and other antiwar causes, which contributed to making his church and Lexington as a whole a hotbed of antiwar activity. Further fusing his political and religious views, in 1970 Wells formulated state legislation testing the president's constitutional power to send soldiers to fight in an undeclared war by requiring the state attorney general to represent Massachusetts soldiers forced into combat before the Supreme Court.[41] Wells's parishioners distributed flyers, formed telephone trees, and spoke at community meetings and church gatherings, which directly contributed to the bill's victory within the state legislature.[42] The legislation eventually provided a model for action across the country and led to the passage of the War Powers Resolution Act in 1973, which stipulated that the president could send U.S. armed forces into action only by the authorization of Congress. The legislation also inspired the suburban-centered peace movement to focus more on tactics and campaigns that could have a direct impact on national policy and electoral politics.[43]

## "Our Father Who Art in Congress"

Father Drinan's congressional campaign in 1970 emerged as crucial to the effort of channeling suburban opposition to the Vietnam War into electoral politics and demonstrated how political campaigns provided the means for grassroots liberals to shape national policy. For twenty-seven years Phillip

Philbin, a hawkish Democrat who served as vice chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, had represented the Third Congressional District, which included both small blue-collar towns in the central part of the state, and the affluent and more liberal Route 128 suburbs.[44] In the winter of 1970, a group of local activists searched for a candidate to challenge Philbin and approached Drinan, the dean of Boston College Law School and author of several works, who had been an outspoken supporter of peace, civil rights, and other liberal issues including birth control. The forty-nine-year-old priest agreed with the activists that the only way to change Congress was to challenge incumbents like Philbin and agreed to run.[45]

Drinan immediately faced his own "Catholic problem," although different from the set of concerns that John F. Kennedy famously confronted in his bid for the presidency a decade earlier. First and foremost, a vocal minority of Catholics opposed Drinan's bid. An early poll found that roughly 30 percent of voters in the district did not believe it was proper for a priest to run for political office.[46] Drinan firmly contended that there was no bar to a "clergyman entering the political process" and said that "perhaps now is the time," given the sense of moral crisis confronting the United States in the late 1960s.[47] On the campaign trail, he frequently mentioned that Protestant clergy had served in Congress for more than two centuries and asked Catholic voters if they wanted to exclude clergy of their faith from politics while allowing Protestants to serve. He also adopted a discourse of Massachusetts distinctiveness, suggesting that surely the state "which sent the first Catholic to the White House in John F. Kennedy and the first Negro, Edward Brooke, to the Senate would have no problem sending the first Jesuit to Congress."[48] Such statements did not alleviate the concerns of many liberal residents, who were initially worried that Drinan's connection to the Catholic Church signaled his social conservatism. When Drinan appeared at campaign stops like the Auburndale Congregational Church in Newton, self-identified liberal members of the district asked pointed questions about his position on birth control.[49] His responses at these events proved satisfactory, and non-Catholic suburban liberals emerged as his biggest supporters.

The effort to secure the nomination for Father Drinan in the Democratic primary developed into one of the best-organized and most suburban-focused campaigns in American political history. In one of his earliest actions, campaign manager John Marttila commissioned a private polling company to conduct a systematic survey of the Third District. Drawing on its data, the pollsters from the Oliver Quayle Company instructed, "If Father

Drinan has to select one major focus of the campaign, it must be the sub-urbs."[50] The consultants stressed that suburban and upper-middle-class parts of the district appeared most receptive to Drinan's dovish stance and thought-ful demeanor and found his religious affiliation least problematic. The report suggested, therefore, that the campaign focus its energy on suburban-centered activities like block parties and coffee klatches, conduct canvassing in more affluent neighborhoods, and abstain completely from going to the more blue-collar areas in the district. This advice of the pollsters provided Drinan's staff with the basic outline for their campaign strategy.[51] The cam-paign gave volunteers explicit instructions for how to respond to the quip that a "priest should not be in politics." The prepared response simultane-ously stressed that Drinan had received the blessing of the Catholic Church to run and that he believed in the abolition of all criminal sanctions against abortion.[52]

The zeal of the middle-class suburban Drinan volunteers led one reporter to dub the campaign a "moral crusade."[53] Throughout the summer and fall sub-urban residents raised money and votes by hosting traditional suburban-style events such as a "Drinan Garage Sale," "punch and politics" get-togethers, and wine and cheese parties.[54] In the last weeks of the campaign, the staff secured one Drinan worker for every twenty-five voters, and on primary day, despite rainy conditions, the volunteers amassed an unprecedented turnout, particu-larly in suburban precincts. "If there was a reasonably liberal housewife at home with her four kids almost anywhere in the district," a reporter quipped, "some-one who would probably vote for Drinan but who would be discouraged by the rain—on election day she was probably called two, possibly three times. The Drinan group would provide a babysitter while she voted, and a ride both ways."[55] In the primary, Drinan beat Philbin by a vote of 28,612 to 22,132. The *Boston Globe* deemed it the "political upset of the year."[56] Drinan's strongest support came from the district's affluent suburbs. He received 69.4 percent of the vote in Newton, as opposed to only 29 percent in the more blue-collar town of Fitchburg.[57] Drinan would go on to a narrow defeat of moderate Republican John McGlennon in the general election on November 3, 1970.

The election received a great deal of national press attention since Drinan was a priest, had run on one of the more "overtly dovish" platforms in the country, and represented a reshaping of the political process.[58] Drinan him-self credited his victory to the fact that he and his suburban liberal volunteer base "were organized and computerized" and "held together right up until the last minute."[59] The election also signaled a major political shift. "The

conclusion seems pretty clear," Drinan declared of the results, "that the belief that the suburbs are conservative and power blocks for the Republican Party just isn't the case."[60] In addition to challenging assumptions about the political atmosphere of the suburbs, Drinan's five terms in Congress also reveal the spectrum of perspectives and tensions within the Catholic community over the relationship between faith and politics.

Once in Congress, Drinan quickly distinguished himself as one of the most liberal members due to his opposition to the Vietnam War and support for civil liberties, human rights, especially in Latin America, and reproductive rights. His voting record consistently earned him both a 100 percent approval rating from Americans for Democratic Action and the continued support of the suburban members of his district.[61] In spite of his iconoclastic reputation, Drinan consciously set himself apart from other more radical priests of the era. "I'm not Father Groppi or Dan Berrigan," he explained. "I don't burn draft cards. I believe in working within the system for change."[62] This liberal rather than radical stance aligned with the perspective of the vast majority of the suburbanites who had campaigned for him and contributed to his popularity with this constituency.

Drinan's faith in the system and aversion to radicalism also governed his attitude toward the Catholic Church. He refused to renounce his priesthood in order to remain in Congress after Pope John Paul II's decree in 1980 that priests could not serve in elected office, which many perceived as a veiled curb on Drinan.[63] Despite pleas from suburban residents in his district to get him to stay, he opted to resign his position.[64] "I am proud and honored to be a priest and a Jesuit," Drinan explained. "As a person of faith I must believe that there is work for me to do which somehow will be more important than the work I am required to leave."[65] Once out of office, Drinan continued to speak publicly on issues of international human rights and reproductive rights.

Drinan's example also helped the religiously influenced and suburban-based peace movement in Massachusetts forge a new base for liberal political candidates. Despite the fact that George McGovern lost nationally, this constituency of affluent liberal suburbanites proved essential to his capture of the Route 128 communities and the state of Massachusetts as a whole in the 1972 election. More than his supposed promotion of the "3 As" of "abortion, amnesty and acid," McGovern's principled and morally minded positions, which emerged from his background as the son of a Methodist and seminary dropout, helped him earn the support of this constituency.[66]

## Legacy

The defeat of McGovern, the conclusion of the Vietnam War, and the departure of Drinan did not lead to the end of liberalism or the involvement religious institutions in political and causes in the Route 128 suburbs. Since the 1970s, religious groups in these communities have participated in a range of causes such as environmentalism, the nuclear freeze, opposition to U.S. military intervention abroad, and gender equality.[67] The campaigns have attracted new generations of residents to move the area, join congregations, and get involved in political and social activism.[68] The causes have also continued to complement the individualist priorities of their members.[69]

Suburban churches and synagogues have played a particularly instrumental role in the campaign for gay rights and same-sex marriage over the past two decades. The Massachusetts Religious Coalition for the Freedom to Marry, founded in 1993, grew to seven hundred institutions, many of them in the Boston suburbs, and stood at the forefront of the campaign to make Massachusetts the first state to legalize same-sex marriage in 2004.[70] In Lexington alone, the Hancock Congregational Church established "Open Hearts, Open Minds Committees," sponsored events such as "The Human Face of Homosexuality," and redrafted its Covenant of the Welcome to include a reference to embracing all sexual orientations. The First Parish Church just across the Battle Green staged large forums such as "Respecting Differences: Creating Safer Schools and More Inclusive Community for Gay and Lesbian People and Their Families." The forum included speakers such as Congressman Barney Frank, who took over Drinan's seat in 1981 and became one of the nation's most prominent openly gay politicians.

Religious institutions throughout suburban Boston took steps to ensure that gay and lesbian families felt welcome in their communities by hanging rainbow flags and banners, sponsoring potlucks and support groups, and performing same-sex marriages.[71] These efforts preserved the image of places like Lexington, Concord, and Newton as welcoming and tolerant and resembled the activities their predecessors organized to welcome African Americans half a century earlier. Also similar to the fair housing movement, the campaigns surrounding gay rights and marriage equality rarely addressed the economic factors—including exclusionary zoning, the high concentration of single-family homes, the absence of rental properties, and high tax rates—that limited the opportunity to live in affluent communities like the

Route 128 suburbs to predominantly upper-middle-class two-parent gay and lesbian families. Brent Coffin, who conducted over twenty interviews with senior religious leaders in Lexington in 2000 and 2001, found near unanimous uncertainty among them regarding how to address issues of economic fairness and justice with their parishioners.[72] Thus, clergy in places like Lexington provided a space for the discussion of gay and lesbian inclusion, but they had far more difficulty doing the same for the issue of economic inclusion. This momentum and tension extended beyond Lexington and the Route 128 area as involvement of suburban religious groups in the fight for gay rights and acceptance for same-sex marriage stretched from Minnesota and Iowa to traditional bastions of the Religious Right such as Orange County, California, and Cobb County, outside Atlanta.[73]

This grassroots movement has had wide-reaching political reverberations as state and national politicians have increasingly voiced support for marriage equality as part of their effort to win the support moderate and liberal voters in the suburbs.[74] When announcing his support for same-sex marriage in May 2012, President Barack Obama directly drew on his Christian faith, making reference to both Christ and the Golden Rule.[75] Politicians like Obama have often adopted broad faith-based language of equality, fairness, and compassion to frame the issue, but rarely have they discussed the specific material privileges and benefits afforded by state-sanctioned marriage or linked the issues of marriage equality to larger concerns about economic inequality.[76] Both parts of this position aligned with the long-standing individualist values and ideals of many affluent suburban professionals and contributed to their strong support for same-sex marriage and the Democratic Party in the 2012 election.[77]

Observers have long lamented that liberals ceded the issue of religion to their conservative opponents.[78] The historical and contemporary examples from metropolitan Boston, however, illustrate that suburban religious political activity has flourished at the grassroots in blue states as well as red states and within liberal churches and synagogues as well as conservative ones. The issue of gay marriage suggests that politicians and strategists are beginning to pay more attention to the implications of this long-standing trend. Historians of American politics, policy, and religion in the twentieth century would do well to follow suit.

# Knute Gingrich, All American?
# White Evangelicals, U.S. Catholics, and the
# Religious Genealogy of Political Realignment

*Bethany Moreton*

In many ways, thanks to President Obama, we are all
Catholics now.
—Former Arkansas governor the Reverend Mike Huckabee,
speaking at the Conservative Political Action Caucus,
February 2012

This is just pure Marxism coming out of the mouth of the
pope.
—Rush Limbaugh, *The Rush Limbaugh Show*,
November 27, 2013

The 2012 primary season was a feast of signification for students of American religion. The combustible coalition that remade the post-Goldwater GOP produced a slate of primary contenders who marked a coming-of-age for religious conservatives beyond the Protestant fold. White evangelicals, fundamentalists, and Pentecostals had been the backbone of the conservative revival, the Bible-believing Americans who put the majority into Moral Majority. In contrast, 2012's headliners—Mormon Mitt Romney and Roman Catholics Paul Ryan, Rick Santorum, and Newt Gingrich—represented the

former denominational junior partners of the self-described "New Christian Right." Their acceptability to the white "values voters" testified to a realignment that has been under way for more than a generation: the most meaningful religious division is no longer *among* adherents of different Christian denominations, as in the national elections of 1928 and 1960, but rather between those who report regularly attending religious services and those who do not. According to polls from the twenty-first century, white evangelicals in the United States demonstrated a greater allegiance to official Roman Catholic positions on issues of sex and reproduction than did American Catholics themselves; the two biggest denominational affiliations of self-identified born-again Christians were Southern Baptist and Catholic. And whether white voters spent Sundays at mass or at a megachurch, they largely voted in 2012 for the Mormon CEO and the Catholic libertarian.[1]

In the aftermath of the loss, Republicans in 2013 declared their party "too old and too white and too male," the victim of demographics. Half a world away, the Vatican soon reached a similar conclusion about octogenarian German hardliner Pope Benedict XVI, who abruptly resigned the papacy to be replaced by the first pontiff from the Western Hemisphere, Pope Francis. Within a year, the tweeting pope had garnered a Person of the Year title from *Time*, graced the cover of *Rolling Stone*, and scored an eye-popping 92 percent approval rating from American Catholics with his embrace of the poor and his denunciation of a Church "obsessed" with abortion and homosexuality. Decrying "an economic system which has at its center an idol called money," Francis wound up quoted in speeches by Democrats like unaffiliated Protestant president Barack Obama, prochoice Catholic House minority leader Nancy Pelosi, and Mormon Senate majority leader Harry Reid. Meanwhile, the Southern Baptist Convention—the largest Protestant denomination in the United States—had beaten both the GOP and the Holy See to the punch, electing in 2012 as its own first African American president a former street preacher from New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward, and voting to allow affiliated churches the option of dropping "Southern" from their names.[2]

On the way to these shake-ups, however, the election afforded plenty of opportunities for additional complexities to emerge in the religio-political firmament. Catholic traditionalist Rick Santorum, scoring early points in the Iowa caucuses with his denunciations of homosexuals and abortion, stumbled badly when he raised as a political issue the "dangers of contraceptives." Meanwhile, the eventual GOP nominees Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan were

both vigorously excoriated by some high-profile members of their own faith traditions as traitors to the social justice teachings of Mormonism and Catholicism, respectively: when the nuns on the bus call you a bad Catholic, you have a lot of explaining to do.[3]

But in the long history of U.S. religion and politics, perhaps the more telling moment was the 2009 conversion to Catholicism of primary candidate Newt Gingrich, the former Speaker of the House who helped orchestrate the 1994 Republican midterm upset. In his personal biography, Gingrich virtually embodied the political power shift of the previous generation: raised a mainline Lutheran in the household of his military stepfather, he was born in Pennsylvania but grew up in part on army bases in Europe and Georgia. He converted to Southern Baptism while in graduate school in New Orleans, drawn to a relatively liberal church by his studies on the role of religion in history. Back in Georgia, as a history professor, he joined New Hope Baptist Church just as the national Moral Majority was forming under the leadership of the Reverend Jerry Falwell and the Southern Baptist Convention was moving decisively toward fundamentalist orthodoxy. According to his pastor, Gingrich did not in those years distinguish himself with zeal for the self-described New Christian Right, more interested in economics and health care than abortion or homosexuality. But his eventual congressional seat included one of the nation's most heavily subsidized counties. Anchored by federal Cold War redistribution via an air base and a military contractor, Cobb County swelled to suburban prosperity with white flight from Atlanta. New Hope grew into a megachurch, and the congressman built alliances with the Moral Majority's savvier political successor, the Christian Coalition. Under the guidance of Gingrich's fellow Georgian Ralph Reed, the Christian Coalition helped provide the 1994 electoral muscle that put the Republicans in charge of both houses of Congress for the first time in four decades and turned Gingrich from minority whip into an unusually influential Speaker of the House. Gingrich's signature legislative achievements included bipartisan welfare reform and balanced budgets, the partial birth abortion ban, and the Defense of Marriage Act.[4]

Leaving office after the Republican debacle of the 1998 congressional elections, Gingrich continued to launch a bewildering array of business and non-profit endeavors, building on his long-standing enthusiasm for "third wave" high-tech entrepreneurialism and communications. His continued political aspirations were hampered by an open secret among his former allies: even as Gingrich led the effort to impeach President Clinton over charges stemming

from his infidelity with a staffer young enough to be his daughter, the Speaker was himself involved in an extramarital affair with a staffer twenty-two years his junior. His divorce and remarriage saved face, but hardly earned him the respect of religious Republican insiders. Only his conversion to Catholicism actually convinced many that Gingrich had sincerely been, in effect, born again. Like a number of other high-profile beltway converts, Gingrich was helped to his new faith by Father C. John McCloskey, a former Wall Street analyst who became a priest in the innovative Catholic parachurch organization Opus Dei. Father McCloskey played a role in the conversions of the originalist jurist Robert Bork, Senator Sam Brownback, supply-side economist Lawrence Kudlow, and conservative columnist Robert Novak. Following his conversion, Gingrich sought to bring Catholics and evangelicals together for shared political goals in an organization called Renewing American Leadership. When Gingrich retreated to honorary chairman in order to run for the presidential nomination, he named as his successor at the organization's helm the Reverend James Garlow, who had organized evangelical opposition to California's Proposition 8 to join more long-standing Catholic and Mormon activism against the state's gay marriage amendment.[5]

The declining significance of denominationalism and the rise of a political alliance among orthodox believers received astute attention from two generations of U.S. historians.[6] More recently, analysts of both white evangelicalism and U.S. Catholicism are taking note as Christian conservatives attempt to temper the harsh sexual politics and laissez-faire economic orthodoxy that fueled GOP gains from Nixon to W.[7] To the extravagantly historically minded, these recent attempts to close ranks among U.S. Christians are a chapter in the five-hundred-year-old story of the Reformation, secularization, and the spiritual conquest that exported the European Wars of Religion to the Western Hemisphere. A figure like Newt Gingrich, facing toward Rome from an Atlanta suburb, highlights long-term aspects of that transformation that are not always in the forefront of political analysis—with some possible implications for the future.

The conservative rapprochement among the country's most observant Christians was the product of the decades after 1960, and was in a sense the mirror image of the New Deal coalition, its predecessor in party alignment. The northern Democratic Party's hospitality to urban labor had unevenly yoked Catholic voters to the New Deal alongside rural southern whites and the

enfranchised minority of African Americans. Despite regular white southern attempts at defection beginning with the Dixiecrat revolt of 1948, the uneasy alliance held together during the boom years.

Although the southern wing's defense of white supremacy was the most vulnerable point of cleavage for these unlikely political bedfellows, the long-favored place of Protestantism in public life was another obstacle to their union. Until Kennedy's own lifetime, the First Amendment's guarantees of religious freedom, like the Bill of Rights more generally, covered only the narrow zone of federal jurisdiction. Into the twentieth century, demonstrates historian David Sehat, states and municipalities were free to punish blasphemy and dissent, require Protestant observance as a qualification for holding public office, restrict religious liberty to Christians, enforce Christian sexual and gender ideology as such, teach an evangelical curriculum in public schools, and indeed "constrain religious belief in any way they saw fit." As long as the "moral establishment"—the leaders of influential churches, religious publications, and organizations like the American Missionary Association, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and the YMCA—did not pursue explicitly denominational goals, its forthright coercion on behalf of a generally reformed Protestant theology could call itself religious freedom. Most of those coerced into conformity, after all, were marginal dissenters, and such proponents of free thought or even free love posed a clear threat to public order. Only the presence of growing numbers of Catholics in the United States—white citizens who differed in practice and belief without defying Christian moral standards—forced a gradual juridical recognition that there was no neutral form of religion. By 1890, Catholicism was the single largest denomination in the United States, highlighting how truly Protestant the "nonsectarian" public norm had been all along.[8]

By the 1920s, however, judicial decisions were moving in the direction of expanded federal civil rights protections, including the right to meaningful religious freedom. And beginning in 1940, a new trend in court decisions offered Protestants a convenient way to redefine their traditional anti-Catholicism as concern for religious liberty rather than defense of Protestant privilege. John F. Kennedy, in a dramatic 1960 campaign speech to three hundred white evangelical ministers in Houston, asserted that faith was a "private affair," denounced state funding of religious schools, and vowed not to make policy decisions—"on birth control, divorce, censorship, gambling"—as a representative of his church. To answer well-publicized charges by representatives of the National Association of Evangelicals, the Southern Baptist

Convention, and the National Council of Churches during the campaign that the Catholic Church represented a political organization as much as a religious one, Kennedy asserted clearly that he believed in an America "where no religious body seeks to impose its will directly or indirectly upon the general populace or the public acts of its officials."[9]

Ignoring the rival theories of Catholic and Protestant religious coercion that had held sway until recently—the former explicitly promoted from Rome, the latter implicitly enforced by American law at every level but the federal—Kennedy's speech rejected papal interference and named American religious freedom an unbroken tradition that relegated religion to the private sphere. The candidate's recourse to a strictly private view of faith thus offered a secular route out of a politically explosive contradiction that had animated more than a hundred fifty years of evangelical-Catholic conflict in the United States. It was a useful myth that helped defuse the midcentury dismantling of evangelical privilege until Protestants and Catholics could make common cause under new conditions.

Those conditions were explicitly material, for the expansion of civil rights that extended First Amendment protections was part of a larger transformation of the state during the years on either side of World War II. As historian Axel Schäfer demonstrates, one of the least appreciated aspects of this "big government" Keynesian era was the massive public subsidy of the nation's faith institutions. New Deal–era aid had been kept scrupulously separate from religious channels, and earlier subsidies, while commonplace, were not of the scale ushered in by the warfare state. In part to tread lightly around conservative Southern Democrats' protection of their one-party *herrenvolk* democracy, wartime Washington deployed at the national level a regionally popular mechanism of state subsidy, at a new order of magnitude: rather than building a state apparatus that was answerable to public control, the federal government would disburse vastly expanded funds to private actors, both for-profit and nonprofit.[10]

Overseas missionary work and sectarian aid provided the leading edge in the expansion of this relationship, finds Schäfer, injecting unprecedented resources into a long-standing front of American foreign policy. The wartime experience of outsourcing and the postwar urgency of raising American prestige abroad combined to excite Washington's interest in sectarian missionaries and foreign aid organizations as warriors in the fight for hearts and minds. Catholic aid agencies—centralized, organized, and already operating in a separate international service network—initially accepted the bulk of

this new largesse. Mainline and evangelical denominations approached the question with a variety of scruples, but ultimately the competition with Catholics and with one another drove most to embrace public subsidy as a practical necessity for expanding operations abroad and at home. In fact, their awareness that their Catholic rivals were accepting aid and yet clearly pursuing sectarian ends alerted evangelical leaders to the leeway available: contrary to their suspicions, it was evidently possible to accept substantial federal funding without therefore being required to shed "pervasively sectarian" ends, as theoretically required by the establishment clause of the First Amendment. Once the wall was breached in foreign mission aid, the initially reluctant evangelical recipients cultivated the funding relationship while building in protections for their religious priorities. Billions of dollars of public funds ultimately built sectarian priorities into foreign policy via support for missionaries and faith-based foreign aid; created a lightly regulated educational, medical, and social service industry; and enhanced religious political clout through a new route even as the courts began limiting statutory coercion against dissent and nonbelief.[11]

The expanded terms of American national citizenship and international leadership thus introduced new rules of engagement for America's religious rivals. The effects of these long-range changes in law and political economy were not immediately felt in the pews. The nativism that had been so thoroughly historically entwined with U.S. anti-Catholic sentiments was destabilized but not immediately toppled by the revelations of European genocide. Meanwhile, the fundamental disagreements that had made religion worth fighting about for five centuries did not immediately melt away in the warming sun of postwar prosperity. The Reformation remained an entirely relevant point of departure for much elite debate.[12] Paul Blanshard's 1949 best seller *American Freedom and Catholic Power* warned of Catholic totalitarianism, and the following year the National Association of Evangelicals adopted a resolution expressing concern over "the militant and aggressive tactics of the Roman Catholic hierarchy within and upon our government."[13] Even the intra-Protestant ecumenical impulses that brought the mainline denominations together in the World Council of Churches were anathema to many white evangelicals, especially those forced to compete with the "liberal juggernaut" on the postcolonial mission field.[14] American Catholics, for their part, were caught up in the 1949 "Boston Heresy Case," in which the Curia struggled to square its own doctrine of "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus* (outside of the Church there is no salvation)" with the desires of assimilating

second- and third-generation Americans to exemplify religious toleration. The issue was finally resolved in distinctly American terms during Vatican II, which ratified respectful engagement with the other members of the newly christened "Judeo-Christian" tradition.[15] Progress toward Will Herberg's imagined national community of *Protestant-Catholic-Jew* was, clearly, slow and uneven, and the future salience of the cross-confessional conservative bloc was unforeseeable to most contemporaries.[16] But in gradually herding together believers of different stripes, changes in jurisprudence provided a stick, while the explosion in public funding offered a carrot.

Other tectonic shifts in Cold War America likewise slowly began to remove barriers to the alliance. First, Catholics largely lost their sinister association with foreignness in the national narrative through the deliberate constriction of immigration. Catholic migrants from Europe had fanned Protestant fears of alien domination since the mid-nineteenth century, giving rise to vigorous nativism and occasional bursts of symbolically charged violence. The Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 imposed immigration caps based on national origins that severely restricted entry from heavily Catholic and Jewish populations. But this eugenic attempt to promote a more Anglo-Saxon America had the paradoxical effect of helping second- and third-generation Southern and Eastern Europeans take full advantage of the midcentury explosion of "affirmative action for whites." As the New Deal, the GI Bill, and the Cold War transferred national wealth to the white middle class, that class itself stabilized as the privileged container for "the Cohens and the Kellys" as well as the Smiths and the Joneses.[17] These Catholics shed much of their prewar reputation for working-class devotionalism and second-rate schooling, and moved instead into the forefront of American culture. Wartime movies like *Going My Way* and *The Song of Bernadette* shone a flattering spotlight on priests and nuns; Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen's neo-Thomist homilies beat out Milton Berle's flamboyant antics for television's biggest audience share; and no less a talent than Ronald Reagan turned Notre Dame's legendary football coach Knute Rockne into a household name.[18]

Second, the anticommunism by which U.S. Catholics had distinguished themselves in the first half of the century became more mainstream after World War II, and ultimately offered an enemy against which to unite with the more conservative wings of Protestantism. Pontiffs had been forcefully denouncing socialism since the 1864 Syllabus of Errors, a consistent critique that culminated in Pius XI's 1937 encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*. While

denouncing unfettered capitalist competition and reaffirming papal support for economic justice and the rights of workers, the treatise condemned "atheistic communism" with specific reference to the three national examples that had drawn vigorous attention from U.S. Catholics since the 1910s: Mexico, Russia, and Spain. At the time, all three divided American Catholics from the Protestant majority; in Cold War retrospect, however, they won for Catholicism a mantle of anticommunist legitimacy that positioned them for intellectual leadership in the fight for the free world.[19]

Finally, fundamental changes in the intimate economic organization of American life opened up new zones of conflict—which many interpreted in the light of their most essential religious beliefs. The revolution against white supremacy and the massive resistance to it represented many strains of ideology, but Christianity was prominent among them.[20] The 1960s sexual revolution and the feminist movement against juridically sanctioned inequality accelerated the logic of companionate marriage that had arisen in a consumer society: as conservative critics argued at the time, a household that was not organized as an economic unit of production and reproduction could not logically justify sex-role differentiation or, indeed, any purpose beyond the mutual satisfaction of its members.[21] These wrenching changes played out as conflicts in homes and workplaces and, ultimately, the formal political sphere as well.

The stresses of the new economic dispensation of the 1970s—"stagflation," deindustrialization, financialization, automation, and offshoring—created an opportunity to split the industrial New Deal coalition and reorganize constituencies around the concerns more salient to the postindustrial era. Some observers referred to this remade political terrain as the elevation of "social" or "cultural" concerns—sex education, the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion, homosexuality, pornography—over straightforward economic interests. And certainly there was no denying that the mass of conservative voters were the clear material losers in the polarization of wealth and decline of the middle class that resulted from their political choices in the 1970s and 1980s. But the convergence of Christian conservatism across denominational lines in those years actually suggests not that religiously conservative voters allowed themselves to be distracted by "culture"—in every case, actually, the social organization of racialized sex and gender—but rather that the elements of economic life that operate through sexuality and gender distinction became more salient for all concerned.[22] Theologies that explicitly rejected the modern conflation of work with

industry, of community with nation-state, of marriage with self-fulfillment spoke to many souls caught in the postmodern, postindustrial transformations of the late twentieth century.

In short, reconciling evangelicals and Catholics around sexual conservatism required a legal redefinition of religious liberty, a massive transfer of resources, and a demographic reorientation around whiteness. But it also drew upon the long tradition of Catholic antimodernist intellectual production in which the inseparability of cultural or social issues and economic ones becomes explicit.

In 1992, Regnery Publishing—the storied conservative house that introduced William F. Buckley to the reading public in 1951 with *God and Man at Yale*—published Marvin Olasky's *The Tragedy of American Compassion*. It argued that private, primarily Christian charities historically have succeeded in alleviating social ills because of the close personal connection they forge between the supplicant and the benefactor. In contrast, Olasky found, government-sponsored social programs inevitably became bureaucratic and disconnected from the human factor, and so increased dependency rather than alleviating it. Conservative Catholic pundit and former secretary of education William Bennett pressed the book upon then-Southern Baptist Newt Gingrich, who distributed copies to the incoming freshmen of the 104th Congress, the first Republican congressional majority in forty years. Olasky also came to the attention of Texas governor Bush.[23]

"Compassionate conservatism" thus became the vehicle by which Catholic antimodernism caught up with evangelical postmodernism in American politics. Through much of the modern era, Catholic social thought was not easily classifiable on a strict left-right axis. Rather, it championed a holistic, hierarchical organization of social and religious duties over against the functional differentiation and rational individualism fostered by industrial modernity—an argument with a long pedigree. The European revolutions of 1848 had soured Pope Pius IX on modernism in all its guises, from capitalism to nationalism to socialism. The ultramontane Church would offer Christendom a rallying point for resisting the acids of modernity, whether those dripped from secular rationalism or faith in the coming revolution: the rock of Peter, at least, would not melt into air.

Elites of industrializing America in the nineteenth century signaled a hunger for this perceived premodern wholeness with their embrace of Catholic aesthetic forms. From cathedral tours of Europe to the novels of Sir

Walter Scott, turn-of-the-century high culture was awash with medieval nostalgia. Henry Adams, the bard of the passing Anglo-Saxon elite, classically expressed the agony of modern weightlessness and the loss of Catholic organic unity in his encounter with the massive Corliss steam engine at the 1900 Paris Exposition: the record of human creation on display "at the Louvre and at Chartres" revealed devotion to the Virgin as "the highest energy ever known to man"—and yet, Adams grieved, "this energy was unknown to the American mind." In trading the Virgin for the dynamo, pursuing the rational Father over the generative Mother, America had made herself an orphan exile in a sterile land.[24]

Much of this spiritual agony remained more aesthetic than confessional, though an influential generation of English and American converts brought sophisticated theology into Anglophone debate.[25] A more lasting contribution was Leo XIII's landmark 1891 papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* ("Of new things" or "Of revolutionary change"—a concession in itself, as the "new things" of industrial modernity had previously merited only sweeping denunciation from Rome). Here the Church laid out a holistic critique of laissez-faire economics and promoted corporatist alternatives like trade unions and a living wage—that is, a model of modern work based in notions of medieval hierarchy and unity, which understood economic actors to be differentiated by function but embedded in collectivities.

Only concern for decorum removed an explicit denunciation of contraception from the final draft of *Rerum Novarum*, where it might at first seem peripheral to a critique of unbridled free-market competition. But this influential synthesis of Catholic social teaching invoked the rights and duties of labor and capital within a fixed hierarchy. The family served as exhibit A in this vision of natural corporatism, the essential logic by which the Church could embrace unions and labor regulation while rejecting the philosophical basis of socialism. As a necessary precondition to criticizing the maldistribution of wealth and the immiseration of industrial workers, the Vatican defended private property rights as natural law predicated on the patriarchal family: "A family, no less than a State, is . . . a true society, governed by an authority peculiar to itself, that is to say, by the authority of the father. . . . Paternal authority can be neither abolished nor absorbed by the State; for it has the same source as human life itself. 'The child belongs to the father.' . . . The socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and setting up a State supervision, act against natural justice, and destroy the structure of the home."[26] Similarly, the National Catholic Welfare Council's Father John A. Ryan, an

influential voice within the New Deal intellectual establishment, was simultaneously the champion of minimum wage legislation and the vigorous opponent of the distribution of birth control information. At the same time that he was publishing a guild-based argument in support of striking anthracite coal miners, Father Ryan was decrying "race suicide" and naming the "perverse" small family as a dangerous proof of "enervating self-indulgence" that would "inevitably bring about the progressive, mental, moral, and physical deterioration" of Americans.[27]

In the depths of industrial depression, Pope Pius XI deepened the corporatist strains of Catholic economic thought in the 1931 papal encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. Its principle of subsidiarity held that no social function should be carried out by a more central or higher authority when a local, lesser authority could do so, a principle that would be taken up by small-government conservatives in the 1990s. At the same time, Pius XI reaffirmed papal allegiance to the labor theory of value, noted the necessity of state ownership of some resources, and asserted that "the right ordering of economic life cannot be left to a free competition of forces."[28]

Another strain of Catholic antimodernism flowed into American conservatism from an unlikely source—Nashville, Tennessee, the Vatican City of America's largest Protestant denomination, the Southern Baptist Convention. The Nashville Agrarians, the interwar years' most visible champions of a specifically southern conservatism, embraced elements of Catholic antimodernism in their 1930 manifesto *I'll Take My Stand*. In his contribution to the volume, poet and movement leader Allen Tate asserted that the appropriate religion for the "feudal" society of the agrarian South was actually Catholicism, not the "trading religion" of Protestantism. Tate, who converted to Catholicism in 1950 and married as his third wife a former nun, argued elsewhere for the formation of a southern academy along the lines of L'Action Francaise, the anti-Semitic French nationalist movement created in the wake of the Dreyfus affair.[29] The Agrarians' subsequent association with the reactionary journal *American Review* put them into conversation with neo-Scholastics and with the European Distributists, Catholic converts like G. K. Chesterton, Eric Gill, and Hilaire Belloc, who denounced industrial wage slavery and financialization and urged a policy of peasant proprietorship as the precondition of authentic spiritual liberty.[30]

The Agrarians were widely discredited by their pre-1937 flirtations with fascism, though some remained influential in American letters for decades.[31] More generally, the larger artistic movement of regionalism that opposed

homogenizing industrial nationalism was thoroughly discredited by the war-time and Cold War demands of universalism and toleration, both crucial to leading the free world away from Soviet bondage.[32] But the logic of antimod-ernism continued to appeal to many who were alienated both by industrial, urban America and by the "suburban captivity of the churches" that followed the lonely crowd to Levittown.[33] The Catholic Worker movement lay in a clear line of descent from the Distributists, but rejected all governments as essentially totalitarian and embraced radical pacifism. Dorothy Day, a former leftist who converted to Catholicism, and Peter Maurin, an itinerant French "fool for Christ," together launched the movement and its newspaper in 1933 on principles of voluntary poverty and radical hospitality to the most mar-ginal members of society. Their Catholic personalism offered a different route to collective rejection of instrumental rationality and atomized individualism through communal farming, expressed by Maurin succinctly: "Catholics should take up this back to the land problem and put it back into operation. Why Catholics: because they realize more clearly than others the shortcom-ings of the old capitalist industrial system."[34] Like these experimental farms—all, ultimately, spectacular failures—the radically pronatalist commune Marycrest was a world away from the upwardly mobile parishioners or the foot-ball fans in South Bend. The integralist movement centered on Marycrest and the lay magazine *Integrity* sought to replace the bourgeois pursuit of "self-expression . . . self-aggrandizement . . . self-improvement" that perverted human nature—most clearly in the sin of birth control.[35]

Of the animating principles behind the Catholic Workers and Marycrest, only the concern with personal contact with the poor was also discernible in the compassionate conservatism of Marvin Olasky, and it led to quite distinct political conclusions. Like Gingrich himself, Olasky embodied a familiar story in his generation, walking the neoconservative road that ran parallel to the path of the New Christian Right. Born to second-generation Russian-Jewish parents in New York, he briefly embraced the Torah as a teenager, then joined the Communist Party and toured the Soviet Union during the colorless Brezhnev era. Plagued by doubts, however, Olasky and his wife con-verted to Christianity in 1976, by way of the rock-ribbed Conservative Baptist Church. He turned to copywriting for chemical giant DuPont, then to teach-ing at the University of Texas. There he came to believe that nineteenth-century-style philanthropy, by fostering personal bonds between donor and recipient that trained the less fortunate in middle-class virtues, could succeed where bureaucratic welfare allegedly failed.[36]

Olasky's vision of compassionate conservatism fit the round peg of Catholic social teaching into the square hole of evangelical individualism. To explain why private associations, rather than public ones, were best suited to ameliorate social ills, Olasky explicitly invoked subsidiarity in the words of John Paul II on the centenary of *Rerum Novarum*: "A community of a higher order should not interfere in the internal life of a community of a lower order, depriving the latter of its functions."[37]

Olasky, however, imbibed his understanding of subsidiarity not from Leo XIII nor Pius XI, but from the theoconservative intellectual Michael Novak. Supported by think tanks like the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Institute, and the Olin Foundation, "theocons" like Novak, Father Richard Neuhaus, and George Weigel undertook to weave together a seamless garment of American religious conservatism. The evangelical vote alone, after all, could not have produced the Reagan Revolution; if the Catholic "Reagan Democrats" were to be reliably incorporated into the conservative project, they would need a firmer foundation on which to stand. These formerly liberal thinkers set about Catholicizing the nascent Moral Majority in ideology if not in formal allegiance. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, theoconservative thinkers offered defenses of war, church-state cooperation, and the free market based in Catholic traditions.[38] In 1998 Texas governor George W. Bush solicited a series of tutorials on Catholic social thought and the "culture of life." By focusing on the Supreme Court decisions that extended First Amendment protections to areas formerly hospitable to the old Protestant moral establishment, the theocons reinterpreted traditional anti-Catholicism as secular opposition to religion in general. The Catholic experience of discrimination could serve as a usable past for the descendants of the anti-Catholic partisans themselves.[39]

At the grassroots, Catholic anti-ERA activist Phyllis Schlafly first demonstrated that a Republican coalition could be formed from the overlapping concerns of traditionalist Catholic, Mormon, and evangelical women who critiqued women's economic vulnerability from a conservative standpoint.[40] (This creative collaboration was echoed on the religious left by the cooperation of progressive evangelicals, Catholics, Quakers, and mainline Protestants through institutions like Bread for the World, *Sojourners* magazine, and Reagan-era peace activism, but they were thoroughly overshadowed by the robust mobilization on the right, especially as opposition to abortion became the gatekeeper issue to religious political legitimacy.)[41] The second generation

of evangelical architects of the New Christian Right made formal attempts to build on the clear concert of interests forming among activists and intellectuals. Ralph Reed, the "wunderkind of the mostly evangelical Christian Coalition," employed the language of compassionate conservatism and family values, and in 1992 began to court Catholics by stressing opposition to abortion. In 1995, he launched the Catholic Alliance, an effort to add a quarter million Catholics to the profamily movement by the next year's elections. Reed fumbled badly, however, by failing to consult any actual Catholics and alienating many of the bishops, who saw any segmentation of the Catholic brand as a potential threat to their claims of unified moral leadership. The Catholic Alliance not surprisingly fell woefully short of its announced goal, and despite the Catholic-inflected pro-life plank that Reed engineered for the 1996 GOP platform, the majority of Catholic voters cast their votes for Bill Clinton.[42]

But in 1993, fifteen Catholic and evangelical leaders signed the public manifesto "Evangelicals and Catholics Together." The document rather sweepingly downplays five-hundred-year-old theological conflicts to assert that, confronted with both Islam and secularism, evangelicals and Catholics must close ranks. After noting major unresolved points of contention, the drafters turn to the common mission ahead: "The pattern of convergence and cooperation between Evangelicals and Catholics is, in large part, a result of common effort to protect human life, especially the lives of the most vulnerable among us" in which the fetus stands in for "the helpless old, the radically handicapped, and others who cannot effectively assert their rights," who nonetheless fail to appear in the subsequent policy recommendations. Rather, the signers rededicated themselves to such specific objectives as boycotts against obscene media, military defense of religious freedom abroad, and the promotion of a vibrant free market.[43]

If domestic Catholics came into their own as heroes of the evangelical right by the late twentieth century, then internationally the historical irony was even more ample: the Vatican, long excoriated by American evangelicals for its supranational sovereignty, won prestige as the implacable foe of international Communism, and began at the end of the twentieth century to offer leadership for the "globalization of family values."[44] Equipped with the moral prestige of a legitimate Cold War hero in the charismatic Pope John Paul II, family values took on a cosmopolitan cast. In this new context, the Vatican was transformed for many evangelicals from the authoritarian barrier against

free will into the only genuinely free actor on the international stage, because of its independence from U.S. and Western European aid agencies and its imperviousness to feminist infiltration.

The shift took place in the context of Cold War struggles to define international population control. As commentators like Father Ryan had frankly acknowledged in the context of turn-of-the-century arguments about white "race suicide," birth control had been thoroughly entangled with eugenic priorities, both domestically and internationally, since the nineteenth century. After World War II, Malthusian arguments reappeared as liberal anticommunist anxiety about the "population bomb," the "billions of half-alive, starving peasants," who would fuel Marxist revolutions in the ex-colonies and retard economic development no matter how much Western aid was showered on the darker nations. Initially the establishment response to international population growth was relatively uncontroversial. Both Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman accepted honorary positions with Planned Parenthood, Lyndon Johnson received the first Margaret Sanger Award in World Leadership, and Richard Nixon appealed to none other than the United Nations to help halt population growth. The liberal World Council of Churches was firmly on the side of controlling fertility, and evangelical Protestants were not vocally opposed, leaving the Catholic position as the outlier, widely expected to change as Vatican II transformed so much of fundamental dogma. In 1968, however, Pope Paul VI reaffirmed the sinfulness of birth control in the papal encyclical *Humanae Vitae*.[45] Nixon, intent on capturing more Catholic Democrats for his Silent Majority in 1972, came out publicly against the liberal recommendations of his own Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, even as his administration secretly worried about the national security implications of continued population growth around the world. Following the domestic defeat of *Roe* v. *Wade*, North Carolina senator Jesse Helms opened a new front for the emerging socioeconomic battle around reproduction when he sponsored a successful amendment to bar USAID funding for abortion overseas.[46]

Here again, the allegedly "cultural" issue of reproductive ethics clearly stated its contrasting economic logics: just as midcentury liberals had forthrightly pointed out that "less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth," the international champions of family values embraced an explicitly supply-side economic argument. Rejecting the sober assertion of limits to growth, the "Cornucopians" of the 1980s promoted a view of expanding population as the ultimate resource, the

wellspring of ingenuity that would innovate humanity out of resource deple-
tion and environmental degradation. (In a 1984 book underwritten by the oil
and textile industries, Georgia congressman Newt Gingrich chimed in with
suggestions for exploiting energy from space.) Best-selling business professor
Julian Simon won a hearing for the optimistic theory as an advisor within the
Reagan administration. A few days before the 1984 Republican Convention,
the administration unveiled its population policy at the U.N. Population
Conference in Mexico City; it was represented by U.N. ambassadors James
Buckley (brother to William F. and son of a Catholic oil magnate radicalized
to anticommunism by the Mexican Revolution) and Alan Keyes, who won
later fame as the complainant in a lawsuit alleging President Obama was not
a U.S. citizen. The official U.S. statement charged that "government control of
economies" had transformed population growth from an "asset" to a "peril,"
and concluded that while short-term measures to limit fertility might occa-
sionally be warranted, "population control efforts alone cannot substitute for
the economic reforms that put a society on the road toward growth."[47]

The resulting "global gag rule" broadened the Helms Amendment to ban
U.S. funding for any international population control organizations that in-
cluded abortion provision, information, or lobbying, regardless of whether
American monies were used to pay for those activities; in effect, it offshored
the domestic fight over reproduction. Although the Mexico City rule became
a ritual marker of changing administrations—dropped by Bill Clinton, rein-
stated under George W. Bush, dropped again by Barack Obama—it gave the
emerging conservative religious coalition a rallying point. In the ensuing de-
cades, Vatican efforts at the U.N. population conferences more generally en-
ergized U.S. family values organizations like James Dobson's Focus on the
Family media empire, the Mormon World Family Policy Center, and—in a
distant echo of Nashville—the Howard Center's Allan Carlson, who cele-
brated agrarian self-sufficiency through communal vegetable farming and
the Amish approach to technology.[48] During the George W. Bush presidency,
the international profamily coalition became a persistent lobbying presence
and watchdog at U.N. conferences, influencing policy, personnel, and formal
statements. Moreover, in foregrounding conservative allies from Africa and
Latin America and dropping the more parochial aspects of its domestic
agenda, the U.S.-dominated defense of the natural family at the international
level has also tried to come to terms with the growing marginality of white
Christians in the global North relative to the former objects of their mission-
ary efforts. The closing of ranks between evangelicals and Catholics

acknowledged a radically new religious geography, crossing from the Cold War to the New World Order on the bridge of reproductive crisis.[49]

In November of 2010, the Gingriches were onstage at a conservative Catholic college in Ohio. After a few words from Callista, her husband took the podium to introduce their joint creation, a documentary about Pope John Paul II's 1979 visit to his native Poland. He drew the audience's attention to a trope that emerged over and over in his interviews with eyewitnesses who were among the three million people present for the pontiff's celebration of mass in Victory Square. "[T]hey said to me, 'All of a sudden we looked around and realized there are more of us than there are of the government. So why should we be afraid of them. . . .' I think it applies more [to the United States] than most of our elites would believe."[50]

This documentary, *Nine Days That Changed the World*—presumably a deliberate echo of John Reed's 1919 account of the Bolshevik Revolution— was produced by a media company called Citizens United. The conservative nonprofit specialized in feature-length productions that showcased Republican political figures or attacked Democratic ones; its oeuvre included, most momentously, *Hillary: The Movie*, the quasi-attack ad at stake in the 2010 Supreme Court decision that removed a generation of legislative restraints on corporate political expenditures. The moral stature of the Cold War pope— the pontiff who forcefully halted the progress of liberation theology, embraced the procapitalist traditionalism of parachurch movements like Opus Dei and *Comunione e Liberazione*, and marked the hundred-year anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* with an endorsement of "the fundamental and positive role of business, the market, private property"—was thus deployed for a classic Sunbelt goal.

In one sense, Newt Gingrich was the least likely of converts, his version of Sunbelt exurban evangelicalism the furthest from Rome: this Newtonian infatuation with technology, after all, bears the clear marks of descent from Henry Adams's turn-of-the-century dynamo, the wondrous creative power that scientific rationality has placed in human hands, the gift of Satan to Faust, of the Reformation to the superstitious serf. But seen from a different angle, the digital technologies of the new millennium are the Virgin's children as well: Gingrich's own techno-utopianism in the 1990s drank deeply from the thought of *Wired* journalist and trickle-down enthusiast George Gilder, who held that "marriage is necessary because of the link between faith in the dynamism of a free-market economy, faith in one's procreative

energies and prospects, and religious faith." The liberty of the digital frontier that Gingrich promoted in his nonprofit Progress and Freedom Foundation required counterbalancing religiously sanctioned gender differentiation.[51] And as historian Fred Turner has shown, the architecture of late twentieth-century consumer technology grew up not only in the closed worlds of corporate-military rationality, but also in the lush gardens of countercultural communes and mystical psilocybic spirituality. They articulate a persistent desire to dissolve boundaries between organism and tool, between information and the bodies that carry it. The ultimate goal of networking society into an endless circuit and finally dissolving the lonely subject of enlightened liberal modernity echoes the longing for organic unity, "Soul within Soul—Mother and child in One!"[52]

Newt Gingrich, of course, suspended his campaign after Romney's nomination became inevitable, and the white values voters who had supported him largely transferred their support to the uncharismatic Mormon; in the end the national election produced only partial variations on the narrow range of scripts available since the Reagan Revolution, and those could not carry the day for "God's Own Party." Thus if the converted Gingrich embodies an important narrative in American political and religious history, he lies at the end of the story. Just as his party is coming to terms with its declining demographic base, both of his adult church homes are reassessing their futures in light of important new trends.

Despite the continued salience of religion in U.S. presidential politics, recent data suggest that a generational change of guard is fundamentally altering the story line. The percentage of Americans reporting no religious preference doubled in the 1990s, from a long-stable 7 percent to almost one in five. Most of those who expressed no religious preference continued to say that religion was very important in their lives, but that its organized representatives were "too concerned with money and power, too focused on rules, and too involved in politics." Though the majority had been raised in a religious faith, they had soured on the hard line coming from organized religion in the Gingrich and Bush years—and they were disproportionately white and voted Democratic. The Democrats won, too, with Hispanic voters regardless of religious affiliation. In short, the Republican presidential slate could still win the overwhelming majority of white Catholics, white evangelicals, Mormons, and frequent churchgoers of all denominations—and lose the White House.[53]

The sober soul searching among postelection Republicans echoed concerns coming from the Gingriches' churches. With titles like *The Great Evangelical Recession*, concerned insiders predicted "a massive decrease in evangelical influence politically, economically, culturally, and financially."[54] The premier family values advice and advocacy empire, Focus on the Family, laid off almost five hundred staff members as donations dropped in the 2010s. Churches affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention increasingly opted for titles like "Christ Journey" or "Christ Fellowship," as polls showed the brand had indeed been tarnished by the denomination's sex-based political crusade since the 1979 fundamentalist takeover and the historically accurate resonance of "southern" with "pro-slavery."[55]

Similar signs of crisis and creative response can be read in the recent history of the Catholic Church. In the rise of the unaffiliated, the American Catholic Church was the single biggest loser: those who left (for no church or a different one) outnumbered those who joined by almost four to one, and more than half of those who joined the ranks of the unaffiliated cited the Church's teachings on homosexuality and abortion as the cause.[56] The costly revelations of clerical sex abuse shattered what little remaining credibility the Church could claim on precisely the issues it had put front and center since its 1968 reaffirmation of the inherent sinfulness of birth control. In an ironic twist, the same Catholic NGOs that had been nurtured by federal donations and purchase of service agreements since World War II became the U.S. bishops' sticking point in opposing the Obama administration's health care reform: Catholics were instructed to oppose the legislation rather than force Catholic schools and hospitals to allow for contraception coverage for their employees. The bishops' argument largely fell on deaf ears in the parishes, where a solid majority supported the measure. With the resignation of Benedict XVI and the elevation of Francis, the tide turned swiftly: right-wing non-Catholic pundits denounced the pope as a Marxist, but his robust attacks on idolatry of "a god called 'money'" resonated with a generation driven from the Church by its prurient fixation on "small-minded rules" and the massive hypocrisy on display in the clerical abuse tragedy.[57] According both to evangelicals and to Catholics, then, the half-century evolution of the values voter has come to a new juncture. They see domestic signs like declining belief, rising numbers of Hispanic Christians, moral outrage over the financial collapse, and the mainstreaming of homosexuality in the broader context of the overall shift of Christianity toward the global South, and all signal something fundamentally new for the faithful.[58] Newt Gingrich and his generation

defined the terms by which religious culture politically engaged economic change in the later twentieth century. But even the former Speaker has rather limply acknowledged that Pope Francis's concern for the poor would be a healthy corrective for the GOP, and both Gingriches made the pilgrimage to Rome to watch the joint canonization of Vatican II iconoclast John XXIII and Cold Warrior John Paul II, putting a brave face on the occasion by noting that the current pope "likes people." Meanwhile, drawing on their broader usable past, newer voices in the conversation include the Walmart Moms and the Nuns on the Bus, the "I am Mormon" campaign, and the Southern Baptists' billboard blitz in favor of liberalized immigration. When Americans—believers and nonbelievers alike—discuss the issues closest to our hearts, we cannot help but invoke centuries of religious struggle.[59]

# NOTES

Introduction

1. George Washington, "Farewell Address," September 19, 1796, in *The Writings of George Washington* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1940), 35:229. On the place of religion in George Washington's political philosophy, see Mary V. Thompson, *"In the Hands of a Good Providence": Religion in the Life of George Washington* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008).

2. Thomas Jefferson to the Danbury Baptist Association, January 1, 1802, in *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 36:258.

3. Thomas Jefferson, "Second Inaugural Address," March 4, 1805, in *Writings* (New York: Library of America, 1984), 519–20.

4. Quoted in Edwin S. Gaustad, *Sworn on the Altar of God: A Religious Biography of Thomas Jefferson* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 98–99. For an analysis of Jefferson and his "wall" metaphor, see Daniel Dreisbach, *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State* (New York: NYU Press, 2002).

5. The theory itself is now widespread in the secondary literature, but for the original and most authoritative account, originally published in 1992, see Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America, 1776–2005: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005).

6. See especially Frank Lambert, *The Founding Fathers and the Place of Religion in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003). On the religious beliefs of the Founders, see also David L. Holmes, *The Faiths of the Founding Fathers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

7. Gaustad, *Sworn on the Altar of God*, 51–55; Lance Banning, *The Sacred Fire of Liberty: James Madison and the Founding of the Federal Republic* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995). On Jefferson and Madison's Virginian milieu, in which religious dissenters chafed under the established supremacy of the official Anglican Church and without which it is difficult to understand their thinking on religious freedom, see Thomas E. Buckley, *Church and State in Revolutionary Virginia, 1776–1787* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977); and John A. Ragosta, *Wellspring of Liberty: How Virginia's Religious Dissenters Helped Win the American Revolution and Secured Religious Liberty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

8. David Domke and Kevin Coe, *The God Strategy: How Religion Became a Political Weapon in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

9. Amanda Porterfield, *Conceived in Doubt: Religion and Politics in the New American Nation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

10. Harry S. Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War* (New York: Viking, 2006). See also Mark A. Noll, *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

11. Matthew Avery Sutton, *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Steven P. Miller, *Billy Graham and the Rise of the Republican South* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

12. Mark A. Noll, *God and Race in American Politics: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Edward J. Blum and Paul Harvey, *The Color of Christ: The Son of God and the Saga of Race in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012). See also Robin Dale Jacobson and Nancy D. Wadsworth, eds., *Faith and Race in American Political Life* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012).

13. David A. Hollinger, *Science, Jews, and Secular Culture: Studies in Mid-Twentieth-Century American Intellectual History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998); Andrew R. Heinze, *Jews and the American Soul: Human Nature in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004); Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Jonathan Freedman, *Klezmer America: Jewishness, Ethnicity, Modernity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008).

14. Andrew J. Rotter, *Comrades at Odds: The United States and India, 1947–1964* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000); Seth Jacobs, *America's Miracle Man in Vietnam: Ngo Dinh Diem, Religion, Race, and U.S. Intervention in Southeast Asia, 1950–1957* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Melani McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East Since 1945*, rev. ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Angela M. Lahr, *Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares: The Cold War Origins of Political Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); William Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945–1960: The Soul of Containment* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); T. Jeremy Gunn, *Spiritual Weapons: The Cold War and the Forging of an American National Religion* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2009); Andrew S. Finstuen, *Original Sin and Everyday Protestants: The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr, Billy Graham, and Paul Tillich in an Age of Anxiety* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); Jason W. Stevens, *God-Fearing and Free: A Spiritual History of America's Cold War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010); Jonathan P. Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle Against Communism in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Raymond Haberski, Jr., *God and War: American Civil Religion Since 1945* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012); Mark Thomas Edwards, *The Right of the Protestant Left: God's Totalitarianism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan,

2012); Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York: Knopf, 2012), 384–600.

15. On Protestant hegemony, see David Sehat, *The Myth of American Religious Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). On coercion as an aspect of assimilation, see Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001). There is a rich and long-standing secondary literature on anti-Catholic nativism, much of it dealing with the ethnocultural interpretation of American political history, but for recent accounts that focus on Protestant politico-religious conflict with other faiths, see Sarah Barringer Gordon, *The Mormon Question: Polygamy and Constitutional Conflict in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Kathleen Flake, *The Politics of American Religious Identity: The Seating of Senator Reed Smoot, Mormon Apostle* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Justin Nordstrom, *Danger on the Doorstep: Anti-Catholicism and American Print Culture in the Progressive Era* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006); Peter Schrag, *Not Fit for Our Society: Immigration and Nativism in America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010); J. Spencer Fluhman, *"A Peculiar People": Anti-Mormonism and the Making of Religion in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012); and Katie Oxx, *The Nativist Movement in America: Religious Conflict in the 19th Century* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

16. David A. Hollinger, "The 'Secularization' Question and the United States in the Twentieth Century," *Church History* 70 (March 2001): 132–43; Michael O'Brien, "The American Experience of Secularisation," in *Religion and the Political Imagination*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Gareth Stedman Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 132–49. This was just as true in the early republic as it was in more modern eras: see John Lardas Modern, *Secularism in Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

17. For the history of secularism and atheism in America, see James Turner, *Without God, Without Creed: The Origins of Unbelief in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985); and Susan Jacoby, *Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004).

18. See especially Philip Hamburger, *Separation of Church and State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

19. Joseph P. Viteritti, *The Last Freedom: Religion from the Public School to the Public Square* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

20. David A. Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

21. Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

22. Pew Research Center, Religion & Public Life Project, "'Nones' on the Rise" (October 9, 2012), http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/.

23. Jon Butler, "Jack-in-the-Box Faith: The Religion Problem in Modern American

History," *Journal of American History* 90 (March 2004): 1357–78. See also Paul Boyer, "In Search of the Fourth 'R': The Treatment of Religion in American History Textbooks and Survey Courses," *History Teacher* 29 (February 1996): 195–216; "Introduction," in *New Directions in American Religious History*, ed. Harry S. Stout and D. G. Hart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 3–11; Hollinger, "'Secularization' Question"; and John F. Wilson, *Religion and the American Nation: Historiography and History* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003).

24. See, respectively, Andrew Preston, "Bridging the Gap Between Church and State in the History of American Foreign Relations," *Diplomatic History* 30 (November 2006): 783–812; and David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

25. For American studies, see R. Marie Griffith and Melani McAlister, "Introduction: Is the Public Square Still Naked?," in *Religion and Politics in the Contemporary United States*, ed. R. Marie Griffith and Melani McAlister (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 1–37. For IR, see Jonathan Fox, "Religion as an Overlooked Element of International Relations," *International Studies Review* 3 (Autumn 2001): 53–73; and Timothy Samuel Shah and Daniel Philpott, "The Fall and Rise of Religion in International Relations: History and Theory," in *Religion and International Relations Theory*, ed. Jack Snyder (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 24–59.

26. For a compelling cautionary note, see Kevin M. Schultz and Paul Harvey, "Everywhere and Nowhere: Recent Trends in American Religious History and Historiography," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 78 (March 2010): 129–62.

27. Laurie F. Maffly-Kipp, "The Burdens of Church History," *Church History* 82 (May 2013): 353–67. On lived religion, a category of religious social history that of course has no direct analogue to political history, see David D. Hall, ed., *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

28. Among recent titles, the following overviews particularly stand out: A. James Reichley, *Faith in Politics* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002); Edith L. Blumhofer, ed., *Religion, Politics, and the American Experience: Reflections on Religion and American Public Life* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002); Gary Scott Smith, *Faith and the Presidency: From George Washington to George W. Bush* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); J. Matthew Wilson, ed., *From Pews to Polling Places: Faith and Politics in the American Religious Mosaic* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2007); Mark A. Noll and Luke E. Harlow, eds., *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the Present*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); John C. Green, *The Faith Factor: How Religion Influences American Elections* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007); Griffith and McAlister, *Religion and Politics in the Contemporary United States*; Frank Lambert, *Religion in American Politics: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Charles W. Dunn, ed., *The Future of Religion in American Politics* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2009); and Ted G. Jelen, *To Serve God and Mammon: Church-State Relations in American Politics*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010).

Chapter 1. "Against the Foes That Destroy the Family"

1. Washington Gladden, "The Increase of Divorce," *Century* 23 (January 1882): 411, 420.

2. For more general expressions of his opposition to anti-Catholicism, see Washington Gladden, *Social Facts and Forces* (New York: Putnam, 1897), 209; see also A. David Bos, "Washington Gladden Versus Anti-Catholicism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 18 (Spring 1981): 281–92.

3. Theodore Dwight Woolsey, *Divorce and Divorce Legislation: Especially in the United States, Second Edition* (New York: Scribner, 1882), 281.

4. "Modern Catholicism," *Century* 27 (February 1884): 626.

5. For statistics, see Robert L. Griswold, "Law, Sex, Cruelty, and Divorce in Victorian America, 1840–1900," *American Quarterly* 38 (Winter 1986): 722; see also Nancy F. Cott, *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 102–10; Glenda Riley, *Divorce: An American Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 5, 94–95.

6. Riley, *Divorce*, 5, 75–85; see also Norma Basch, *Framing American Divorce: From the Revolutionary Generation to the Victorians* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 68–74.

7. *The National Divorce Reform League—An Abstract of Its Annual Reports, October 1885* (Boston: National Divorce Reform League, 1885), 1; Augustine F. Hewit, "Dr. Woolsey on Divorce," *Catholic World* 35 (April 1882): 14.

8. On divorce in North Dakota, see "The Week," *Outlook* 55 (April 17, 1897): 1012–13; see also Riley, *Divorce*, 114.

9. The classic articulation of this view remains John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1955), esp. chaps. 4 and 5. Recent scholarship has provided some nuance to this perspective, noting instances of Protestant-Catholic cooperation on issues such as temperance and charity did occur. See John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: Norton, 2003), 123–24; Deidre M. Moloney, *American Catholic Lay Groups and Transatlantic Social Reform in the Progressive Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), esp. chap. 2.

10. On the triumph of liberal theology in American Protestantism during this period, see Gary Dorrien, *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805–1900* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), esp. chap. 5; William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992), esp. 113–22; on liberal Catholicism, see Robert D. Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959); Jay P. Dolan, *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 71–78, 99–117.

11. Washington Gladden, *Applied Christianity: Moral Aspects of Social Questions* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1886), 187.

12. Washington Gladden, *Tools and the Man: Property and Industry Under Christian Law* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1893), 9.

13. Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1892), 262. For the NDRL recommendation, see *Report of the National Divorce Reform League for the Year Ending December 31, 1894* (Boston: Everett Press, 1895), 24.

14. National Divorce Reform League Constitution, quoted in *National Divorce Reform League—An Abstract of Its Annual Reports*, 1.

15. Ibid., 3. The suggestion that divorce led to abortions was common; see Dike, "Some Aspects of the Reform Question," *Princeton Review* 60 (March 1884): 175; Woolsey, *Divorce and Divorce Legislation*, 236–37.

16. "The Week," *Outlook* 56 (May 29, 1897): 243.

17. John Ireland, "The Church and Divorce," in *The Apostolic Church, a Series of Lectures to Which Is Added a Lecture on Divorce* (Saint Paul, MN: North-Western Chronicle, 1882), 58.

18. Ibid., 53.

19. John Lancaster Spalding, *Socialism and Labor and Other Arguments Social, Political, and Patriotic* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg, 1902), 111.

20. L. C. B., "Divorce," *Catholic World* 48 (October 1888): 23–24; James M. Cleary, "Intemperance: The Evil and the Remedy," *Catholic World* 58 (October 1893): 12; Helen M. Sweeny, "A New London Note-Book," *Catholic World* 56 (October 1892): 96; Helena T. Goessmann, "At All Sacrifices," *Catholic World* 57 (August 1893): 650.

21. See, for example, Gary Dorrien's discussion of the influential theology of Horace Bushnell in *Making of American Liberal Theology*, 135–38.

22. Ireland, "Church and Divorce," 56.

23. Augustine F. Hewit, "The Catholic Law of Marriage," *Catholic World* 39 (May 1884): 147.

24. George M. Searle, "The Divorce Question," *Catholic World* 48 (March 1889): 822.

25. James Gibbons, "Is Divorce Wrong?," *North American Review* 149 (November 1889): 523.

26. Gladden, "The Increase of Divorce," 414–15.

27. George Harris, *Moral Evolution* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1896), 222.

28. Dike, "Some Aspects of the Divorce Question," 185.

29. Ibid., 182.

30. Samuel W. Dike, "Present Phases of the Divorce Question" (Auburndale, MA: National Divorce Reform League, 1890), 4.

31. Lyman Abbott, "Christ's Teaching on Social Topics. VII: Marriage and Divorce," *Outlook* 53 (March 14, 1896): 477.

32. "Divorce Legislation in Connecticut," *Catholic World* 4 (October 1866): 101.

33. Searle, "Divorce Question," 822.

34. Harris, *Moral Evolution*, 366.

35. The major site of such debates was over public education; see McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, esp. 37–42.

36. Nearly every treatment of divorce touches on most of these issues; for Catholic perspectives, see Gibbons, "Is Divorce Wrong?" and Searle, "Divorce Question"; for Protestant perspectives, see Gladden, "Increase of Divorce" and I. E. Dwinell, "Easy Divorce: Its Causes and Evils, a Social Study," *New Englander and Yale Review* 43 (January 1884): 48–66.

37. Woolsey, *Divorce and Divorce Legislation*, 256; Hewit, "Dr. Woolsey on Divorce," 16.

38. Searle, "Divorce Question," 825.

39. Gibbons, "Is Divorce Wrong?," 524.

40. Searle, "Divorce Question," 829–30.

41. Woolsey, *Divorce and Divorce Legislation*, 281.

42. Ibid., 251.

43. Gladden, "Increase of Divorce," 418; see 418–19 for his list of proposed reforms.

44. John Lancaster Spalding, *Religion, Agnosticism, and Education* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg, 1903)*,* 187.

45. John Ireland, *The Church and Modern Society: Lectures and Addresses*, vol. 1 (Chicago: D. H. McBride, 1903), xxi.

46. Edward Everett Hale, "The Unitarian Conference," *Outlook* 50 (October 6, 1894): 558–59.

47. Washington Gladden, *The Christian Pastor and the Working Church* (New York: Scribner, 1898), 435.

48. Harris, *Moral Evolution*, 377.

49. Hewit, "Dr. Woolsey on Divorce," 14.

50. Riley, *Divorce*, 123.

51. For more on Americanism and its condemnation, see R. Scott Appleby, *"Church and Age Unite!" The Modernist Impulse in American Catholicism* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 80–89.

## Chapter 2. American Jewish Politics

1. For synthetic studies of the relationship between Jewish identity and space, see Barbara Mann, *Space and Place in Jewish Studies* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012); and Julia Brauch, Anna Liphardt, and Alexander Nocke, *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Spaces, Traditions of Place* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008). For a historical analysis of how power figures into Jewish history, see David Biale, *Power and Powerlessness in Jewish History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1986).

2. See Eli Lederhendler, *New York Jews and the Decline of Urban Ethnicity, 1950–1970* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001), 1–4; Ezra Mendelsohn, ed., *People of the City: Jews and the Urban Challenge*, Studies in Contemporary Jewry vol. 15 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Joachim Schlör, "Jews and the Big City: Explorations on an Urban State of Mind," in *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Spaces, Traditions of Place*, ed. Julia Brauch, Anna Liphardt, and Alexander Nocke (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008); and Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press,

2004). Also see *Jewish Quarterly Review* 12 (January 2005) and *Prooftexts* 26 (Winter/Spring 2006) for special issues devoted to Jews and urbanism.

3. Karl Marx's 1844 essay "On the Jewish Question" is the clearest expression of Western anxiety about Jewish urban economic power. Marx, however, drew upon Weber, who came to similar conclusions about the contrast between legitimate and illegitimate power, though Weber did not attack Jews with Marx's vitriol. Weber did, however, describe the modern city as a setting for the seemingly illegitimate modes of power to revolutionize life. See http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/jewish-question/index.htm; and Max Weber, *Economy and Society*, ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978). For a useful discussion of Weber, see Michael Alexander, "The Jewish Bookmaker: Gambling, Legitimacy, and the American Political Economy," in *Jews and the Sporting Life*, Studies in Contemporary Jewry vol. 23, ed. Ezra Mendelsohn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008). For a sweeping history of how Western society imagined itself through iterations of anti-Judaism, see David Nirenberg, *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition* (New York: Norton, 2013), esp. chaps. 7–13.

4. See Dan Diner, "Ambiguous Semantics: Reflections on Jewish Political Concepts," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 98, no. 1 (Winter 2008): 89–102. For studies that locate urbanism as central to the Jewish political imagination in Palestine and Israel, see Barbara Mann, *A Place in History: Modernism, Tel Aviv, and the Creation of Jewish Urban Space* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006); and Alona Nitzan-Shiftan, "Capital City or Spiritual Center? The Politics of Architecture in Post-1967 Jerusalem," *Cities* 22, no. 3 (June 2005): 229–40.

5. Ismar Schorsch, "The Emergence of Historical Consciousness in Modern Judaism," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 28, no. 1 (1983): 413–37; and Yosef Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), chap. 4.

6. Moses Rischin, *The Promised City: New York's Jews, 1870–1914* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), 3.

7. Irving Howe, *World of Our Fathers* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976). For a forum offering a critical reevaluation of Howe's book, see *American Jewish History* 88, no. 4 (December 2000). Also see Jonathan Sarna, "The Cult of Synthesis in American Jewish Culture," *Jewish Social Studies* n.s. 5, nos. 1–2 (Fall 1998–Winter 1999): 52–79.

8. The title of this essay and this formulation owe a debt to Ann Braude's formative essay "Women's History *Is* American Religious History," in *Retelling United States Religious History*, ed. Thomas Tweed (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 87–107.

9. Doreen Massey, "Places and Their Pasts," *History Workshop Journal* 39, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 188.

10. See Claude Fischer, "The Subcultural Theory of Urbanism: A Twentieth-Year Assessment," *American Journal of Sociology* 101, no. 3 (November 1995): 543–77; Robert Park, "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban

Environment," in *The City*, ed. Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, and Roderick McKenzie (1925; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967); and Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 1 (July 1938): 1–24.

11. Mann, *Space and Place in Jewish Studies*, 81.

12. This builds upon Deborah Dash Moore's important work in *At Home in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981).

13. On the origins of the ecological school of urban development in which Wirth wrote, see Robert Park and Ernest Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924). More generally on the Chicago school of sociology, see Fred Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977); and Luigi Tomasi, ed., *The Tradition of the Chicago School of Sociology* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1998). For analyses of how Chicago school thinking about cities and mobility fits into the long trajectory of American thought about assimilation and immigration, see Gary Gerstle, "Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans," *Journal of American History* 84, no. 2 (September 1997): 524–58; and Russell Kazal, "Revisiting Assimilation: The Rise, Fall and Reappraisal of a Concept in American Ethnic History," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (April 1995): 437–71.

14. Thomas Kessner, *The Golden Door: Italian and Jewish Immigrant Mobility in New York City, 1880–1915* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

15. Louis Wirth noted this pattern in his 1928 *The Ghetto* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928). On Jewish residential concentration in New York City, see Moore, *At Home in America*, 30–31.

16. Gerald Gamm, *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 17. Other historians who do not focus specifically on Jews still tend to explain the rapid pace of Jewish movement within and outside of cities as a function of Jews' low level of home ownership. See, for example, Arnold Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940–1960* (1983; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); John McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); and Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

17. Marshall Sklare, "Jews, Ethnics, and the American City," *Commentary* 53, no. 4 (April 1972): 72.

18. Moore, *At Home in America*, 39.

19. On the ties between Jewish real estate development and industrial development in New York City, see Andrew Dolkart, "From the Rag Trade to Riches: Abraham E. Lefcourt and the Development of New York's Garment District," in *Chosen Capital: The Jewish Encounter with American Capitalism*, ed. Rebecca Kobrin (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012).

20. Karla Goldman, *Beyond the Synagogue Gallery: Finding a Place for Women in American Judaism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000). For broader

studies of the way that cities carved out public spaces for activities and individuals formally confined to private space, see the editor's introduction and the essays in Catherine Rottenberg, ed., *Black Harlem and the Jewish Lower East Side: Narratives out of Time* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2013).

21. Paula Hyman, "Immigrant Women and Consumer Protest: The New York City Kosher Meat Boycott of 1902," *American Jewish History* 70, no. 1 (September 1980): 93.

22. Susan Glenn, *Daughters of the Shtetl: Life and Labor in the Immigrant Generation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 199. For similar studies of the role that ethnic identity played in labor politics, see Gary Gerstle, *Working Class Americanism: The Politics of Labor in a Textile City, 1914–1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919–1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

23. Annelise Orleck, *Commonsense and a Little Fire: Women and Working-Class Politics in the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 30.

24. Diner, "Ambiguous Semantics," 94.

25. Melissa Klapper, "'Those by Whose Side We Have Labored': American Jewish Women and the Peace Movement Between the Wars," *Journal of American History* 97, no. 3 (December 2010): 645.

26. Shaul Kelner, "Ritualized Protest and Redemptive Politics: Cultural Consequences of the American Mobilization to Free Soviet Jewry," *Jewish Social Studies* 14, no. 3 (Spring/Summer 2008): 4.

27. For an interesting and constructivist analysis of how and when American Jews perceived their religious identity as relevant to public and political matters, see Alan Mittleman, Robert Licht, and Jonathan Sarna, eds., *Jews and the American Public Square: Debating Religion and Republic* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002).

28. Lederhendler, *New York Jews*, chap. 1.

29. Park, "The City," 6. For an overview of sociological theory on the neighborhood, see Robert Sampson, *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), chap. 2.

30. For an excellent analysis of the currency of neighborhood naming and space, see Deborah Dash Moore, "On the Fringes of the City: Jewish Neighborhoods in Three Boroughs," in *The Landscape of Modernity: Essays on New York City, 1900–1940*, ed. David Ward and Olivier Zunz (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1992).

31. Hasia Diner, *Lower East Side Memories: A Jewish Place in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 131. See also Hasia Diner, Jeffrey Shandler, and Beth Wenger, eds., *Remembering the Lower East Side: American Jewish Reflections* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).

32. Olivier Zunz, *The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Industrial Development, and Immigrants in Detroit, 1880–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), pt. 4; and Sidney Bolkosky, *Harmony and Dissonance: Voices of Jewish Identity in Detroit* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press), 17–19, 436.

33. Henry Meyer, "Some Facts About Jews in Detroit," Jewish Welfare Federation,

1940, Jewish Federation of Metro Detroit Archival Collection, Reuther Library, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, box 548, folder 3, 19.

34. For a thorough discussion of this, see my forthcoming *Metropolitan Jews: Politics, Race, and Religion in Postwar Detroit* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming). On Jews and publics schools, see Stephan Brumberg, *Going to America, Going to School: The Jewish Immigrant Public School Encounter in Turn-of-the-Century New York City* (New York: Praeger, 1986).

35. For historical examinations of the trend of blacks moving into once-Jewish space, see Jeffrey Gurock, *When Harlem Was Jewish, 1870–1930* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979); William Helmreich, *The Enduring Community: The Jews of Newark and MetroWest* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1999); Hillel Levine and Lawrence Harmon, *The Death of an American Jewish Community: A Tragedy of Good Intentions* (New York: Touchstone, 1992); and Beryl Satter, *Family Properties: Race, Real Estate, and the Exploitation of Black America* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2009).

36. On black domestic workers in white homes, see Eileen Boris and Premilla Nadasen, "Domestic Workers Organize!," *WorkingUSA: The Journal of Labor and Society* 11, no. 4 (December 2008): 413–37.

37. The literature examining how structural forces shaped urban life is vast. For some of the most significant and recent work, see Alison Isenberg, *Downtown America: A History of the Place and the People Who Made It* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Satter, *Family Properties*; Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); Sugrue, *Origins of the Urban Crisis*; and Samuel Zipp, *Manhattan Projects: The Rise and Fall of Urban Renewal in Cold War New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

38. Robert Fishman remarks on panel 2 at the "Jews and the American City" conference, Temple University, November 11, 2010, transcript available at http://www.cla.temple.edu/feinsteincenter/past-events/.

39. In using the term "cosmopolitan canopy," I am drawing on Elijah Anderson, *Cosmopolitan Canopy: Race and Civility in Everyday Life* (New York: Norton, 2011).

40. On the urban Jewish left, see Tony Michels, *A Fire in Their Hearts: Yiddish Socialists in New York* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); Tony Michels, ed., *Jewish Radicals: A Documentary History* (New York: New York University Press, 2012); Annie Polland, "'May a Freethinker Help a Pious Man?': The Shared World of the 'Religious' and the 'Secular' Among Eastern European Jewish Immigrants to America," *American Jewish History* 93, no. 4 (December 2007): 375–407; Daniel Soyer, "Jewish Socialism Enters the Mainstream, 1933–1944," in *Chosen Capital: The Jewish Encounter with American Capitalism*, ed. Rebecca Kobrin (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012); and Marshall Field Stevenson, "Points of Departure, Acts of Resolve: Black-Jewish Relations in Detroit, 1937–1962" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1988).

41. Leftism endured in certain pockets of postwar Jewish urban life, though even then it rarely transformed the spatial reality of Jewish life. See, for example, George

Sanchez, "'What's Good for Boyle Heights Is Good for the Jews': Creating Multiracialism on the Eastside During the 1950s," *American Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (September 2004): 633–61.

42. See Lila Corwin Berman, "Jewish Urban Politics in the City and Beyond," *Journal of American History* 99, no. 2 (September 2012): 492–519; Antero Pietila, *Not in My Neighborhood: How Bigotry Shaped a Great American City* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2010); and Satter, *Family Properties*.

43. On the ways that Jews (and scholars of American Jews) have imagined their urban neighborhoods after they left them, see Riv-Ellen Prell, "Community and the Discourse of Elegy: The Post War Suburban Debate," in *Imagining the American Jewish Community*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England/ Brandeis University Press, 2007), 67–90.

44. Mark Dollinger, "The Other War: American Jews, Lyndon Johnson, and the Great Society," *American Jewish History* 89, no. 4 (December 2001): 437–61.

45. See Lila Corwin Berman, "Sociology, Jews, and Intermarriage in Twentieth-Century America," *Jewish Social Studies* 14, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 32–60; and Michael Staub, *Torn at the Roots: The Crisis of Jewish Liberalism in Postwar America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

46. On the forces that formed postwar suburbs, see David M. P. Freund, *Colored Property: State Policy and White Racial Politics in Suburban America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

47. Nathan Glazer, "The National Influence of Jewish New York," in *Capital of the American Century: The National and International Influence of New York City*, ed. Martin Shefter (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1993), 167.

48. See Berman, "Jewish Urban Politics in the City and Beyond."

49. On liberal political activism in the suburbs, see Lily Geismer, "Don't Blame Us: Grassroots Liberalism in Massachusetts, 1960–1990" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2010); Matthew Lassiter and Christopher Niedt, "Suburban Diversity in Postwar America," *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 1 (January 2013): 3–14; and Sylvie Murray, *The Progressive Housewife: Community Activism in Suburban Queens, 1945–1965* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

50. Milton Himmelfarb, "The Jewish Vote (Again)," *Commentary* 55, no. 6 (January 1973): 81.

51. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1963).

52. Ben Halpern, "The Roots of American Jewish Liberalism," *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 66, no. 2 (December 1976): 193.

53. Murray Friedman, "The White Liberal's Retreat," *Atlantic Monthly* 21 (January 1963): 43.

54. On neoconservatism, see Murray Friedman, *The Neoconservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy* (New York: Cambridge University

Press, 2005). On the so-called New York Jewish intellectuals, see Joseph Dorman, *Arguing the World: The New York Intellectuals in Their Own Words* (New York: Free Press, 2000).

55. See Seth Kamil, "Tripping Down Memory Lane: Walking Tours on the Jewish Lower East Side," in Diner, *Lower East Side Memories*, 226–40; and Beth Wenger, "Memory as Identity: The Invention of the Lower East Side," *American Jewish History* 85, no. 1 (March 1997): 3–27.

56. See Max Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900–1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Page's idea about cities as agents of creative destruction is tied to broader theoretical ideas about capitalist economies and their similar mode of progress through cycles of creation and destruction. See Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1942).

57. A list of current-day urban-focused Jewish organizations includes the Jewish Council on Urban Affairs, Jewish Funds for Justice, Jews United for Justice, Jewish Community Action, Progressive Jewish Alliance, AVODA: The Jewish Service Corps, Jewish Organizing Initiative, Repair the World, Tikkun Ha-Ir, Jews for Racial and Economic Justice, and Urban Adamah.

58. On Moishe House, see http://www.moishehouse.org/houses.asp.

59. One recent example of the important comparative work to come out of attention to urban spatial patterns is Rottenberg, *Black Harlem and the Jewish Lower East Side.*

### Chapter 3. Fighting for the Fundamentalists

1. Joel A. Carpenter, "Introduction," in *Fundamentalism in American Religion 1880–1950*, ed. Carpenter (New York: Garland, 1988), 3–6; Charles Trumbull, "Victorious Life Conferences in the Far East," *Sunday School Times*, May 1, 1920, 245–46.

2. W. H. Griffith Thomas, "Modernism in China," *Princeton Theological Review* 19 (October 1921): 630–31, 669, 671; Paul Hutchinson, "The Conservative Reaction in China," *Journal of Religion* 2 (July 1922): 337–61.

3. William R. Hutchison, "Modernism and Missions: The Liberal Search for an Exportable Christianity, 1875–1935," in *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*, ed. John K. Fairbank (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), 126–31; Robert Moats Miller, *Harry Emerson Fosdick: Preacher, Pastor, Prophet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 106–9.

4. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?," *Christian Work* 102 (June 10, 1922), 721–22; Harry Emerson Fosdick, *The Living of These Days: The Autobiography of Harry Emerson Fosdick* (New York: Harper Chapel Books, 1967), 145.

5. Majors boasted full capacities in production, transportation, refining, and marketing. The independent (and midmajor) oil companies lacked integrated infrastructures, economies of scale, and price-setting abilities. At midcentury majors included Exxon, Gulf, Texaco, Mobile, Shell, Standard Oil of Indiana, and Standard Oil of California.

6. Carpenter, *Fundamentalism in American Religion*, 3–4; Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1830–1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 249–50. On J. H. Blackstone and father W. E. Blackstone in China, see Papers of William Eugene Blackstone, Billy Graham Center Archives, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL, box 3, folders 6–10; and Lyman Stewart Papers, Blackstone Correspondence Box, Lyman Stewart Papers (LSP), Biola University Library, Biola University, La Mirada, CA.

7. Fosdick, *Living of These Days*, 179–80; Miller, *Harry Emerson Fosdick*, 106–8.

8. Robert Martin Krivoshey, "'Going Through the Eye of the Needle': The Life of Oil Man Fundamentalist Lyman Stewart, 1840–1923" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1973), 16; Earl M. Welty and Frank J. Taylor, *The 76 Bonanza: The Fabulous Life and Times of the Union Oil Company of California* (Menlo Park, CA: Lane, 1966), 43; "They Done Sam Kier Wrong!," *Our Sun: Magazine of Sun Oil Company*, Summer 1963, 23–25, in Sun Oil Collection, Hagley Museum and Archives, Wilmington, DE, box 10, Mr. J. N. Pew, Jr. folder.

9. Paul Sabin, *Crude Politics: The California Oil Market, 1900–1940* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 15–20; Krivoshey, "Going Through the Eye of the Needle," 25–27.

10. Ida M. Tarbell, *The History of the Standard Oil Company*, Briefer Version, ed. David M. Chalmers (New York: Dover Publications, 2003), 22; Lyman Stewart to his children, September 4, 1914, LSP; Welty and Taylor, *76 Bonanza*, 93.

11. Krivoshey, "Going Through the Eye of the Needle," 74.

12. Welty and Taylor, *76 Bonanza*, 139. On southwestern oil as "America's lifeblood," see Carl Coke Rister, *OIL! Titan of the Southwest* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949), vii, 392; Krivoshey, "Going Through the Eye of the Needle," 82; Lyman Stewart to Milton Stewart, September 30, 1884; Milton Stewart to Lyman Stewart, [n.d.] 1896, LSP.

13. Krivoshey, "Going Through the Eye of the Needle," 85–111.

14. Ibid., 141; Lyman Stewart to Milton Stewart, November 11, 1901; Lyman Stewart to Ida Tarbell, February 14, 2013, Lyman Stewart Correspondence, LSP.

15. Lyman Stewart to William L. Stewart, July 18, 1905; Luther Conant, Jr., to Lyman Stewart, October 17, 1907; Lyman Stewart to Union Oil Company, October 23, 1970, LSP.

16. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 119; Timothy E. W. Gloege, "Consumed: Reuben A. Torrey and the Construction of Corporate Fundamentalism" (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2007), 403–19; James O. Henry, "Black Oil & Souls to Win," *King's Business*, February 1958, 11–41; Lyman Stewart to Mrs. H. E. Butters, August 26, 1911, LSP.

17. Brendan Pietsch, "Lyman Stewart and the Funding of Fundamentalism" (paper, American Historical Association, January 2009); Krivoshey, "Going Through the Eye of the Needle," 363; Herbert Faulkner West, ed., *The Autobiography of Robert Watchorn*

(Oklahoma City: Robert Watchorn Charities, 1959), 164; Stanley White to Lyman Stewart, March 15, 1909, LSP.

18. "Western Securities," *Los Angeles Times*, January 25, 1925; Joseph Ezekiel Pogue, *The Economics of Petroleum* (New York: John Wiley, 1921), 73.

19. David Rockefeller, *David Rockefeller Memoirs* (New York: Random House, 2002), 243–44.

20. Welty and Taylor, *76 Bonanza*, 180; *San Francisco Examiner*, December 20, 1921; "Union Oil Saved from Foreign Control," *Los Angeles Examiner*, March 22, 1922.

21. Welty and Taylor, *76 Bonanza*, 187; *Petroleum World*, October 1923.


## Chapter 4. A "Divine Revelation"?

1. "Roosevelts Attend Presidents' Church," *New York Times*, March 5, 1933, 3; "100,000 at Inauguration," *New York Times*, March 5, 1933, 1; John L. Sutton, Jackson, Mississippi, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 9, 1935, 1, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY (hereafter FDR Library), box 17, Mississippi folder.

2. "Editorial Observations," *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, March 9, 1933, 1; "Roosevelt to Take Oath on Old Dutch Bible; Book Will Open at Paul's Words on Charity," *New York Times*, February 28, 1933, 5; "The President and the Bible," *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, May 4, 1933, 8. The King James translation of 1 Corinthians 13 uses the term "charity"; most other translations use the term "love" instead. The King James Version was commonly used in the 1930s, and the news reports referred to the passage as one about "charity," rather than "love."

3. "Text of New President's Address at Inauguration," *Washington Post*, March 5, 1933, 2.

4. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the nation's clergy, September 24, 1935, Church Matters, FDR Library, box 1. In all, the administration sent more than a hundred thousand letters to American clergy.

5. On those midwestern workers and southern planters, see James C. Cobb, *The Most Southern Place on Earth: The Mississippi Delta and the Roots of Regional Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919–1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Anthony Badger, *Prosperity Road: The New Deal, Tobacco, and North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

6. Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York: Knopf, 2012), 291–409; Jarod Roll and Erik Gellman, *The Gospel of the Working Class: Labor's New Deal Prophets* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2011); Ronald Isetti, "The Moneychangers of the Temple: FDR, American Civil Religion, and the New Deal," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (Summer 1996): 678–93; Merlin Gustafson and Jerry Rosenberg, "The Faith of Franklin Roosevelt," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Summer 1989): 559–66; Monroe

Billington and Cal Clark, "Clergy Reaction to the New Deal: A Comparative Study," *Historian* 48, no. 4 (1986): 509–24; Alan Brinkley, *Voices of Protest: Huey Long, Father Coughlin, and the Great Depression* (New York: Knopf, 1982); Anthony P. Dunbar, *Against the Grain: Southern Radicals and Prophets, 1929–1959* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981).

7. Matthew Avery Sutton, "Was FDR the Antichrist? The Birth of Fundamentalist Antiliberalism in a Global Age," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 4 (March 1, 2012): 1052–74; Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: Norton, 2010); Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009); Leo P. Ribuffo, *The Old Christian Right: The Protestant Far Right from the Great Depression to the Cold War* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983).

8. Mrs. M. L. Brantley, Whitehaven, Tennessee, to Eleanor Roosevelt, September 24, 1934, Correspondence with Government Departments, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers, FDR Library, box 262, 2–3.

9. D. B. Raulins, "Editorial Observations," *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, October 5, 1933, 1. A few historians have touched on this shift but focused on other periods: Andrew J. F. Morris, *The Limits of Voluntarism: Charity and Welfare from the New Deal Through the Great Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988). Scholars who have explored religion and the New Deal include David Hollinger, "After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Ecumenical Protestantism and the Modern American Encounter with Diversity," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 1 (June 2011): 21–48. See also Mark G. Toulouse, "Socializing Capitalism: The *Century* During the Great Depression," *Christian Century*, April 12, 2000, 415–18; Kenneth J. Heineman, *The Catholic New Deal: Religion and Reform in Depression Pittsburgh* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999); Beth S. Wenger, *New York Jews and the Great Depression: Uncertain Promise* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996). None of these addresses the New Deal in the South.

10. Ira Katznelson, *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time* (New York: Norton, 2013), 131–224. See in particular the voting charts on 153–54, which show growing dissent among southern Democrats primarily after 1942.

11. The historiography of these efforts is extensive, but often focused on only single denominations or programs. See Anthea D. Butler, *Women in the Church of God in Christ: Making a Sanctified World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Gaines M. Foster, *Moral Reconstruction: Christian Lobbyists and the Federal Legislation of Morality, 1865–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Paul Harvey, *Redeeming the South: Religious Cultures and Racial Identities Among Southern Baptists, 1865–1925* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); William A. Link, *The*

*Paradox of Southern Progressivism, 1880–1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); John Patrick McDowell, *The Social Gospel in the South: The Woman's Home Mission Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1886–1939* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982).

12. Elna Green, *This Business of Relief: Confronting Poverty in a Southern City, 1740–1940* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003); Dorothy M. Brown and Elizabeth McKeown, *The Poor Belong to Us: Catholic Charities and American Welfare* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Michael Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America* (1986; repr., New York: Basic Books, 1996); Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890–1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1992).

13. E. P. Alldredge, *Southern Baptist Handbook* (Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1931), 37; "Our Present Denominational Situation," *(Arkansas) Baptist Advance*, August 7, 1930, 1, 9; Nan Elizabeth Woodruff, *As Rare as Rain: Federal Relief in the Great Southern Drought of 1930–31* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985); Alison Collis Greene, "'No Depression in Heaven: Religion and Economic Crisis in Memphis and the Delta, 1929–1941" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2010), 83–130; Samuel C. Kincheloe, *Research Memorandum on Religion in the Depression* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1937), 1–30.

14. Election results accessed at uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/national.php?f=0&year=1932 on September 2, 2012. On the clergy and Prohibition in the 1920s and 1930s, see Barry Hankins, *Jesus and Gin: Evangelicalism, the Roaring Twenties and Today's Culture Wars* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Joe L. Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007); Foster, *Moral Reconstruction*.

15. Greene, "No Depression in Heaven," 144–75; Kenneth K. Bailey, *Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 111–29.

16. David Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 151–53. On Christian labor advocacy, see Janine Giordano Drake, "Between Religion and Politics: The Working Class Religious Left, 1880–1920" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois, 2013); Heath W. Carter, "Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago" (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2012). No southern denomination signed on to the 1908 Social Creed of the Churches until 1934, and then only the Methodists did so. Still, many southern clergy promoted it from the pulpit and in newspapers.

17. D. B. Raulins, "Editorial Observations," *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, September 7, 1933, 1; D. B. Raulins, "Editorial Observations," *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, October 5, 1933, 1.

18. "Support the President," *(Arkansas) Guardian*, August 5, 1933, 2.

19. "Vandy Prof Calls Clergy NRA's 'Worst Laggards,'" news clipping, n.p., n.d., Alva W. Taylor Papers, Disciples of Christ Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, box 6,

Newspaper Clippings—1930–1939 folder. For more on Taylor, see Dunbar, *Against the Grain*, 28–40; Jon Egerton, *Speak Now Against the Day: The Generation Before the Civil Rights Movement in the South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 77–78.

20. "The Drys Are to Hold Mass Meetings," *Arkansas Baptist*, June 8, 1933, 1; Ben F. Johnson III, *John Barleycorn Must Die: The War Against Drink in Arkansas* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2005). On the NIRA's elimination of agricultural workers, see Ira Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Norton, 2005).

21. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear*, 131–59.

22. "Whose Responsibility Charity," *Arkansas Baptist*, December 7, 1933, 1, 7; "Annual Report of Baptist State Hospital to the Arkansas Baptist State Convention," in *Proceedings of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention* (Little Rock: Arkansas Baptist State Convention, November 15–17, 1932), 34–38, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville (SBHLA); "Baptist State Hospital," in *Proceedings of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention* (El Dorado: Arkansas Baptist State Convention, January 16–18, 1934), 38–40, SBHLA. On public designation of private agencies, see Brown and McKeown, *Poor Belong to Us*, 164–67.

23. "Substituting Government for Religion," *Mississippi Baptist Record*, October 12, 1933, 2–3.

24. See, for instance, Kincheloe, *Research Memorandum on Religion in the Depression*, 45–58. See also Brown and McKeown, *Poor Belong to Us*. Linda Gordon, among others, shows how the state maintained this role. Linda Gordon, *Pitied but Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare* (New York: Free Press, 1994).

25. William Leuchtenburg, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, 1932–1940* (New York: Harper, 1963), 132–50; see also Anthony J. Badger, *The New Deal: The Depression Years* (New York: Ivan R. Dee, 2002); Nick Taylor, *American-Made: The Enduring Legacy of the WPA: When FDR Put the Nation to Work* (New York: Bantam, 2008).

26. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the nation's clergy, September 24, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 1.

27. Aubrey Mills, "Supplementary Report on Clergy Letters," President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 35, Report of Aubrey Mills folder, n.p. The Mills report is a quantitative summary of clergy letters by state, divided into positive, positive with comments, and negative responses for each major issue. The twelve thousand responses mentioned arrived by the end of November, when Mills wrote up his summary. In all, more than thirty thousand clergy responded. Those later responses are part of the source material for this report, but not for Mills's statistical summary.

28. Rev. Joseph Boone Hunter, Pulaski Heights Christian Church, Little Rock, Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, November 8, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder.

29. Robert A. George, First Congregational Church, Memphis, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 17, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 34, Tennessee folder.

30. W. M. Alexander, MECS Board of Christian Education, Nashville, Tennessee, October 7, 1935, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Church Officials, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 35.

31. Luke Edwin Alford [Methodist], Canton, Mississippi, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, September 28, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 17, Mississippi folder.

32. Rabbi Meyer Lovitt, Beth-Israel Congregation, Jackson, Mississippi, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 11, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 17, Mississippi folder.

33. R. G. Moore, Missionary Secretary, Board of Missions, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Leland, Mississippi to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 17, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 17, Mississippi folder.

34. See, for instance, Cobb, *Most Southern Place on Earth*; David Eugene Conrad, *The Forgotten Farmers: The Story of Sharecroppers in the New Deal* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965); Donald Holley, *Uncle Sam's Farmers: The New Deal Communities in the Lower Mississippi Valley* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975).

35. M. K. Rogers, Montrose, Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 10, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder.

36. W. T. Bone, Humphreys, Arkansas to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 8, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder.

37. A. D. Maddox, McKenzie, Tennessee, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, November 3, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 30, Tennessee folder.

38. C. F. Karriker, United Lutheran Church, Fort Smith Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, November 5, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder.

39. Even those southern churches that opposed the Social Gospel often embraced the broader notion that the church was responsible for addressing social problems to some degree, and conservative clerical support for the New Deal was widespread. The opponents were among the most conservative of southern fundamentalists. See Harvey, *Redeeming the South*, 17–44, 197–226; Sutton, "Was FDR the Antichrist?"

40. J. J. Galloway, Hughes Parish M.E.C.S., Hughes, Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 1, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder.

41. George W. Bell, Whiteville M.E. Church, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, September 28, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 30, Tennessee folder.

42. W. P. Blackwell, First Christian Church, Jackson, Tennessee, to FDR, October 28, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 30, Tennessee folder.

43. On the southern administration of relief, see Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White*; Harvard Sitkoff, *A New Deal for Blacks: The Emergence of Civil Rights as*

*a National Issue* (1978; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Woodruff, *Rare as Rain*.

44. E. B. Rucker, Martin, Tennessee, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 21, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 30, Tennessee folder.

45. On the unequal administration of the New Deal, particularly in the rural South, see Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White*; Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Defying Dixie: The Radical Roots of Civil Rights, 1919–1950* (New York: Norton, 2009); Anthony Badger, *FDR: The Hundred Days* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2008); Roger Biles, *The South and the New Deal* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994).

46. J. E. Adams, Gould, Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 24, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder, misspellings in the original.

47. Rev. Guy D. Magee, Tyronza, Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 14, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder, misspellings and emphasis in the original.

48. "All Eyes on Washington," (editorial) *Mississippi Baptist Record*, January 21, 1937, 4.

49. Greene, "No Depression in Heaven," 83–189, 246–95.

50. *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (New Orleans, 1937), 101, 102.

51. *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (Richmond, VA, 1938), 117.

52. Ibid.

53. J. M. Dawson, "Arguments for Including Churches in the Social Security Tax Answered," William M. Whittington Collection, MUM00476, Department of Archives and Special Collections, J. D. Williams Library, University of Mississippi, Oxford, box 29, 2. See also "Petition to the Members of the 76th Congress by the State Secretaries Association of the Southern Baptist Convention, Tampa, Florida, February 19, 1939, Re. H. R. 101," Whittington Collection, box 29.

54. N. B. Bynum, Brinkley, Arkansas, to Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 16, 1935, President's Personal File 21A—Church Matters, FDR Library, box 3, Arkansas folder.

## Chapter 5. The Rise of Spiritual Cosmopolitanism

1. Leigh Eric Schmidt, *Restless Souls: The Making of American Spirituality from Emerson to Oprah* (San Francisco: Harper, 2005).

2. Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, "Many Americans Mix Multiple Faiths: Eastern, New Age Beliefs Widespread" (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, December 2009). See also Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, "U.S. Religious Landscape Survey" (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, June 2008); Robert D. Putnam and David E. Campbell, *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010).

3. Pew Research Center, Religion & Public Life Project, "'Nones' on the Rise" (October 9, 2012), http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/.

4. Christian Smith with Patricia Snell, *Souls in Transition: The Religious and*

*Spiritual Lives of Emerging Adults* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 287. Smith's argument here draws on N. Jay Demerath III, "Cultural Victory and Organizational Defeat in the Paradoxical Decline of Liberal Protestantism," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34, no. 4 (1995): 458–69.

5. Demerath, "Cultural Victory and Organizational Defeat," 468.

6. For a fuller account, see my book *The Rise of Liberal Religion: Book Culture and American Spirituality in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

7. Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: Norton, 2006), 137–53.

8. Frank C. Laubach, *Letters by a Modern Mystic* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement, 1937), 17.

9. Ibid., 10–11.

10. Ibid., 14.

11. The biographical material on Laubach is of mixed quality. See David E. Mason, *Frank C. Laubach, Teacher of Millions* (Minneapolis: T.S. Denison, 1967); David E. Mason*, Apostle to the Illiterates* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1966); Helen M. Roberts, *Champion of the Silent Billion: The Story of Frank C. Laubach, Apostle of Literacy* (Saint Paul, MN: Macalaster Park, 1961); and Marjorie Medary, *Each One Teach One: Frank Laubach, Friend to Millions* (New York: Longmans, Green 1954).

12. Mason, *Apostle to the Illiterates*, 33.

13. Laubach, *Letters by a Modern Mystic*, 9–10.

14. Frank C. Laubach to "My Dear Folks," June 15, 1930, Frank C. Laubach Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, box 1, June–December 1930 folder.

15. Laubach, *Letters by a Modern Mystic*, 14.

16. "Dr. Frank C. Laubach, Crusader Against Illiteracy, Dead at 85," *New York Times*, June 12, 1970, 39.

17. David A. Hollinger, "After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Ecumenical Protestantism and the Modern American Encounter with Diversity," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 1 (June 2011): 21–48.

18. Ibid., 22.

19. Ibid., 48.

20. Charles Taylor, "Why We Need a Radical Redefinition of Secularism," in *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*, ed. Eduardo Medieta and Jonathan Van Antwerpen (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 36.

21. The standard history of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is James E. Pitt, *Adventures in Brotherhood* (New York: Farrar, Straus, 1955).

22. "Religious Book Week Starts May 4," *Publishers' Weekly*, April 26, 1947, 2221–22.

23. "Factsheet: Religious Book Week, October 24–31, 1948," National Conference of Christians and Jews Records, Social Welfare History Archive, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, box 6, folder 21.

24. "Spot Announcements and Station Breaks for Religious Book Week, October 24–31, 1948," National Conference of Christians and Jews Records, box 6, folder 21.

25. Important exceptions to this inattention to the cultural importance of religious liberalism include Schmidt, *Restless Souls*; Jeffrey J. Kripal, *Esalen: America and the Religion of No Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Christopher G. White, *Unsettled Minds: Psychology and the American Search for Spiritual Assurance, 1830–1940* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009); Courtney Bender, *The New Metaphysicals: Spirituality and the American Religious Imagination* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); and Kathryn Lofton, *Oprah: Gospel of an Icon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

26. The literature on Protestant liberalism is vast. William R. Hutchison's *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) served for a generation as the key American intellectual history, a history now greatly augmented by Gary Dorrien's encyclopedic three-volume *The Making of American Liberal Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001, 2003, 2006). Also of importance are two essay collections: William R. Hutchison, ed., *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900–1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger, Jr., eds., *Re-forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998). Alongside these titles stand shelves of books on the Social Gospel. Standout works include Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991) and Ralph E. Luker, *The Social Gospel in Black and White* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).

27. Smith, *Souls in Transition*.

## Chapter 6. "A Third Force"

1. "Give Us the Ballot," May 17, 1957, in Martin Luther King, Jr., Clayborne Carson, et al., *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Volume IV, Symbol of the Movement: January 1957–December 1958* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 208–15. For various versions of the speech, see the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Archive, Howard Gotlieb Archival Research Center, Boston University (MLK-HGA), box 105, folder 1. I would like to thank Vernon Mitchell, Jr. for the conversation that sparked this essay and Matthew Avery Sutton and Sarah Azaransky for their insights.

2. Ramona Garrett and Wilhelmina Plummer to Martin Luther King, Jr., June 10, 1957, MLK-HGA, box 105, folder 3.

3. Martin Luther King, Jr. to Ramona Garrett, July 16, 1957, in King et al., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Volume IV*, 235–36.

4. Adam Clayton Powell Jr., "Address at the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom" (Washington, DC, May 17, 1957), in *Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement, 1954–1965*, ed. Davis W. Houck (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 244–46.

5. Ibid.

6. Norman J. Whitney to Martin Luther King, May 19, 1957, MLK-HGA, box 105, folder 5; "D. C. Pilgrimage Prods Solons," *Jet*, May 30, 1957, MLK-HGA, box 105, folder 5.

7. For more on the shifting and contested categories of "religion" and "politics," see Amanda Porterfield, *Conceived in Doubt: Religion and Politics in the New American Nation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012). For "religion" and "law," see Sarah Barringer Gordon, *The Spirit of the Law: Religious Voices and the Constitution in Modern America* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2010). The literature on religion and politics in the civil rights movement is voluminous. Barbara Dianne Savage has shown how political hopes often drove how scholars interpreted African American religion. Barbara Dianne Savage, *Your Spirits Walk Beside Us: The Politics of Black Religion* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2008). One recent work that engages religion and politics with an eye toward contested identities is Sarah Azaransky, *The Dream Is Freedom: Pauli Murray and American Democratic Faith* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). The main work that examines Powell, King, and others and tries to determine the relationships among their religious and politics views is Peter J. Paris, *Black Religious Leaders: Conflict in Unity* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1991).

8. Powell, "Address at the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom."

9. Charles V. Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.: The Political Biography of an American Dilemma* (New York: Atheneum, 1991); Wil Haygood, *King of the Cats: The Life and Times of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1993).

10. Adam Clayton Powell, *Keep the Faith, Baby!* (New York: Trident Press, 1967), 89.

11. For letterhead examples, see Adam C. Powell to Martin Luther King, Jr., November 16, 1965, The King Center, Atlanta, Archive Online (KC-AO), http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-adam-c-powell-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014); C. Sumner Stone, Jr. to Martin Luther King, Jr., October 5, 1965, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-c-summer-stone-jr-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014).

12. Adam C. Powell to Martin Luther King, August 31, 1961, MLK-HGA, box 51, folder 1.

13. Powell, *Keep the Faith, Baby*, 51–55.

14. Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, 207–8; Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., *Adam by Adam: The Autobiography of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.* (New York: Dial Press), 54; Theodore M. Vestal, *The Lion of Judah in the New World: Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia and the Shaping of Americans' Attitudes Toward Africa* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011).

15. Powell, *Adam by Adam*, 103–4, 118; Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, chap. 11. Powell claimed that he was the one who encouraged Malcolm X to travel and to see the international side of Islam. Powell, *Adam by Adam*, 244. Manning Marable emphasizes Powell's crucial role in the life of Malcolm X. See Manning Marable, *Malcolm X: A Life of Reinvention* (New York: Viking, 2011).

16. Powell, *Adam by Adam*, 38.

17. Ibid., 39.

18. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., *Marching Blacks* (1945; repr., New York: Dial Press, 1973), 17–18.

19. Powell, *Adam by Adam*, 39.

20. Powell, *Marching Blacks*, 195. For more on reconsiderations of ecumenicalism during this age, see David A. Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

21. Powell, *Marching Blacks*, 196–97; Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire*.

22. Curtis J. Evans, *The Burden of Black Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

23. Powell, *Marching Blacks*, 195.

24. Powell, "Burn, Baby, Burn," in *Keep the Faith, Baby*, LP, side 2; Powell, *Keep the Faith, Baby*, 237.

25. See Edward J. Blum, *W. E. B. Du Bois, American Prophet* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), esp. chaps. 3 and 4; Gayraud S. Wilmore and James H. Cone, eds., *Black Theology: A Documentary History, 1966–1979* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979).

26. Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), chap. 3; Patrick Allitt, *Religion in America Since 1945: A History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 31, 68–69; Mark Silk, *Spiritual Politics: Religion and America Since World War II* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988); Claude A. Frazier, *Politics and Religion Can Mix!* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1973).

27. Adam Clayton Powell to President Eisenhower, March 28, 1957, Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Museum, and Boyhood Home, Online Archive, http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/research/online_documents/civil_rights_eisenhower_administration/1957_03_28_Powell_to_DDE.pdf (accessed January 16, 2014). Powell continued this strategy in 1958 when offering guidance to King, who was to meet with President Eisenhower; Telegram, Adam Powell to Martin Luther King, June 20, 1958, MLK-HGA, box 94, folder 4. For more on religion and anticommunism, see Jonathan P. Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle Against Communism in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Dianne Kirby, "Anglo-American Relations and the Religious Cold War," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 10, no. 2 (2012): 161–81.

28. Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith*, 188–89; Philip Dray, *At the Hands of Persons Unknown: The Lynching of Black America* (New York: Modern Library, 2003); Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

29. Powell, *Keep the Faith, Baby*, 285.

30. Ibid., 13.

31. Ibid., 287.

32. Ibid., 122.

33. Quoted in Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, 361.

34. Powell, *Adam by Adam*, ix; "Keep the Faith, Baby," in Powell, *Keep the Faith, Baby*, LP, side 1.

35. Powell, *Marching Blacks*, 92. For more on the church, see A. Clayton Powell, Sr., *Upon This Rock* (New York: Abyssinian Baptist Church, 1949).

36. Quoted in James Haskins, *Adam Clayton Powell: Portrait of a Marching Black* (New York: Dial Press, 1974), 113.

37. "Personal Poster of Prayer and Protest," http://www.liveauctioneers.com/item/20993110_rare-personal-poster-card-for-natl-day-of-prayer-mar (accessed January 20, 2014).

38. "One-Hour Work Stoppage to Spotlight Bus Boycott," *Indianapolis Recorder*, March 3, 1956, 1–2; "Powell Weighing Bigger Bias Fight: Considers Resigning Pulpit and Possibly Congress to Spur Integration Drive," *New York Times*, March 4, 1956, 55.

39. "'Deliverance Day' Prayers Slated Today," *Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun*, March 28, 1956, 5.

40. "One-Hour Work Stoppage to Spotlight Bus Boycott," *Indianapolis Recorder*, March 3, 1956, 1–2.

41. "Nation's Communities Mark Deliverance Day of Prayer," *Nashua (New Hampshire) Telegraph*, March 29, 1956: 7.

42. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America*, 50–57, 193.

43. Powell, *Marching Blacks*, 64.

44. "HUC-JIR Statement, 1956," March 28, 1956, American Jewish Archives, Marcus Repository, Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, OH.

45. "Congressman Powell Says He May Resign His Seat," *Bermuda Recorder*, March 7, 1956, 1; Powell, *Keep the Faith, Baby*, 83–86. Seymour Martin Lipset discussed the pro-Protestant politics of Powell in *Revolution and Counterrevolution: Change and Persistence in Social Structures* (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 293. See also Randall Balmer, *God in the White House: A History* (New York: HarperCollins, 2008), chap. 1.

46. "Come Back Home, Billy!," *Afro-American*, March 10, 1956, 2.

47. Ibid., 2.

48. Matthew Avery Sutton, *American Apocalypse: A History of Modern Evangelicalism* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2014), chap. 11; Steven P. Miller, *Billy Graham and the Rise of the Republican South* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

49. Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, esp. chaps. 18–20; "FBI File on Adam Clayton Powell, Jr." (microfilm; Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1995), 4 reels.

50. For the Falwell speech, see Matthew Avery Sutton, ed., *Jerry Falwell and the Rise of the Religious Right: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2013).

51. Paul Anderson to Martin Luther King, Jr., May 10, 1968, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-paul-anderson-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014).

52. Martin Luther King, Jr. to Adam Clayton Powell, June 10, 1958 in King et al., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Volume IV*, 420–21.

53. Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, 407.

54. Martin Luther King, Jr. to Rabbi Julius Rosenthal, December 10, 1965, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-mlk-rabbi-julius-rosenthal (accessed January 16, 2014).

55. Rabbi I. Usher Kirschblum to Martin Luther King, Jr., March 23, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/if-i-were-negro (accessed January 16, 2014).

56. Chas. W. Bailey to Martin Luther King, Jr., March 2, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-chas-w-bailey-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014); Evelyn Rawley to Billy Mills, March 3, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-evelyn-rawley-billy-mills (accessed January 16, 2014).

57. Irene Zimmerman to Martin Luther King, Jr., January 29, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-irene-zimmerman-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014).

58. Anonymous letter to Martin Luther King, Jr., March 17, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/adverse-letter-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014); Anonymous letter to Martin Luther King, Jr., March 30, 1968, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/anonymous-letter-mlk-16 (accessed January 16, 2014); see also Alice Brainerd to Martin Luther King, Jr., August 19, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-alice-brainerd-mlk (accessed January 16, 2014); anonymous letter to Martin Luther King, Jr., March 30, 1968, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/anonymous-letter-mlk-16 (accessed July 16, 2014).

59. Richard U. Smith to Martin Luther King, Jr., March 14, 1967, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-richard-u-smith-mlk (accessed July 16, 2014).

60. Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, x; David J. Garrow referred to Powell repeatedly as "Congressman" and rarely discussed his ministerial roles in *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: Vintage, 1988), 62, 342. For more on the King-Rustin issue, see 139–40.

61. Mentioned in Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell*, 361–62.

62. Martin Luther King, Jr. to Adam Clayton Powell, January 2, 1968, KC-AO, http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-mlk-adam-clayton-powell (accessed July 16, 2014).

## Chapter 7. The Theological Origins of the Christian Right

1. Daniel K. Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 6; Sara Diamond, *Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1990), vii; Chris Hedges, *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 37.

2. The definitive account of the Christian Right's national political organization is

Williams, *God's Own Party*. Two histories that use local political histories to cast light on the national movement are Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: Norton, 2010) and Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002). Robert Putnam and David Campbell used an ambitious national survey to reveal the spectrum of political and religious opinion among Americans, including conservative Christians (Robert D. Putnam and David E. Campbell, *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us* [New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010]).

3. Quoted in Clyde Wilcox and Gregory Fortelny, "Religion and Social Movements," in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American Politics*, ed. Corwin Smidt et al. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 275.

4. "Straton to Fight Darwin in Schools," *New York Times*, February 9, 1922, 9.

5. William Martin, *With God on Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America* (1996; repr., New York: Random House, 2005), 121ff.; Williams, *God's Own Party*, 134ff.

6. John C. Whitcomb, Jr. and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood* (1961; repr., Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1964), 1.

7. Ibid., 118.

8. John C. McCampbell, foreword, in ibid., xvi.

9. Paul Scharf, "The Genesis Flood, Tidal Wave of Change," *Baptist Bulletin*, July 9, 2010, http://baptistbulletin.org/?p=9502. On the book's importance in launching the modern creationist movement, see Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists: From Scientific Creationism to Intelligent Design* (1992; repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 208ff.

10. Henry Morris, foreword, in Whitcomb, *The World That Perished* (1988; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1989), 11.

11. See, for example, "Texas Told Evolution Is School Peril," *Baltimore Sun*, October 15, 1964, 3; "Arizona Clergy Split on Evolution Teaching," *Los Angeles Times*, May 25, 1964, 14; Chris Kazan, "'Monkey Trial' of '66 Has Its Opening in Little Rock Today," *Washington Post*, April 1, 1966, A1.

12. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1 (1873; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 10–12, 170. For one Princetonian's thoughtful encounter with Darwin, see David N. Livingstone and Mark A. Noll, "B.B. Warfield (1851–1921): Inerrantist as Evolutionist," *Isis* 91, no. 2 (June 2000): 283–304. For an overview of the developments at Princeton in the context of broader trends in American intellectual history and higher education, see Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1986).

13. Quoted in Whitcomb and Morris, *Genesis Flood*, xx. The authors later state that biblical interpretation is a "scientific and scholarly discipline" (20).

14. Charles Colson and Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1999), xiii.

15. Tim Potter, "Reacting to What They See as Grave Problems in Public Schools,

More and More Wichita-Area Parents Have Decided to Teach Their Children Themselves," *Wichita Eagle*, March 26, 1995, 1D; Frank Garofalo, "Speaker Calls for Activism by Christians," *Wichita Eagle*, March 22, 1992, 1B.

16. Daniel Cattau, "Students Learn to Defend Faith—Conferences Groom Christian Collegians for 'Culture Wars,'" *Dallas Morning News*, July 18, 1993, 31A.

17. R. G. Paine, "Young Should Be Encouraged to Make Sane, Moral Choices," *Columbus Dispatch*, October 26, 1989, 8A.

18. The best introduction to Van Til's thought is Cornelius Van Til, *Christian Apologetics* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1976).

19. Whitcomb and Morris, *Genesis Flood,* xxi. Elsewhere they write, "After all, any real *knowledge* of origins or of earth history antecedent to human historical records can only be obtained through divine revelation. Since historical geology, unlike other sciences, cannot deal with currently observable and reproducible events, it is *manifestly impossible* ever to really *prove,* by the scientific method, any hypothesis relating to pre-human history" (213). On Whitcomb's presuppositionalism, see Numbers, *Creationists,* 185ff., 200.

20. The letters of progressive scholars like Robert Staples and Mildred Wynkoop to their colleagues at Nazarene Theological Seminary during the 1970s demonstrate this point; see, for example, Wynkoop to colleagues, May 5, 1978, 1.2227–21, Wynkoop Collection, Church of the Nazarene Archives, Lenexa, KS. For the Society for Pentecostal Studies' adoption of presuppositionalist language, see "Constitution and By-Laws of the Society for Pentecostal Studies," 1970, 1, Society for Pentecostal Studies Papers, David Allan Hubbard Library, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, box 1, folder 16.

21. Harold J. Ockenga, "Christ for America" (presidential address, May 4, 1943), in *United . . . We Stand: A Report of the Constitutional Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals, May 3–6, 1943* (Boston: NAE, 1943), 13; "Hitler as an Orator: Full Translation of an Electioneering Speech, 'Vision of the Future Germany,'" *Manchester Guardian*, March 16, 1933, 12; Paul Winkler, "Nazism vs. Religion," *Washington Post*, May 14, 1944, B4.

22. L. Brent Bozell, "The Strange Drift of Liberal Catholicism," *National Review* 11, no. 6 (August 12, 1961): 83; Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford, 1995), 119.

23. J. Edgar Hoover, "An Analysis of the New Left: A Gospel of Nihilism," *Christianity Today* 12, no. 15 (April 26, 1968): 3, 4.

24. Schaeffer, "Apologetics" (Farel House lecture, 1964), 20, Farel House Library, L'Abri, Huemoz, Switzerland.

25. Schaeffer offered this narrative of Western man's descent from the Christian optimism of ancient times across the "line of despair" into the modern age. See, for example, Francis Schaeffer, *Escape from Reason* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1968).

26. Gene Edward Veith, Jr., "The Fragmentation and Integration of Truth," in *Francis Schaeffer: Portraits of the Man and His Work*, ed. Lane T. Dennis (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1986), 32–33.

27. Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God: How I Grew Up as One of the Elect, Helped Found the Religious Right, and Lived to Take All (or Almost All) of It Back* (New York: Carroll & Graf, 2007), 266.

28. Daymon Johnson, "Reformed Fundamentalism in America: The Lordship of Christ, the Transformation of Culture, and Other Calvinist Components of the Christian Right" (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1994), 169.

29. Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Great Evangelical Disaster* (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1984), 23.

30. Johnson, "Reformed Fundamentalism in America," 171–72; Terry, quoted in Garry Wills, *Under God: Religion and American Politics* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990), 324. Wills was possibly the first prominent outside observer to note Schaeffer's influence on the Christian Right.

31. Jerry Falwell, "Why I Do the Talk Shows," *WorldNetDaily*, November 10, 1999; Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God,* 315; Williams, *God's Own Party,* 155ff. Cal Thomas, vice president of the Moral Majority, called Schaeffer's *Christian Manifesto* his organization's "battle plan for the rest of the century" (quoted in Johnson, "Reformed Fundamentalism in America," 161). Pat Robertson also admired Schaeffer and relied heavily on *A Christian Manifesto* in his book *The Secret Kingdom: A Promise of Hope and Freedom in a World of Turmoil* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982); Tim LaHaye, *The Battle for the Mind: A Subtle Warfare* (New York: Fleming Revell, 1980. For Tim and Beverly LaHaye's use of presuppositionalism, see Tim and Beverly LaHaye, *A Nation Without a Conscience* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1994), 140–41.

32. Veith, "Fragmentation and Integration of Truth," 47.

33. Rob Staples to Richard S. Taylor, September 10, 1971, 3433–5, Staples Collection, Church of the Nazarene Archives; John Howard Yoder to Whom It May Concern, "A Communications Ministry," May 10, 1982, 1. Fr. "Alternative Schaeffer," Hist. Mss. 1–48, John Howard Yoder Collection, Mennonite Church U.S.A. Archives, Goshen, IN, box 185.

34. Joe T. Odle to M. O. Owens, Jr., August 30, 1974, M. O. Owens Papers, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, box 2, folder 21.

35. Claude Cookman, "Schaeffer Communicates; Explains Pessimistic View," *Record* 86, no. 12 (November 29, 1963): 1, Wheaton College Special Collections, Wheaton, IL; Lynn Carpenter, "Schaeffer Films: Decaying Society," *Moody Student* 43, no. 2 (September 23, 1977): 1, Crowell Library and Archives, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.

36. Thomas V. Morris, *Francis Schaeffer's Apologetics: A Critique* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1976), back copy. For more on Schaeffer's wide influence, see Harold O. J. Brown, "Standing Against the World," in Dennis, *Francis Schaeffer*, 15ff.; *Christianity Today* 38 (April 4, 1994): 40. In D. Michael Lindsay's sociological study of evangelicals who occupy elite positions in politics, business, the arts, and the academy, many of his interview subjects cited Schaeffer as a primary influence (Lindsay, *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007], 39).

37. *Christianity Today* 38 (April 4, 1994): 40.

38. Schaeffer, *Great Evangelical Disaster,* 25.

39. Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live? The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture* (New York: Fleming Revell, 1976), 19–20.

40. Numbers, *Creationists*, 238ff., 246–47.

41. Colson and Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?*, 14–16.

42. Ibid., 17.

43. John Wimber, "The Kingdom of God: Establishing Christ's Rule," *Fulness Magazine*, January/February 1985, 39. The intersection of spiritual warfare and American politics recently landed on the radar of the mainstream media when journalists discovered presidential candidate and Texas governor Rick Perry's connections to New Apostolic Reformation, a shadowy religious movement that seeks to drive demons out of the government and usher in godly revival by infiltrating Washington. See Forrest Wilder, "Rick Perry's Army of God," *Texas Observer*, August 2011, http://www.texasobserver.org/rick-perrys-army-of-god/.

44. Paul Eidelberg, "The Temptation of Herbert Marcuse," *Review of Politics* 31, no. 4 (October 1969): 442; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "The Crisis of Our Culture and the Teaching of History," *History Teacher* 13, no. 1 (November 1979): 89.

45. Ed McAteer, "If the Foundation Be Destroyed . . . What Can the Righteous Do?," *Southern Baptist Advocate*, September 1980, 8.

46. Michael Farris, "Classics a Solid Ingredient in Education," *Washington Times*, September 23, 1997, E6. Conservative Presbyterian Doug Wilson established an influential hub of classical Christian education in Moscow, Idaho, in the 1980s through a K–12 institution, Logos School, and later a college called New St. Andrews College. See Doug Wilson, *Recovering the Lost Tools of Learning: An Approach to a Distinctively Christian Education* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991).

47. Margaret Poloma, *The Charismatic Movement: Is There a New Pentecost?* (Boston: Twayne, 1982), 13.

48. "Study Commission on Glossolalia, Preliminary Report" (Diocese of California, Division of Pastoral Services, 1962), 3, du Plessis Papers, David Allan Hubbard Library, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA (DAHL), box 43, folder 2; Dennis J. Bennett, *Nine O'Clock in the Morning* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1970), 61; Walter H. Steele, memo to the Reverend Clergy of Baton Rouge, March 5, 1962, du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 30, folder 20; R. E. Armstrong to du Plessis, October 30, 1963, du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 7, folder 71.

49. Brick Bradford, *Charismatic Communion*, no. 2 (March 1967), du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 8, folder 89.

50. Roman Catholic—Pentecostal Commission, "Final Report: Roman Catholic—Pentecostal Dialogue" (Eldoret, Kenya: GABA Publications, 1977), 1, Glasser Papers, DAHL, box 66, folder 14; John Cardinal Willebrands to du Plessis, June 25, 1970, du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 59, folder 6; Roman Catholic—Pentecostal Commission, "Final Report," 1; Hamer to du Plessis, August 6, 1971, 1, du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 17, folder 16; G. Raymond Carlson to Cecil M. Robeck, February 11, 1993, 1, Robeck, Cecil M. Jr. Correspondence, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, Springfield, MO.

51. Jim Byrne to du Plessis, October 25, 1972, du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 10, folder 16.

52. Arthur Glasser, "Bangkok: An Evangelical Evaluation," June 8, 1973, 2, Glasser Papers, DAHL, box 19, folder 3; Jim Byrne to du Plessis, October 25, 1972, du Plessis Papers, DAHL, box 10, folder 16; C. B. Hastings to W. C. Fields, November 13, 1970, Wilmer C. Fields Papers, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville (SBHLA), box 21, folder 39.

53. Frank C. Senn, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 626–39.

54. Lee E. Dirks, *Religion in Action: How America's Faiths Are Meeting New Challenges* (Silver Spring, MD: Newsbook, 1965), 41; L. R. Barnard, "Not Our Sort of Art," *Watchman-Examiner*, January 4, 1960, 34.

55. "Evangelicals and Ecclesiastical Tradition," *Christianity Today* 9, no. 2 (October 23, 1964): 27.

56. "Protestant Monk Visits MBI," *Moody Student* 33, no. 5 (December 1, 1967): 3, Crowell Library Archives, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL; David C. George to Don B. Harbuck, July 22, 1972, 2, Don B. Harbuck Papers, SBHLA, box 8, folder 40.

57. Kilian McDonnell to Dan Fuller, March 13, 1968, Fuller Papers, DAHL, box 14, folder 14.

58. For an example of the persistence of anti-Catholic sentiment among conservative Protestants after the founding of the Moral Majority, see Tom Greeley, "Anti-Catholic Rhetoric Heightens Religious Tensions," *Los Angeles Times*, December 13, 1981, SD A1A.

59. Gordon H. Clark, foreword, in Carl Henry, *Remaking the Modern Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1946), 12.

60. Bruce Buursma, "Evangelicals Roll Out Think Tank," *Chicago Tribune*, May 11, 1985, 6.

61. Lindsay, *Faith in the Halls of Power*, 98.

62. George M. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 48.

63. Michael Cromartie, ed., *A Preserving Grace: Protestants, Catholics, and Natural Law* (Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1997), vii.

64. Rick Santorum, *It Takes a Family: Conservatism and the Common Good* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2005), 28.


Chapter 8. More than Megachurches

1. Richard Connolly, "Father Drinan Ready for Vote 'Miracle,'" *Boston Globe*, September 13, 1970.

2. John P. Roche, "A Misfit Liberal," *Washington Post,* October 8, 1970.

3. Jon Butler, "Jack-in-the-Box Faith: The Religion Problem in Modern American History," *Journal of American History* 90 (March 2004): 1359.

4. See especially Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: Norton, 2011); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009); Daniel K. Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010). See also Kim Phillips-Fein, "Conservatism: A State of the Field," *Journal of American History* 98 (December 2011): 723–43.

5. Butler, "Jack-in-the-Box Faith," 1375–76.

6. Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1955), 13. Many sociologists and cultural critics also addressed the trend in addition to ibid., 69–73; see David Riesman, "The Suburban Dislocation," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 314 (November 1957): 123–46; William H. Whyte, *The Organization Man* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1956).

7. For more on the rise of religion in the suburbs in the postwar era, see James Hudnit-Beumler, *Looking for God in the Suburbs* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 29–84; Eileen Luhr, *Witnessing Suburbia: Conservatives and Christian Youth Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

8. For more on this migration, see Lily Geismer, *Don't Blame Us: Suburban Liberals and the Transformation of the Democratic Party* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), esp. chap. 1.

9. Paula Leventman, *Professionals Out of Work* (New York: Free Press, 1981), 67; see also Christopher Rand, *Cambridge, U.S.A.: Hub of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 17–18.

10. Henry R. Lieberman, "Technology: Alchemist of Route 128," *New York Times*, January 8, 1968; Margaret Pugh O'Mara, *Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 88.

11. For more about the new forms of religion that took shape in California after World War II, see McGirr, *Suburban Warriors,* esp. 45–51, and Dochuk, *Bible Belt to Sunbelt,* 141–256.

12. See, for instance, "Education: Abandon Parochial Schools?," *Time*, August 25, 1961; John McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 152; Albert I. Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia* (Boston: Beacon, 1959); "Merger Ratified by Two Churches," *New York Times,* May 24, 1960; John H. Fenton, "Two Denominations Achieve Merger," *New York Times,* May 12, 1961.

13. Dana Greeley, "Liberal Religion: What It Is: What Is Not" (Boston: Unitarian Universalist Association, 1965).

14. Andrea Greenwood and Mark W. Harris, *An Introduction to the Unitarian and Universalist Traditions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 186–98. For the long-standing links between Unitarianism and Harvard, see George M. Marsden, *The*

*Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 181–95.

15. "Unitarian Praises Benefits of Science," *New York Times*, July 27, 1959; Dana McLean Greeley, "Religion and Science," in *Forward Through the Ages: Writings of Reverend Dana McLean Greeley, 1970–1986*, ed. Dana Greeley (Concord, MA: First Parish in Concord, 1986), 44–46.

16. First Parish Church in Lexington Unitarian Universalist, "History of the First Parish Church," http://fpc.lexington.ma.us/index.php/history.

17. Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia*, 27; Joshua A. Fishman, "Moving to the Suburbs: Its Possible Impact on the Role of the Jewish Minority in American Community Life," *Phylon* 24, no. 2 (1963): 150; Harry Gersh, "The New Suburbanites of the 50's," *Commentary* 17 (1954): 209–21. See also Gerald Gamm, *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

18. Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia*, 26–27.

19. Gamm, *Urban Exodus*, 194–95; Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia*; Sherry Israel, "Moving Apart and Growing Together 1967–1994," in *The Jews of Boston: Essays on the Occasion of the Centenary (1895–1995)*, ed. Jonathan D. Sarna and Ellen Smith (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1995), 107–20.

20. McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries,* 84.

21. Marion Coletta, interview by Nancy Earsy, November 1, 1993, Lexington Oral History Projects, Inc., http://www.lexingtonbattlegreen1971.com/files/Coletta,%20Marion.pdf; see also Michael J. O'Sullivan, "Sacred Heart 75th Anniversary, Celebrating the Past Present and Future: A Historical Thesis" (December 16, 2007), http://sacred heartlex.org/documents/SacredHeartLexHistory.pdf; "1975 Centennial: St. Brigid's Parish, Lexington Massachusetts," http://sacredheartlex.org/documents/StBrigid1975Cen tennialPart2.pdf.

22. Norma McGavern-Norland, interview by Eugenia Kaledin, August 22, 1991, Lexington Oral History Projects, Inc., http://www.lexingtonbattlegreen1971.com/files/ Norland,%20Norma.pdf. See also Coletta interview.

23. Gibson Winter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches: An Analysis of Protestant Responsibility in the Expanding Metropolis* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), 57–58; Riesman, "Suburban Dislocation," 132; Gersh, "New Suburbanites," 219–20.

24. "Churches: The Apostolic Few," *Time*, May 24, 1963. Hancock Church sponsored eleven different clubs, including three youth groups and two different dinner and entertainments clubs for married couples. Evening Alliance of the First Parish Church, Directory of Organizations in Lexington and Bus Schedules, 1950, Francis Loeb Library, Harvard University Graduate School of Design.

25. "Churches: The Apostolic Few."

26. Newton Chamber of Commerce, "Brightest Spot on the Golden Circle" (pamphlet, 1969), Newton Collection, Newton Public Library, Newton, MA.

27. For more on the New Deal's role in stimulating the politics and identity of white suburban homeowners, see David M. P. Freund, *Colored Property: State Policy and*

*White Racial Politics in Suburban America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern of Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

28. For more on ideas of meritocratic individualism in the suburbs, see especially Lassiter, *Silent Majority*, 8–9, 122–23.

29. See Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, eds., *The Rise and Fall of the New Order, 1930–1980* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

30. For more on the links between the National Council of Churches and postwar liberalism, see Jill K. Gill, *Embattled Ecumenism: The National Council of Churches, the Vietnam War and the Trials of the Protestant Left* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011), esp. chapter 2.

31. For a discussion of *An American Dilemma* and its influence on liberalism, see Thomas J. Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North* (New York: Random House, 2008); Walter Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience: Social Engineering and Racial Liberalism, 1938–1987* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987); Daryl Michael Scott, *Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche, 1880–1996* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 93–160. For more on psychology in the postwar era, see Ellen Herman, *The Romance of American Psychology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

32. See, for instance, Rev. Robert A. Storer, Rev. Malcolm R. Sutherland, Jr., and Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, "Personal Faith: The Minns Lectures for 1955" (Boston: Minns Lectureship Committee, 1955). See also Stephanie Muravchik, *American Protestantism in the Age of Psychology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 28–81; Phillip Rieff, *The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); and Butler, "Jack-in-the-Box Faith," 1376.

33. Hudnit-Beumler, *Looking for God in the Suburbs*, 10–11; Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia*, 89, 97; Winter, *Suburban Captivity of the Churches,* 134.

34. Juliet Saltman, *Open Housing as a Social Movement: Challenge Conflict and Change* (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1971), 29–39; Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty,* 213–20. American Friends Service Committee, New England Regional Office, "Proposal for Long-Range Work on Education Issues in Boston, June, 1975," Freedom House Inc. Records, Archives and Special Collections Department, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, box 34, folder 1188 (hereafter FH-Northeastern).

35. Morton Rubin, "The Function of Social Research for a Fair Housing Practice Committee," *Journal of Intergroup Relations* 2, no. 4 (Autumn 1961): 326. For more on the fair housing movement, see Lily Geismer, "Good Neighbors for Fair Housing: Suburban

Liberalism and Racial Inequality in Metropolitan Boston," *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 3 *(*May 2013): 454–77.

36. Eph Weiss, "Informal Report to the Members of the L.C.R.C.," February 3, 1961, Lexington Civil Rights Committee Collection, Cary Memorial Library, Lexington, MA (hereafter LCRC Collection); Fair Housing Federation of Greater Boston, "Excerpts from Statements of Viewpoint Prepared for the Osgood Hill Conference, October 20–21, 1961," Phyllis M. Ryan Papers, Archives and Special Collections Department, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, box 3, folder 9.

37. The Natick Committee on Homes for Minority Groups, Flyer, 1957, FH-Northeastern, box 58, folder 2519; Richard O'Donnell, "Committees on Housing Work for Racial Harmony," *Boston Globe*, May 24, 1961.

38. Belmont Fair Practices Committee, "An Invitation to Act for Democracy!" 1961, LCRC Collection; Lexington Civil Rights Committee, LCRC Flyer, n.d., LCRC Collection.

39. For more on the suburban-based peace movement, see Lily Geismer, "Don't Blame Us: Grassroots Liberalism in Massachusetts, 1960–1990" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2010).

40. William J. Lewis, "Oct. 15 Was Born Here," *Boston Globe*, October 10, 1969; "Strike Against the War," *Time*, October 17, 1969; Diane White, "'This Is Real Grass Roots,'" *Boston Globe*, October 15, 1969; Diane White, "War Rallies: All over Towns," *Boston Globe*, October 10, 1969.

41. John M. Wells, "The Minister's Story," in *The People vs. Presidential War*, ed. John M. Wells (New York: Dunellen Co., 1970), 8–9.

42. Mary Ann Seitz, "Making the System Work," in Wells, *People vs. Presidential War,* 124; John Elder, "Grass Roots Political Action," and Richard Cauchi, "Grass Roots Political Action," in Wells, *People vs. Presidential War,* 85–90; "Massachusetts Governor Weighs a Bill Challenging Legality of Vietnam War," *New York Times*, March 29, 1970; *Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Melvin Laird*, Brief for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in Support of Its Motion for Leave to File Complaint, July 1970, Jack Backman Papers, Special Collections, State Library of Massachusetts, Boston, MA, box 29, folder 946.

43. Wells, "Minister's Story," 16.

44. Norman C. Miller, "'Good Old Phil': How One Congressman Holds on to His Seat by Wooing Home Folks," *Wall Street Journal*, September 8, 1970.

45. Deckle McClean, "Causes and Caucuses," *Boston Sunday Globe Magazine*, April 12, 1970; John Fenton, "Massachusetts Politics: A Priestly Hat Is Thrown into the Ring," *New York Times*, February 23, 1970.

46. "30% Don't Like Priests in Politics; Drinan Campaign Faces Big Hurdle," *Boston Globe*, March 3, 1970.

47. McClean, "Causes and Caucuses."

48. Fenton, "Massachusetts Politics."

49. R. W. Apple, Jr., "Priest in Massachusetts Is Opposed as Politician," *New York Times*, June 17, 1970.

50. Oliver Quayle and Company, "A Survey of the Political Climate in Massachusetts' Third Congressional District," May 1970, Papers of Robert F. Drinan, Special Collections, Burns Library, Boston College, Newton, MA (hereafter Drinan Papers).

51. Eliot Friedman, "How to Win the Primary by Really Trying," *Boston Sunday Globe*, October 18, 1970.

52. Drinan for Congress, "Suggested Responses to Common Questions," ca. 1970, Drinan Papers.

53. Friedman, "How to Win."

54. Drinan for Congress, "So You're Going to Have a Drinan Yard Sale," 1970; Physicians for Drinan, "Wine and Cheese Party to meet Robert F. Drinan," Newton Centre, June 5, 1970; Dr. and Mrs. James S. Skinner, 18 Oxbow Road, "Concord Fundraising Garden Party with Robert F. Drinan," ca. 1970; Pat and Jack Hunter, West Newton "Punch and Politics" Party in Honor of Drinan, June 12, 1970, all in Drinan Papers.

55. Vin McLellan, "Father Drinan: A Victory in the Rain," *Boston Phoenix,* September 26, 1970.

56. Robert Healy, "Drinan Victory Upset of the Year," *Boston Evening Globe*, September 17, 1970.

57. Robert Healey, "The Message of Drinan Win," *Boston Globe*, September 27, 1970.

58. "New Politics and Old," *Time*, September 28, 1970; R. W. Apple, Jr., "Some Post-Primary Observations," *New York Times*, September 17, 1970.

59. "Computer, Enthusiastic Workers," *Boston Globe*, September 17, 1970.

60. Bill Kovach, "Liberal Shift Detected in Massachusetts Vote," *New York Times*, September 17, 1970.

61. Marjorie Hunter, "Drinan Is Leaving His Mark as Dedicated Liberal," *New York Times,* May 6, 1980.

62. Marcie Himmelstein, "Ralph Nader Congress Project Citizens Look at Congress: Robert F. Drinan," 1972, Records of Citizens for Participation in Political Action, Special Collections, Healey Library, University of Massachusetts–Boston, Boston, MA, box 36. See also George W. Cornell, "Priest Urges More Clerics in Congress," *Los Angeles Times*, September 26, 1973.

63. Henry Tanner, "Pope's Wish Is Seen in Curb on Drinan," *New York Times,* May 6, 1980; Michael Knight, "Drinan's Aides Say He Is Told to Quit Politics," *New York Times*, May 5, 1980; Francis X. Clines, "About Politics: Father Drinan to Go Forward, Gently," *New York Times,* May 17, 1980.

64. Michael Knight, "Voters in Drinan's District Upset over Vatican Order," *New York Times*, May 7, 1980.

65. Michael Knight, "Drinan Accepts Vatican's Order to Quit Politics," *New York Times*, May 6, 1980.

66. Margaret H. Merry to the editor, *Lexington Minute-Man,* October 12, 1972.

67. See, for instance, Robert Surbrug, *Beyond Vietnam: The Politics of Protest in Massachusetts, 1974–1990* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009); Taylor Adams, "Interfaith Group Unites for Environment," *Boston Globe,* April 19, 2010; Dana

McLean Greeley, "The Relevance of Women's Liberation" (Concord, MA: First Parish Church, December 28, 1975).

68. For more on this trend at the national level, see Bill Bishop, *The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-Minded America Is Tearing Us Apart* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2008), 173–79.

69. Brent Coffin, "Moral Deliberation in Congregations," in *Taking Faith Seriously*, ed. Mary Jo Bane, Brent Coffin, and Richard Higgins (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 118–19. For instance, the First Parish Church in Lexington continues to "help its members live out their values in their daily lives" by organizing projects like the Lexington Interfaith Garden on church property. Abiding by the motto "Growing Good Food for Good Neighbors," the initiative serves the simultaneous goals of maintaining the town's interfaith network, educating residents on "the value of local, sustainable farming," and "providing fresh produce for people in need." First Parish in Lexington, "Lexington Interfaith Garden," http://www.fpcuu.org/index.php/lexington-interfaith -garden; Lexington Interfaith Garden, http://interfaithgarden.org/about/.

70. *Goodrich v. Department of Public Health*, Brief of Amici Curiae of the Religious Coalition for the Freedom to Marry, et al in Support of Plaintiff-Appellants, November 8, 2002; "Statement from the Religious Coalition for the Freedom to Marry," *Boston Globe*, May 14, 2004.

71. Coffin, "Moral Deliberation," 113–45; Emily Sweeney, "More Gay Parents Choose Suburbs—Neighborhoods Becoming Blended," *Boston Globe*, February 24, 2002; Rev. John Hudson, interview by Renee Garrelick, August 17, 2001, Concord Oral History Program, Concord Public Library, Concord, MA; Jenny Rankin, interview by Michael and Carrie Kline, September 3, 2010, Concord Oral History Program.

72. Coffin, "Moral Deliberation," 137–38.

73. Greg Hernandez, "Family in Focus," *Advocate*, June 7, 2005; Talya Minsberg, "In Sleepy Minnesota Suburbs, Church Ladies Launch Gay Marriage Crusade," *Atlantic. com*, July 11, 2012; Matthew D. Lassiter, "Big Government and Family Values: Political Culture in the Metropolitan Sunbelt," in *Sunbelt Rising: The Politics of Place, Space and Region*, ed. Michelle Nickerson and Darren Dochuk (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 103–4; Marcus E. Howard, "Church Walks for Marriage Equality in Ga.," *Marietta Day Journal*, February 14, 2012. See also Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, "Changing Attitudes on Gay Marriage" (April 2012), http://features.pewfo rum.org/same-sex-marriage-attitudes/; Quinnipiac University Polling Institute, "American Catholics Support Same-Sex Marriage, Quinnipiac University National Poll Finds; Catholics Want New Direction From Next Pope" (press release, March 8, 2013), http:// www.quinnipiac.edu/institutes-and-centers/polling-institute/connecticut/ release-detail?ReleaseID=1863.

74. Alan Greenblatt, "Gay Marriage Stand Could Help Obama in Suburbia" (National Public Radio, May 11, 2012), http://www.npr.org/2012/05/11/152491824/gay-ma rriage-stand-could-help-obama-in-suburbia; Domenico Montanaro, "Is Obama's Gay Marriage Stance All About Suburban Voters?," *NBC News*, May 8, 2012.

75. Elizabeth Tenety, "Obama: Christ and the Golden Rule Informed Support of Same-Sex Marriage," *Washington Post,* May 10, 2012.

76. Jackie Calmes and Peter Baker, "Obama Says Same-Sex Marriage Should Be Legal," *New York Times*, May 9, 2012; Office of the Governor, "Statement of Governor Patrick on President Obama's Support for Same-Sex Marriage" (May 9, 2012), http://www.mass.gov/governor/pressoffice/pressreleases/2012/2012509-governor-statement-on-president-support-of-same-sex-marriage.html. For more about the state privileges offered by marriage and for a groundbreaking study of sexuality and suburbia, see Clayton C. Howard, "The Closet and the Cul de Sac: Sex, Politics, and Suburbanization in Postwar California" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2010).

77. Walter Olson, "Republicans Helped Same Sex Marriage Win at the Polls," *Washington Post,* November 30, 2012; Nate Cohn, "BankersAbandoned Obama—But the Rest of the Rich Hold Surprisingly Strong," *New Republic Online*, November 14, 2012, http://www.newrepublic.com/blog/electionate/110109/greenwich-abandons-obama-affluent-voters-elsewhere-render-mixed-verdict.

78. See, for instance, E. J. Dionne, Jr., *Souled Out: Reclaiming Faith and Politics After the Religious Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Amy Sullivan, *The Party Faithful: How and Why Democrats Are Closing the God Gap* (New York: Scribner, 2008); E. J. Dionne and William A. Galston, "The Old and New Politics of Faith: Religion and the 2010 Election" (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, November 17, 2010).

## Chapter 9. Knute Gingrich, All American?

1. Ross Douthat, "Divided by God," *New York Times*, April 8, 2012; Robert P. Jones, "Pope Francis's Challenge to the Evangelical-Catholic Coalition," *Atlantic*, April 17, 2014, www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/04/pope-francis-white-evangelicals/360755/ (accessed May 1, 2014); McCauley, "Faith Factor."

2. Lizzy Davies, "Pope Condemns Idolatry of Cash in Capitalism," *Guardian*, September 22, 2013, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/22/pope-francis-idol-money (accessed May 1, 2014); Antonio Spadaro, S.J., "A Big Heart Open to God," *America*, September 30, 2013; Aaron Blake, "Pope Francis Denounces 'Trickle-Down' Economics," *Washington Post*, November 26, 2013, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/11/26/pope-francis-denounces-trickle-down-economics/ (accessed May 1, 2014); Sheryl Gay Stolberg, "Popular Voice in the Capitol? It's the Pope's," *New York Times*, January 5, 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/06/us/politics/popular-voice-in-the-capitol-its-the-popes.html (accessed May 1, 2014). The full text of Pope Francis's 2013 apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (The Joy of the Gospel) is available in English at http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html.

3. Al Cardenas quoted in Jonathan Martin, "Election Aftermath: GOP Soul-Searching: 'Too Old, Too White, Too Male?,'" *Politico*, November 7, 2012, www.politico.

com/news/stories/1112/83472.html#; Robin Abcarian, "Birth Control Uproar: The '60s All over Again," *Los Angeles Times*, March 25, 2012; Gregory A. Prince, "Mitt Romney Is Not the Face of Mormonism," *Huff Post Religion Blog*, September 19, 2012, www.huffing tonpost.com/gregory-a-prince-phd/mitt-romney-is-not-the-face-of-mormon ism_b_1897404.html; Thomas Burr, "[Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid: Mitt Romney Is Not the Face of Mormonism," *Salt Lake Tribune*, September 24, 2012; Erika Eichelberger, "Road Tripping Nuns Take on the Ryan Budget," *Mother Jones*, June 25, 2012, www.motherjones.com/mixed-media/2012/06/nuns-on-the-bus-ryan-budget.

4. Dan Gilgoff, "Newt Gingrich's Faith Journey: How a Thrice-Married Catholic Became an Evangelical Darling," *CNN Belief Blog*, December 10, 2011, http://religion.blogs .cnn.com/2011/12/10/newt-gingrichs-faith-journey-how-a-thrice-married-catholic -became-an-evangelical-darling/.

5. Gilgoff, "Newt Gingrich's Faith Journey"; Laurie Goodstein, "Gingrich Represents New Political Era for Roman Catholics," *New York Times*, December 17, 2011; Barbara Matuswo, "The Conversion of Bob Novak," *Washingtonian*, June 1, 2003; Jessica Garrison, "Pastor Rallies Clergy Against Gay Marriage," *Los Angeles Times*, June 26, 2008; Stephanie Strom, "The Political Pulpit," *New York Times*, September 30, 2011.

6. This is a central contribution of Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988). A succinct analysis of the postwar electoral data can be found in Geoffrey Layman, *The Great Divide: Religious and Cultural Conflict in American Party Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); an elegant historical synthesis is Daniel K. Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

7. Given its relatively recent vintage, much of this analysis has so far taken place within Christian ministry circles—including online communities—and in the secular and religious press rather than in scholarly forums; see, for example, Ross Douthat, "The Terms of Our Surrender," *New York Times*, March 1, 2014; David Kinnaman and Gabe Lyons, *UnChristian: What a New Generation Really Thinks about Christianity . . . and Why It Matters* (Ada, MI: Baker, 2012); Matt K. Lewis, "For Christians, a Silver Lining to Losing the Culture War?," *Week*, April 3, 2014, http://theweek.com/article/ index/259131/for-christians-a-silver-lining-to-losing-the-culture-war# (accessed May 1, 2014); Josh McDowell and David H. Bellis, *The Last Christian Generation* (Holiday, FL: Green Key Books, 2006); Christine Wicker, *The Fall of the Evangelical Nation: The Surprising Crisis Inside the Church* (New York: HarperCollins, 2008). For some thoughtful scholarly analyses of the demographic factors driving much of the change, see Christian Smith with Patricia Snell, *Souls in Transition: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of Emerging Adults* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Robert Wuthnow, *After the Baby Boomers: How Twenty- and Thirty-Somethings Are Shaping the Future of American Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

8. David Sehat, *The Myth of American Religious Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); direct quotation from p. 4. For a related analysis that nevertheless

draws distinct conclusions from this history, see Philip Hamburger, *Separation of Church and State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

9. John F. Kennedy, "Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association," September 12, 1960, www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/ALL6YEBJMEKYGMCntnSCvg.aspx; Zachary R. Calo, "'The Indispensable Basis of Democracy': American Catholicism, the Church-State Debate, and the Soul of American Liberalism, 1920–1929," *Virginia Law Review* 91, no. 4 (June 2005): 1037–73; John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: Norton, 2003), 166–88; Mark S. Massa, *Catholics and American Culture: Fulton Sheen, Dorothy Day, and the Notre Dame Football Team* (New York: Crossroad, 1999), 126–47.

10. Nancy Maclean, "Southern Dominance in Borrowed Language: The Regional Origins of American Neo-Liberalism," in *New Landscapes of Inequality: Neoliberalism and the Erosion of Democracy in America*, ed. Jane L. Collins, Micaela di Leonardo, and Brett Williams (Santa Fe, NM: School of Advanced Research Press, 2008), 21–38.

11. Axel Schäfer, *Piety and Public Funding: Evangelicals and the State in Modern America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012). For book-length treatments of missionary interactions with American foreign policy more generally, see Daniel H. Bays and Grant Wacker, *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home: Explorations in North American Cultural History* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003); David S. Foglesong, *The American Mission and the "Evil Empire": The Crusade for a "Free Russia" Since 1881* (New York : Cambridge University Press, 2007); Todd Hartch, *Missionaries of the State: The Summer Institute of Linguistics, State Formation, and Indigenous Mexico, 1935–1985* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006); William R. Hutchison, *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); Sylvia M. Jacobs, *Black Americans and the Missionary Movement in Africa* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1982); Sally Engle Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i: The Cultural Power of Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Barbara Reeves-Ellington, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and Connie Anne Shemo, *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812–1960* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); David Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant? The Politics of Evangelical Growth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Jeffrey Swanson, *Echoes of the Call: Identity and Ideology among American Missionaries in Ecuador* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Ian Tyrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

12. Classic works on the longer history of anti-Catholicism include Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (1938; repr., Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964) and John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925* (1955; repr., New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002).

13. Wuthnow, *Restructuring of American Religion*, 72–75, NAE quotation from 74.

14. This argument belongs to Melani McAlister, *Our God in the World: The Global Vision of American Evangelicals* (forthcoming).

15. Massa, *Catholics and American Culture*, 21–37.

16. Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1955); James P. McCartin, "The Waning of the Catholic 'Other' and Catholicism in American Life after 1965," *Revue française d'études américaines*, no. 95, Le fait religieux aux États-Unis: approches culturelles et cultuelles (February 2003): 7–29; John Schmalzbauer, "Reading Herberg from Wheaton: 'Protestant, Catholic, Jew' and American Evangelicalism," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 23, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 25–39.

17. On the stabilization of the twentieth-century category of "white," see Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); David R. Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs* (New York: Basic Books, 2006); on the Johnson-Reed Act, see Mae Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 21–55; on the racial preferences built into the subsidized expansion of the middle class, see Cheryl I. Harris, "Whiteness as Property," *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (June 1993): 1707–91; George Lipsitz, "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: Racialized Social Democracy and the 'White' Problem in American Studies," *American Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (September 1995): 369–87; Ira Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Norton, 2005). The direct quotation comes from a popular World War II song, "When Those Little Yellow Bellies Meet the Cohens and the Kellys," neatly encapsulating the racial opposition by which "white" became simultaneously more inclusive and more exclusive; quoted in Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 33.

18. For excellent overviews of the changing fortunes of midcentury Catholicism in the United States, see Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950–1985* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 16–48; Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 384–417; James T. Fisher, *Communion of Immigrants: A History of Catholics in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 114–36; and William M. Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1920–1940* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980), 152–80. On the generational changes in observance and the rising stature of Catholics in American mass culture in the same years, see James T. Fisher, *The Catholic Counterculture in America, 1933–1962* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989); James P. McCartin, *Prayers of the Faithful: The Shifting Spiritual Life of American Catholics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010); Massa, *Catholics and American Culture*; Robert A. Orsi, *Thank You, St. Jude: Women's Devotion to the Patron Saint of Hopeless Causes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); and Anthony Burke Smith, *The Look of Catholics: Portrayals in Popular Culture from the Great Depression to the Cold War* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2010).

19. The full text of the encyclical in English is available on the Vatican's website: www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19031937_divini-redemptoris_en.html. Recent treatments of this religious mobilization in the early Cold War include, in addition to relevant sections of works previously cited, Jonathan P. Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle against Communism in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); William Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945–1960: The Soul of Containment* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York: Knopf, 2012), 411–600; and Jason W. Stevens, *God-Fearing and Free: A Spiritual History of America's Cold War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010). On U.S. Catholicism specifically, see Patrick J. McNamara, *A Catholic Cold War: Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., and the Politics of American Anticommunism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005); on U.S. evangelicalism, see Angela M. Lahr, *Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares: The Cold War Origins of Political Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); on the larger religious context of the Cold War, see contributions to Philip Muelhenbeck, ed., *Religion and the Cold War: A Global Perspective* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2012). And see note 11.

20. See David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

21. See Nancy F. Cott, *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), esp. 156–79; Rebecca L. Davis, "'Not Marriage at All, but Simple Harlotry': The Companionate Marriage Controversy," *Journal of American History* 94, no. 4 (March 2008): 1137–63; Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

22. Representative works that resist that false dichotomy are reviewed in Bethany Moreton, "Why Is There So Much Sex in Christian Conservatism and Why Do So Few Historians Care Anything about It?," *Journal of Southern History* 75, no. 3 (August 2009): 717–38.

23. Franklin Foer, "Spin Doctrine," *New Republic*, June 5, 2000; David Grann, "Where W. Got Compassion," *New York Times Magazine*, September 12, 1999; Marvin Olasky, *The Tragedy of American Compassion* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 1992).

24. Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams: An Autobiography*, ed. Henry Cabot Lodge (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1919), 388–89. The analysis of Adams and the larger argument on late Victorian nostalgia for Catholic aesthetics belong to T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), esp. 184–215, 270–97.

25. Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Converts: British and American Intellectuals Turn to Rome* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997).

26. The full text of *Rerum Novarum* in English is available at www.papalencyclicals.net/Leo13/l13rerum.htm. Arnold F. McKee, "The 'Natural' Right to Private Property," *Review of Social Economy* 49, no. 4 (Winter 1991): 483–501; A. M. C. Waterman, "The

Intellectual Context of 'Rerum Novarum,'" *Review of Social Economy* 49, no. 4 (Winter 1991): 465–82. In American labor history, defense of a "living wage" was not new; but in contrast to trade union demands for a radical consumerism to replace the lost privileges of artisanal mastery, argues historian Lawrence Glickman, the Progressive-era concept in more elite discourse was altogether more restrictive; see Glickman, *A Living Wage: American Workers and the Making of Consumer Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997).

27. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*; Leslie Woodcock Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception: An American History* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 40–42; Francis L. Broderick, *Right Reverend New Dealer John A. Ryan* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 39–47; Benjamin K. Hunnicutt, "Monsignor John A. Ryan and the Shorter Hours of Labor: A Forgotten Vision of 'Genuine' Progress," *Catholic Historical Review* 69, no. 3 (July 1983): 384–402; quotation from John A. Ryan, "The Small Family and National Decadence," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, February 1904, 143–44.

28. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom,* 150–51. The full text of *Quadragesimo Anno* in English is available at www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html. See also Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, "Chapter 4, Section IV: The Principle of Subsidiarity," in *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004).

29. Robert H. Brinkmeyer, Jr., *The Fourth Ghost: White Southern Writers and European Fascism, 1930–1950* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 32 and passim.

30. Ibid., 34–38; Allitt, *Catholic Converts*, 206–10; Thomas A. Underwood, *Allen Tate: Orphan of the South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 162–63, 204–7.

31. George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945 Thirtieth Anniversary Edition* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2006), 145–49; Nancy MacLean, "The Neo-Confederacy versus the New Deal: The Regional Utopia of the Modern American Right," in *The Myth of Southern Exceptionalism*, ed. Matthew Lassiter and Joseph Crespino (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 308–30.

32. Erika Doss, "The Art of Cultural Politics: From Regionalism to Abstract Expressionism," in *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of Cold War*, ed. Lary May (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 195–220; Brinkmeyer, *Fourth Ghost*, 12–14.

33. Gibson Winter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches: An Analysis of Protestant Responsibility in the Expanding Metropolis* (New York: Macmillan, 1962) offered a contemporary critique of the bland spirituality of the Eisenhower years.

34. The analysis here belongs to Fisher, *Catholic Counterculture*, 1–99; Maurin, paraphrasing the decentralist Ralph Adams Cram in one of his "Easy Essays" of 1935, quoted on 42.

35. Fisher, *Catholic Counterculture*.

36. Grann, "Where W. Got Compassion"; Olasky, *Tragedy of American Compassion.*

37. Marvin Olasky, "Subsidiarity: The Thinking Behind Catholic Compassionate Conservatism," *World*, November 9, 2002.

38. On the theoconservatives, see Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals*; Damon Linker, *The Theocons: Secular America Under Siege* (New York: Doubleday, 2006).

39. Schäfer, *Piety and Public Funding*; Winnifred Fallers Sullivan, "Neutralizing Religion; or, What Is the Opposite of 'Faith-Based'?," *History of Religions* 41, no. 4 (May 2002): 369–71. On the important specific case of tax exemptions for religious schools, see Joseph Crespino, "Civil Rights and the Religious Right," in *Rightward Bound: Making America Conservative in the 1970s*, ed. Bruce Schulman and Julian Zelizer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 90–104. For the longer historical background, see Sehat, *Myth of American Religious Freedom.*

40. On Schlafly, see Donald T. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

41. David R. Swartz, *Moral Minority: The Evangelical Left in an Age of Conservatism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 239–43.

42. R. Scott Appleby, "Catholics and the Christian Right: An Uneasy Alliance," in *Sojourners in the Wilderness: The Christian Right in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Corwin E. Smidt and James M. Penning (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), 94–96.

43. Various authors, "Evangelicals and Catholics Together: Christian Mission in the Third Millennium," *First Things*, May 1994; William M. Shea, *The Lion and the Lamb: Evangelicals and Catholics in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 180–85. On the significance of the fetus as the synecdoche for an array of vulnerable social actors and arrangements, see Lauren Berlant, "America, 'Fat,' the Fetus," *boundary 2* 21, no. 3 (Autumn 1994): 145–95; Sara Dubow, *Ourselves Unborn: A History of the Fetus in Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Susan Friend Harding, *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

44. This section relies heavily on the analyses of Doris Buss and Didi Herman, *Globalizing Family Values: The Christian Right in International Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003); Jennifer S. Butler, *Born Again: The Christian Right Globalized* (Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press, 2006); Michelle Goldberg, *The Means of Reproduction: Sex, Power, and the Future of the World* (New York: Penguin, 2010).

45. For the most thorough analysis of this history, see Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception.*

46. Goldberg, *Means of Reproduction*, 37–68. As Goldberg notes, to suggest that international population control was broadly accepted at the level of elite U.S. government and NGO policy in the 1950s and 1960s is not to imply that it was unproblematic; see Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconceptions: The Struggle to Control World Population* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2010);

Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (New York: Vintage, 1999).

47. Goldberg, *Means of Reproduction*, 90–99; Robert Wright, "Newt Gingrich's History in Outer Space," *Atlantic*, January 27, 2012, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/01/newt-gingrichs-history-in-outer-space/252168/; Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, "Ideology and Politics at Mexico City: The United States at the 1984 International Conference on Population," *Population and Development Review* 11, no. 1 (March 1985): 1–28; first direct quotation is Lyndon Johnson, "Remarks on the Twentieth Anniversary of the U.N. Charter" (June 25, 1965), in Goldberg, *Means of Reproduction*, 52; subsequent direct quotations from "Policy Statement of the United States of America at the United Nations International Conference on Population," in Finkle and Crane, "Ideology and Politics," 11.

48. Butler, *Born Again*, 104–6.

49. Buss and Herman, *Globalizing Family Values*, 83–88.

50. Franciscan University Distinguished Speakers Series, "Callista and Newt Gingrich Introduce Nine Days" (November 24, 2010), www.youtube.com/watch?v=x7cSdGPdelo.

51. This argument belongs to Linda Kintz, *Between Jesus and the Market: The Emotions That Matter in Right-Wing America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), 142–216; Gilder quoted on 144.

52. Fred Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). See also John Markoff, *What the Dormouse Said: How the Sixties Counterculture Shaped the Personal Computer Industry* (New York: Viking, 2005); N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Quoted phrase from Henry Adams, "Prayer to the Virgin of Chartres," in Lears, *No Place of Grace*, 280.

53. Pew Research Center, Religion & Public Life Project, "'Nones' on the Rise" (October 9, 2012), http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/, p. 10; Michael Hout and Claude S. Fischer, "Why More Americans Have No Religious Preference: Politics and Generations," *American Sociological Review* 67, no. 2 (April 2002): 165–66, 172–73; Pew Research Center, "Latinos, Religion, and Campaign 2012" (Washington, DC: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, October 18, 2012), www.pewforum.org/Race/Latinos-Religion-and-Campaign-2012.aspx; Jaweed Kaleem, "Religious Vote Data Show Shifts in Obama's Faith-Based Support," *Huffington Post*, November 7, 2012 (updated November 8, 2012), www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/07/obama-religion-voters-2012_n_2090258.html.

54. John S. Dickerson, *The Great Evangelical Recession: 6 Factors That Will Crash the American Church . . . and How to Prepare* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2013), 26.

55. Electa Draper, "Focus on the Family Announces More Layoffs," *Denver Post*, September 16, 2011; Patricia Borns, "For Some Baptists, the Name of the Church Is a Hindrance to Saving Souls," *Miami Herald*, May 5, 2013.

56. Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, "Faith in Flux: Changes in Religious Affiliation in the U.S." (April 27, 2009), 21–23, www.pewforum.org/Faith-in-Flux.aspx.

57. Jaweed Kaleem, "Health Care Ruling Prompts Catholic Bishops to Amp Up Efforts Against Contraception Mandate," *Huffington Post*, June 28, 2012, www.huffington post.com/2012/06/28/health-care-religion-catholic-bishops_n_1635521.html.

58. Anna Peterson, Manuel Vásquez, and Philip J. Williams, "Introduction: Christianity and Social Change in the Shadow of Globalization," in *Christianity, Social Change, and Globalization in the Americas*, ed. Anna Lisa Peterson, Manuel A. Vásquez, and Philip J. Williams (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 1–22. For a synthesis of the scholarship on Christianity's growth in the global South, see Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Rise of Global Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

59. www.gingrichproductions.com/2014/04/at-twin-pope-canonizations-newt-ging rich-call-pope-francis-a-man-of-the-people/ (accessed May 1, 2014); Ryan Sager, "Revenge of the Wal-Mart Voters," *RealClear Politics*, June 27, 2006, www.realclearpolitics. com/articles/2006/06/revenge_of_the_walmart_voters.html; Laurie Goodstein, "Nuns Weigh Response to Scathing Vatican Rebuke," *New York Times*, July 28, 2012; Goodstein, "Mormons' Ad Campaign May Play Out on the '12 Campaign Trail," *New York Times*, November 17, 2011; Alan Gomez, "Evangelicals Launch $250,000 Immigration Campaign," *USA Today*, May 21, 2013. On the recent history of U.S. religious progressives, see Christian Smith, *Resisting Reagan: The U.S. Central American Peace Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Swartz, *Moral Minority*; Mary Jo Weaver, ed., *What's Left? Liberal American Catholics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

Lila Corwin Berman is associate professor of history at Temple University. She holds the Murray Friedman Chair of American Jewish History and directs the Feinstein Center for American Jewish History. She is the author of *Metropolitan Jews: Politics, Race, and Religion in Postwar Detroit* (2015) and *Speaking of Jews: Rabbis, Intellectuals, and the Creation of an American Public Identity* (2009).

Edward J. Blum is professor of history at San Diego State University. He is the author of several books on race and religion in the United States, including *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion, and American Nationalism* (2005) and, with coauthor Paul Harvey, *The Color of Christ: The Son of God and the Saga of Race in America* (2012).

Darren Dochuk is associate professor in the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics and Department of History at Washington University in Saint Louis. He is the author of *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (2010). He is also coeditor of *Sunbelt Rising: The Politics of Space, Place, and Region* (2011).

Lily Geismer is assistant professor of history at Claremont McKenna College. She is the author of *Don't Blame Us: Suburban Liberals and the Transformation of the Democratic Party* (2015).

Alison Collis Greene is assistant professor of history at Mississippi State University. Her first book, *No Depression in Heaven: Religion and Economic Crisis in the Alluvial Empire* (forthcoming).

Matthew S. Hedstrom is assistant professor of religious studies and American studies at the University of Virginia. He is the author of *The Rise of Liberal Religion: Book Culture and American Spirituality in the Twentieth Century* (2013).

David Mislin is an assistant professor at the intellectual heritage program at Temple University. His first book is in production at Cornell University Press.

Bethany Moreton is associate professor of history and women's studies at the University of Georgia and a series editor for Columbia University Press's Studies in the History of U.S. Capitalism. She is the author of *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (2009).

Andrew Preston teaches American history at Cambridge University, where he is a fellow of Clare College. In addition to numerous scholarly and newspaper articles, he is the author of *The War Council: McGeorge Bundy, the NSC, and Vietnam* (2006) and coeditor of three other books. His most recent book is *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (2012).

Bruce J. Schulman is the William E. Huntington Professor of History at Boston University. He is the author of three books and editor or coeditor of four others. He is currently completing a volume covering the period 1896–1929 for the Oxford History of the United States.

Molly Worthen is assistant professor of history at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where she teaches courses in North American religious and intellectual history. Her most recent book is *Apostles of Reason: The Crisis of Authority in American Evangelicalism* (2013). She writes about religion and politics for the *New York Times*, *Slate*, and other publications.

Julian E. Zelizer is the Malcolm Stevenson Forbes, Class of 1941 Professor of History and Public Affairs at Princeton University and a fellow at New America. He is the author and editor of fifteen books on American political history as well as a weekly column on CNN.com. His most rcent book is *The Fierce Urgency of Now: Lyndon Johnson, Congress, and the Battle for the Great Society* (2015).

# INDEX