Searching for God's Economy in Protestant Theology

2011 by Robert Trawick

In his 1912 book *Christianizing the Social Order*, Walter Rauschenbusch wrote:

> Business life is the unregenerate section of our social order. If by some magic it could be plucked out of our total social life in all its raw selfishness, and isolated on an island, unmitigated by any other factors of our life, that island would immediately become the object of a great foreign mission crusade for all Christendom.[1]

While Rauschenbusch is clearly appalled by the ethics or lack thereof in American business, he is far from fatalistic. Implicit in his description of the United States economic model is a claim that it is not the *only* economic model. There are alternatives, and Rauschenbusch dedicated much of his theology to finding them, to describing what he took to be God's economy.

Rauschenbusch's vision of a model economy was certainly shaped by the excesses of late 19th and early 20th century capitalism, but it is not inextricably tied to its time and place. Indeed, much of his understanding of what constituted Christian behavior in the economic realm harkened back to the theology of the Reformation and much of it is of contemporary relevance.

Protestant theology at its best has always been concerned with economic life. Indeed, Protestant, and more specifically Reformed theology has been both praised and blamed for creating the worldview necessary for the rise of capitalism. There is much material in the tradition that gives sanction to the type of enterprise on which capitalism is based and there is material as well which sharply criticizes the excesses that capitalism can spawn.

One theme that emerges from Protestant theological reflection on economic life is its connection to the common good. For Calvin human economic life is radically tempered by a demand to serve others. We can also find in the history, however, the seeds of an excessive individualism which, while it runs counter to the spirit of Calvin's own work, has been attached to Calvinism. Rauschenbusch was attempting to counter this tendency and to reclaim a Protestant heritage which asserted that Christian economic theory was less concerned with *value*, measured in terms of capital, than with *values*, measured in terms of obedience to the will of God. This insistence, that economic life should be part of our theological reflection and that it cannot be disassociated from our duties and responsibilities to God and to our neighbor, is the type of narrative which begs to be reclaimed in contemporary theology.

Resources from Calvin: Vocation and Stewardship

Central to understanding Calvin's thought on human economic activity is an appreciation of the related doctrines of vocation and stewardship. While Calvin will have important things to say about the role of government, he is primarily focused on individual action in community and the idea of the common good looms large in all of his reflections.

Calvin's doctrine of vocation follows from the work of Martin Luther, a generation before him. In his essay, "Talent and Vocation in Human and Protestant Thought," Richard Douglas asserts that concerning vocation "Calvin's position was essentially the same as Luther's in every important assumption."[2] Douglas only slightly overstates his case. Calvin adopted large pieces of Luther's doctrine, believing that all Christians were endowed with a vocation and that the proper functioning of the Christian community depended on the combined efforts of multiple talents. Both Luther and Calvin viewed Christian economic life as fundamentally co-operative and not as competitive.

Luther's most important contribution to the development of the doctrine was in broadening vocation to include a wide range of human activity, challenging contemporary theories that limited vocation to religious occupation. But Luther's doctrine also shows him to be embedded in the medieval social structure in which he lived. He was confident that the social class structure of the period was a manifestation of God's design, and while he was adamant that everyone is valuable in God's economy, he also had little understanding of or appreciation for social mobility.

Calvin's doctrine of vocation presses further than does Luther's, championing a social order unfettered by social location. While Calvin and Luther do share important normative assumptions, to assert that they are "essentially the same in every important assumption" risks missing Calvin's distinctive contributions. More satisfying, then, is Van't Spijker's assessment that "Calvin never had any doubts about the idea that he was continuing along the way indicated by Luther. But Calvin went further along this way."[3]

Calvin makes clear that human beings have a role to play in creating and maintaining God's social order. But the possibility of meaningful human work, creating anything resembling God's economy, is, for Calvin, severely hampered by our bondage to sin, so much so that, without the intervention of God, our activity will be irredeemably tainted. For this reason, when Calvin deals with ethics, he deals with it under the category of Christian liberty.[4] Freed by God from sin, called to vocation, human beings become instruments of God's work on earth, able and duty-bound to create and maintain a Christian social order through the agency of God working in them. Calvin writes of the human so much under the influence of God's call that, when "animated by the spirit of Christ, he again begins to breathe."[5]

Once Calvin has reminded us of the futility of our efforts unsupported by God's grace, he gives us a picture of what human interaction should look like under the power of vocation. The proper direction of human vocational activity was outwards, towards others. He writes, of Paul's letter to the Corinthians, "…he [Paul] orders every one to bring what he has to the common heap, and not keep back gifts of God in the way of enjoying every one his own, apart from others, but aim unitedly at the edification of all in common."[6] Whatever else we may say about human activity in God's economy, it is necessarily a co-operative affair with a robust sense of the common good taking precedence over any individual gain.

Calvin's work is also particularly important to modern readers looking to reframe the narrative concerning the role of government. While it is true that individual human work is to be about creating and maintaining a Christian social order, that order will not happen through individual

effort alone. For Calvin, government plays a conspicuous role, roughly equal to but separate from the church in social ethics. Government, while not always acting as such, is certainly a good in Calvin's writing, ordained by God.

While we would ideally conduct our economic transactions with others fairly, our impulses to goodness are corrupted by sin. The state is charged with a wide range of activity in the economic sphere, both in regulation and in distribution. Among the many functions of the state, Calvin notes that the state must create such conditions that "men may transact their business together without fraud or injustice; that integrity and modesty may be cultivated among them; in short, that there may be a public form of religion among Christians and that humanity may be maintained among men."[7]

Vocations then exist both for individuals and for institutions in Calvin. Vocation is, for Calvin, the manifestation of God's grace in the life of a Christian. It is a transforming call whereby we become vessels of divine possibility. We are to live as bearers of vocation in every aspect of our earthly lives, certainly including economic ones.

The interrelated doctrine of stewardship allows Calvin to comment on the allocation of resources in earthly society. On the question of property, Calvin neither scorned nor glorified private acquisition. But we hold property only as stewards.[8] Using this medieval metaphor describing a servant who managed a lord's estate while the lord was away, Calvin insisted that such property as we have must be used wisely and generously.

André Biéler writes that unequal distribution of wealth is not, in Calvin's system, an arbitrary matter, but rather a spur to the redistribution of goods, regarded with an almost sacramental reverence, realizing as it does both faithful stewardship in the giver and grateful acceptance in the receiver. Biéler explains, "The rich man has a providential mission. He is charged with sharing a part of his wealth…so that the poor will no longer be poor…The poor man is destined to be the neighbor of the rich, to be the one who, on the part of God, offers the rich man an opportunity…of freeing himself from monetary slavery."[9] Such "mutual communication of goods," according to Biéler, is not intended to eliminate the inequities which naturally occur given the multiplicity of vocations, but rather to mitigate their harsher consequences.[10]

Calvin, in a belief much twisted and abused by his theological progeny, did believe that personal material benefit on earth was a result of God's grace, but "the purpose of grace does not end in possession but rather in the good works which should follow it."[11] Because God's grace is manifest in the good works which issue from possession, specifically in the transfer of goods, and because the poor as much as the rich have important roles to play in these transactions, the pernicious corollary which time and misrepresentation have attached to Calvin's understanding of private property, that those of lesser means are therefore less graced, has no place in Calvin's theology.[12] Reading from Calvin we learn that

It is an error which is far too common among men, to look upon those who are oppressed with afflictions as condemned or reprobate…Most men, from making judgments about the favor of God from an uncertain and transitory state of prosperity, applaud the rich, and those upon whom, as they say, fortune smiles; so, on the other hand, they insult contemptuously the wretched and

miserable, and foolishly imagine that God hates them, because he does not exercise so much tolerance toward them as he does to the reprobate. The error of which I speak…is one which has prevailed in all ages of the world.[13]

The trained economist, looking in Calvin for an economic program more precise than his interrelated understanding of vocation and stewardship will be disappointed. Even given the exhaustive work done by Biéler on Calvin's economic thought, one is forced to conclude with Herbert Lüthy that "Calvin speaks as a pastor and as a teacher of the Christian religion, and what he says, more or less incidentally, respecting the economic behavior of men is always an exegesis and an explanation of the teaching of the Scriptures as they relate to human conduct."[14] Calvin may not be an economist, but he is an ethicist of unique significance. His ability to hold together an endorsement of private property with a scathing critique of undue luxury represents one of his most significant triumphs.

An Unfortunate Detour: Puritan Economic Thought

It has, of course, been widely noted that the social humanism that Biéler finds in Calvin is barely evident in the Calvinism that follows him. Concerning the doctrine of vocation in particular, Richard Douglas notes that the "highly unified theology of vocation" which developed during the Reformation was a "transitory and impermanent" ethic which "survived intact for scarcely two generations."[15] The most conspicuous inheritors of Calvin's economic thought were the Puritan communities in England and later in the American colonies, and it is to them that much of the opprobrium for distorting Calvin's work has been attached.

Some of this is patently unfair. English Puritan theologians such as William Perkins and Richard Baxter did subtly change the focus of Calvin's economic thought, but we might give them credit for attempting to extend the doctrine of vocation beyond the boundaries of medieval society and to apply it to a world vastly different from Calvin's Geneva. However, they do contribute to the devolution of vocation into a much more secular theory, one that prizes above all human industry almost as an end in itself.

The influence of Puritanism on the Reformation idea of vocation has been a topic of debate at least since the publication of Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Weber notes that among Puritans, the question of whether one was of the elect became central.[16] The determining sign of election became work, and the horror of idleness dominates much of the theology of this period. Weber further notes that the emphasis placed on continual activity led to a rapid increase in production. The combination of a fervent industriousness with another typically Puritan focus on frugality in consumption led to the accumulation of capital.

The accumulation of wealth which resulted from the conscientious exercise of Puritan values placed the Puritan in a dilemma. The fear of riches is obvious in the work of Puritan theologians, but the proper exercise of calling would lead, at least in theory, to the possession of the very thing about which Puritan theology worries. Kemper Fullerton, writing on Weber's thesis avers, perhaps too glibly that "the Puritan attitude to calling, with its almost automatic result in accumulation of riches, was destined to become more influential than the Puritan fear of riches."[17]

While Weber's work on the Puritan theology of vocation and its effects has carried great weight in the ongoing discussion of Reformed economics, R.H. Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* is less known, but no less valuable. Tawney's major premise is that Puritan theology created such a schism between the life of the elect and the life of the world that any attempt at social cohesion within the world was abandoned and that individual conscience became the sole reference point for religious practice. He writes, "While the revelation of God to the individual soul is the center of all religion, the essence of Puritan theology was that it made it, not only the center, but the whole circumference and substance, dismissing as dross and vanity all else but this secret and solitary communion."[18]

The end result of this theology is a weakening of social bonds and an abandonment of any sense of an organic model of community. As Tawney expresses it, the Puritan view towards any human association is that such association is inevitably suspect. The casualty in the strengthening of the individual will, which was to Tawney the dominant theme of Puritan theology, was any sense of social cohesion. As Tawney explains, "The moral self-sufficiency of the Puritan nerved his will but it corroded his sense of social solidarity. For, if each individual's destiny hangs on a private transaction between himself and his Maker, what room is left for human intervention?"[19]

The distrust of human intervention, either individually or on the part of government, and the discarding of the ideals of fraternity for those of liberty,[20] led to an increasing disregard among those of the Puritan persuasion towards any efforts made in the direction of limiting liberty in the name of the common good. The distrust of the world led to an increasing confidence in individual choices, both in politics and in the market. Tawney speaks of a "profound distrust [of] the interference both of Church and of State" leading to an "administrative nihilism."[21]

If Tawney is correct, we have moved a long way from Calvin's understanding of human economic activity. While Puritan theology rarely went so far as to unabashedly praise wealth accumulation (that will come later) it opens doors towards unfettered human economic activity in ways that Calvin directly opposes. If our religious faith centers entirely on a personal, private focus on our own salvation it becomes difficult to find any room for what Calvin called vocation and limited space for the practice of true stewardship.

Puritan and Revivalist Theologies in American Protestantism

The extent to which Puritan theology has colored the theological heritage of the United States has been debated, but it is certainly a significant part of our theological lineage. So too, and perhaps to a much greater degree, is the theology of revivalism, which has affinities with Puritan theology but is distinct from it. Revivals played a significant role in the churching of the United States and however disparate they may have been in different times and different locations, they largely played from the same script. The potential believer was made to despair of the possibility of their own life without conversion. The anxiety and fear produced was tempered by the offer of a new way of life in Jesus Christ. And the culmination of the revival was the joyous acceptance of Christ with all the attendant promises of the rewards of a new life.

While revivals were in a sense communal experiences, and certainly benefitted from what Durkheim labeled the "collective effervescence" of religious emotion experienced in a group

setting, they promoted an essentially privatized theology. As George Marsden has noted, "The individual stood alone before God; his choices were decisive. The church, while important as a supportive community, was made up of free individuals."[22] The theme of working for the common good is largely absent, and when found in revivalist theology, it is often countered by premillennialist dispensationalism which averred that reform of the social order was not a primary concern of the church because it would not be realized in any meaningful way until the advent of the Second Coming of Christ.

One of the cruder results of this emphasis on the individual in American theology was that school of thought that came to be known as the Gospel of Wealth. Drawing as it did on themes of calling and industriousness, the Gospel of Wealth may be said to be, in some respects, the offspring of Puritan theology. But it lacks the mediating influence of the Puritan suspicion of immoderate wealth. Of the numerous tracts and sermons printed and delivered supporting this new theological direction, none enjoyed wider hearing than Russell Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds" sermon.

Conwell first gave his sermon in 1861 and repeated it six thousand times throughout the country. The rhetorical thrust of the sermon was that every believer had acres of diamonds available in their own backyards. One had only to invest the necessary industry to be assured of spectacular return. In Conwell's hands, the Calvinist understanding of wealth as a sign of God's grace was grossly distorted into an implication that poverty was a mark of sinfulness and every Christian had a duty to accumulate wealth.[23] When Conwell challenges himself in the sermon with a query as to whether growing rich is antithetical to the Gospel, he replies "…to make money honestly is to preach the Gospel."[24] He continues, "…the number of poor who are to be sympathized with is very small. To sympathize with a man whom God has punished for his sins, thus to help him when God would still continue a just punishment, is to do wrong, no doubt about it, and we do that more than we help those who are deserving."[25] With Conwell and those who followed him, Protestant theology finally takes the step which Calvin had resisted and around which Puritan theology had gingerly tread. Protestant economic thought was being used to praise the rich and damn the poor.

The Response of the Social Gospel

Conwell did not go long unchallenged. A movement of socially progressive ministers and professors, largely centered in the urban centers of the northeastern United States, began to coalesce into a theological movement which came to be known as the Social Gospel. In a period stretching from the end of the American Civil War to the early decades of the twentieth century, the Social Gospel theologians were the voice of loyal Christian opposition to Conwell and his ilk. In the words of Winthrop Hudson, "By the turn of the century the adherents of two antithetical Gospels—'the gospel of wealth' and 'the social gospel'—were locked in combat and struggling for predominance."[26]

Within mainline churches, a growing number of influential preachers began to embrace a more progressive theology. Continuing to emphasize individual character as the primary focus of religion, ministers such as Horace Bushnell and Henry Ward Beecher began to develop a theology which emphasized the humanness of Jesus and offered his work in the world as a moral challenge to nineteenth century Christians. Individual transformation, it was asserted, must be

accompanied by devotion to the work of Jesus and the following in his footsteps—an idea potent enough to exercise the more systematic theologies of writers such as Walter Rauschenbusch.

In his earliest work, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, Rauschenbusch critically contrasted the spirit of the early church with a "contemporary social impotence"[27] in Christianity. What Rauschenbusch praised in the early church was its fraternalism, its recognition of all members as equally children of God. And Rauschenbusch takes great pains to show that a spirit of fraternity was not simply part of their religious lives, but an organizing principle for society at large. Discussing the probable role of deacons in the early church, Rauschenbusch concludes that the office involved not just preaching and teaching, but the providing of material sustenance. Of the early Christian communities, he writes "the administration of mutual helpfulness was a vey important part of their existence, and…their common life must have extended far beyond their common religious duties."[28]

The extension of fraternity as an organizing principle of society resulted in the relief of the poor, care for those suffering loss, and a high valuing of work. In describing the duties of early Christians to their communities, Rauschenbusch writes, "The duty of working was strictly urged in the primitive church; holy idleness was an outgrowth of later asceticism."[29] Such a prioritizing of work is unremarkable and we have seen it to varying degrees already. But Rauschenbusch ascribes to the early church a proactive function in creating work. He writes, "…if a man was out of work, the churches assumed the responsibility either of finding him a job or of caring for him. Thus the means of life were guaranteed him in either case."[30] The stigmatization of the unemployed and the economically disadvantaged are, in Rauschenbusch's reconstruction of the early church not present because the distribution of work and wealth are part of the responsibilities of fraternity placed upon the community at large.

The accuracy of Rauschenbusch's historical analysis is not ultimately important. The crucial role played by this reconstruction is that it forms the core of Rauschenbusch's understanding of the Kingdom of God, a concept that will become the organizing principle of all of his work. As Harlan Beckley explains, "we must begin with his convictions that the centrality of the Kingdom of God in the work of Christ is a redemptive force bearing on the social order and is normative for human conduct and for social institutions."[31] Rauschenbusch is reintroducing to the discussion of human activity in the world a notion that God is actively directing our actions towards a common good.

The most concise picture of what the Kingdom of God looks like is found in *Christianizing the Social Order*. Here Rauschenbusch draws on the familiar Pauline metaphor of society as organic. He writes, "Paul's philosophy of the Christian Church is the highest possible human society. The ideal society is an organism and the Christianizing of the social order must work toward a harmonious co-operation of all individuals for common social ends."[32] The remaking of society in this image is the task Rauschenbusch sets for theology and for the church.

For the task of bringing about the Kingdom, Rauschenbusch identifies several elements of society as already largely fraternal in their ethical practice and to which society can look to for resources for regeneration. The family, the church, our educational system, and democratic politics all operate more or less in such a way that individual interests are channeled into a

broader interest towards society as a whole. Rauschenbusch exults, "Social Christianity is not, then, an untried venture. The larger part of Christianizing the social order is already accomplished, and the success which has attached to it ought to create a victorious self-assertion in all who stake their faith on its effectiveness. These redeemed portions of our social life are the portions to which our hearts go out in loving pride and loyalty."[33]

Noticeably absent from Rauschenbusch's list of the redeemed segments of the social order is business. Business life is that portion of our society from which the greatest threat to the Kingdom of God emanates. Rauschenbusch points to the exploitation of children, the callous acceptance of industrial accidents, and the unrelenting hostility between employer and employee as signs that a fraternal ethic has remained largely absent from our business relations.

Charles Howard Hopkins, who wrote one of the earliest histories of the Social Gospel movement in the 1940s, gives a pithy summation of Rauschenbusch's critique of capitalism, citing four basic tenets of capitalist relationships that run counter to the Kingdom of God.[34] The first and most overriding of Rauschenbusch's concerns is that capitalism operates primarily by competition, being motivated by "selfishness, covetousness, and craft, rather than mutual interest, good will, comradeship, and solidarity—the marks of a Christian social order."[35] Second, Rauschenbusch complains that power in a capitalist system is always autocratic, never communal. Third, capitalism thrives when it practices dishonesty in the form of "adulteration of foods, short weights, spurious advertising, overproduction, and similar practices perilous not only to the consumer but also to business and national morality."[36] Finally, capitalism is driven to evaluate actions based solely on profit motive.

The critique is powerful in its rhetorical passion, but it doesn't contain any strikingly original propositions. *Christianizing the Social Order* exists primarily as an institutional critique, focusing as it does on the structural impediments to the realization of the Kingdom of God while at the same time noting those structural elements of society which contribute to its realization. Rauschenbusch has affirmed the priority of a social understanding of all elements of our life, including our economic activity, over the prevailing capitalist ethic.

In doing so, Rauschenbusch made a major contribution to reclaiming social justice as a vital, indeed central piece of Christian work. The blurring of the distinction between the church and the world is more pronounced in Rauschenbusch than in any American theologian up to his time. Rauschenbusch's theology has as its goal the extension of a Christian ethic into every segment of society, hence his program of Christianizing the social order. While we might balk at the language of Christianizing today, we should nonetheless take seriously his emphasis on not limiting our religious imagination to private, individual concerns.

A Proposal: God's Economy as a Responsibilist Ethic

The ethical category for thinking about God's economy can be rather elusive in Reformed theology. If we take Calvin as a model, there are certainly points at which our understanding could be labeled as deontological, but we nevertheless would want to include some purposive language which would remove it from that category. This language might lead us to assume the social ethic we are working towards is teleological, but it certainly prioritizes right action (in this case obedience to a call) over any human conception of the good in such a way that puts it at

odds with the dominant stream of teleological thought. We might more fruitfully explore a Reformed vision of God's economy as belonging to a third category, that of responsibilism as defined by H. Richard Niebuhr.

Niebuhr defines responsibilism in contrast to both deontology and teleology by examining the questions each ethical system asks when faced with a moral dilemma. The teleologist will ask "What is my goal?" while the deontologist will ask "What moral law applies?"[37] A responsibilist ethic asks neither one of these questions first, but rather asks "What is going on?" and therefore, "What is fitting?"[38]

Particularly important to Niebuhr is that the responsibilist ethic always occurs within the context of a group of people in society. Niebuhr writes, "Our ethic is responsible, it appears, when it is a response to action upon us in a continuing discourse or interaction among beings forming a continuing society."[39]

I would propose that any theologically honest appraisal of God's economy must take into account that we are responding to an action upon us, that action being the calling by God to fulfill a particular role. It is always directed outwards toward others and it recognizes the need of other actions by other persons differently called to fulfill its ultimate purpose. God's economy is action within a true community, and not within a collection of essentially disassociated individuals.

As we have seen in the story of the Puritan interpretation of various aspects of Calvin's thought, overemphasis on individual virtues (industriousness, thrift) may lead to a chilling effect on a concern for the social responsibilities of God's economy. If we lose the vision of human vocation in the service of God's providential ordering of society, with all the abridgement of personal ends entailed, we run the danger of diminishing the transformative power of the doctrine into a vague admonition of leading a pious, individual existence.

It is perhaps understandable, given the intimate connection of the United States with the classical liberal tradition and its emphasis on individual liberty, that our public discourse is reluctant to advance, so far as to posit, the purpose of our human labors as service to the neighbor. Yet it is precisely such an understanding that Calvin's vision of God's economy demands.

Notes

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: MacMillan, 1913), 156.

[2] Richard M. Douglas, "Talent and Vocation in Humanist and Protestant Thought," *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E.H. Harbison*, eds. Theodore Rabb and Jerrold E. Siegel (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969), 292.

[3] W. Van't Spijker, "The Influence of Luther on Calvin According to the Institutes," *John Calvin's Institutes: His Magnum Opus: Proceedings of the South African Congress for Calvin Research* (Potchefstroom: Institute for Reformational Studies, 1986), 104.

[4] Karl Barth, *The Theology of John Calvin*, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 194.

[5] John Calvin, "The Necessity of Reforming the Church," *Calvin's Tracts and Treatises, Volume One*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1958), 134.

[6] John Calvin, *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, trans. John Pringle (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1948), 410.

[7] John Calvin, *On God and Political Duty*, ed. John T. McNeill (New York: MacMillan, 1950), 47.

[8] John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: William B. Eeerdmans, 1995), Book III, chapter x, 31-32.

[9] André Biéler, *The Social Humanism of Calvin*, trans. Paul T. Fuhrman (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), 22.

[10] Ibid, 33.

[11] W. Venter, "Calvin and Economics according to the Institutes," *John Calvin's Institutes: His Magnum Opus: Proceedings of the South African Congress for Calvin Research* (Potchefstroom: Institute for Reformational Studies, 1986), 305.

[12] For an entertainingly trenchant dissection of this belief, see W. Fred Graham, *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin and his Socio-Economic Impact* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1971), 66ff.

[13] John Calvin, cited in Graham, 66.

[14] Herbert Lüthy, *From Calvin to Rousseau: Tradition and Modernity in Socio-Political Thought form the Reformation to the French Revolution*, trans. Salvator Attanasio (New York: Basic Books, 1970), 73.

[15] Douglas, "Talent and Vocation in Humanist and Protestant Thought," 295.

[16] Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 110.

[17] Kemper Fullerton, "Calvinism and Capitalism: and Explanation of the Weber Thesis," *Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics*, ed. Robert W. Green (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1959), 19.

[18] R.H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1962), 227.

[19] Ibid, 229.

[20] Ibid, 230.

[21] Ibid, 230.

[22] George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006), 224.

[23] Catherine Albanese, *America: Religions and Religion, Second Edition* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992), 125.

[24] Russell Conwell, *Acres of Diamonds* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1915), 18.

[25] Ibid, 21.

[26] Winthrop S. Hudson, *Religion in America: Fourth Edition* (New York: MacMillan, 1987), 282.

[27] Ibid, 219.

[28] Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 129.

[29] Ibid, 130.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Harlan Beckley, *Passion for Justice: Retrieving the Legacies of Walter Rauschenbusch, John A. Ryan, and Reinhold Niebuhr* (Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press, 1992), 33.

[32] Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: MacMillan, 1913), 366.

[33] Ibid, 155.

[34] Hopkins, 222.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid, 223.

[37] H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Responsible Self* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1963), 60.

[38] Ibid, 61.

[39] Ibid, 65.