

Religion and Evolution in Progressive Era Political Economy: Adversaries or Allies?

Thomas C. Leonard

Of the several influences on early Progressive Era American political economy, two stand out, evangelical Protestantism and evolutionary science.¹ Scholarly and popular accounts alike have tended to make science and religion antagonists, no more so than with the conflict they find between evangelical Protestantism and evolutionary science, as exemplified by accounts of the 1925 Scopes trial.² But evangelical Protestantism and evolutionary science comfortably coexisted in Progressive Era American political economy. Leading progressive³ economists, not least

Correspondence may be addressed to Thomas C. Leonard, Department of Economics, Fisher Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544; e-mail: tleonard@princeton.edu. This essay benefited from the constructive criticism of several distinguished scholars. I especially wish to acknowledge the comments of Marie Griffith and Wallace Best, as well as those of the participants in the American Religious History seminar at Princeton University.

1. The term *evangelical* can be elusive. In the nineteenth-century American context it refers less to a specific group or church than to a set of widely held Protestant commitments: (1) the need for conversion (being “born again”), (2) the authority of the Bible, (3) an emphasis on the sacrifice and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and (4) activism, in the form of missionary or social work (Bebbington 1989, 2–3).

2. The concept of religion and science in conflict can be found in late-Victorian-era books such as John William Draper’s *History of the Conflict between Science and Religion* (1875) and Andrew Dickson White’s *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896). See Livingstone 1984, 2.

3. *Progressive* is no less a problematic term than *evangelical*. For the purposes of this essay, I employ a definition elaborated in Leonard 2009a: the progressives believed in a powerful, national state, conceiving of government as the best means for promoting the social good and

the evangelicals attached to the Social Gospel movement, readily and routinely assimilated ideas borrowed from evolutionary science—heredity, selection, fitness, and race—into their religiously motivated project of economic reform. This essay argues that the progressive economists’ merger of evolutionary science and Protestant belief was made possible by the fact that the Social Gospel was itself already (in part) an accommodation to the implications of post-Darwinian evolutionary thought, and that Progressive Era evolutionary science was protean, fragmented, and plural, enabling intellectuals to enlist evolutionary ideas in support of diverse, even opposing, positions in political economy.

Liberal Theology and Progressive Reform: The Rise of the Social Gospel

Into the late 1870s, American Protestant churches were no force for economic reform. To the contrary, they “presented a massive, almost unbroken front . . . in defense of the social status quo” (May 1949, 91). The same was true of American political economy, whose leading text in the middle of the nineteenth century was written by Rev. Francis Wayland, president of Brown University and a defender of laissez-faire, whose objective in *The Elements of Political Economy* (1837) was to set forth God’s laws to the extent that they justified property, production, and distribution (Fogel 2000). When T. E. Cliffe Leslie surveyed American political economy for his English readers in 1880, he noted the “conspicuousness of a theological element,” the “sectarian purposes” of American colleges, and the tendency of American treatises to see providential design in the way free markets promoted the welfare of men.⁴ But American Protestantism, like Ameri-

rejecting the individualism of (classical) liberalism; the progressives venerated social efficiency; the progressives believed in the epistemic and moral authority of science, a belief that comprised their view that biology could explain and control human inheritance and that the still nascent sciences of society could explain and control the causes of economic ills; the progressives believed that intellectuals should guide social and economic progress, a belief erected upon two subsidiary faiths, a faith in the disinterestedness and incorruptibility of the experts who would run the administrative government they envisioned, and a faith that expertise could not only serve the social good, but also could identify it; and, while antimonopoly, the progressives believed that increasing industrial consolidation was inevitable, and desirable, consistent with their faith in planning, organization, and command. In this essay, I use the lowercase *progressive* to distinguish reformers (progressives) from members of the Progressive Party.

4. Leslie likened some American treatises to children’s Sunday School tracts, instancing Arthur Latham Perry’s *Elements of Political Economy* (1866).

can economics, changed its relationship to economic reform during the late Gilded Age and the Progressive Era, enough that Richard Hofstadter (1955, 152) could later characterize, with cause, the entire progressive movement, in all its multifaceted variety, as “a phase in the history of the Protestant conscience, a latter-day Protestant revival.” Economic historian and Nobel laureate Robert Fogel (2000, 10) refers to Progressive Era economic and social reform as a “Third Great Awakening.”

The Social Gospel describes a late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century form of evangelical Protestantism that sought economic and social improvement via a religiously motivated and scientifically informed project of social redemption. Historians of the Social Gospel, following Arthur Schlesinger’s (1932) influential essay “A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875–1900,” characterize the Progressive Era changes in American Protestantism as a response to two mostly external challenges: the challenge to Protestantism’s social program posed by the effects of the rise of industrial capitalism and its concomitants, and the challenge to Protestantism’s intellectual (or theological) program posed by the twofold secularizing forces of Darwinism and the Higher Criticism of Germany. The Social Gospel, on this view, was the product of an accommodation of the liberal wing of American Protestantism to radically changed socioeconomic conditions and to modern ideas regarding the origins of humankind and the truth-value of Christianity’s sacred texts.⁵

On the socioeconomic side, liberal Protestants were deeply affected, as were nearly all Americans, by the spectacular changes in American economic life during the last third of the nineteenth century. Following the Civil War, the United States industrialized on a revolutionary scale; the growth in productivity, in output, and in wealth was unprecedented in human history. Industrialization coincided with the development of a transportation and communication infrastructure; railroad and telegraphy networks both measured and fostered the new national scope of American markets. The transformation from an agricultural to an industrial economy gave rise to a set of profound social dislocations, among them “urbanization,” a neologism for characterizing the movement from farm to factory. The growth in labor demand was met, in part, by immigration on a large scale, which introduced to America polyglot peoples with disparate cultural and religious traditions. Coincident with industrialization,

5. So while the Social Gospel influenced all Protestant denominations, it was most influential in the more liberal Unitarian and Congregationalist churches.

urbanization, and immigration was the 1880s rise of labor unions (craft and mass), the 1890s consolidation of industry into pools and trusts, and recurrent and sometimes violent labor conflict, for which names like Homestead and Pullman still serve as synecdoches.

On the intellectual side, Darwinism explained mankind's origins as entirely natural; it seemed to obviate any supernatural role in the creation of humanity. And, by arguing that all organic life shared a common descent, Darwinism also threatened Christian belief in the divine spark—the indwelling soul—said to reside uniquely in the human animal. The German Higher Criticism, for its part, also adopted a naturalistic line. Moving German scientific history into Bible studies, previously the province of Christian theology, the Higher Criticism argued that scripture should be read as empirically testable stories, with multiple authors, and not as revelation, the literal word of God.

The Social Gospel was not a working-class movement. Like nearly all progressives, the Social Gospellers were members of the professional middle classes. Henry May (1949, 235), in an influential early reading of the Social Gospel movement, put it this way: “The Social Gospel of the American nineteenth century . . . did not grow out of actual suffering but rather out of moral and intellectual dissatisfaction with the suffering of others. It originated not with the ‘disinherited’ but rather with the educated and pious middle class. It grew through argument, not through agitation; it pleaded for conversion, not revolt or withdrawal.”

The Social Gospel was erected upon a version of Protestant postmillennialism, the Christian doctrine that prophesizes that a Kingdom of God—reigning for one thousand years of peace and love—would be realized on Earth by the good works of Christian men and women. Opposed to premillennialism, which imagined that the Kingdom of God would be accomplished only by the triumphal bodily return of Jesus Christ, postmillennialism taught that the world could be redeemed by human beings, using the providential gifts of science and acting in the spirit of Christ (Quandt 1973).

The postmillennial substitution of good works for Christ himself as the agency of redemption helped make the Social Gospel especially congruent with the more rationalistic aspects of progressive reform. That a new order could be realized without supernatural intervention was a consequence of naturalistic challenges to religious faith, and also a crucial means for redirecting religious energy toward the more earthly concern of social reform. Said Rochester Seminary professor Walter Rauschenbusch in his influ-

ential 1907 manifesto of the Social Gospel, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, “For the first time in religious history we have the possibility of so directing religious energy by scientific knowledge that a comprehensive and continuous reconstruction of social life in the name of God is within the bounds of human possibility” (quoted in Bateman 2001, 79).

The postmillennialist change in doctrine, in responding to the implications of evolutionary science, freed space for Protestant teaching to make use of the new ideas from the natural and social sciences. Liberal Protestant reform still invoked the language of Christian brotherhood, for example, but could portray brotherhood not as a divine creation, but as the product of evolution (Quandt 1973). Ohio pastor Washington Gladden, an early and long-standing leader in the Social Gospel movement and charter member of the American Economic Association, said in his *Social Salvation* (1902) that Christianity “must be a religion less concerned about getting men to heaven than about fitting them for their proper work on earth” (30). Rauschenbusch ([1907] 1908, 59–60), who had spent eleven years ministering to an immigrant congregation in New York City’s Hell’s Kitchen neighborhood, told his readers that Christ himself wanted to displace the “crude and misleading” idea of a “Messianic cataclysm” with a “saner theory” of redemption via social reform.

The change from saving individual souls to redeeming society with scientific knowledge required training ministers more widely, and liberal seminaries added Christian social science texts, notably Richard T. Ely’s *The Social Law of Service* (1896) and *Social Aspects of Christianity* (1889b), to their syllabi. Ely’s *Introduction to Political Economy* (1889a) sold thousands of copies at Chautauqua camp meetings and was widely read among seminarians. George Herron, the radical Congregationalist minister Ely had helped place in a sociology professorship at Iowa College (later Grinnell College), once asked Ely rhetorically, “Unto whom should I send them if not to you?” (quoted in Rader 1966, 60–61).⁶

Conservative theologians, represented by traditional divines such as Charles Hodge of the Princeton Theological Seminary, and editor of the *Princeton Review*, flatly rejected Darwinism. In his 1874 book *What Is Darwinism?* Hodge’s reply was that Darwinism “is atheism, utterly inconsistent with the Scriptures” (177). Hodge well understood the nontheistic

6. Although the Social Gospel movement clearly represents a change in the outlook of the Protestant churches, especially with respect to *economic* reform, it is nonetheless possible to see it as continuous with a long-standing tradition of social reform in American Protestantism. I thank Wallace Best for this point.

and anticreation implications at the heart of Darwinism; he saw that the “denial of design in nature is virtually the denial of God” (Larson 1997, 18). Hodge was one of the last American divines (as opposed to clergymen in general) to refuse any accommodation whatsoever with evolutionary science in the post-Darwinian era.⁷ Conservative theology ordinarily went with conservative politics (just as the new liberal theology ordinarily went with progressive politics). Traditional premillennialists tended to see social reform as misguided. If only the bodily return of Jesus Christ himself could redeem the world, bringing the Kingdom of God to earth was beyond the reach of men and women and would, moreover, delay Christ’s return.

As the Progressive Era advanced, the Social Gospel increasingly distanced itself from theism. Christian conversion, for example, traditionally a matter of spiritual rebirth, came more and more to refer to moral improvement of the individual (Quandt 1973, 394). The agencies of redemption also were expanded beyond the church. “God works through the State in carrying out His purposes more universally,” Richard T. Ely (1896, 162–63) could say, “than through any other institution.”⁸

And just as salvation was increasingly socialized, so too was sin. Economist turned sociologist Edward A. Ross, in *Sin and Society: An Analysis of Latter-Day Iniquity* (1907), summarized the new view that sin was no longer a matter of individual failure. Sin, Ross said, was social in cause.⁹ Social Gospeler Josiah Strong, whose *Our Country* was a best seller in the 1880s, likewise argued that “the ethics of Jesus applied not just to the individual but to economic and political structures as well” (Fogel 2000, 122). As John R. Commons (1894, 71) put it, “Society is the subject of redemption.”

Social Gospelers, inside and outside theological circles, increasingly effaced the line between revelation—what God discloses—and scientific

7. When in 1868 the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University) imported James McCosh to be its president, it knew it was getting a theologian able to at least partly reconcile Christian belief with Darwinism. McCosh offered a kind of natural theology, wherein the law of natural selection is one of the methods God used to produce a multifarious nature, and that the history of evolution reveals “a design and a unity of design in it, in the unconscious elements all being made to conspire to a given end.” This quotation and an excellent discussion are available in Livingstone 1992.

8. John R. Commons (1894, 54) echoed Ely: “Government . . . is the greatest power for good that exists among men.”

9. Although Ross revisited the Christian idea of inborn sinfulness, he did not believe thereby that all human beings were perfectible by good works. On the contrary, as a eugenicist, Ross merely substituted biological inadequacy for spiritual inadequacy. For Ross, persons from racially inferior groups were, if not fallen as such, nonetheless hereditarily beyond uplift.

knowledge, what humankind can discover for itself (Quandt 1973, 400). Strong accomplished this by declaring that natural laws, such as evolution by natural selection, were the laws of God. Lyman Abbott, editor of *Outlook*, a leading progressive journal, Henry Ward Beecher's successor in the pulpit at Plymouth Congregational Church in Brooklyn and a charter member of the American Economic Association, went further still. God did not create evolution by natural selection. It was, rather, that God was immanent in nature, and also in all good and progressive institutions (Abbott 1900).

As Jean Quandt (1973, 401) points out, Abbott's thoroughgoing immanentism completely swallowed the supernatural in the natural, essentially reaching the fatal conclusion that Charles Hodge had seen and resisted. William Graham Sumner, himself an Episcopalian priest who ministered for five years before joining the Yale faculty in 1872, agreed with Hodge, although Sumner embraced rather than resisted the implication. "When theologians declare that they accept the evolution philosophy because, however the world came to be, God was behind it," Sumner said, "this is a fatal concession for religion or theology. It may be safe from attack but it is also powerless and a matter of indifference" (quoted in Everett 1946, 19).¹⁰ Sumner was thus doubly offensive to Social Gospel economic reformers: not merely did their reform-minded political economy reject Sumner's individualism and free-market economics; their liberal theology was at odds with Sumner's emphasis on the antitheistic implications of Darwinism and his view that social evolution, like natural evolution, need not be progressive.

"To Redeem All Our Social Relations": The Social Gospel and Progressive Era Political Economy

Religious activism has long held a distinctive place in American reform, as it did with the Progressive Era political economists who made American economics into a professional, reformist, expert, and university-based discipline. The founders of the American Economic Association (AEA) offered a program of economic reform that was deeply informed

10. At Yale, Sumner remained an Episcopal priest, but his religious beliefs changed. "I never consciously gave up a religious belief," Sumner famously said; "it was as if I had put my beliefs into a drawer, and when I opened it, there was nothing there at all" (quoted in Marsden 1994a).

by the Social Gospel (Bateman and Kapstein 1999). The merger of Christian faith, science, and reform characteristic of the Social Gospel also well described Progressive Era American economics and the other nascent sciences of society, notably sociology.

When the AEA published its first membership list in 1886, it was dominated by ministers and ministers' sons, especially those affiliated with the Social Gospel. Bob Coats (1988) counted twenty-three clergymen among the fifty-five or so charter members who signed on in Saratoga in 1885, and Charles Hopkins (1940) singled out thirteen of them as prominent leaders of the Social Gospel movement, among them Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbott, R. Heber Newton, and Newman Smyth.¹¹ Josiah Strong, who joined not long thereafter, referred to the AEA economists as belonging to the "Christian School of Political Economy" (Fine 1951, 605).¹²

Ely, the prime mover behind the AEA founding, offered a representative Social Gospel view of Christianity. "Christianity," Ely (1889b, 53, 57) asserted, "is primarily concerned with this world," and its mission is to "bring to pass here a kingdom of righteousness and to rescue from the evil one and redeem all our social relations." Ely counted it as a selling point of his economic program, when he represented it to Daniel Coit Gilman, president of Johns Hopkins University, that it "would help in the diffusion of a sound, Christian political economy" (quoted in Crunden 1982, 13).¹³ Gilman was most receptive to this framing, believing, as he did, that economics and science more generally were the best means to advance Christian aims. Rightly understood, Gilman said, the new university sciences could be the handmaidens of religion (Marsden 1994b, 156–59).

Ely did not hesitate to join the AEA's mission to that of Social Christianity's. In the very first AEA publication Ely proclaimed that "the mis-

11. Using the AEA's first published list of members (1886), I count 20 members (of 182 total) with a religious title, all Protestant in affiliation.

12. A few years later, W. D. P. Bliss, publisher of the Christian Socialist paper the *Dawn*, found sixty clergymen on the AEA rolls, which he presented as prima facie evidence that clergy were concerned with American labor issues. Bliss was replying to the 1892 charge, made by Terrence Powderly, leader of the Knights of Labor, that "you can count on the ends of your fingers the number of clergy interested in the labor question" (quoted in Rauschenbusch 1912, 9).

13. Simon Newcomb, Ely's nemesis at Johns Hopkins, acidly characterized Ely's view of the AEA as follows: it is "intended to be a sort of church, requiring for admission to its full communion a renunciation of ancient errors, and an adherence to the supposed new creed" (quoted in Coats 1960, 558). Newcomb exaggerated, but his characterization was not so far from how Ely himself represented the project to friendly audiences.

sion of the Church is likewise emphasized [by the AEA].” In support of the joint mission of reform economics and the Social Gospel, Ely quoted Jesse Macy of Iowa College (later Grinnell College), also a charter AEA member. “The preacher,” said Macy, “in an important sense, is to be the originator of true social science; his work is to render possible such a science” (Ely 1886, 17).

The scope of redemption Ely’s Christian reform imagined was not modest. “Christianity,” said Ely, “is a national concern.” Indeed, Ely (1894) argued, it is an international concern: “The mission of Christianity,” he averred, “is indicated by the title of Canon Fremantle’s great work, *The World as the Subject of Redemption*.”¹⁴ Ely’s vision of America as a covenant nation with a world redemptive calling (Eisenach 1999, 226) was entirely in keeping with other leading Social Gospel progressives. Like Lyman Abbott and Josiah Strong, for example, Ely vigorously promoted a Christianized Anglo-Saxon manifest destiny.

Most of the association’s leading cofounders—Henry Carter Adams, John Bates Clark, Edmund J. James, Simon Patten—were, like Ely, not just economic reformers, but also Social Gospellers. All of them were sons of respectable, evangelical New England families who “valued moral conscience in social and political as well as personal life” and who “demanded of themselves and their countrymen moral purity and social renewal” (Ross 1991, 102; see also Furner 1975, 49–54).

Robert Crunden (1982, 16), in his *Ministers of Reform*, presents the thesis that progressivism was defined by Protestantism, not only because so many progressive leaders came from evangelical homes, but also because they had resisted ministerial or missionary careers, seeking a new vocational outlet for what Dorothy Ross calls their “oppositional Christian conscience.” Many, such as Ely, failed to have the conversion experience so central to the evangelical Protestantism they were raised in, which led, Crunden suggests, to a characteristic period of self-doubt and wandering. These personal crises led many future Social Gospellers to devise new vocational roles, most characteristically social worker, muckraking journalist, and university-based social scientist, professions they helped devise

14. Ely’s remarks were made in the context of his nationalist argument for banning the immigration of Chinese to the United States. In it Ely criticized the “Christian Church” for its “unfortunate stand” against immigration restriction. “The [pro-immigration] policy which she pursues is largely the result of individualism,” Ely maintained, “and this has been one of the historical weaknesses of Protestantism.”

and that provided an outlet for their oppositional Christian conscience. Their ultimate success in colonizing these new social spaces amounted to the founding of what Eldon Eisenach (1994, 45) terms a “lay clerisy.”¹⁵

Henry Carter Adams provides an early example. Adams was born in 1851 in the frontier state of Iowa. His father, Ephraim Adams, joined fellow graduates of the Andover Theological Seminary in 1843 to form the famous Iowa Band, dedicating their lives to building a Christian commonwealth west of the Mississippi. Ephraim Adams helped cofound Iowa College (later Grinnell College), an institution of Christian education (Dorfman [1954] 1969, 9).

Adams intended to enter the ministry, to the point of enrolling at Andover Theological Seminary in 1875. But then, as E. R. A. Seligman recalled in a memorial to him, Adams experienced a personal crisis and abandoned the ministry for “economic science.” Seligman, with his characteristic acuity, remarked that Adams found in progressive social science simply a different outlet for his oppositional Christian conscience; Adams pursued economics “not so much for itself, as constituting an avenue through which to reach his goal of ethical reform” (Seligman 1922, 403).

Adams is an exemplar, but Clark, James, Patten, and John R. Commons also fit the Social Gospel profile well. Commons’s mother, Clara Rogers, whom Commons remembered “as the strictest of Presbyterian Puritans,” hoped that John would become a minister. He did not, pursuing his reform calling outside the church. But, recalling his graduate student days at Johns Hopkins, where Ely instructed him to do case work for the Baltimore Charity Organization, Commons (1934, 8, 43–44) said that being “a social worker as well as a graduate student in economics” was “my tribute to her longing that I should become a minister of the Gospel.”¹⁶

The Social Gospel movement also counted adherents in the other nascent American social sciences, notably in the fledgling university discipline of sociology. An example is John Bascom, a progressive social

15. Dorothy Ross (1991, 102) makes the interesting claim that the less reformist among the founding American economists were less reformist (in part) because they were not from evangelical homes and thus lacked the impetus of an “oppositional Christian conscience.” She locates J. Laurence Laughlin, Arthur T. Hadley, Frank Taussig, and Henry Farnam in this group, noting that they were not sons of ministers but of successful businessmen or professional men.

16. Commons (1894, 46–48) himself preached that the best way for good Christians to assist in social and economic reform was to join a charity organization society, which, although founded upon Christian precepts, practiced “modern, scientific charity,” that is, did not merely dispense alms to relieve misery, but used social science to train social workers and to ensure that assistance efficiently improved character.

scientist who served as president of the University of Wisconsin from 1874 to 1887 and whose *Sociology* (1887) can be described as a scholarly form of Kingdom theology (Morgan 1982). Albion Small, the pioneering Chicago sociologist and graduate of Newton Theological Seminary, also wrote an influential textbook (Small and Vincent 1894) clearly informed by his commitment to Social Christianity,¹⁷ as did Small's colleague, Charles Richmond Henderson (1893), a Baptist minister who for a time served as the University of Chicago's chaplain (Morgan 1969). Henderson, who was very active in Chicago urban reform, saw sociology as an intellectual requirement of his pastoral mission, in quintessentially Social Gospel fashion. "To assist us in the difficult task of adjustment to new situations," Henderson wrote in 1899, "God has providentially wrought out for us the social sciences and placed them at our disposal" (quoted in Diner 1975, 524). Just as Ely regarded the state, so Henderson regarded the new social sciences as a God-given instrument for Christian economic reform.

During the severe economic depression of 1893, and occasioned by their meeting at Chautauqua, Ely joined with John R. Commons and George D. Herron to form the short-lived Institute of Christian Sociology (Furner 1975, 150).¹⁸ Josiah Strong was its second president. Commons (1934, 51) recalled in his autobiography that the institute's aim "was to present Christ as the living Master and King and Christian law as the ultimate rule for human society, to be realized on earth." Herron (1894, 23), for his part, regarded social science and Christian law as a single enterprise: "Jesus Christ offers sociology the only scientific ground of discovering all the facts and forces of life." "Sociology and theology," said Herron, "will ultimately be one science" (32).

The conflation of what should be with what was in the economy and society was characteristic of American economic reformers, who sometimes called themselves the "ethical economists." From 1894 to 1899,

17. Small chaired the United States' first Department of Sociology (1892), which was located in the Chicago Divinity School. Small was the founding editor of the *American Journal of Sociology* (1895), which he edited for many years. The first two issues of the *AJS* featured articles by Social Gospelers—Shailer Mathews on Christian sociology and Josiah Strong on evangelical alliances—along with an article on Christian Socialism.

18. The controversial Herron was a radical Christian Socialist whose sermons on the necessity of destroying capitalism alarmed even Commons. Mary Furner (1975, 151–52) tells of how Albion Small, a Social Gospelier who was trying to establish the scientific bona fides of sociology at John D. Rockefeller's newly founded University of Chicago, begged Ely to disassociate himself from Herron, whose Christian sociology was, in Small's view, all advocacy and no objectivity—a threat to scientific aspirations of the nascent discipline.

Herron edited the most popular (and most radical) Social Gospel journal, the *Kingdom*, which announced in its first issue that Christ should rule supreme in “all the affairs of life—intellectual, social, commercial, political and ecclesiastical” (quoted in White and Hopkins 1975, 150). Herron’s proclamation encapsulated the Social Gospel view that Christian intellectuals should guide social and economic progress, a belief erected upon the idea that social scientific reform could not only serve the social good, it could also identify it. As Ely (1889b, 118) blandly asserted, the progressive economists “consciously adopt an ethical ideal” and “point out the manner in which it is to be attained, and even encourage people to strive for it.”

The Social Gospel economists were liberal in their politics and in their theology, and some of them did not hesitate to announce their views of what modern Protestantism should be. “Christianity which is not practical,” said Ely (1891, 531), for example, “is not Christianity at all.” But, as laypersons who had eschewed careers in ministry or missionary work, their ultimate end was to redeem market relations, not the church per se. That is, the Social Gospel economists’ arguments for bending church attitudes toward reform were motivated primarily by factors external to rather than internal to Protestant doctrine.¹⁹

Ely spoke of the priority of social reform when, in 1886, he suggested that the importance of religion for reform came to him “by an independent route as a social scientist” (Quandt 1973, 403). John R. Commons (1894, 43–44) scolded the churches for their belatedness in joining economic reform, accusing them of leaving social improvement to “atheists and agnostics.” Walter Rauschenbusch spoke plainly of the priority of reform when, in the opening lines of his last book, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* ([1917] 1922), he said: “We have a social gospel. We need a systematic theology large enough to match it and vital enough to back it.”²⁰ To the extent Ely and the other Social Gospel economists influenced Protestant thought, it was via the indirect means of recruiting liberal clergy to the cause of American social and economic reform.

19. I am speaking here of the *objects* of reform. There is little doubt that the Christian progressive economists’ social reform impulse was, as noted, influenced by their particular religious upbringing.

20. Most Social Gospelers, like the progressive economists, were more Social Christians than Christian Socialists. Some, however, like Rauschenbusch, and before him George Herron, were more radical. “If we can trust the Bible,” Rauschenbusch ([1917] 1922, 183–84) wrote, “God is against capitalism, its methods, spirit, and results. The bourgeois theologians have misrepresented our revolutionary God,” for a “conception of God which describes him as sanctioning the present social order . . . is repugnant to our moral sense.” This reminds us, as Wallace Best impressed on me, that the Social Gospel movement was itself plural.

The Protean Aspect of Evolutionary Science, circa 1900

The influence of the Social Gospel upon early Progressive Era political economy will not be a surprise to those who know Bradley Bateman's work.²¹ What is perhaps less well understood is that early Progressive Era economics, like the Social Christianity it originally drew upon, was also profoundly influenced by post-Darwinian evolutionary science. In fact, liberal Protestants conspicuously fastened ideas from evolutionary science to their religiously informed project of economic and social reform. Progressive economists were no exception: their reform proposals comfortably commingled their Christian ideas about social justice with evolutionary ideas about race, fitness, selection, and evolutionary change. By 1912 Walter Rauschenbusch could say, in *Christianizing the Social Order*, "Translate the evolutionary theories into religious faith, and you have the doctrine of the Kingdom of God" (90).

That the most influential Social Gospel theologian of the twentieth century could speak of religious faith as a translation of evolutionary theory usefully measures the powerful influence of post-Darwinian evolutionary ideas upon liberal Protestantism. Darwinism was indeed the "master metaphor" of the Progressive Era (Bellomy 1987), in large part because there seemed to be something in Darwin for everyone.

Eugenicist and biometrician Karl Pearson found a case for socialism in Darwin, as did the cofounder of the theory of evolution by natural selection, Alfred Russel Wallace,²² while Herbert Spencer defended free markets on evolutionary grounds (even if he was no Darwinist; see Leonard 2009b). Militarists left and right found survival-of-the-fittest arguments useful for the defense of imperialism, while anarchist Peter Kropotkin argued that nature could select for cooperation, as explained in his *Mutual Aid* (1902). Nature, said Kropotkin, could select for cooperation among individuals within a species, and also between species—symbiosis. David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University and a leader of the American peace movement, opposed the First World War on grounds it was dysgenic—the fittest men were killed, while the unfit stayed home to reproduce. Darwin himself seems to have been pro-natalist, while

21. See, for example, Bateman 1998, Bateman and Kapstein 1999, and Bateman 2001. See also Nelson 1991.

22. Wallace published extensively on political economy. He opposed free trade, usury, and exports, championed minimum wages, land nationalization, and free bread for the indigent, and represented "capital" as "the enemy and tyrant of labour" (see Coleman 2001).

neo-Malthusian Margaret Sanger, who coined the term *birth control*, embraced eugenics.²³ Darwin's "bulldog," T. H. Huxley, thought natural selection justified agnosticism (a term he coined), whereas devout American interpreters, such as Asa Gray, found room in Darwinism for a deity.

It is a tribute to the protean qualities of Darwinism that Darwin ultimately inspired exegetes of virtually all ideologies: laissez-faire and socialist, individualist and collectivist, pacifist and militarist, and pro-natalist and neo-Malthusian, as well as religious and agnostic (Jones 1998, 7). As historian of biology Paul Crook (1996, 268) points out, Darwinian ideas could be assimilated into "traditional value systems, theodicies and moral philosophies," including those that "spurned stark survivor ethics." And, although Darwinism was sometimes used as a synonym for evolutionary science more generally, the influence of non-Darwinian evolutionary ideas at the turn of the twentieth century made Progressive Era evolutionary science still more fragmented, plural, and contentious.

Dorothy Ross (1991, 106) argues that, for the progressive economists who founded the AEA in 1885, "the triumph of Darwinian evolution was now broadly visible, and it became more central to their world view." In broad outline, this is surely correct. But Darwinism is not one idea but several, and its triumph occurred only in stages, such that some of its most important ideas, including natural selection, were not accepted until the "Darwinian Synthesis" of the 1940s. Thus could Progressive Era intellectuals enlist evolutionary ideas in support of diverse, even opposing, positions in American political economy, as elsewhere.

To see this, let us unpack some concepts, defining *Darwinism* as gradual evolution caused by the natural selection of small, random variations of inheritable traits. We can, following Mayr 2001, describe Darwin as advancing five ideas: evolution, common descent, multiplication of species, gradualism, and natural selection.

Take evolution first. Evolution, as such, is the idea that the world is not constant but rather is steadily changing, so that organisms are transformed in time. All living things, wrote Darwin (1859, 491) at the conclusion of the *Origin of Species*, "have been, or are being, evolved." The concept of evolution was by no means new with Darwin, and neither was the *Origin* the first scientific account to cast doubt on the biblical creation story. Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, for example, published

23. On Darwin's private view of birth control, this during the famous Bradlaugh-Besant trial, see Peart and Levy 2008. On Victorian-era economics and eugenics more generally, see Peart and Levy 2005.

in the 1830s, made it difficult to square the Bible's days of creation with eons of geological time. But Darwin's *Origin* made its case especially persuasively, and, among intellectuals, it fairly quickly bested the creationist concept that all species remained constant over time.

Common descent, second, is the theory that every group of organisms is descended from a common ancestor, and that all animals, plants, and microorganisms ultimately branch back to a single origin of life on earth. The "tree of life," Darwin called it. The first two Darwinian ideas, evolution and common descent, won acceptance relatively early among American scholars and scientists.²⁴ This was not the case, however, for the remaining three ideas, which did not become majority views until the 1940s.²⁵

Gradualism is the theory that evolutionary change in populations takes place gradually and not by the sudden (i.e., saltational) production of new individual types. Gradualism implies that variations in inherited characteristics are minute and, as the *Origin's* motto had it, that nature doesn't make leaps. Organic evolution proceeds very slowly.

Natural selection is a theory of the mechanism of evolution, which says that evolutionary change occurs via the production of inheritable variation in every generation. The relatively few individuals who survive to reproduce, owing to their well-adapted combination of inheritable characteristics, give rise to succeeding generations, and these adaptive hereditary traits, especially those that conduce to increased reproduction, come to predominate among members of the species.

The ideas of evolution and of common descent were widely accepted by intellectuals and scientists in the Progressive Era. But survival of the fittest—aka natural selection—and evolution's pace (gradual or saltational), direction (random or progressive), and consequences (desirable or undesirable) were all vigorously contested, both inside and outside evolutionary science.

In Darwin's day (he died in 1882), part of the problem was that his account was incomplete: Darwin did not know about genetics, and he admitted that he lacked knowledge of the mechanisms by which inherited characteristics varied or were transmitted. This large explanatory

24. This is not to say they were accepted by all. Polygenism, the theory that different human races were created at different times, thus not sharing common descent, remained in use into the twentieth century, popular among scientific racists.

25. I will not discuss speciation, or the multiplication of species, the theory that explains the origins of organic diversity by postulating that species multiply, either by splitting into daughter species or by establishing geographically isolated populations that evolve into new species.

lacuna left room for disagreement, and even for a deity. American botanist Asa Gray, for example, was an early advocate of Darwinism—he arranged for the *Origin's* first publication in the United States and publicly opposed Darwin's most eminent American critic, the naturalist Louis Agassiz. But Gray was also an evangelical Christian. Gray was able to fill one gap in Darwin's account with a theistic twist: God was responsible for the beneficial variation of inherited characteristics, thereby promoting a progressive evolution (Larson 2004, 86). Gray's genetic variation was purposeful and divine in origin.

The matter of which traits could be inherited was also wholly unresolved in Progressive Era evolutionary science. Alfred Russel Wallace, who first became a socialist upon reading Edward Bellamy's utopian *Looking Backward* in 1889, was a hard hereditarian; Wallace argued that characteristics acquired during an organism's lifetime were not transmitted to progeny. Herbert Spencer, a proponent of laissez-faire, was a neo-Lamarckian. Like Asa Gray, Spencer embraced purposeful variation, although, as an agnostic, he made it human in origin. He imagined that competition induced human beings to actively adapt themselves to their environments, improving their mental and physical skills—acquired traits that would be inherited by their descendants. Spencer's view was that, in the struggle for existence, self-improvement came from conscious, planned exertion, not from the chance variation and natural selection that are the heart of Darwinism.²⁶

The mechanism of inheritance was thus intimately connected to another contested question, one with obvious implications for reform: Is evolution progressive? Evolution *was* progressive in Spencer, whereas, for Darwin, at least the early Darwin, evolution implied no teleology, only change. As Darwin (1859, 351) warned in the *Origin*, "I believe . . . in no law of necessary development." And, with respect to human beings, Darwin (1871, 177) again demurred, cautioning, in the *Descent of Man*, that "progress is no invariable rule."

Spencer's optimistic belief in human progress via Lamarckian bootstrapping was at odds with Darwinism's randomness and its openness to nonprogressive change. Spencer's status as the standard bearer of progressive Lamarckism in the 1890s was such that many social reformers,

26. Darwin was somewhere in between: "I am convinced," he wrote, "that natural selection has been the main but not the exclusive means of modification." This is why hard hereditarians like Wallace and August Weismann were called neo-Darwinians, to distinguish them from Darwin himself, who sometimes entertained Lamarckian inheritance.

such as Lester Frank Ward, found themselves in the awkward position of defending Spencer, a man whose individualism and laissez-faire economics they loathed (Degler 1991, 22).

Also relevant for reform in the Progressive Era was the contested question of how fast human beings evolve. Both Darwin and Spencer thought species evolved only very gradually, with clear implications for social reform. Thus it was on anti-gradualist grounds that progressives condemned what Hofstadter (1944, 85) later called the “cold determinism of Spencer’s philosophy.”

But reformers could find comfort in evolutionary science when it embraced the prospect of nature making leaps. Even Darwin’s “bulldog,” T. H. Huxley, saw no reason to restrict variations to be “infinitesimally small,” as Darwin supposed. Why couldn’t, with sufficiently dramatic mutations, nature make leaps? Indeed, only with this implied saltationist belief could many economists endorse eugenics, which was predicated on the idea that desirable traits could be bred into humanity (and undesirable ones bred out) with reasonable dispatch.²⁷

And was competition in nature a model for or a threat to human society? “Nature red in tooth and claw” was a favorite phrase of reformers who wished to condemn free-market capitalism as brutish or animalistic. “The principle of competition,” announced the Bellamyite Nationalist platform, “is simply the application of the brutal law of the survival of the strongest and most cunning” (quoted in Bannister 1970, 390). Lester Frank Ward depicted nature as a threat to be overcome: “Man’s successful evolution,” he said, “amounted to the suppression of competition” (quoted in Morgan 1993, 583). It is human “resistance to the law of nature,” Ward (1898, 257–58) argued, that promotes good ends. Man “begins to make great strides” only when “competition is wholly removed.”

But a more benevolent view of competition in nature was also available from evolutionary science, handy for pro-competition economists. Wallace, in particular, argued that natural selection (among animals) was relatively painless; animals were happy, he judged. Natural selection, wrote Wallace (1889, 40) in *Darwinism*, affords “the maximum of life and the enjoyment of life with minimum of suffering and pain.”²⁸ And we have already seen Peter Kropotkin’s *Mutual Aid* (1902) argument that the struggle for

27. Eugenics would be of little practical use if it took several hundred generations to breed in better traits and breed out worse ones.

28. Although a cofounder of the theory of evolution by natural selection, Wallace always referred to the theory as “Darwinism.”

existence need not involve conflict, much less violence: cooperation could well be the fittest strategy. And Darwinian fitness meant far more than mere physical strength, as evidenced by the evolutionary success of a relatively weak species, *Homo sapiens*.

Perhaps most central of all was the following question: Is natural selection, aka survival of the fittest, the mechanism of evolution? At the turn of the twentieth century, the majority opinion inside evolutionary science was no. Indeed, Darwin was then best known as the author of the idea that human beings have apes for ancestors. By 1900, many, perhaps even most, biologists rejected natural selection as the primary motor of evolution. Stanford zoologist Vernon Kellogg, one of America's most prominent evolutionary scientists, wrote in 1907 that "the fair truth is that Darwinian selection theories stand to-day seriously discredited in the biological world" (quoted in Larson 1997, 20). Thus do historians of biology refer to the first decade or so of the twentieth century as "the eclipse of Darwinism" (Bowler 1983).

Among Progressive Era social scientists, then, there was room to propound and to criticize survival-of-the-fittest doctrine. Evolutionary ideas could be deployed to defend *laissez-faire*, but also to attack it. Thomas N. Carver (1912, 88), a conservative Harvard economist, wrote in *The Religion Worth Having* that "the laws of natural selection are merely God's regular methods of expressing his choice and approval." "The naturally selected," Carver pronounced, "are the chosen of God" (88).²⁹ Progressives rejoined, in many places, that, as Lester Frank Ward (1907, 298) put it, "the fittest, as all know, are not always the ideally best." In fact, said Ward (1898, 258), economic competition tends to reward inferior types, preventing "the really fittest from surviving."

Importantly, one could reject the application to human society of survival-of-the-fittest doctrine without rejecting the virtue of selection and its importance for the biological fitness of the human species. There was, in fact, little disagreement between conservatives and progressives on the importance of selecting the best; the disagreement concerned only how, and to what extent, humankind should superintend its own evolution. Proponents of *laissez-faire* argued that the best way to improve the race was by Spencerian bootstrapping, for individuals to purposefully improve their

29. Carver (1912) is speaking here of nations, not individuals, which goes to a further ambiguity in Progressive Era evolutionary thought, whether individuals or groups (species) are the focus of selection.

minds and bodies—natural selection. Wallace, and proto-feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman, argued that the best mechanism would be to improve the economic status of women, and they will choose fitter husbands—female selection. The mainline eugenicists, for their part, wanted government experts to select the fittest—social selection.

**“Breeding Grounds of Righteousness”:
Evolutionary Influences on the Social
Gospel Economists**

The diversity of post-Darwinian evolutionary science during the Progressive Era is well established among historians of biology. But Progressive Era social-science historiography still reflects the extraordinary influence of Richard Hofstadter’s (1944) *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860–1915*, a narrow reading of which identifies Darwinism with free-market capitalism, attaches the epithet “social Darwinism” to it, and because economic reform opposed free-market capitalism, wrongly infers that economic reform thereby opposed the application of evolutionary ideas to society. Ever since Hofstadter’s intervention, the social Darwinists have been conservative, survival-of-the-fittest apologists for the Gilded Age economic order, with Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner the exemplars (Leonard 2009b).

Careful students of American Progressive Era social science, such as Dorothy Ross (1991), recognize that evolutionary ideas influenced not only free-market economists, but also the progressive economists and reformers who led the assault upon *laissez-faire* and who cast Spencer and Sumner as *bête noirs*.³⁰ After all, Thorstein Veblen (1899) proposed that economics be reconstructed upon Darwinian principles.³¹ And John Dewey (1909) claimed Darwin for his version of pragmatism.³² Hofstadter (1944) was not unalert to the use of evolutionary ideas by reformers. He even gave it a name, *Darwinian collectivism*. But it did not catch on, perhaps because, in 1944, Hofstadter’s contempt for free markets was far more developed than his still incipient skepticism regarding reform.

30. See also Jeff Biddle’s (1990) close reading of Commons’s evolutionary influences.

31. See Malcolm Rutherford (1998) on Veblen’s Darwinian program.

32. Alfred Marshall ([1890] 1920, 19), whose *Principles* frontispiece recorded the same motto found in *The Origin of Species* (1859), *natura non facit saltum*, opined that “the Mecca of the economist lies in evolutionary biology.” On the use of biology analogies in Marshall, see Niman 1991.

Whatever the reason, subsequent coinages, such as Eric Goldman's (1952) *reform Darwinism*, have not fared much better. Measured by terminological usage, *social Darwinism*, read in the Hofstadter sense of apology for laissez-faire capitalism, vastly outnumbers both *Darwinian collectivism* and *reform Darwinism*. *Social Darwinism* appears thousands of times in the literature, whereas the terms *Darwinian collectivism* and *reform Darwinism* number a scant few dozen.³³

But the progressive economists trafficked heavily in evolutionary ideas, and the Social Gospelers among them no less so. This should be no surprise: the Social Gospel was itself (in part) an accommodation to the implications of Darwinism, and, moreover, the prestige and diversity of Progressive Era evolutionary thought induced progressives, no less than their political opponents, to borrow concepts congenial to their purposes and to acquire, in the bargain, the imprimatur of biological science for their fledgling sciences of society. Beginning near the outbreak of World War II, American economics would ultimately model itself upon physics and applied mathematics, but, at the turn of the century, biology was its scientific exemplar. Simon Patten, writing in 1894, observed, "We are closing this century with as definite a bias in favor of biologic reasoning and analogy as the last century closed with a similar bias in favor of the method of reasoning used in physics and astronomy" (924). "The great scientific victories of the nineteenth century," Patten believed, "lie in the field of biology" (924).

To understand the influence of evolutionary thought upon American reform at the turn of the twentieth century, we must appreciate, as Peter Bowler (2005, 28) rightly insists, "the fascination excited both inside and outside science by the prospect of reconstructing the ascent of life on earth." American progressives were drawn to this reconstruction project as to many others, believing, as they did, that everything could be improved by the application of science, that, as Jane Addams said, "every . . . element of human life is susceptible of progress" (quoted in Eisenach 2006, 226).

Race thinking in American social science probably reached its high-water mark in the Progressive Era, and racial science and eugenics were especially in vogue, this decades before the Nazi atrocities committed in

33. *Social Darwinism* and its cognates are cited in JSTOR 4,258 times from 1944 to the present, and fully one-third of these citations also mention Spencer and/or Sumner. Hofstadter's *Darwinian collectivism* appears a scant 14 times from 1944 to the present (searched 31 May 2007; Leonard 2009a). *Reform Darwinism* and its cognates appear 79 times overall (searched 20 June 2010).

the name of eugenics discredited the use of biological concepts in the sciences of society. Thorstein Veblen (1899, 119), for example, grounded his theory of the predatory capitalist, in *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, upon the varying race instincts he attributed to the three European races, “the dolichocephalic-blond, the brachycephalic-brunette, and the Mediterranean.”³⁴ Race instincts, not social habits, made Veblen’s capitalist. Veblen returned to racial science in “The Mutation Theory and the Blond Race” (1913b) and in “The Blond Race and the Aryan Culture” (1913a), as well as in other places. The most influential racial taxonomy, this in the heyday of American race science, was *The Races of Europe* (1899), written by an economist, William Z. Ripley.³⁵

The Social Gospel economists were no less influenced by the vogue for evolutionary explanation in the social sciences. Richard T. Ely’s (1903) *Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society* attempted an evolutionary synthesis that would explain the evolution of society, the economy, and humankind. Simon Patten’s *Theory of Social Forces* (1896) and *Heredity and Social Progress* (1903) were, among other efforts, his attempt to found his sui generis political economy upon an evolutionary scientific foundation. John R. Commons wrote papers concerned with the inferior heredity he found in some Americans. His *Races and Immigrants* (1907), most of which was originally published in the *Chautauquan*, depicted African Americans as irredeemably inferior biologically and also made a case against immigration on racial grounds. Charles Richmond Henderson, the University of Chicago minister, also focused on “degeneracy” in his *Introduction to the Study of the Dependent, Defective, and Delinquent Classes* (1893), a social work text and part of the progressive project to make charity organizations more scientific. All of these projects we may speak of as part of reform Darwinism.

34. At the turn of the century, Veblen’s *Journal of Political Economy* published an extraordinary outpouring of articles by economist Carlos Closson, who popularized and proselytized for the scientific racism of two leading physical anthropologists, Georges Vacher de LaPouge and Otto Ammon (e.g., LaPouge and Closson 1897). The European anthropologists measured thousands of human heads, calculating the cephalic index, or ratio of head width to head length, which they believed demonstrated a permanent race hierarchy. Racial science, founded upon the measurement of heads, was destined, wrote LaPouge and Closson (1897, 54), “to revolutionize the political and social sciences as radically as bacteriology has revolutionized the sciences of medicine.” Veblen selected their boast to introduce his influential evolutionary critique of neoclassical political economy, “Why Is Economics Not an Evolutionary Science?” (1898). See Maccabelli 2008.

35. Ripley trained at MIT and Columbia, spent a long career at Harvard studying railroad economics, and served, in 1933, as president of the AEA.

Reform Darwinism heartily embraced the Darwinian idea of continuous evolution, which comported with the possibility (if not the necessity) of progress and with the idea that economies, like species, can vary across time and place. Ely (1938, 154) recalled of his AEA insurgency, “The most fundamental things in our minds were on the one hand the idea of evolution, and on the other hand, the idea of relativity.” By “relativity,” Ely meant his German professors’ historicist view that economic laws varied across time and place, so that economies and societies had to be understood in the context of their historical, or evolutionary, development. To understand an economy, you needed to know something of its evolutionary history.

But natural selection, or survival of the fittest, was another matter. The heart of reform Darwinism was its threefold rejection of natural selection: evolution by natural selection was too wasteful, too gradual, and too indifferent to progress, moral and other. Lester Frank Ward, the parent of reform Darwinism for his pioneering use of evolutionary ideas in support of reform, granted the analogy conservatives made between nature and society: the Gilded Age economic order, he said, *was* a jungle. Continuous economic warfare, especially between labor and capital, demonstrated the inability of free markets to harmoniously regulate themselves.

Ward’s point of departure was twofold: nature need not be a model for society and nature should not be a model for society. To the contrary, the “biological economy” of nature was wasteful. Nature’s functions are “performed in a sort of random, chance manner, which is precisely the reverse of economical,” argued Ward ([1882] 1913, 35). Why should society aspire to imitate nature when, unique among animals, human beings, acting purposefully, could be more efficient, as demonstrated by the success of agriculture and the domestication of animals (breeding) (see Hovenkamp 2010)? Human direction could not only reduce nature’s inefficiency; it could improve natural production at a faster rate, and it could ensure that evolutionary change was not left to blind chance, but was made progressive. “Man’s task is not to imitate the laws of nature,” as Hofstadter (1944, 58) glossed Ward, “but to observe them, appropriate them, direct them.”

The next, crucial step for progressivism was to assert that man’s superior stewardship of nature could also be applied to human society. Ward’s analogy was clear: artificial selection is superior to natural selection, in society no less than in nature. Ward coined the term *sociocracy* to describe his vision of social improvement via intelligent direction of society’s evolution. The term that ultimately won the day, however, was *social control*,

a Progressive Era catchphrase popularized by Edward A. Ross (1901), the economist turned sociologist who worked closely with Ward, eventually marrying Ward's niece. Social control, for Ross, concerned "the shaping of individuals" (1896, 521), who were but "plastic lumps of human dough," Ross maintained, to be formed on the great "social kneading board" (1901, 168). Laissez-faire, as Ward (1884, 566) had said, was a perverse "gospel of inaction," when what was needed was purposeful rather than accidental social change.

The key theoretical innovation here was not the idea of human purposefulness as such, for traditional American individualism was nothing if not purposeful. Nor was it the concept of progress as such. Both purpose and progress were central to Herbert Spencer, Ward's biggest target. What Ward and the reform Darwinists did was to posit the holist concept that society or a group, not just the individual, could be purposeful. Post-Darwinian evolutionary thought was ambiguous on whether individuals or the groups (species) they belonged to were the unit of selection, and this accommodated the key progressive notion of society as an evolved organism. "Whether 'state,' or 'nation,' or 'society,'" Henry Carter Adams (1886, 16) wrote, "the fundamental thought is the same. The thing itself brought into view is an organic growth and not a mechanical arrangement." For the progressives, the American nation was not constituted solely by its founding principles as embodied in a social compact made by individuals; it was, rather, an organic entity constituted by a people or a race connected by evolutionary consanguinity.³⁶

The Social Gospel economists, no less than other progressives, retained the anti-individualism of the society-as-organism concept. Richard T. Ely (1884, 49), firing the early shots of his AEA insurgency, echoed Ward when he said that "the nation in its economic life is an organism, in which individuals . . . form parts." "This is strictly and literally true," Ely proclaimed, "as is shown conclusively by comparing the facts of economic life with the ideas embraced in the conception, organism." Commons (1894, 3), in his *Social Reform and the Church*, preached that the individual is not a "separate particle," but an "organ bound up in the social organism." The minister, said Commons, should "begin with the organic nature of society, showing that it is based properly on Christian ethics" (21). Jane Addams (1912, 124), charismatic founder of Chicago's Hull

36. Gary Gerstle (1994) calls these opposed and rival conceptions of the American nation "civic nationalism" and "racial nationalism," respectively.

House settlement, described her Social Christianity as “a humanitarian movement endeavoring to embody itself not in a sect,” but rather in “the social organism itself.”

Ward’s pioneering claim, that human engineering of the socioeconomic environment could improve, direct, and hasten social evolution, was the heart of reform Darwinism, and it became a kind of creed among progressives. Before Ross’s *social control* predominated as the term of art, progressives used the Darwinian nomenclature to argue for the virtues of reform.³⁷ In the influential *Promise of American Life*, for example, Herbert Croly of the *New Republic* made his case for a vigorous national government, arguing that artificial selection, by which he meant state-guided reform, was superior to natural selection, by which he meant *laissez-faire*. The state, said Croly (1909, 191), had a responsibility to “interfere on behalf of the really fittest.”

Ely and Commons also characterized social control in Darwinian terms. Ely (1903, 141) referred to the “superiority of man’s selection to nature’s selection.” “Darwin,” Commons (1934, 657) said, “had two kinds of ‘selection,’” natural selection and artificial selection. “Ours,” said Commons, referring to progressives, “is a theory of artificial selection” (657).³⁸ Why? Because, Commons (1894, 6–7) warned, “evolution is not always a development upwards.” We must not, Commons said, “placidly” rely upon natural selection. Purposeful social change of the socioeconomic environment, Commons’s theory argued, would improve upon natural selection, making it not only more efficient, but also more ethical. When the Social Gospelers made the charge that natural selection was too indifferent to progress, they had in mind not only improved efficiency but also moral improvement.

The moral improvement enabled by artificial selection figured in the Social Gospel economists’ arguments for regulating industry, notably the question of raising the moral plane. Henry Carter Adams’s (1887) influential monograph “The Relationship of the State to Industrial Action” made a case for regulation of industry on grounds that unregulated economic competition would select for the worst kind of men, whereas regulation

37. Darwin began the *Origin of Species* explaining natural selection by analogy to artificial selection: nature selects, Darwin suggested, as does a breeder of dogs or pigeons. Darwin came to regret his metaphor of nature selecting, because it wrongly implied purpose rather than chance; at Wallace’s urging he substituted Spencer’s “survival of the fittest” for natural selection in the *Origin’s* fifth edition. Commons (1890) mentions this, saying, “the term ‘natural selection’ is a misnomer, as Darwin himself perceived. It means merely survival.”

38. Cited in Ramstad 1994, 65.

would ensure that economic competition would not promote immorality. Adams used Darwinian terms to characterize the work of regulation as “the possibility of industrial and social development by the process of artificial rather than natural selection, or . . . by the process of imposing conditions under which natural selection in industry may work” (quoted in Schäfer 2000, 41).

Other Social Gospel progressives took readily to Adams’s idea that state interference could combat the moral evils of unregulated competition. Ely (1889a, 83) said, “Competition tends to force the level of economic life down to the moral standard of the worst men who can sustain themselves in the business community,” and even referred to this as a law of competition. Commons likewise echoed that “competition forces all employers to come down to the level of the most grasping” (quoted in Gonce 2002, 765). The younger John Bates Clark also endorsed a version of the raising-the-moral-plane argument. For the Social Gospel economists, competition in nature was not a model to be emulated but a threat to be regulated, in society as in nature.

But which moral evils of unregulated competition should the state combat? Adams’s example was manufacturers who employed women and children. Nine of ten manufacturers recognize that “protracted labor on the part of women and children . . . must ultimately result in race deterioration.” The tenth manufacturer—the worst man—cares not about “the rights of childhood” or the “claims of family,” and employs women and children, whose lower wages allow him to underprice his competitors, who are thereby forced to also employ women and children, or else succumb. Thus does the man of the “lowest character” set the “moral tone to the entire business community.” The way to improve the moral tone was for the state to artificially select, that is, to refuse employment to children and married women (Adams 1887, 41–42). In this way, Adams argued, the benefits of competition were maintained even as its moral evils were combated.

Adams’s proposal to bar married women from industry helps illustrate the twofold dilemma faced by Social Gospel progressives. One was philosophical: Which evils should artificial selection try to eliminate?³⁹ The other was political: What if other reformers did not share their view of what Christian ethics judged morally evil? Nearly all Progressive Era

39. From a biological standpoint, the reformist argument for improving society by artificial selection faced a fundamental question—what justified artificial selection’s criteria for selection? The institutionalist economist Morris Copeland (1936, 343–44) later criticized Commons on these grounds, arguing that the selection criteria employed were themselves the production of a prior selection process, and needed explanation (Hodgson 2003).

reformers could support bans on child labor, but not all thought that married women should be barred from factory work. Nor did all progressives think that alcohol must be prohibited, or that blue laws must be passed to promote observance of the Christian Sabbath.⁴⁰ John R. Commons, Simon Patten, and Edward A. Ross, for example, preached against the evils of drink, while John Dewey thought that reformers had more important things to worry about than “booze.”

Closely related was the question of scope: How far should artificial selection go in its efforts to improve society? In particular, should social control of society’s evolution extend to social control of human heredity, or eugenics? The answer to this question turned on the extent to which the social evils of inefficiency, immorality, and vice were seen to be hereditary.

Progressives placed great emphasis on the importance of environment, but this did not, in the Progressive Era, preclude a concern with bad heredity. To the contrary, evolutionary science still readily accommodated Lamarckian inheritance and therefore the prospect of improving bad blood by improving bad homes.⁴¹ Eugenics was popular and scientifically prestigious in the Progressive Era, and the Social Gospel economists, as reform Darwinists, were drawn to it in varying degrees.

Commons, for example, was a strong Lamarckian: “Heredity,” he said plainly, “can be modified by modifying environment” (1894, 73). Nurture can modify nature, and this matters because, Commons said, the challenge of reform is not merely improving the environment, but also overcoming bad heredity, “the physiological problem of breeding.” Any unhealthy environment, moreover, can adversely affect heredity; and Commons worried, as did many progressives, about race degeneration: a “new race of men is being created with inherited traits of physical and moral degeneracy suited to the new environment of the tenement house, the saloon and the jail” (7).

So the problem of reform “is not merely a question of picking out individuals after they are born,” Commons maintained, “but of saving them

40. Ely, for example, borrowed Adams’s collective action logic to promote observance of the Christian Sabbath. In the so-called Sunday Barbers cases, one unscrupulous barber opens for business on the Sabbath, compelling his rivals, all good Christians who would otherwise prefer to observe the Sabbath, to also open on Sundays, on pain of losing business. Blue laws ensured that the moral plane of competition was not lowered by the one unobservant barber.

41. *Euthenics*, a term coined by the founder of home economics, Ellen Swallow Richards, described eugenic improvement through environmental means. “Euthenics,” said Richards (1910, viii), “deals with race improvement through environment.”

generations and centuries before they are born" (73). And, since this selection is a long-term project, just as "the Anglo Saxon displaced the Indian," so too must society grasp that "the question of reform is not how to reform but how to *displace* the baser elements" (73).⁴²

In later work, Commons elaborated on the different influences of environment and heredity, this in his work emphasizing the adverse effects of hereditarily inferior classes and races upon American wages, American employment, and American racial health. Commons's *Races and Immigrants in America* (1907, 7) began with the premise that race differences are "established in the very blood and physical constitution." He carefully distinguished race degeneration, or what happens to a given race under adverse socioeconomic conditions, from "race suicide," or what happens when the "native" Anglo-Saxon stock is outbred by its racial inferiors, especially African Americans, Asians, and Southern and Eastern Europeans. Commons also distinguished race inferiority, which he said was hereditary, from backwardness, which was environmental (210).⁴³

Commons's ideas about heredity and its putative effects upon wages, employment, and race integrity were not somehow incidental to his Social Gospel project of reform. To the contrary, Commons stated plainly his belief that the "'race suicide' of the American . . . stock should be regarded as the most fundamental of our social problems" (200), a view shared by many, including Social Gospelers among the clergy. Oscar McCulloch, for example, a leading Social Gospel minister in Indianapolis, was inspired by Richard Dugdale's *The Jukes: A Study in Crime, Pauperism, Disease, and Heredity* (1877) to study degeneracy among 250 of Indiana's families, eventually publishing his research in a volume called *The Tribe of Ishmael* (1891).⁴⁴

42. Commons (1894, 111) acknowledged that the question, "Are acquired characters inherited?" was yet unresolved, but continued to insist that "degeneration," such as drunkenness, could "by no possibility bequeath a healthy body to the offspring." Lester Frank Ward, for his part, thought the whole reform project depended upon the possibility of Lamarckian inheritance, and that until such time as science conclusively ruled out the possibility of environmental reforms improving human heredity, it was best to "hug the delusion" (Stocking 1962, 253).

43. In Commons's view, backward Appalachian whites, owing to their racial fitness as Anglo-Saxons, could be educated and thereby assimilated into American life. Poor blacks could not be so uplifted. Black hereditary inferiority, Commons (1907, 213) believed, could be remedied only by interbreeding with superior races. In addition to the 12 percent of Americans who were black, Commons (1890) estimated that "defectives" constituted fully 5.5 percent of the U.S. population in 1890, and that nearly 2 percent of the population was irredeemably defective.

44. See Rosen 2004 for more on McCulloch and other clergy attracted to eugenics. A surprising number of liberal clergy used their pulpits to proselytize for eugenics.

Walter Rauschenbusch, for his part, also placed heredity at the center of his reform preoccupations—notably economic competition. Good Christians, Rauschenbusch (1912, 179) preached in *Christianizing the Social Order*, should end economic competition, which was immoral, even “murderous,” and, when unrestrained by government interference, “establishes the law of tooth and nail” and “dechristianizes the social order.” In its place, Rauschenbusch told his readers, the state should erect a cooperative commonwealth of “mutual interest . . . comradeship and solidarity” (179). Rauschenbusch was vague on the organizational details of the cooperative economy he proposed, but clear on the reasons economic competition had displaced economic cooperation—economic greed and bad heredity.

Linking heredity to his conception of Christian virtue, Rauschenbusch suggested that the cooperative society was Teutonic in origin; “fraternal democracy,” with its common property, had evolutionary roots dating to “the early history of our Aryan race” (376). For Rauschenbusch, the capacity for “fraternal democracy” was “dyed into the fiber of our breed”—transmitted hereditarily, not invented. The threat, then, was the inflow of “immigrants from the south and east of Europe,” lured by the “great transportation interests,” who “have lowered the standard of living for millions of native Americans” and, worse, have “checked the propagation of the Teutonic stock,” thereby altering “the racial future of our nation” (278).⁴⁵ And as inferior immigrants undermined good Teutonic stock, they thereby undermined the “higher strains of social organization” carried therein (378). The American system of economic competition, Rauschenbusch ([1907] 1908, 275) wrote in *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, causes “an unnatural selection of the weak for breeding and the result is the survival of the unfittest.”

Happily for Rauschenbusch (1912, 40–41), there was an alternative to “the decay and extinction of Western civilization”—artificial selection guided by social science: “We now have such scientific knowledge of social laws and forces of economics of history that we can intelligently mold and guide the evolution in which we take part.” We have now reached the point where, Rauschenbusch prophesied, “we can make history make us.”

45. Rauschenbusch (1912, 278) neatly tied together his anticapitalism and anti-Catholicism: “If in the next thirty years the Catholic population outnumbers the Protestant and if the Church then applies Roman theories about Church and State to American life and politics we shall owe that serious situation in part to the capitalistic interests that overcame the poverty and conservatism of the European peasantry and set this mass immigration moving.”

Rauschenbusch's racial hereditarianism was extreme but hardly atypical among reform Darwinians. When he imagined that, in the ancient Teutonic forests, "the social supremacy of the Aryan race manifested itself and got its evolutionary start" (376), he was merely recasting in Christian Socialist terms the then popular notion that the capacity for democratic government was a race trait unique to the Anglo-Saxon (or Teutonic or Aryan) people.⁴⁶ "Fraternal democracy" could be a race trait, too. Rauschenbusch could not claim Anglo-Saxon ancestry for Christianity itself, but he did claim for Christians a superior evolutionary pedigree, saying "God's pioneers are always few . . . the choicest members and segments of the race," and "Christianity itself is such a strain of higher social life derived from one of the breeding grounds of righteousness" (374, 378). The "new race" of Christians, Rauschenbusch ([1907] 1908, 114) informed his readers, saw that "as surely as Christ was destined to reign so surely were the Christians [destined] . . . not only to be superior to the others but to absorb all others" (114).

Simon Patten also worried about race suicide; indeed, his most famous student, Rexford Tugwell, claimed that he and not Edward A. Ross should get credit for coining the term. Patten ultimately put less emphasis on inherited debility, racial and other, than did Commons, for example, and thus arrived at a less strenuously eugenic view of social reform. But Patten (1911a, 402), unsure about whether "degeneration was due to bad environment or to heredity," vacillated about the importance of heredity for social reform.

Simon Patten was quintessentially progressive, in his Social Gospel impulses, in his biologically informed social science, and, consequently, in his ambivalence toward the poor. As early as 1885, Patten saw in American industrialization the beginning of an era of material abundance, which, for him, marked the end of scarcity and had the virtue of raising living standards among the poor, a lifelong goal for Patten. But abundance, Patten believed, also brought with it new hazards; in particular, the easing of the struggle for existence made men "careless and indolent" and permitted "the continuance of the low social classes." Higher standards of living were a blessing insofar as they ameliorated the harsh struggle for existence, but a "curse" because they permitted the "survival of the

46. A key figure in the Teutonic "germ theory" of American institutions was historian Herbert Baxter Adams, who, assisted by Richard T. Ely, led the pioneering history and politics seminar at Johns Hopkins University.

ignorant” (1885, 217). Competition in human society was, for Patten, both good and bad in its effects.

Patten’s *Theory of Social Forces* (1896) was his first systematic attempt to integrate evolutionary science into his sui generis political economy, and here, too, Patten worried about the “degenerate tendencies” of material abundance. His *Heredity and Social Progress* (1903) attempted to place some of his most important ideas upon a biological foundation. The book was very poorly received, but Patten did not abandon evolutionary thought as a source of scientific ideas. Tortuous biological reasoning figures in nearly all of Patten’s idiosyncratic oeuvre—*The Social Basis of Religion* (1911b), for example, has chapters dedicated to “morbid degeneration” and “senile degeneration” and returns repeatedly to the relative importance of inherited traits versus traits acquired in a person’s lifetime. “Race progress,” said Patten (1911b, 128), comes through improved heredity, whereas civilization and culture are traits acquired socially.

In *The Social Basis of Religion*, Patten had resolved that culture and other nonhereditary transmissions were more important than improved heredity for social progress. But still, he could not shake his fear that inherited racial vigor would be checked by civilization, that progressive improvement would promote race degeneration (129). And in “The Laws of Environmental Influence,” also published in 1911, Patten concluded by equivocating on the question. “Heredity,” he said, “is the one power that can transform man into a superman and we must rely on it to reach this higher level.” However, Patten (1911a, 402) argued, the “subman is made by environment,” and “we must get rid of the subman before we can rise to the superman’s level.”

In “Types of Men,” Patten (1912), using a model of interactions between “round faced” and “long faced” human types, sounded a reasonable anti-eugenicist note, noting especially the challenge for the social selectionist of deciding *which* traits merit elimination. But in 1915 he again contradicted himself, declaring that “eugenics is giving us a stronger man and a vigorous woman” (1915, 613). Patten’s ongoing ambivalence about eugenics is a measure of the quintessentially progressive tension between a commitment to social work, which meant uplifting the poor, and a commitment to social control, which meant restraining the poor.

Among the Social Gospel economists, the odd man out was John Bates Clark. Clark, no less than his progressive confreres, thought the central problem of industrial society was one of ethics; he agreed with the other “ethical economists” that the state should raise the moral plane. But the mature Clark (1899) departed in two important ways. First, he believed

that economic competition, when it functioned properly, was ameliorative not destructive—workers paid their marginal products got what they deserved. A wage equal to marginal contribution to output was fair, Clark believed, so the way to ethically defensible economic arrangements was for the state to ensure that labor markets (like output markets) were properly competitive. “Though we are forced to ride roughshod over *laissez-faire* theories,” Clark (1907, 379–80) said, “we do so in order to gain the end which those theories had in view, namely, a system actuated by the vivifying power of competition, with all that that signifies of present and future good.”

Clark’s second departure was his eschewal of heredity, selection, fitness, and race talk. Compared to Commons, Patten, Rauschenbusch, and the other Social Gospelers caught up in the ideas of reform Darwinism, the mature Clark’s silence on what they took to be the greatest social issue of the day stands out.⁴⁷ Not a reform Darwinist, neither was Clark a conservative Darwinist: he did not invoke survival-of-the-fittest notions to defend free markets, as did, for example, Thomas N. Carver. In part, this is because Clark did not defend free markets—he advocated the state ensuring competition—but it is also that Clark had no use for a human hierarchy in his political economy. Where reform Darwinists depicted economic competition as selecting for the unfit and conservative Darwinists depicted economic competition as selecting for the fit, Clark made no attempt to judge economic competition by its putative effects on biological fitness.⁴⁸

Ross and Ely wanted to exclude Asians; Patten wanted to exclude the “subman”; Commons wanted to exclude these groups and more—all on grounds that the labor force participation of immigrants, African Americans, and mental defectives was economically and biologically destructive. But Clark identified the moral evil as wages below the worker’s contribution to output, and, as best I can tell, eschewed the invidious distinctions made by the Social Gospelers drawn to reform Darwinism.

47. The younger Clark (1885), who was then more hostile to economic competition, at least to competition that had ceased to be in the public interest, made recourse to the society-as-organism metaphor.

48. Clark (1899) did speak of competition as “natural,” and sometimes employs “evolution” to connote the dynamics of change, as opposed to the static model he employed. As such, one might read his pioneering neoclassical economics, where market competition is socially beneficial, as consistent with the more harmonious evolutionary conceptions of the natural order offered by Peter Kropotkin and Darwin himself. But Clark did little to emphasize the connection, and, importantly, eschewed the Darwinian concepts central to his reform Darwinist fellows, selection, fitness, heredity, and race.

Conclusion: The Intellectual Gospel

The Social Gospel, like the progressive movement it so well embodied, went into decline after World War I. Partly this was because the slaughter of the Great War gave the lie to the progressive idea of spiritual and social progress via enlightened social control. But the Social Gospel also suffered from earlier developments internal to American social science. By the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1914, American economics had become an expert, scientific discipline, having established a beachhead in the universities by 1900 and in government soon thereafter. Between 1900 and 1914, the imperatives of professionalization pushed progressives toward the view that scientific credibility required an economics free of the embarrassing pieties of the Social Gospelers; in Mary Furner's (1975) formulation, objectivity required forswearing advocacy.

Professional economics' turn away from the language and imagery of Social Christianity was not solely a matter of vocational calculation, however. Reform economics recast its idealism in a more secular form also in recognition of the increasing diversity of progressivism that made the Social Gospel vision of a Protestant commonwealth too particular: Catholics, Jews, and others could sensibly entertain different views of what religious ethics demanded of the state.

The decline of the Social Gospel coincided with the rise of its rival, conservative Protestantism, during the war years and in the 1920s. Conservative Protestantism, with its emphasis on personal rather than social salvation, had remained influential throughout America even during the heyday of the Social Gospel, and, during the war, it recrudesced in the form of what came to be called fundamentalism.⁴⁹ Among other objections, the fundamentalists rejected what they regarded as the Social Gospelers' modernist worship of science, paradigmatically Darwinism. The fundamentalists had a point. The Social Gospelers injected Christian ethics into their program of scientific reform, and they also believed that science, not least evolutionary science, should be a necessary constituent of any modern religion. Their view that American Protestantism could and should accommodate science was quintessentially progressive: the church, no less than society and the economy, could be reformed.

49. The term *fundamentalism* derives from *The Fundamentals: Testimony to Truth*, a collection of conservative Protestant writings written in opposition to modernism of the sort embraced by Social Gospelers, and published from 1910 to 1915 in twelve paperback volumes. Conceived and financed by Lyman Stewart, a California oil magnate, over three million copies of *The Fundamentals* were printed (Marsden 1980, 118–19).

G. Stanley Hall, psychologist and Clark University president, provides an early example of the Social Gospel belief that religion must be put on a more scientific basis if it was to survive the crisis of faith (Marsden 1994b, 163). Simon Patten's (1911b, v) own effort to place religion on a more scientific basis, *The Social Basis of Religion*, he described as transferring Christian doctrines from "the traditional basis to the realm of social science." Patten's former student and Wharton School colleague Scott Nearing (1916) went further still; his *Social Religion: An Interpretation of Christianity in Terms of Modern Life* dispensed with theology and the other elements of established Christian practice and essentially made Christianity coextensive with economic reform.

Walter Rauschenbusch ([1907] 1908, 119), in his influential *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, argued for a more scientific religion on grounds that the church must "always embody the best thought of its age, or its age will seek religion outside of theology." About this, Rauschenbusch proved to be right. The post-World War I rise of Protestant fundamentalism alarmed scientists, who saw the revival of antievolutionism as a threat to science and to liberal values and who set out to rebut the fundamentalists' charge that evolutionary science and religion were antagonistic.

An important example was Edwin G. Conklin (1863–1952), an eminent embryologist recruited in 1908 by Woodrow Wilson to Princeton, where he served until retirement in 1933.⁵⁰ Conklin's *The Direction of Human Evolution*, based on lectures he gave in 1920, makes a case for, as he called it, the "religion of evolution." What sort of religion was Conklin's religion of evolution? In the religion of evolution, God is not a transcendental creator, but is immanent in nature. Christ is not divine; he is a great ethical teacher. Truth is not revelation; it is scientific knowledge. Evil is not sin; it is "disease, physical defects, effeminacy, luxury, indolence, retrogressive selection of civilization" (1922, 239). The religion of evolution deals not with the next world, but with this world (246). Its test of righteousness is not unthinking assent to some "formal creed" but "dedication to a life of service" (244). The religion of evolution is not "egocentric," that is, concerned with the salvation of individual souls; it is "ethnocentric," dedicated to the "superlative importance of the race or species" (241).

50. Conklin was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1908, was awarded the academy's gold medal in 1942, and served as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1936, and an unprecedented two terms as president of the American Philosophical Society. He appeared on the cover of *Time* magazine in 1939, where he was described as, among other things, "a preacher of science" (Atkinson 1985).

The religion of evolution is the essential core that remains when traditional Christianity is shorn of its supernaturalism and its “relics of fetishism [*sic*], emotionalism and superstition” (242).

Conklin’s religion, a eugenics-tinged ethic of purposeful service to the progress of the race, perfectly encapsulated the modernist Protestantism to which fundamentalists were reacting. His eagerness to vindicate scientific inquiry as itself a kind of religious calling provides a striking example of what historian David Hollinger (1989, 117) refers to as the “intellectual gospel,” a “gospel” that bore a strong resemblance to its better-known cousin. If Christianity would not accommodate science, Christian intellectuals would, as Rauschenbusch feared, get their religion outside the church. Conklin and other progressive intellectuals, repelled by Protestant fundamentalism, did just that: they found religious potential in science, celebrated science in a religious idiom, and believed that “conduct in accord with the ethic of science could be religiously fulfilling” (Hollinger 1989, 123).⁵¹

Religion has never yet returned to the place it held in American economics during the Social Gospel heyday. But when Ely, Commons, Patten, and the other Social Gospel economists, like all progressives, secularized their Christian idiom, they abandoned neither their religious idealism nor their affinity for evolutionary science. Instead, these economists found a different yet parallel vehicle for expressing them both—the intellectual gospel, where the enlightened could find religious meaning in scientific inquiry’s ethos of objectivity, self-denial, pursuit of truth, and service to a cause greater than oneself.

References

- Abbott, Lyman. 1900. *The Evolution of Christianity*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Adams, Henry Carter. 1886. Economics and Jurisprudence. *Science* 8.178:15–19.
- . 1887. The Relationship of the State to Industrial Action. *Publications of the American Economic Association* 1.6:7–85.
- Addams, Jane. 1912. *Twenty Years at Hull House: With Autobiographical Notes*. New York: Macmillan.
- Atkinson, J. W. 1985. E. G. Conklin on Evolution: The Popular Writings of an Embryologist. *Journal of the History of Biology* 18.1:31–50.
- Bannister, Robert. 1970. “The Survival of the Fittest Is Our Doctrine”: History or Historionics? *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31.3:377–98.

51. Other examples are biologist Winterdon Curtis’s *Science and Human Affairs* (1922) and John Dewey’s *A Common Faith* (1934) (Hollinger 1989, 130, 132).

- Bascom, John. 1887. *Sociology*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Bateman, Bradley W. 1998. Clearing the Ground: The Demise of the Social Gospel Movement and the Rise of Neoclassicism in American Economics. In *From Interwar Pluralism to Postwar Neoclassicism*, edited by Mary S. Morgan and Malcolm Rutherford. *HOPE* 30 (supplement): 29–52.
- . 2001. Make a Righteous Number: Social Surveys, the Men and Religion Forward Movement, and Quantification in American Economics. In *The Age of Economic Measurement*, edited by Judy L. Klein and Mary S. Morgan. *HOPE* 33 (supplement): 57–85.
- . 2005. Bringing in the State? The Life and Times of Laissez-Faire in the Nineteenth-Century United States. In *The Role of Government in the History of Economic Thought*, edited by Steven G. Medema and Peter Boettke. *HOPE* 37 (supplement): 175–99.
- Bateman, Bradley, and Ethan Kapstein. 1999. Between God and the Market: The Religious Roots of the American Economic Association. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13.4:249–58.
- Bebbington, David W. 1989. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin, Hyman Ltd.
- Bellamy, William. 1889. *Looking Backward, 2000–1887*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bellomy, Donald C. 1987. Two Generations: Modernists and Progressives, 1870–1920. *Perspectives in American History*, n.s., 3:269–306.
- Biddle, Jeff E. 1990. Purpose and Evolution in Commons's Institutionalism. *HOPE* 22.1:19–47.
- Bowler, Peter. 1983. *The Eclipse of Darwinism*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 2005. Revisiting the Eclipse of Darwinism. *Journal of the History of Biology* 38.1:19–32.
- Carver, Thomas N. 1912. *The Religion Worth Having*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Clark, John Bates. 1885. *Philosophy of Wealth*. Boston: Ginn and Co.
- . 1899. *Distribution of Wealth: A Theory of Wages, Interest, and Profits*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1907. *Essentials of Economic Theory*. New York: Macmillan.
- Coats, A. W. 1960. The First Two Decades of the American Economic Association. *American Economic Review* 50.4:555–74.
- . 1988. The Educational Revolution and the Professionalization of American Economics. In *Breaking the Academic Mould: Economists and American Higher Learning in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by W. Barber. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
- Coleman, William. 2001. The Strange “Laissez Faire” of Alfred Russel Wallace: The Connection between Natural Selection and Political Economy Reconsidered. In *Darwinism and Evolutionary Economics*, edited by J. Laurent and J. Nightingale. Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Commons, John R. 1890. Natural Selection, Social Selection, and Heredity. *Arena* 18:90–97.
- . 1894. *Social Reform and the Church*. New York: Crowell.

- . 1907. *Races and Immigrants in America*. New York: Chautauqua Press.
- . 1934. *Myself*. New York: Macmillan.
- Conklin, Edwin G. 1922. *The Direction of Human Evolution*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Copeland, Morris A. 1936. Commons' Institutionalism in Relation to the Problem of Social Evolution and Economic Planning. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 50.2:333–46.
- Croly, Herbert. 1909. *The Promise of American Life*. New York: Macmillan.
- Crook, Paul. 1996. Social Darwinism: The Concept. *History of European Ideas* 22:261–74.
- Crunden, Robert. 1982. *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives' Achievement in American Civilization, 1889–1920*. New York: Basic Books.
- Curtis, Winterdon. 1922. *Science and Human Affairs from the Viewpoint of Biology*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Darwin, Charles R. 1859. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. London: John Murray.
- . 1869. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. 5th ed. London: John Murray.
- . 1871. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Vol. 1. London: John Murray.
- Degler, Carl. 1991. *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dewey, John. 1909. Darwin's Influence on Philosophy. *Popular Science Monthly* 75:90–98.
- . 1934. *A Common Faith*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Diner, Steven. 1975. Department and Discipline: The Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, 1892–1920. *Minerva* 13.4:514–53.
- Dorfman, Joseph. [1954] 1969. Henry Carter Adams: The Harmonizer of Liberty and Reform. In *Two Essays by Henry Carter Adams*, edited by Joseph Dorfman. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Draper, William Paul. 1875. *History of the Conflict between Science and Religion*. London: Henry S. King.
- Dugdale, Richard. 1877. *The Jukes: A Study in Crime, Pauperism, Disease, and Heredity*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Eisenach, Eldon. 1994. *The Lost Promise of Progressivism*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- . 1999. Progressive Internationalism. In *Progressivism and the New Democracy*, edited by Sidney Milkis and Jerome Mileur, 226–58. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- , ed. 2006. *The Social and Political Thought of American Progressivism*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Ely, Richard T. 1884. *The Past and the Present of Political Economy*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. 2nd ser. Baltimore: N. Murray.

- . 1886. Report of the Organization of the American Economic Association. *Publications of the American Economic Association* 1.1:5–32.
- . 1889a. *Introduction to Political Economy*. New York: Hunt & Eaton.
- . 1889b. *Social Aspects of Christianity and Other Essays*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co.
- . 1891. The Next Things in Social Reform. *Christian Union*, vol. 43, no. 17, 23 April.
- . 1894. Thoughts on Immigration. *Congregationalist*, 5 July.
- . 1896. *The Social Law of Service*. New York: Eaton & Mains.
- . 1903. *Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1938. *The Ground under Our Feet*. New York: Macmillan.
- Everett, John R. 1946. *Religion in Economics: A Study of John Bates Clark, Richard T. Ely, Simon N. Patten*. New York: King's Crown Press.
- Fine, Sidney. 1951. Richard T. Ely, Forerunner of Progressivism, 1880–1901. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 37.4:599–624.
- Fogel, Robert. 2000. *The Fourth Great Awakening and the Future of Egalitarianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Freemantle, W. H. 1892. *The World as the Subject of Redemption*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- Furner, Mary. 1975. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865–1905*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Gerstle, Gary. 1994. The Protean Character of American Liberalism. *American Historical Review* 99.4:1043–73.
- Gladden, Washington. 1902. *Social Salvation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Goldman, Eric F. 1952. *Rendezvous with Destiny*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Gonce, Richard A. 2002. John R. Commons' "Five Big Years": 1899–1904. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 61.4:755–77.
- Henderson, Charles R. 1893. *An Introduction to the Study of the Dependent, Defective, and Delinquent Classes*. Boston: D. C. Heath.
- Herron, George. 1894. *The Christian Society*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co.
- Hodge, Charles. 1874. *What Is Darwinism?* New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co.
- Hodgson, Geoffrey. 2003. John R. Commons and the Foundations of Institutional Economics. *Journal of Economic Issues* 37.3:547–76.
- Hofstadter, Richard. 1944. *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860–1915*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 1955. *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR*. New York: Vintage.
- Hollinger, David. 1989. Justification by Verification: The Scientific Challenge to the Moral Authority of Christianity in Modern America. In *Religion and Twentieth-Century American Intellectual Life*, edited by Michael J. Lacey, 116–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopkins, Charles. 1940. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865–1915*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hovenkamp, Herbert. 2010. Coase, Institutionalism, and the Origins of Law and Economics. University of Iowa Legal Studies Research Paper 10-07.

- Jones, L. 1998. Social Darwinism Revisited. *History Today* 48.8:7–8.
- Kropotkin, P. A. 1902. *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. New York: McClure, Philips & Co.
- LaPouge, Georges Vacher, de, and Carlos C. Closson. 1897. The Fundamental Laws of Anthro-sociology. *Journal of Political Economy* 6.1:54–92.
- Larson, Edward J. 1997. *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004. *Evolution: The Remarkable History of a Scientific Theory*. New York: Modern Library.
- Leonard, Thomas C. 2003. “More Merciful and Not Less Effective”: Eugenics and American Economics in the Progressive Era. *HOPE* 35.4:687–712.
- . 2009a. American Economic Reform in the Progressive Era: Its Foundational Beliefs and Their Relation to Eugenics. *HOPE* 41.1:109–41.
- . 2009b. Origins of the Myth of Social Darwinism: The Ambiguous Legacy of Richard Hofstadter's *Social Darwinism in American Thought*. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 71.1:37–51.
- Leslie, T. E. Cliffe. 1880. Political Economy in the United States. *Fortnightly Review*, 1 October.
- Livingstone, David N. 1984. *Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter between Evangelical Theology and Evolutionary Thought*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans.
- . 1992. Darwinism and Calvinism: The Belfast-Princeton Connection. *Isis* 83.3:408–28.
- Lyell, Charles. 1830. *Principles of Geology*. Vol. 1. London: Charles Murray.
- Maccabelli, Terenzio. 2008. Social Anthropology in Economic Literature at the End of the 19th Century: Eugenic and Racial Explanations of Inequality. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 67.3:481–527.
- Marsden, George M. 1980. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1994a. God and Man at Yale. *First Things* 42:39–42. www.firstthings.com/article/2009/03/004-god-and-man-at-yale-1880-46.
- . 1994b. *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marshall, Alfred. [1890] 1920. *Principles of Economics*. 8th ed. London: Macmillan.
- May, Henry F. 1949. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. New York: Harper Bros.
- Mayr, Ernst. 2001. *One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and the Genesis of Modern Evolutionary Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McCulloch, Oscar. 1891. *The Tribe of Ishmael: A Study in Social Degradation*. Indianapolis: Charity Organization Society.
- Morgan, J. G. 1969. The Development of Sociology and the Social Gospel in America. *Sociological Analysis* 30.1:42–53.

- . 1982. Preparation for the Advent: The Establishment of Sociology as a Discipline in American Universities in the Late Nineteenth Century. *Minerva* 20:25–58.
- Morgan, Mary. 1993. Competing Notions of “Competition” in Late Nineteenth-Century American Economics. *HOPE* 25.4:563–604.
- Nearing, Scott. 1916. *Social Religion: An Interpretation of Christianity in Terms of Modern Life*. New York: Macmillan.
- Nelson, Robert. 1991. *Reaching for Heaven on Earth: The Theological Meaning of Economics*. Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Niman, Neil B. 1991. Biological Analogies in Marshall’s Work. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 13.1:19–36.
- Patten, Simon. 1885. *Premises of Political Economy*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Co.
- . 1894. The Failure of Biologic Sociology. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 4:919–47.
- . 1896. *The Theory of Social Forces*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science.
- . 1903. *Heredity and Social Progress*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1911a. The Laws of Environmental Influence. *Popular Science Monthly* 79:396–402.
- . 1911b. *The Social Basis of Religion*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1912. Types of Men. *Popular Science Monthly* 80:273–79.
- . 1915. Economic Zones and the New Alignment of National Sentiment. *Survey* 23:612–13.
- Pearl, Sandra, and David Levy. 2005. *The “Vanity of the Philosopher”: From Equality to Hierarchy in Post-Classical Economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 2008. Darwin’s Unpublished Letter at the Bradlaugh-Besant Trial: A Question of Divided Expert Judgment. *European Journal of Political Economy* 24:343–53.
- Perry, Arthur Latham. 1866. *Elements of Political Economy*. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.
- Porter, Theodore. 1986. *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820–1900*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Quandt, Jean. 1973. Religion and Social Thought: The Secularization of Postmillennialism. *American Quarterly* 24.4:390–409.
- Rader, Benjamin G. 1966. *The Academic Mind and Reform: The Influence of Richard T. Ely in American Life*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Ramstad, Yngve. 1994. On the Nature of Economic Evolution: John R. Commons and the Metaphor of Artificial Selection. In *Evolutionary and Neo-Schumpeterian Approaches to Economics*, edited by Lars Magnusson, 65–121. Boston: Kluwer.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter. 1907. The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology. *American Journal of Theology* 11:111–27.
- . [1907] 1908. *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. New York: Macmillan.

- . 1912. *Christianizing the Social Order*. New York: Macmillan.
- . [1917] 1922. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. New York: Macmillan.
- Richards, Ellen Swallow. 1910. *Euthenics: The Science of Controllable Environments*. Boston: Whitcomb and Barrows.
- Ripley, William Z. 1899. *The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study*. New York: D. Appleton and Co.
- Rosen, Christine. 2004. *Preaching Eugenics: Religious Leaders and the American Eugenics Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, Dorothy. 1991. *The Origins of American Social Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, Edward A. 1896. Social Control. *American Journal of Sociology* 1.5:513–35.
- . 1901. *Social Control: A Survey of the Foundations of Order*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1907. *Sin and Society: An Analysis of Latter-Day Iniquity*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rutherford, Malcolm. 1998. Veblen's Evolutionary Programme: A Promise Unfulfilled. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 22:463–77.
- Schäfer, Axel. 2000. *American Progressives and German Social Reform, 1875–1920*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. 1932. A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875–1900. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 64:523–47.
- Seligman, E. R. A. 1922. Memorial to Former President Henry C. Adams. *American Economic Review* 12.3:401–8.
- Small, Albion, and G. Vincent. 1894. *An Introduction to the Study of Society*. New York: American Book.
- Stocking, George W. 1962. Lamarckianism in American Social Science: 1890–1915. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23.2:239–56.
- Strong, Josiah. 1885. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*. New York: American Home Missionary Society.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1898. Why Is Economics Not an Evolutionary Science? *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 12.4:373–97.
- . 1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study in the Evolution of Institutions*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1913a. The Blond Race and the Aryan Culture. *University of Missouri Bulletin* 2.3:491–507.
- . 1913b. The Mutation Theory and the Blond Race. *Journal of Race Development* 3 (April): 39–57.
- Wallace, Alfred Russel. 1889. *Darwinism: An Exposition of the Theory of Natural Selection, with Some of Its Applications*. London: Macmillan.
- Ward, Lester Frank. 1884. Mind as a Social Factor. *Mind* 9.36:563–73.
- . 1898. *Outlines of Sociology*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1907. Social and Biological Struggles. *American Journal of Sociology* 13.3:289–99.

- . [1882] 1913. *The Scientific Basis of Positive Political Economy*. In vol. 3 of *Glimpses of the Cosmos*. New York: G.P. Putnam and Sons.
- Wayland, Francis. 1837. *The Elements of Political Economy*. New York: Levitt, Lord & Co.
- White, Andrew Dickson. 1896. *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
- White, Ronald C., Jr., and C. Howard Hopkins. 1975. *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

