UNITED SERVICE IN DIVISIVE TIMES

THE PITTSBURGH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, 1916–1929

Tyler B. Flynn, Jr.
Eastern University

ABSTRACT: Despite the disruption of the Great Steel Strike of 1919 and the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920s, the Pittsburgh Council of Churches managed to hold together a fragile coalition for the cause of social betterment in the Steel City. Their noteworthy service record reveals a Protestant establishment eager to appear strong in the face of mounting criticism of indifference as well as a sincere desire to do good.
KEYWORDS: Pittsburgh, Social Gospel, American Protestantism, Pittsburgh Council of Churches, Daniel L. Marsh, Charles L. Zahniser

When the Protestant churches of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, formed an interdenominational organization in late 1916 with the stated purpose of fulfilling the Social Gospel aim of "enlistment in the Christian life and service," they would soon have their newfound bonds challenged.[1] A major steel strike beginning in the fall of 1919 stretching from Baltimore to Chicago—and affecting Pittsburgh profoundly—immediately tested the Pittsburgh Council of Churches' (PCC) resolve to "'stand for the protection of the workers'" in the city's mills and factories.[2] The Great Steel Strike was violent, disruptive, controversial, and stirred public alarm about a possible Bolshevik revolution on American soil. As in many American cities at the time, the owners of industrial plants and financial interests in Pittsburgh were overwhelmingly Protestant in their affiliation, putting the labor-sympathetic leadership of the PCC at odds with powerful factions in their constituency.[3] Two years before the strike, for instance, one of the PCC's key leaders, the Reverend Daniel L. Marsh, had openly complained that the church was "muzzled by rich pew-holders" and that now was the time for change.[4]

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY: A JOURNAL OF MID-ATLANTIC STUDIES, VOL. 84, NO. 1, 2017.
Copyright © 2017 The Pennsylvania Historical Association

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Theological divisions also rattled Protestant Americans in the years around World War I as fundamentalists reacted to the rise of liberalism, also known as modernism, in two denominations with a strong presence in Pittsburgh. Northern Baptists, with 10,229 members in 1916, and the northern Presbyterian Church (USA), with 59,551 members in the same year, together accounted for nearly a third of the PCC's membership rolls. Both denominations experienced bitter divisions on the national level during these years over competing interpretations of the Bible that could easily have led to rifts in Pittsburgh's Baptist and Presbyterian communities.[5]

By appearances, it might have seemed that the ecumenical-minded PCC was born at the wrong time as its early momentum—aided by wartime mobilization efforts in 1917 and 1918—faced a series of roadblocks beginning in 1919: labor strikes, Red Scare anxieties, cultural, ethnic, and racial clashes. Yet despite these challenges, member congregations remained committed to the agenda of the PCC through the tumult that soon followed its founding, accumulating an impressive record of voluntary service and reform advocacy. Claiming to represent 83 percent of Allegheny County's 235,182 Protestant church members in a city of 1,018,463 by a 1916 count—at the time one of the largest metropolitan areas in the United States—PCC leaders enlisted hundreds of clergy and laypeople in a variety of undertakings.[6] By the late twenties, they had conducted several local surveys of conditions in various neighborhoods, encouraged members to participate in existing reform organizations, sought to assimilate recently arrived African Americans and immigrants, and established a Morals Court providing mentors to young law-breakers, among dozens of other noteworthy undertakings. Under the spirited leadership of two Pittsburgh-area clergymen—Presbyterian Charles Reed Zahniser and Methodist Daniel L. Marsh—the PCC presented a unified front and underscored that its thousands of members cared enough about the welfare of the Steel City to fight for its improvement.[7]

The story of the Social Gospel in Pittsburgh has received limited attention from historians, most of that dealing with efforts in the years leading up to World War I before the formation of the PCC in 1916. Keith Zahniser, in particular, has written extensively about Protestant elites' efforts to mobilize the city's churches behind the cause of municipal reform beginning in the late 1880s, but his coverage ends with the dissolution of the Christian Social Service Union in 1916.[8] In studies about religion in Pittsburgh, furthermore, it is often the assumption that Protestant churches protected the robber-baron class while turning a blind eye to their victims suffering in the mills

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and the immigrant hovels.[9] Although there were factions within the churches and some clergy who were loyal to the interests of Pittsburgh's captains of industry, their influence was waning by the second decade of the twentieth century as the values of Progressivism and reform gained popular support. Increasingly, churchgoers and Pittsburgh-area ministers sympathized with the plight of the immigrant laborer in his or her neighborhood and at work, even if they shied from openly confronting the ruling capitalist class.

The growing chorus of journalistic pieces, detailed urban studies, and the prodding of churchgoing citizens had awakened this sizable Protestant population of congregations to the problems in their own back yard and by 1910 the cause of social Christianity gained momentum. Implied in many sermons and editorials was the argument that if this Protestant ruling class did not repent of their negligence, God might take away their custodial role over Pittsburgh's affairs and give it to an alien people. Now was the time to act, they believed, and under the diplomatic leadership of Daniel Marsh and Charles Reed Zahniser, hundreds stepped up to the call to service. The decade of service and reform advocacy that followed demonstrates that many of Pittsburgh's Protestants were eager to set aside their differences to face—in a united front—the perceived threats of immigration, urban poverty, vice, political corruption, the exploitation of workers, and the growing tide of secularism. Establishment anxieties had a lot to do with why this regional subculture so robustly engaged in voluntarism in the Steel City between 1916 and 1929, illustrating the hopes and insecurities of Protestant Americans during this time.[10]

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL SERVICE AND THE FORMATION OF THE PITTSBURGH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES IN 1916

The Pittsburgh Council of Churches (PCC) started the new year of 1917 with a recruitment drive and quickly had thousands of laypersons enlisted in a variety of causes, but this strong start had been three decades in the making. The earliest significant efforts at activism emanated in the 1880s from Calvary Episcopal Church in the wealthy East End suburbs where the Reverend George Hodges was rector from 1881 to 1894. Hodges was committed to the Social Gospel, a movement among British and American Protestants deemphasizing individual salvation, instead stressing using the resources of the churches to address poverty, worker exploitation, pollution,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and other problems caused by rapid industrialization and urbanization. Typical of his fellow Social Gospelers, Hodges expressed a desire to bring Christian ideals "out of the distant sky into [the] streets" of American cities, calling for "fraternal love" in a time when many celebrated Gilded Age individualism.[11] Historian Henry May describes Hodges as a pivotal early voice in the emerging Social Gospel, as important a Christian reform advocate as such luminaries as Washington Gladden, R. Heber Newton, Philip S. Moxom, F. G. Peabody, Lyman Abbott, Charles Stelzle, Josiah Strong, and Graham Taylor.[12] Preaching his progressive Christian convictions, George Hodges spurred his well-to-do Calvary Episcopal congregation to lead the fight for honest and just government, housing reform, temperance, and aid to the unemployed in Pittsburgh during the 1890s and into the first decade of the twentieth century.[13]

Calvary Church produced laypersons who contributed significantly to the reform cause in the Steel City at this time: Henry D. W. English, president of the Chamber of Commerce and chairman of the Pittsburgh Civic Commission; George Guthrie, a pioneering anti-machine reformer who was elected mayor of Pittsburgh in 1906; attorney George R. Wallace, who was executive secretary of the reforming Voters' League; Judge Joseph Buffington of the city's orphan court; industrialist and US Congress member James W. Brown; and H. Kirke Porter, (also a businessman-congressman) who served with the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the Western Pennsylvania Institute for the Blind. Calvary Church's well-connected parishioners—members of the old Pittsburgh social elite—were joined in their early efforts by other citizens and organizations sympathetic with the reform cause such as the Reverend C. E. St. John of First Unitarian Church, businessman Oliver McClintock of Second Presbyterian, the United Presbyterian Ministerial Association, the founders of the Kingsley House settlement, and those involved in congregational women's organizations. At this stage, this small regional coalition of reformers was comprised of upper-class families with a strong sense of *noblesse oblige* and idealistic clergy and church members who all wanted to challenge civic neglect and corruption in municipal government.[14]

Despite their tireless efforts, the Social Gospel movement in Pittsburgh in the 1890s and the first decade of the twentieth century did not attract much support from the city's massive Protestant church population; most of its momentum, instead, came from the contributions of this relatively small number of citizen-reformers who eventually grew weary in their lonely

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

fight for municipal reform.[15] Illustrative of this undertaking by the city's patrician class of Social Gospel activism was the 1906 election of Pittsburgh mayor George Guthrie. Although a reform candidate through and through who called for revived democracy, he hailed from one of the city's founding families and believed that it was primarily the job of the ruling class to fix the city's problems.[16] As much as he and other Social Gospel advocates attempted to attract the mass of Protestant churchgoers to their cause, the fact remains that their overriding tendency was to approach reform through the existing circles of Pittsburgh's elite classes and the various civic organizations they had traveled in for decades.

As Keith Zahniser has underscored, there was a disjoint between this first wave of Social Gospel activists—and their strident calls to uproot vice, graft, and corruption in city government—and the broader Protestant middle-class constituency. What this first generation of Pittsburgh-area Social Gospel reformers like George Guthrie and Henry D. W. English did accomplish, however, was to plant the seed of the idea of citizen-based activism that would come to fruition—in a modified form—in the next generation of Protestants who made the PCC their primary outlet. The PCC involved a far greater percentage of the area's churches and laypeople than the first wave of Social Gospel efforts, even if it dropped overt calls for sweeping municipal reform—a cause that stirred controversy, for the feeling among churches was that direct political advocacy was not the appropriate role of the clergy. Instead, the PCC rallied around attempts to assist the needy through volunteering and encouraged laypeople and clergy to participate in existing municipal reform organizations of their own choosing, a message with a wider appeal.[17]

What also helped to win over the middle-class Protestant constituency in Pittsburgh were the writings of journalists and survey investigators who did their part to expose blighted areas to the Pittsburgh public. Although there were dozens of magazine pieces about Pittsburgh written by morally outraged journalists in the decades following the Civil War, the most influential was an article by Lincoln Steffens entitled "Pittsburg: A City Ashamed," appearing in the reformist *McClure's Magazine* in 1904. For this investigative writer whose famous book *The Shame of the Cities* (1904) did much to awaken the public to the corrupt alliance between industry and municipal government in several American cities, Pittsburgh was one of the worst; as he phrased it so colorfully, the Steel City was "hell with the lid on." To Steffens, the Pittsburgh industrial class had quietly built up their millions in the iron

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and steel industry, but in the process "despoiled the government," "let it be despoiled, and bowed to the despoiling boss." Like journalists writing before him, Steffens linked the ruling business class of Pittsburgh to the area's Protestant churches as he pointed to the "Scotch Presbyterians and Protestant Irish" as the larger religious-ethnic subculture to which the city's robber barons retreated. Steffens did acknowledge the activism of the "strong minority" of Social Gospel citizen-laypersons from Calvary and other religious circles who opposed this corrupt alliance between the steel industry and the city's Flinn-Magee Republican machine. But he noted that theirs was a "long, brave [and lonely] fight" against such entrenched forces and that the public had not rallied around them quite as they hoped.[18]

Others soon echoed Steffens's well-received muckraking critique of Pittsburgh as a city run by the steel industry, financial interests, and a Republican machine whose questionable decisions Protestant churches seemed willing to turn a blind eye to. The *Pittsburgh Survey* of 1907 and 1908, for instance, was a path-breaking sociological study that exposed unpleasant facts about impoverished neighborhoods and worker exploitation in the mills and factories in the Steel City. Initiated by a small group of professional and business elites including some of the pioneers of the Social Gospel movement such as then-mayor George Guthrie, William H. Matthews of the Kingsley House settlement, H. D. W. English of the Chamber of Commerce, and US circuit court judge Joseph Buffington, the *Pittsburgh Survey* revealed a city in peril.[19] Investigator Edward Divine, for example, described a business culture obsessed with profits, even at the expense of the welfare of tens of thousands laboring in the mills. Holding the owners and managers of the factories responsible, Divine described Pittsburgh's prevailing culture of "absentee capitalism" and noted the "incredible amount of overwork by everybody," particularly those in the steel mills and the railroad yards. Immigrant family life was in a state of "destruction," Divine concluded, as the "great majority of [male] laborers" suffered under inadequate wages while women's wages were still lower than men's.[20] Protestant churches, in the opinion of these investigators, offered a moralistic piety that directed attention away from more pressing structural economic problems and focused instead on personal spirituality and the afterlife. Divine found the churches a cause of concern, stating that their "orthodox spirit" of Calvinism—a reference to the Presbyterian churches that held such sway in the region—focused on "outward moral decorum" while the city's real problems festered.[21] Investigator John Fitch similarly complained of wealthy and influential congregations with an

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

"individual, not social" emphasis while the opportunity for "organized Christian service" against the great injustices of their day passed by.[22]

As other *Pittsburgh Survey* investigators highlighted dysfunction in politics, health, housing, women's employment, and water treatment, there was a common refrain: Pittsburgh was a city whose leaders excelled in profit-making, but invested little of their resources in civic efficiency or workplace justice. The Protestant churches, furthermore, were complicit in this neglect and ought to be held accountable.[23] The *Survey* found a sympathetic national audience upon its publication in 1908 and the finger-pointing directed at the city's Protestant middle and upper classes helped awaken a new attitude.[24] In 1910, for instance, when a Voters League investigation into the Pittsburgh City Council revealed bribery and vice-related corruption, the public was outraged and Social Gospel leaders helped other reformers draft a proposal called the Pittsburgh Plan. It went to the state capital of Harrisburg the following year and passed only with most of its critical reform measures removed, but nonetheless served as a defining moment for the city. The general public—including the churches—was now awakened and demanded more responsible government, much to the relief of the city's old Social Gospel circle of reformers than had been pointing to the same issues for years.

The reform cause in Pittsburgh also benefited from the Men and Religion Forward Movement campaign in 1912, which attracted many from Protestant denominations in western Pennsylvania and had a significant influence on American religion for the next several years.[25] This interdenominational event involved male church members in evangelism and social service activities, laying the groundwork for the formation of the Christian Social Service Commission (CSSU) in Pittsburgh in 1912. At the outset, the Pittsburgh-based CSSU claimed 400 member congregations from Baptist, Christian, Congregational, Evangelical Association, Lutheran, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Presbyterian, Reformed Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Reformed, United Brethren, United Evangelical, and United Presbyterian denominations.[26] Building on themes from the 1910 Voters League investigation two years earlier, the CSSU focused on moral government concerns such as agitating for the enforcement of antiprostitution laws, restricting the licensing of saloons and the distribution of liquor, reform of the court system to reduce the power of local wards and aldermen, and surveys of distressed industrial neighborhoods. Its leaders shared Steffens's critique that cities like Pittsburgh throughout the United States were run not

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

only by corrupt and self-interested machine politicians, but also by the business interests that kept them in power. With this belief in mind, leaders in the CSSU pushed vigorous municipal reform agenda and made politics and the idea of moral government a front-and-center theme. The CSSU, therefore, set out to continue to expose the Protestant church members in their constituency to the greatest problems in the governance of the city and then to recruit them to citizen-based and voter-based solutions. Throughout its four years of existence, however, the CSSU continued to walk the fine line between advocating for moral government and industry without explicit political advocacy, an ambiguity ultimately leading to its dissolution.[27]

THE LAUNCHING OF THE PITTSBURGH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES IN JANUARY 1917

Even if it fell short of its goal of mobilizing the vast majority of Pittsburgh's Protestant churches, the 1912 formation of the CSSU was an important moment for the city's Social Gospel movement. It demonstrated that a growing number in Pittsburgh's various denominational bodies and congregations were committed to the idea of church-based voluntarism in one shape or another. One of the reasons for the CSSU's successful achievements was the emergence of two talented young clergymen at the time—Charles Reed Zahniser (1873–1955) and Daniel L. Marsh (1880–1968)—who would prove indispensable in mobilizing the city's Protestants in the decade and a half to come. Although both from families with deep roots in Pennsylvania, neither was part of the tight-knit circle of elites who essentially ran the city and resided in the East End suburbs where Calvary Episcopal was located. This relative outsider status may have aided them in relating to—and winning over—ordinary middle-class churchgoers who helped make the PCC so successful later on. Charles Reed Zahniser, born in Mercer County, north of Pittsburgh, grew up Presbyterian in a region where five out of ten Protestants belonged to either the Presbyterian or the United Presbyterian denomination.[28] After theological studies at the University of Chicago, he returned to Pittsburgh in 1901 to form the Lemington Presbyterian Church, became involved with the Anti-Saloon League, and in 1912 assumed the position of executive secretary of the CSSU, where he also served as the editor of its periodical, the *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook*. During his career, Zahniser also authored several titles on the Social Gospel, his 1911 *Social Christianity* being

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

his first and most explicit expression of his understanding of what Christian activism should be. The "Social Question," as he described it, required Protestant clergy and laypeople to act "clearly and honestly" and demanded they confront the injustices caused by "absentee capitalism."[29]

Zahniser could boast the highest Social Gospel credentials and would one day correspond sympathetically with labor leader William Z. Foster during the Great Steel Strike of 1919. His books lambasted that workers were "little more than part of the [industrial] machine" and he aligned himself with Social Gospel mainstays such as Shailer Matthews, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Francis Greenwood Peabody, declaring the old individualistic evangelism "insufficient." Zahniser also had orthodox leanings and stated often that social redemption required more than improved housing, neighborhoods, factory sites, and an overhaul of the city's political culture. Revealing his more conservative Presbyterian tendencies, Zahniser often claimed that the "reality of sin" in the individual was also a cause of social problems, a view that he was aware aligned him with "the great mass of Christian people."[30] His interest in balancing Social Gospel aims with more traditional orthodox Christian ideas such as personal sinfulness would serve him well in Pittsburgh, where the average Protestant churchgoer leaned more to the orthodox end of the spectrum.

Daniel L. Marsh, like his friend Zahniser, was the right leader at the right time and used his talents to draw his fellow Methodists together behind many charitable and public-minded causes. Born in 1880 in West Newton, Pennsylvania, southeast of Pittsburgh, Marsh descended from English Quakers who had settled the eastern end of the state in the late seventeenth century with William Penn. After attending public primary and secondary schools, he collected a variety of degrees blending a study of society with the traditions of Methodism: bachelor's and master's degrees from Northwestern University, a year with that university's settlement house in Chicago in 1906, and ordination two years later after theological studies at University of Chicago Divinity School, the Garrett Biblical Institute, and the Boston University School of Theology. Very much in step with the times, he soon engaged in Progressive Era causes as well: he entered Pittsburgh's conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1903, taught for a time in West Newton's township schools, and, like Zahniser, was also a member of the Anti-Saloon League, and served as a minister in Monaca, just northwest of Pittsburgh. In just a few years at this post, he not only built a new church, but helped increase its membership by 400 percent.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

The Methodist congregations in western Pennsylvania were impressed enough with his work that, in 1913 at the age of thirty-three, he was appointed superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church Union in Pittsburgh. In that role, Marsh raised $1 million for the denomination's work there and oversaw the construction of several new churches, a farm retreat for city youth, a children's home, a Goodwill Industries plant, and the launching of philanthropic and evangelistic missions to fourteen different ethnic communities in Pittsburgh. He took a position at the Smithfield Street Methodist congregation in the city and gained a reputation as a young clergyman with a special rapport with the public. At this downtown location, for instance, he also began to deliver radio addresses in the 1920s on the nation's first commercial radio station, KDKA, drawing the attention of the average churchgoer and the public at large.[31]

The mobilization effort for World War I in 1917 enjoyed widespread support among not only American Protestant denominations, but Jewish and Catholic bodies as well, and Daniel Marsh proved to be in step with the times by volunteering as a chaplain for the YMCA: he served on several transport voyages with troops across the Atlantic, on the Chateau-Thierry front and as director of lectures and religious activities at Chaumont, General Pershing's headquarters.[32] Marsh accompanied five different divisions as a special lecturer and was awarded status as an honorary faculty of the French army interpreter's school, making him an exemplar of patriotic service for the war effort; the Great War in Europe was a cause that many Progressives believed was a holy crusade for righteousness and would make the world a more just and democratic place.[33]

Aside from having these two public-minded clergymen with an acute sensitivity to their times, it also helped that they had a friendship borne of mutual respect. When Marsh left Pittsburgh in 1926 to begin a tenure as Boston University's fourth president, for instance, he brought his old friend Zahniser in 1929 to serve as professor of applied Christianity for the duration of his professional career. As president of Boston University, Marsh displayed his talent for getting things done as he had in Pittsburgh: by 1930 he had overseen the move to a new fifteen-acre campus in the Charles River, established the university's College of Music, raised $4.3 million for its endowment, and oversaw an increase in student enrollment from 10,000 in 1926 to 15,445 in 1930, making Boston University the largest educational institution in New England. Marsh would retire in 1951 after this long and noteworthy period of service at this Methodist-affiliated institution with the satisfaction

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

that he had fulfilled many of his dreams for improving American public life. Much like his fellow Pittsburgh reformer Zahniser, Marsh saw true societal transformation as the outgrowth of putting into action the "two sides of Christianity": the "devotional, worshiping spirit" that "links the individual to God," and the "ethical" side that "links us socially to our fellows."[34]

The religious sensibilities and political skills of these two leaders would prove vital in keeping the Social Gospel alive in Pittsburgh as the Christian Social Service Union struggled in 1914 and 1915. The most common complaint about the CSSU was that its calls for moral government were pulling the churches into direct political advocacy, which many felt was not the role of the Christian church. Their belief was that the church ought to advocate for religious and spiritual principles, but steer clear of explicit political activism or endorsement of specific candidates.[35] Other things doomed the CSSU by 1916, one being the complaint that it did not speak for the congregations it claimed to represent. There was some truth to this criticism, as its policies and priorities were not subject to denominational approval, nor were there formal elective processes by which committee members achieved their posts. Furthermore, its funding—an annual budget of a meager $5,000—came not from member churches or denominational bodies but rather from individuals interested in its specific reform undertakings who might easily appear to have a secret agenda.[36] The topic of labor reform, for instance, was a touchy one in Pittsburgh, and the CSSU's efforts to advocate for industrial workers often drew fire. In its four years of operation the CSSU had found some support among the churches for investigative surveys, municipal reform, and anti-vice and anti-prostitution efforts. But its efforts to deal with controversial subjects such as labor reform met more pointed resistance from powerful factions within some Presbyterian congregations with direct ties to the steel mills.[37] This was most likely the "small coterie of Conservatives" that well-known Social Gospel labor advocate Charles Stelzle wrote about in his autobiography, a faction he felt was responsible for forcing his resignation from the Presbyterian Bureau of Social Service in 1913.[38]

Theological differences also helped kill the Christian Social Service Union, as conservatives often complained that the Social Gospel prioritized reform at the expense of the Bible, spirituality, and historic doctrines. For example, conservative Presbyterian figures like the Reverend Maitland Alexander of First Presbyterian downtown and the Reverend George Montgomery, superintendent of the Presbytery of Pittsburgh, regularly

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

stated that the ultimate purpose of the church was "the teaching of the Bible" and the saving of souls.[39] Social betterment mattered to both these Presbyterian leaders, but the primary task of the church to them was a moral and spiritual one, to preserve timeless truths and to facilitate the encounter of people with the supernatural. Methodists in Pittsburgh were often as ambivalent to social service, exhibiting a "parochial selfishness" toward reform, in the words of Daniel Marsh in 1920, and contented as long as Sunday school attendance was high and congregational rolls rose as well.[40]

In the end, though, apathy—and not active resistance—was probably the biggest obstacle to laity support of the CSSU; for instance, the Episcopalian Diocesan Social Service Commission complained in 1915 that its chief problem was trying to convince the average Episcopalian parishioner that "social service is indeed of paramount importance."[41] The Anti-Saloon League had long complained of the same problem, citing in 1904 that most congregations failed to elect representatives to serve on its governing body, even if they supported the ASLs goals in principle.[42] Reform advocates in the conservative United Presbyterian denomination used their weekly publication to underscore that it was possible to retain an orthodox theology and still support social service, but it was an uphill fight. "It is incumbent on the good people of all our cities to unite their forces in the purification and upbuilding," wrote the *United Presbyterian* in 1912, typical of its decades-long pleas for lay participation in Social Gospel causes.[43]

Part of the reason that it was so easy for the middle- and upper-class Protestant population to turn a blind eye to social problems was due to Pittsburgh's changing demographics in the late nineteenth century. In the 1880s and 1890s, middle-class residents of German, Irish, and English descent migrated from the central industrial district, where pollution and overcrowding was a growing problem, toward quieter streetcar suburbs. Industrialization of the old downtown nudged city-dwellers out and a fast-growing population made the greener communities of Oakland, Squirrel Hill, Shadyside, Wilkinsburg, Allegheny City (called the North Side or North Shore today) and Mt. Washington attractive alternatives. Other suburban neighborhoods catering to old elite families of Irish Protestant and German descent likewise flourished; evidence of the prosperity of these new suburbs was the fact that East Liberty (on the East End) housed two-thirds of the city's wealthy population by 1915. Working-class neighborhoods also became more clearly defined, and easier to ignore, as crowded

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

hillsides or narrow strips of land beside rivers near the steel mills provided affordable housing for the recently arrived. By the 1880s these neighborhoods had high concentrations of African Americans, Russian Jews, Poles, Hungarians, Croatians, and Italians; the segregation of the city by class and ethnicity became solidified.[44] To the city's suburban middle class and elite families in Pittsburgh's greener suburbs, it was all the easier to perceive these neighborhoods as wholly other: dirtier, more raucous, Catholic or otherwise religiously alien, vice-ridden, subject to machine political influence, and beyond redemption.

One of the goals of the PCC was to rectify this disjoint between middle- and upper-class streetcar suburbs and the working-class neighborhoods in the city's industrial districts. By and large, they succeeded in using the CSSU's earlier efforts as a building block to bring together a much larger percentage of Pittsburgh's Protestant congregations to advocate for and volunteer in several service enterprises. Beginning its work on January 1, 1917, as a direct successor to the CSSU, the PCC also absorbed an older evangelistic organization and the City Missions Council, an outreach effort to immigrants formed in 1914.[45] A successful Billy Sunday revival crusade also that year had further stirred the churches and demonstrated that cooperation across denominational lines was possible and potentially fruitful.[46] The PCC's charter laid out clearly that executive officers and committee membership posts were to be filled by vote of member congregations; churches with more dues-paying members had a greater say than those with less.[47]

By the end of its first year of operation in late 1917, the PCC claimed twelve member denominations and by the end of its second year of operation, fifteen; all told, 83 percent of Allegheny County's Protestant church members belonged.[48] After the first election, member congregations selected Charles Reed Zahniser as executive secretary, a position he held until 1929 when the Reverend W. I. Wishart of Eighth United Presbyterian Church was elected president.[49] Between the two of them, Marsh—as superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Union—and Zahniser—as one of the region's most visible Presbyterians or United Presbyterians—represented 137,023 of the city's 235,182 Protestant church members. This was nearly 60 percent of the city's total Protestant population and underscores the extent to which these two charismatic clergymen-reformers were in the right place at the right time, that their message was reaching an audience.[50] By many measures, the PCC was off to an auspicious start.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

THE CHALLENGE OF PITTSBURGH AND THE CALL TO REPENTANCE

The success of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches in 1917 was the result of these factors, but its coincidental overlap with the American war mobilization effort could not have better timing, providing momentum for the PCC's ecumenical efforts in 1917, 1918, and into 1919. Support for American entry in the Great War in the spring of 1917 had much to do with anti-German sentiments, but it also drew on deep reserves of religious optimism: as William Leuchtenburg phrased it, "American moral idealism" and "Christian democratic ideals" converged in new ways and helped unify millions of Protestants behind the war effort.[51] Even before American entry, English-derived denominations in the eastern United States like Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Episcopalians were already inclined to support the Allies.[52]

Once Congress declared war in 1917, church leaders in the United States—like their counterparts in Europe—endorsed the war as nothing less than a holy crusade with rhetoric that was both militaristic as well as full of idealism. Congregational clergyman Lyman Abbott, for instance, was typical of liberal Social Gospelers in casting the Great War as an opportunity to mobilize American churches behind the antipoverty cause at home and democracy abroad.[53] The YMCA, through which Daniel Marsh volunteered, worked closely with the US War Department and became the greatest conduit for Protestant laity and clergy volunteers. All told, 11,000 civilian service personnel accompanied the armed forces to Europe, a greater number assisted the military at home, and the United Fund Drive of 1918 broke records as it raised $200 million for the cause of victory—all of these were the result of this remarkable mobilizing of American Protestants.[54] This accomplishment was as much a local affair as it was something coordinated through agencies such as the Red Cross, the Federal Council of Churches (FCC), or the YMCA, as individual congregations served as neighborhood posts whereby millions of citizens could do their part. Church membership and attendance peaked in 1917 and 1918 and, as it turned out, the Great War in Europe probably did more to unify the Protestant churches than had previous ecumenical efforts such as the formation of the FCC in 1908.[55]

At the war's end, furthermore, leaders like YMCA's John R. Mott and Presbyterian layman Robert E. Speer moved quickly to capitalize on the momentum of the wartime Protestant effort and established the Interchurch

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

World Movement (IWM) in December of 1918. Although doomed to a very brief life due to unrealistic fundraising goals and other problems, the IWM illustrates the soaring confidence and sense of unified mission that characterized American Protestantism from the spring of 1917 to late 1919, after which a series of events undercut these strong feelings of togetherness.[56] Therefore the coincidental timing of the launch of the PCC with the war itself could not have been better; in the end it helped propel the organization forward in its first two years.

In this atmosphere of war rhetoric and talk of holy crusades for social righteousness, the newly formed PCC conducted its first major undertaking in 1916, a survey of the city's demographic, religious, industrial, municipal, and vice-related conditions. Published as a book and broadly disseminated following its release in January of 1917, *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* was authored by Methodist Daniel Marsh, but in conjunction with representatives from Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, Baptist, and Congregationalist bodies.[57] Repentance from sin was a strong theme in *The Challenge of Pittsburgh*, as Marsh scolded suburban dwellers who turned a blind eye to "wretched housing conditions" on their way to and from work in the city while retreating to "a good residential section" on the city's outskirts where they spent their evenings "buried in a newspaper." Echoing the 1907–8 *Pittsburgh Survey* findings, Marsh also chastised the ruling class of the city—from the rich industrialist to any one of his white-collared employees—for an "excessive devotion to money-making," perpetuating a "ruthless," "greedy," and "selfish" system. Shamelessly allying with municipal authorities, these individuals at the helm of the city's "predatory" financial interests allowed vice and poverty to fester while becoming wealthy, a situation that was, in Marsh's words, "utterly indefensible."

Careful not to alienate his own constituency with too much finger-pointing, Marsh also challenged the industrial worker to repent of his evident weakness for "drunkenness, improvidence, political corruption, ignorance, superstition, [and] the social evil [prostitution]." The vices of the immigrant worker, the self-satisfaction of the suburban middle class, and the greed of the industrial elite all, asserted Marsh, had "questions of [individual] character at root." Indeed, as he summarized this perspective, "every evil that disturbs the world today [was] reducible in the last analysis to a question of character" and remedies had to begin with a person's decision to change, accompanied by designs to improve social environment and institutions.[58] The blame for Pittsburgh's problems therefore lay everywhere—rich, poor,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and middle-class—and the solution was in a blend of spiritual repentance and practical service by all.

The tone of *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* drew on a tradition of rhetoric clearly laid out in a Social Gospel's manifesto, Josiah Strong's 1885 *Our Country*: bring Christianity and civilization to every corner of the continent, or face serious repercussions. As Strong wrote in this influential publication, "If a community [fails to] produce good citizens and able men," "their descendants [would eventually be] displaced by some other stock," who were "alien in blood, and religion, and in civilization."[59] Protestants in Pittsburgh expressed similar fears about their own tenuous status as a religious-ethnic Anglo-American establishment, especially as the foreign-born Catholic population continued to grow in the early twentieth century. Calls for repentance, a style of rhetoric originally from Puritan New England known as the Jeremiad, were ubiquitous in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era from voices as diverse as clergymen and social satirists.[60]

Setting the stage for the Jeremiad tone in *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* were decades of scathing critiques by journalists and other observers appalled at the city's unsightliness and inefficiency. Baltimore journalist H. L. Mencken, for instance, once wrote that "no sane man would be a Pittsburgher if he could help it," that the "soil there is of a peculiar quality, being composed of almost equal parts of coal dust, grease and garbage."[61] Historian Roy Lubove wrote that Pittsburgh was so infamous for its ugliness and the selfishness of its ruling class that it was an "old pastime" among journalists to compete over who could best capture the city's repulsiveness in words. As he writes, "Pittsburgh would have emerged as the envy of America if scabrous criticism alone could reconstruct a city."[62] This growing chorus of mockery and disdain over the decades following the Civil War led to Jeremiad-styled warnings about the dire consequences facing Pittsburgh's prominent citizens if they failed to live up to the requirements of their custodial role. The Reverend George Hodges of Calvary Episcopal Church, for example, in 1892 described poverty as a pressing concern that Jesus called believers to confront, "or pay the fearful penalty."[63] In similar tones, Daniel Marsh framed *Challenge of Pittsburgh* as exactly that: a kind of last warning to step up and face poverty and corruption, to "destroy unchristian social conditions," or face divine consequences of disobedience.[64]

Despite the longstanding pattern of apathy among the city's average churchgoers when faced with calls for voluntary social service, the response to *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* was enthusiastic as the first printing

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

of 5,000 copies sold out immediately and another printing was ordered a few months later in October of 1917. Congregational bulletin boards and denominational periodicals likewise advertised its agenda and many civic leaders praised its message.[65] *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* called churchgoers to attack the centers of corruption and greed in financial-industrial sectors, municipal government, and the vice trade associated with saloons, gambling, and prostitution. Careful to avoid advocating directly in the political realm and stir ill feelings. as had the CSSU, *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* encouraged the laity to join existing reform organizations such as those within public schools, the city's libraries, the Allied Boards of Trade consisting of thirty-six civic organizations and 10,000 members, the Civic Club of Allegheny County, the Associated Charities and its auxiliaries, the YMCA and YWCA, the Hungry Club, and the Allegheny County Sabbath Association.[66] A back-handed compliment to *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* came in the form of a denouncement by none other than the *National Liquor Dealers' Journal*, which stated that its readers needed to fight the "Rev. Daniel Marshes of the country."[67]

In line with its aim of rousing the Protestant church members of the city, many ministers discussed its findings in their sermons and its content was the subject of hundreds of Bible studies, young people's societies, and women's groups. North Presbyterian Church, for instance, drew an average of seventy-five people in successive Wednesday night prayer meetings and the Perrysville Avenue Community Class enrolled 156 people for four classes taught by the Reverend Charles Zahniser.[68]

To follow through on *The Challenge of Pittsburgh*'s call to arms in the name of social Christianity, Zahniser, Marsh, and other PCC leaders spoke to Allegheny County congregations, seminaries, and civic and reform organizations to improve Pittsburgh's industrial, housing, and political conditions. To encourage stricter enforcement of existing vice and crime laws and improvement of political practices, the PCC maintained close ties in subsequent years with the Ministerial Union, the Civic Club of Allegheny County, and the Voters' League. The Council's Social Service Commission channeled citizen complaints to city officials, assisted in investigations about city council activities, and published articles in various periodicals on issues of law enforcement. Although it never specifically endorsed a political party or specific candidate, the PCC did consistently encourage its members to "vote intelligently" and especially advocated the enforcement of Prohibition laws in the early 1920s, which they associated with the eradication of gambling, worker

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

inefficiency and endangerment, spousal abuse and neglect, immigrant poverty, and political corruption. Its members were encouraged to vote from a Christian conscience on legislation concerning "dependency, delinquency, sex-control, industrial relations and public health."[69]

In the estimation of Zahniser, the PCC's "most significant constructive project" was persuading the city to establish a Morals Court in 1918. When reformer-attorney George R. Wallace approached him in 1914 about corruption and incompetence in Allegheny County's police courts (calling them "the rottenest thing in the city"), Zahniser traveled to Chicago to study William Healy's reform efforts there in the juvenile criminal courts. Thereafter, Zahniser and other Social Gospel leaders lobbied the mayor and city council members until, in the face of public outcry, they created a centralized court in 1918 taking all cases of a "moral" nature: those involving women, minors, crimes of a sexual nature, families, and gambling.[70] The mayor appointed an experienced social worker, former head of the Voters League, and Calvary Episcopal Church parishioner named Tensard De Wolf as a special magistrate whose tough-minded idealism made him well suited for the job. The primary concern of reformers like De Wolf was that the city's police courts had been sending thousands of adolescent boys and girls to jail for minor offenses where they "were being taught how to be professional criminals" by the other inmates.[71] If not incarcerated, juvenile offenders were instead being sent back to the same neighborhoods where they had first learned their criminal ways; both options, reformers believed, left impressionable young people in the kinds of environments that enabled law-breaking and immorality. In contrast, Tensard De Wolf would use the Morals Court to determine what influences were encouraging these 5,000-plus boys and girls appearing before his court every year to rebel, prescribe a well-conceived corrective course, and in doing so would be uprooting the problem closer to its source. De Wolf also aimed to influence the peers of these young people—many of whom were in gangs—to change the social culture of street kids toward "useful social ends."[72]

In addition to helping reform Pittsburgh's criminal justice system, the Morals Court was also a conduit for Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish citizens to volunteer their time as mentors to the youths appearing before Judge De Wolf. After thorough examination of the juvenile offender's mental health, De Wolf assigned a small percentage of them deemed suitable to adult mentors in a "Big Brothers" program. Mentors were drawn from existing agencies with connections to religious communities such as the Jewish Big

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Brothers, the YMCA, the Urban League, and the Catholic Big Brothers and drew some of the city's most wealthy and prominent citizens. Big Brother and Big Sister mentors were expected to maintain communication with their charges, hold them accountable for school attendance and work, and were also expected to serve as "a friend, counselor, and to some degree, an associate" in the spirit of religious idealism and charity.[73] In 1925 one *Literary Digest* journalist praised the Morals Court as "a masterpiece of social coordination" and noted that many of the city's "richest and most influential business and professional men of Pittsburgh" had befriended these youngsters, encouraging them to join churches, taking them to the movies, to the swimming pool, to a baseball or football game, and eventually helping them find gainful employment.[74] The president of the Pittsburgh city council commented, similarly, that the Morals Court would never have come into existence "had it not been for the Council of Churches" and would not have lasted "three months" had the churches not been "back of it!"[75] One observer speaking for the *National Municipal Review* praised the "regenerative work of the court" and described it as the outgrowth of the "social conscience and energy of the city."[76] The Morals Court only ended up assigning between 5 and 10 percent of offenders who appeared before Judge De Wolf with personal mentors from these religious communities.[77] Regular PCC reports, furthermore, revealed that a high percentage of these juvenile offenders were unredeemable and ended up as repeat offenders, in various reformatories, or in prison. Nonetheless, the presence and success of the Morals Court in turning at least some lives in the right direction were enough that it became a tremendous symbolic achievement for social Christianity advocates and reformers in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area.

OBSTACLE TO UNITY: THE GREAT STEEL STRIKE OF 1919

The backdrop to the achievements of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches were two highly divisive controversies that easily could have derailed its energetic start in 1917 through the next two years: the 1919 steel strike and the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the early twenties. The first of these lasted from September 22, 1919, to January 7, 1920, involved more than 300,000 steelworkers—the bulk of whom resided in Pittsburgh—and was the largest in American history.[78] This major labor event had its roots in the economic and political atmosphere of the United States following the war's

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

end in 1918. Congress had dismantled wartime agencies and unemployment shot up to 7 percent, a circumstance complicated by the fact that veterans were pouring into the labor market and competing for available jobs. The sense of chaos was exacerbated by the spread of the "Spanish influenza," a flu pandemic taking the lives of a half million Americans in 1918, and sickening 20 million others.[79]

With worker frustration growing in this tenuous economic climate, a massive confrontation between organized labor and management ensued in 1919 as the year witnessed 3,600 strikes involving 4 million American workers.[80] Seattle shipyard workers walked off their jobs in January, sparking a general strike involving 60,000 in that city and lasting several days. The mayor of Seattle and other city leaders lashed out at the Central Labor Council of Seattle and claimed the strike was the work of Bolshevik revolutionaries. Later that year, Boston policemen went on strike and, with no law enforcement personnel in place, looting and vandalism quickly ensued and an atmosphere of pandemonium prevailed. Massachusetts governor Calvin Coolidge responded to the situation swiftly and harshly, declaring that "there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time." As with these two major instances in 1919, strikers would usually find themselves portrayed as villains; the situation was little different in Pittsburgh.[81]

On September 22 William Z. Foster of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) rallied 250,000 steelworkers located in Midwestern and eastern cities in protest of unjust working conditions.[82] The steel industry, led by the massive United States Steel Corporation based in Pittsburgh, was infamous for widespread use of the twelve-hour day and seven-day week, low pay, and refusal to acknowledge labor unions. Most of the Pittsburgh strikers were foreign-born, unskilled, or semi-skilled. Steel mill employers hired armed guards to disperse picket lines and protect strikebreakers crossing them; police were so brutal in mill towns along the Monongahela River south of Pittsburgh that they garnered the name "Cossacks" as they disrupted meetings, brutalized strikers, and arrested workers without cause.[83] Judge Elbert Gary, head of US Steel, had the benefit of sympathetic newspapers in Pittsburgh and kept his mills running with nonunion labor. The public, by and large, took newspaper accounts as credible, sympathized with US Steel, and viewed the strikers as violent foreign agitators with little regard for law. The hostility of public opinion was significant enough in Pittsburgh and other cities that the AFL backed off of its demands and the strike ended January 7, 1920, having

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

gained none of its aims. The twelve-hour-day remained, as did the low wages; the entire labor movement in the United States was badly hurt and would not recover from the setback for over a decade.[84]

Two and a half years after its promising start, the PCC found itself in the middle of a labor crisis that was attracting international attention. The PCC faced a test of whether it could face the high standards of labor advocacy set in *The Challenge of Pittsburgh*, and that there could be "no peace in industry without justice."[85] In short, the PCC did not overwhelmingly rally the region's congregations to the side of striking steelworkers and was not able to facilitate tangible gains for labor. Critics from across the country lambasted the PCC for not doing enough to counter the claims of US Steel or Pittsburgh's several English-speaking newspapers, all of which sided with the employers against the strikers. Even more damning, by first appearances, is the fact that early in the strike, PCC executive secretary Charles Reed Zahniser specifically asked clergymen in the region "not to comment on the strike," an act of cowardice in the eyes of some outside pro-labor critics.[86]

Despite appearances, however, the facts are more complicated and demonstrate that the PCC made honest efforts to give the steelworkers a fair hearing with the public. In September 1919, just days after the strike began, the PCC immediately formed a committee to investigate the competing claims between labor and US Steel for the purposes of bringing the findings before their churchgoing constituents. By November, however, they transferred this work to the Interchurch World Movement (IWM, formed in 1918 by the Federal Council of Churches) to investigate the steel strike in sympathy with the oft-maligned immigrant steelworkers. Representing Methodist, United Evangelical, Baptist, Disciples, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, United Brethren, and Episcopalian national denominations, the IWM ran a field investigation in Pittsburgh beginning in October 1919 and sent its findings to Woodrow Wilson the following June. "Unless vital changes are brought to pass," this report stated to the president, "renewal of the conflict in this industry seems inevitable."[87]

Methodist bishop Francis J. McConnell, chairman of the IWM, defended the PCC's decision to dissolve its steel strike committee and hand that work off to the IWM. He responded to the "considerable criticism" directed at the PCC with the explanation that an outside organization like the IWM would be more objective, less subject to local sympathies and pressures, and could consider the strike not only in Pittsburgh, but in other affected cities far from western Pennsylvania. The PCC, furthermore, already was

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

controversial in Pittsburgh because some of its constituents viewed it as "too progressive from the beginning," making the investigation of a highly controversial labor strike even more of a potential problem for the fledgling organization.[88] McConnell highlighted that the PCC leadership and members actively facilitated its research, welcomed its field researchers arriving into town, and provided them "a place for their meetings." He also noted that they did their best to open "channels for interviews with steel manufacturers and labor leaders."[89] On December 14, 1919, in response to the Palmer raids and the general atmosphere of panic in the Red Scare after World War I, the PCC issued a statement calling for calm. It was to be read from every pulpit in PCC congregations and was sent to all Pittsburgh newspapers to be published the following Monday. It pleaded for sympathy, asking churchgoers to express a "real Christian attitude" to "neighbors of foreign birth," and for an end to segregated housing, "civic neglect," and "bad industrial policies."[90] Charles Zahniser corresponded with the AFL's William Z. Foster one month into the strike, asking him to clarify if he was, in fact, an advocate of violent revolution as an earlier pamphlet of his indicated. Foster clarified in a cordial response letter that this was "a number of years ago" and "my ideas have changed so radically" that there was no reason for alarm. Foster signed his letter "Fraternally yours" to Reverend Zahniser, and the two seemed to have an understanding that they were generally both seeking the same ends: justice for the steelworker.[91]

The Interchurch World Movement's investigation also revealed that the caricature of Pittsburgh-area Protestant clergymen turning a blind eye to industrial injustices was inaccurate. To the contrary, many clergy in Allegheny County were suspect of the newspapers' anti-steelworker claims and resented attempts on the part of town officials to shut down union meetings or manipulate public opinion. Ambrose Hering of the Lutheran Inner Mission Society, for instance, wrote in November 1919 that the strike was "but the symptom of a wide-spread social and economic unrest," lambasting the "poor misguided officials" who were "suppressing free speech and the right of assembly" and US Steel Corporation for making it seem that all foreigners were "Bolshevists [*sic*]" and "Reds, etc."[92] Clergymen, furthermore, were not unaware of attempts on the part of industry officials to pressure religious organizations to take their side. The Employers Association of Pittsburgh, for instance, encouraged its constituents "*to discontinue financial support of their respective churches*" if they were found to be cooperating with the labor-sympathetic FCC, with which the PCC

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

was closely allied. Six months later in a January 1921 missive from the Employers Association, the Pittsburgh Ministerial Association resolved that such efforts were little more than an attempt to intimidate the churches. Its resolution bluntly stood by the churches' "historic right and duty" to take ethical stands in opposition to big business and lambasted William Frew Long of the Employers' Association as a mouthpiece for the city's "high-type Christian employers."[93]

In the steel-mill community of McKeesport just south of Pittsburgh on the Monongahela River, ministers and priests had an open confrontation with its mayor, George A. Lysle, a lieutenant of the State Constabulary, the president of National Tube Mills, and the secretary of the local Chamber of Commerce in the early days of the strike. Mayor Lysle called the Ministerial Association of McKeesport together to persuade them to get the word out that strikebreakers would be protected and that William Z. Foster, a known subversive and public enemy, was behind this strike. One minister present at this meeting stated, for the record, that he was not going to comply with the mayor's wishes and that he was "in favor of the right of labor to organize." The Reverend Robert Kirk of Central Presbyterian, Mayor Lysle's own pastor, preached a sermon called "Disturbers of the Peace" defending the strikers the next Sunday. Following the service, Lysle confronted the minister and threatened him with prosecution if he did not keep quiet. Another clergyman confided with IWM investigators his belief that "fully three-fourths of the ministers in attendance were not in sympathy with the way the conference was called, nor with the Mayor's [anti-labor] attitude."[94]

These voices of sympathy for strikers and the efforts on the part of the PCC are noteworthy for they balance the perception of inaction many had at the time. Even if the PCC had no measurable effect on aiding the failing strike, there was no guarantee that taking a controversial public stand on behalf of them would have necessarily changed its outcome. Nonetheless, many felt that this was a missed opportunity for the PCC to use its resources to help the industrial worker. The IWM's own investigation, as sympathetic as it was to the PCC, cited that its leadership did not show extraordinary resolve to fight the steel employers or the newspapers in their antilabor campaign.[95] The PCC's strategy in this combustible atmosphere was pragmatic, however: facilitate the IWM's efforts and continue to reiterate the pro-labor views of the FCC's "Social Creed of the Churches" that were central to Marsh's *The Challenge of Pittsburgh*, but refrain from more direct or controversial actions that might lead to a breakup of the fragile coalition.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

OBSTACLE TO UNITY: THE FUNDAMENTALIST-MODERNIST CONTROVERSY

Soon after the Great Steel Strike of 1919 and the criticism that the PCC experienced, a second major controversy would test the PCC's bonds. In this instance, however, it was more successful in setting aside distractions and maintaining a positive message. Since roughly the turn of the century, a theological difference of opinion had appeared in Protestant seminaries and at denominational meetings in the Midwest and northeast United States. The culmination was the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, lasting from the early to late 1920s. In many ways, it was indicative of the culture wars that would divide Americans thereafter: traditionalists with a small-town ethos versus progressives with a more cosmopolitan, big-city outlook, each competing for influence over the future of the nation.[96] Theological liberals, also known as modernists, sought to introduce the Christian faith to new scientific trends such as evolutionary theory and geological discoveries, downplaying the Genesis creation account and traditional doctrines tied closely to the Bible. These theological liberals often contended that the ethical imperatives of the Christian faith had come to be overshadowed by an overemphasis on personal morality and the afterlife and wanted the latter to take a secondary role to the here-and-now. Most Social Gospel advocates also operated from a liberal theological perspective, even if not all theological liberals were necessarily vested in it and its strident calls for reform. Fundamentalists were those Protestants who, in increasingly militant fashion, rejected the rise of liberal theology and also rejected—to varying degrees—aspects of modernity such as urbanization, immigration, and secularization. They believed that they were preserving foundational and essential parts of the Christian faith and viewed liberalism as too accommodating to modernity, threatening the very essence of their religion.[97]

Around the time of World War I, the Social Gospel became a point of contention as fundamentalists came to view it as an insidious outgrowth of liberal theology and therefore a threat. After the Civil War, evangelical Protestants had embraced social service efforts like charitable work and philanthropy as valid complements to evangelistic outreach; the idea was that good deeds—both public and private—should naturally flow from the sincere Christian believer. By the early twenties, however, there were few, if any, voices in conservative evangelical and fundamental circles who spoke in positive terms about social service as a natural complement to soul-saving.[98]

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Although the Disciples of Christ denomination experienced turmoil over theological differences at this time, the worst fallout from the fundamentalist-modernist controversy occurred in two denominations: Presbyterians and Baptists located in the Midwest and northeast US.[99] The 1922 comments of liberal Baptist clergyman Harry Emerson Fosdick, at the pulpit of New York City's First Presbyterian, caused a major uproar among Presbyterians. Nearby Princeton Theological Seminary also was the site of bitter disagreements as the famous New Testament professor J. Gresham Machen departed in 1929 to found Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. Northern Baptists had strong factions of vocal liberals as well as vocal fundamentalists, and the latter began leaving the denomination to form their own self-identified Bible institutes, seminaries, missions boards, and denominational bodies in the early twenties.[100] Northern Baptists also claimed liberal luminaries such as Shailer Mathews, Walter Rauschenbusch, Harry Emerson Fosdick, and many modernist seminaries such as the divinity school at the University of Chicago.[101] The most celebrated, and damaging, single event for the fundamentalist cause was the July 1925 Scopes Trial in Dayton, Tennessee. Although biology teacher John Scopes was found guilty of illegally teaching evolution in his high school class, the real losers were the fundamentalist creationists, who came off looking foolish during the cross examination by experienced trial lawyer Clarence Darrow.[102]

Pittsburgh was not unaffected by the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, but it was muted in comparison to the rancor and bitterness of other regions of the United States. There certainly was potential for major conflict, however, as stated earlier, as the city was home to a sizable contingent of both northern Baptists and northern Presbyterians together totaling nearly a third of the PCC's overall membership.[103] Further adding to the potential for division was the fact that the various Protestant denominations in western Pennsylvania had tended to take their traditions and theology quite seriously. In the words of Charles Zahniser, the churches of Pittsburgh had always exhibited an "intensity of theological convictions [that ran] in separate channels," a reality that had always made interdenominational cooperation a challenge.[104]

Western Theological Seminary was one of two Presbyterian-affiliated seminaries in the city and overt in its modernist leanings, even if it avoided the schisms that roiled Princeton, the nation's foremost Presbyterian seminary. Two downtown Presbyterian congregations, the conservative First Presbyterian and the more liberal Second Presbyterian, disagreed openly over

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

how to evangelize the nearby immigrant population.[105] First Presbyterian was a well-to-do congregation led by the Reverend Maitland Alexander from 1899 to 1927; Alexander had served as the moderator of the 1915 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and was a major player for the fundamentalist cause during this time. He helped foster an active congregation and encouraged charitable gestures, but was an outspoken critic of liberal theology and voiced suspicions of the Social Gospel on many occasions. In a 1911 piece in the region's Presbyterian periodical, for instance, he asked if his fellow believers were becoming too caught up in social betterment and labor causes, losing sight of the heart of Christianity, "the oracles of God, the sacraments, [and] the knowledge, faith and power of Jesus Christ."[106] In 1917, when Daniel Marsh released the widely disseminated *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* calling for laity involvement in reform, Alexander took up a very public evangelistic preaching campaign, reflecting his belief that the primary task of the church was not social service, but the saving of souls.[107]

Evolution theory affected Pittsburgh when New York attorney Clarence Darrow visited in 1915 for a celebrated public debate; in that same year, Pittsburgh's antiprostitution coalition broke apart over differences regarding the church's right to enforce morality, revealing how fragile such ties between Protestant-affiliated groups could be. New fundamentalist denominations made inroads into Pittsburgh, too, as members of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), the Nazarenes, the Assemblies of God, and Holiness groups each established new congregations in the region.[108]

In comparison to the sore feelings associated with the fundamentalist-modernist controversy in other parts of the Midwest and northeast United States, Pittsburgh was mild. Part of the reason was simply that the most adamant and outspoken figures in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy lived elsewhere. Warring liberals and fundamentalists were abundant in cities like Chicago, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Princeton, New Jersey; the Scopes Trial drama unfolded in a small Tennessee town, and there were pillars of both sides in cities such as Baltimore, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, Rochester and Hamilton in upstate New York, and Cincinnati. Following Maitland Alexander, Pittsburgh's most visible fundamentalist was Presbyterian clergyman Clarence Edward Macartney, who assumed the post at First Presbyterian with Alexander's retirement in 1927. Macartney had presided over the 1924 Presbyterian General Assembly as moderator and leader of the fundamentalist coalition; his credentials had been unquestioned ever since he responded to Harry Emerson Fosdick's confrontational "Shall the

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Fundamentalists Win?" opinion piece in the *Christian Century* in 1922.[109] But even if his theological ideas aligned with fundamentalists, Macartney did not share their separatism and opted, instead, to cooperate with liberals within his denomination. Macartney's diplomatic sensibilities were evident during his tenure as moderator of the 1924 General Assembly when, to the surprise of many, he did very little to drive liberals from key posts.[110]

That Clarence Macartney—and not a more combative candidate that First Presbyterian could have hired—replaced Maitland Alexander certainly helped the PCC cause. This church was arguably the flagship Protestant congregation of the city, representing the region's most populous and influential denomination and was located in a bustling financial and industrial district just blocks from where the Monongahela and Allegheny rivers converge. If Maitland Alexander had openly called into question liberal theology and the Social Gospel during his almost-three decades at First Presbyterian, Macartney preached an orthodox message without finger-pointing. Macartney had grown up in a small Scottish-descended Reformed Presbyterian Church that taught, in his own words, that "schism and sectarianism" were "sinful" and "inimical to true religion."[111] When J. Gresham Machen left Princeton in 1927 to form a new seminary, his friend and fellow Princeton graduate Clarence Macartney protested because he believed the fallout would hurt both Princeton Theological Seminary and a new seminary fundamentalists aimed to establish in Philadelphia. Machen was furious at the seeming betrayal and their differences led to a falling out; despite the toll it took on a friendship, however, the decision was consistent with Macartney's belief in cooperation and unity, a conviction that certainly did not hurt the interdenominational mission of the PCC.[112]

A final reason why the fundamentalist-modernist controversy did not diminish the efforts of the PCC to advance its social service agenda was that the city's churches had more pressing local concerns. As a de facto ruling class that had long drawn criticism for their apparent neglect and indifference, the region's Protestants knew their legitimacy was in question and inaction might lead to disestablishment on some level. Compared to the looming threat of losing power to labor unions, Catholic voters, immigrants, or the Democratic Party, the fundamentalist-modernist controversy was a relatively minor concern. The weight of a potential disestablishment was evident in Daniel Marsh's *The Challenge of Pittsburgh*, which prodded its readers to envision Pittsburgh as a "Holy City" led by the faithful. Would the churches of Pittsburgh fulfill the task of transforming the Steel City into a "city of

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

God" in the "way of righteousness," Marsh asked in the preface. Or would they fall into "sin and selfishness" and reject the challenge that Pittsburgh, with all of its civic dysfunction and workplace injustice, presented them with?[113] This sense of looming judgment, and the Jeremiad call to repentance in one's custodial role, pervaded the Protestant rhetoric in the churches and periodicals of Pittsburgh at the time. The *United Presbyterian*, for instance, editorialized that Pittsburgh and other industrial cities needed "Christianized officials" in order to achieve "Civic righteousness." Quoting Scripture, they reminded their readers that "'When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice.'"[114]

Fears of disestablishment were not just a concern in Pittsburgh, but affected all American Protestants in the twenties: church membership and attendance began slipping as secular values took root, the Ku Klux Klan attracted millions in the first half of the decade with its nativist rhetoric and calls for a return to traditional values, and the writings of social commentators like H. L. Mencken and Sinclair Lewis unsettled many as they mocked the clergy and the average believer as silly and irrelevant. The widespread support for Prohibition throughout the twenties among American churchgoers, even as the policy backfired badly, illustrates the extent to which the old Protestant establishment in the United States sensed that its position was slipping and that it had to fight for even a dying cause.[115]

Charles Reed Zahniser reflected that the churches had come to a collective "realization" that the "unmet needs" of Pittsburgh were a first priority and that this sense of custodianship for the city was strong enough to overcome theological differences, even as the fundamentalist-modernist controversy was raging. The slogan Zahniser felt best summarized this pragmatic resolve to stay with the volunteer agenda of the PCC was "'Church Union; Not around Creeds But in Deeds.'"[116] It is likely that the fear of failing in this protector role—with the city, a national audience, and especially God, watching—motivated the member churches of the PCC to look past longstanding denominational rivalries and focus instead on public betterment.

ADVANCING SOCIAL SERVICE: OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Even with the distractions of the 1919 steel strike and the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that unfolded soon after, the PCC managed to win acclaim on other issues. PCC leaders boasted, after ten years in operation,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

that their Morals Court program aiding troubled youths could "hardly be overestimated."[117] A *Harper's Magazine* writer predicted this success just three years in, noting that presiding judge Tensard De Wolf had "deeply stirred the life of the city" and that the Morals Court is what "all cities may be doing to-morrow."[118] There was evidence that such optimism was more than wishful thinking as the *Literary Digest* reported that the number of male offenders under age twenty-one appearing before the court dropped from 6,000 to 2,500 after its first six years of operation.[119]

The *Challenge of Pittsburgh* campaign and the Morals Court were some of the PCC's most noteworthy successes in marshalling religious forces behind social service and reform. Yet there were many smaller-scale achievements that, irrespective of the degree to which they did or did not substantively alter Pittsburgh's civic state of affairs, stirred the city's Protestant churchgoers to enthusiasm for the idea of public service. For instance, in addition to the *Challenge of Pittsburgh* city-wide survey, the PCC sponsored four other surveys, two focusing on specific neighborhoods: "The Uptown" in 1917 and "Rankin" in 1920, and two focusing on specific themes: "The New Negro Population" in 1918 and "Crime and Its Treatment" in 1924. The PCC established a room registry program so that visitors to the city, and particularly young women recently migrated in search of employment, could know where to find "respectable and reliable" housing and not unwittingly find themselves snared in prostitution and other vice trades.[120]

In the area of prisoner welfare, the PCC persuaded Pennsylvania reform governor Gifford Pinchot in 1923 to remove the old "political" board of trustees of the Western Penitentiary and replace it with "a new one of exceptionally high character." Similar to the Morals Court agitation, PCC activists wanted Allegheny County's prisons to truly be reformatories, to transform criminals into productive citizens, and believed that a board consisting of people with "Christian ideals" and "humanitarian impulses" was the means to such an end. Governor Pinchot appointed one United Presbyterian (Judge James Gray), two Presbyterians (Harry H. Willock and Mrs. Rae Muirhead), two Methodists (William Sankey and Harry Samson), Roman Catholic Lee Griffith, and Calvary Episcopal Church reformer H. D. W. English, to the board of trustees of Western Penitentiary in response.[121]

In 1920 the PCC established a Department of Women's Work to better coordinate the many congregation- and denomination-based volunteer women's organizations already active, but more specifically to coordinate

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

mentoring efforts in support of the Morals Court's Big Sister program.[122] For example, its Education Committee in 1921 listed such aims as publicizing the efforts of the Morals Court, developing cooperative relationships with secular social service agencies, encouraging Protestant laywomen to engage in social Christianity efforts, responsible voting, and personal evangelism. It sent speakers to churches, missionary meetings, nonreligious women's clubs, and Bible classes, issuing press releases with special attention paid to the "rehabilitating work among delinquent girls and delinquent families."[123]

The influx of African Americans in search of industrial jobs from the South to northern cities like Pittsburgh during the years of World War I was the topic of much discussion in the PCC and resulted in the creation of a special investigative committee. Formed in January 1917, as one of the council's inaugural initiatives along with *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* survey, the resulting report entitled "The New Negro Population" was released in 1918. In addition to rousing empathy for the struggles of African Americans living in Pittsburgh, this study challenged labor unions to end their longstanding practice of excluding black workers, expressed fears about machine politicians who might exploit these newly arrived migrants, and called for the creation of wholesome social outlets to undercut the influence of seedy pool halls and saloons.[124] In response to this report, the city's black congregations—some of which were members of the PCC—formed the Alliance of Negro Churches in 1918 and created committees on evangelism, social service, comity, and Christian education, and focused special attention on improving housing conditions for the city's 38,000 African Americans.[125]

One of the purposes of the PCC was to facilitate comity, a term referring to the streamlining of separate denominational efforts so as to eliminate overlap and increase cooperation regarding evangelism and social service. Inevitably, however, there were denominational projects that could not be replicated by a PCC project and remained in action. The Methodist Church, for example, had early on been a leader in social Christianity activities and formed the Methodist Episcopal Church Union in 1880 toward this end. Daniel Marsh supervised this body from 1913 until 1926 when he left to assume the presidency of Boston University. Noteworthy among the Methodist Episcopal Church Union's achievements was establishing the Pittsburgh branch of the Goodwill Industries in 1926 and renovation of the Trinity Temple in the Strip District that offered club rooms, classrooms, a laundry, roof garden, with a "church of all nations" chapel open all hours to nearby residents in this industrial sector.[126]

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Members of the Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh did not embrace social Christianity with quite the same vigor of their Methodist counterparts because they tended to consider spirituality and evangelism a greater priority. Nonetheless, Presbyterians had missions to Italian and French communities. To meet the influx of Slavic peoples after the turn of the century, they hired Vaclav Losa, a Moravian-born clergyman-evangelist who opened a mission in McKees Rocks and thereafter served as a leader in outreach to Allegheny County's eastern European population.[127]

Maitland Alexander's tenure at First Presbyterian downtown demonstrates how a minister vocally committed to conservative theological orthodoxy could nonetheless advance social outreach. Under Alexander's direction, for instance, First Presbyterian's congregation initiated programs for young people: a Boys' Club that provided industrial skills, a sewing and millinery school for girls, a nursery, outreach to street boys who sold newspapers, a club for adolescent girls employed at nearby retail outlets, a well-used gymnasium, a program for relief and job placement for unemployed men, a clothing, coal, and supplies program for the poor, and the Central Chapel mission at Seneca and Forbes avenues.[128] By the time he retired in 1927 after nearly three decades of ministry, Alexander's First Presbyterian had a membership of almost 3,000 and was a clear presence in the downtown business district.[129]

The United Presbyterian Church of North America, rooted in seventeenth-century Scotland and eventually merging in 1958 with its larger sibling, the Presbyterian Church, was a vocal supporter of social Christianity. Certainly this denomination's strong antebellum abolitionist tradition was a harbinger of the service and reform activities its clergy and laypeople would undertake during the Progressive Era. The *United Presbyterian* religious weekly, for example, devoted regular stories to Christian ethics, temperance, poverty, citizenship and voting, municipal corruption, workplace conditions, labor unions, and the duties of the wealthy businessman to the church and society.[130] Its editor, H. H. Marlin of the Fourth United Presbyterian congregation, was a driving force for Social Gospel there for the two and a half decades following his assumption of the post of editor in 1913. All measures indicate that he was expressing a consensus on the value of reform among many in his denomination.

Another outspoken Social Gospel advocate in this denomination was the Reverend J. Alvin Orr of the First United Presbyterian Church on the North Side; he was not only president of the Citizens League but also oversaw a congregation active in social work and opened a full-service settlement house

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

in 1917. Its stated aim was encouraging "a personal acceptance of Christ" as well as addressing "the social and physical welfare of its neighborhood." This community house boasted a gymnasium, bowling alley, swimming pool, a large kitchen and dining room, club rooms, a roof garden, and offered classes in Bible study, "domestic science, sewing, [and] business efficiency."[131]

Baptists also sustained efforts similar to these, such as multiple missions to and night schools for the immigrant populations of the city and Allegheny County, with special focus on Italians, Swedes, Slovaks, Germans, Hungarians, and Poles. They also operated a home for the elderly and a Children's Home in Mt. Lebanon Township, sixteen different Daily Vacation Bible Schools that offered venues of wholesome recreation to neighborhood children, and many other similar offerings. Baptists employed four women who directed settlement-house activities in industrial communities such as Rankin, McKeesport, Braddock, Homestead, Lawrenceville, and downtown; at these locations, nearby residents could participate in Baptist-run sewing schools, Bible studies, temperance meetings, family-related meetings, and classes for practical homemaking skills.[132] Episcopalian contributions to the city's Social Gospel movement came primarily through socially prominent activists, judges, and elected officials who were members of Calvary Episcopal Church, men such as H. D. W. English, George Guthrie, Joseph Buffington, and Tensard De Wolf. Rector George Hodges had been the pioneer at Calvary for this Social Gospel influence, but his successors, such as W. D. Maxon and James McIlvaine, also spoke out on behalf of honest government and church leadership on public morality issues.[133] Episcopalians also sustained several service and outreach institutions such as the Church Home, the Saint Margaret Memorial Hospital, the Saint Barnabas Free Home for convalescent or incurable men, the Woman's Auxiliary to the Board of Missions, and many others focusing on fostering a sense of fellowship and spiritual nurture.[134]

Lutherans did not belong to the PCC but they nonetheless contributed to the larger Social Gospel movement through several ventures. With a total of roughly 22,000 members coming from more than a hundred congregations, Lutherans of different synods made their presence felt through the Passavant Hospital in the Hill District, four homes for orphaned children, three homes for the elderly, one for epileptics, missions to German, Swedish, Slavic, and Jewish immigrants, settlement houses in the Spring Garden district and the Soho district, and parish outreach to mothers and children on the North Side. After 1907 Lutherans ran a program to guide their fellow

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

members migrating to Pittsburgh on where to find employment, education, or the better neighborhoods to reside, ran a program to inform "rural and small town communities" about the necessity of service to hard-hit urban immigrants and workers. They also cooperated with police, the courts, and probation officers on guiding criminals to a better life and in 1916 opened the Lutheran Inner Mission Institute "for the study and discussion of Pittsburgh social and religious problems." During the summer of 1916, seven Lutheran churches held Vacation Bible Schools, enrolling 1,134 children and utilizing the volunteer efforts of 100 workers toward the end of "socialized Christianity and militant Christian citizenship."[135]

CONCLUSION: A PROTESTANT RULING CLASS CLEANS UP ITS ACT

The history of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches from the years of World War I to the end of the 1920s illustrates the anxieties and hopes of American Protestants at this time: long viewing themselves as caretakers of the Steel City, they found themselves out of step with social changes accompanying the spread of industry and urbanization in the decades following the Civil War. But beginning in 1910, they began to turn their establishment anxiety into practical action intended to address some of the longstanding civic problems plaguing Pittsburgh. Even if their efforts, like those of most Progressive Era reformers, did not lead to sweeping and sudden improvements, those efforts did establish patterns and precedents that came to fruition in later generations. The years following World War I were a time when Americans were reactive and divided, sounding alarm over foreign-born anarchists and the creep of insidious theological ideas into the churches, among other concerns. By many measures, the PCC should not have survived the steel strike or the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. But it weathered both and showed how genuine religious and moral sentiment, fears of losing power, and the lingering momentum of Progressive Era calls for citizen activism converged to create a noteworthy service record.

The Great Depression curtailed the activity of the PCC because financial contributions slowed greatly, requiring its board of directors to cut the executive secretary position for the better part of the decade. Presbyterian clergyman J. W. Claudy had served in this position from 1929 when Charles Zahniser left for his post at Boston University, but he stepped down in 1931 due to the lack of funds.[136] Despite the fact that many cities experienced a

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

sharp dropoff in their local Council of Church activities during the thirties, this was not the case in Pittsburgh. As Zahniser recalled in a 1944 retrospective, its strong period of activism from 1917 to 1925 provided a "strength and stability" that carried through the rough Depression years when its work "went steadily on." The Morals Court, for instance, remained the centerpiece of the PCC's social outreach and continued to pair up denominational laypersons and clergy with juvenile offenders in a mentoring relationship. The ecumenical spirit among participating churches was also strong in the thirties, evidenced in the fact that many would reach out to members of other denominations they had met through the PCC for various tasks and appointments.[137] In the early forties, with the war effort sparking an economic recovery, the PCC hired the Reverend O. M. Walton as its executive secretary and he served until the late fifties when Rev. Robert L. Kincheloe took over. In 1958 the PCC's budget was a substantial $95,125 and one Presbyterian historian described it as an organization that continued to be an "aggressive and well-supported" interdenominational force in Pittsburgh.[138]

During the sixties, several new organizations emerged that, like the PCC, had close ties to the city's denominations, but now were taking the lead in both drawing the churches together and working to reach out to those who were not raised in a Protestant tradition. The Pittsburgh Experiment, for instance, began as a businessman's small group association in the postwar era, founded by the Reverend Sam Shoemaker, a clergyman serving at the same Calvary Episcopal Church congregation that had launched the Social Gospel movement over a half century earlier. Another Episcopalian clergyman associated with Calvary Episcopal, Don James, assumed the executive director position at the Pittsburgh Experiment in 1960, but he opted against merging with the PCC because he felt it was old and stodgy. Other new evangelical-leaning organizations like Young Life Pittsburgh—outreach in the high schools, and the Coalition for Christian Outreach—outreach on college and university campuses, attracted thousands in the sixties and seventies and were supplanting the work the PCC had once done.[139] Records indicate that the PCC declined and dissolved by the end of this decade, a relic of an earlier era when denominational bodies held more sway. Yet, despite its dissolution, the PCC's dual mission of spiritual invigoration and Social Gospel activism has lived on in these new interdenominational organizations and they remain a force for Protestant Christianity in the Steel City today.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

TYLER B. FLYNN, JR. did his graduate studies at the Pennsylvania State University and is currently an associate professor of history at Eastern University in St. Davids, Pennsylvania, located in suburban Philadelphia. He has published articles on the history of Presbyterianism in western Pennsylvania and evangelistic outreach efforts among teenagers in postwar Buffalo, New York.

NOTES

I would like to thank Gary S. Smith for his generous help in directing me to relevant sources and sharing his knowledge of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches. Another indispensable overview of Pittsburgh's Social Gospel that has aided my study is Keith A. Zahniser's *Steel City Gospel: Protestant Laity and Reform in Progressive-Era Pittsburgh* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

1. Charles Reed Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches: A Historical Interpretation* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Council of Churches, 1943), 11, 15.
2. The Federal Council of Churches' *Social Creed of the Churches* quoted in Daniel L. Marsh, *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* (New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1917), 76.
3. Contemporary observers and recent historians have consistently linked the city's ruling elite in the early twentieth century with the Protestant churches; for the contemporary account, see Lincoln Steffens, *The Shame of the Cities* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957; originally published by McClure, Phillips and Co., 1904), 102; Edward T. Divine, "Pittsburgh the Year of the Survey," *The Pittsburgh District Civic Frontage: Russell Sage Foundation* (New York: Survey Associates, 1914), 3, 4, 10, 11, 223. In a 1958 publication, George Swetnam made the claim that "almost three-fourths of Pittsburgh's industry was controlled by Presbyterian money" at the end of the nineteenth century; see Swetnam, "All Ye That Labor," in *The Presbyterian Valley*, ed. William W. McKinney (Pittsburgh: Davis and Warde, 1958); Joseph F. Rishel, *Founding Families of Pittsburgh: The Evolution of a Regional Elite* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990), 166–70; Michael Fitzgibbon Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848–1860* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990), 27, 28, 79, 133; Roy Lubove, *Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh*, vol. 1, *Government, Business, and Environmental Change* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995; originally published by John Wiley and Sons, 1969), 12, 59, 60, 61.
4. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 71.
5. Ibid., 227.
6. For the percentage of Allegheny County Protestants belonging to the Pittsburgh Council of Churches, see Keith A. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel: Protestant Laity*

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and Reform in Progressive-Era Pittsburgh (New York: Routledge, 2005), 191; for denominational participation, see Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 13, 27, 227. For the population of Allegheny County, that is, Pittsburgh and suburbs, the US Census in 1910 counted a population of 1,018,463; Bureau of the Census, *Population of Minor Civil Divisions: 1910, 1900, and 1890*, prepared by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (Washington, DC, 1913), 533, 571. For Pittsburgh's metropolitan population in comparison to other American cities, see John Bodnar, Roger Simon, and Michael P. Weber, *Lives of Their Own: Blacks, Italians, and Poles in Pittsburgh, 1900–1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), 20.

7. A most helpful secondary source on the Pittsburgh Council of Church's service and reform advocacy record are a paper delivered by Gary Scott Smith entitled "Pittsburgh and the Social Gospel," read at the Duquesne History Forum, October 21, 1994, and William M. McKinney, "Many Streams, One River," in *Presbyterian Valley*, ed. McKinney, 550–53; this article deals with PCC activism in detail, but the most helpful primary sources come from the *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* from 1916 to 1925, Daniel Marsh's *The Challenge of Pittsburgh* (1917), Charles Reed Zahniser's *Pittsburgh Council of Churches* (1943), and Charles Zahniser's *In Glorious Tradition: A Brief Review of the Beginnings and Organizational Backgrounds of the Council of Churches of Allegheny County* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Council of Churches, September 25, 1953).
8. Keith Zahniser's *Steel City Gospel: Protestant Laity and Reform in Progressive-Era Pittsburgh* (New York: Routledge, 2005) is the most exhaustive study of the Social Gospel in Pittsburgh, but deals primarily with the twenty-five years preceding the formation of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches. William McKinney's edited *Presbyterian Valley* is a helpful 1958 account that does touch on some of the council's efforts; another helpful essay is Linda K. Pritchard's "The Soul of the City: A Social History of Religion in Pittsburgh," in *City at the Point: Essays on the Social History of Pittsburgh*, ed. Samuel P. Hays (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989), 327–60.
9. By and large, Protestantism in Pittsburgh is under-studied and often dismissed as a subset of the city's marked class and ethnic divisions. See Francis G. Couvares, *The Remaking of Pittsburgh: Class and Culture in an Industrializing City, 1877–1919* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 34–35, 96; Solon J. Buck and Elizabeth Hawthorn Buck, *The Planting of Civilization in Western Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1979), 120–24; John N. Ingham, "Steel City Aristocrats," in *City at the Point*, ed. Hays, 267, 268, 271, 280–82; John N. Ingham, *Making Iron and Steel: Independent Mills in Pittsburgh, 1820–1920* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1991), 171–73; Holt, *Forging a Majority*, 28; Rishel, *Founding Families*, 166; Philip Klein et al., *A Social Study of Pittsburgh: Community Problems and Social Services of Allegheny*

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

County (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 290, 400, 912–13; Lubove, *Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh*, 59; John Bodnar, *Steelton: Immigration and Industrialization, 1870–1940* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990), 76; Kenneth J. Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal: Religion and Reform in Depression Pittsburgh* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 35–38; David Cannadine, *Mellon: An American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006), 403, 604.

10. Sydney E. Ahlstrom describes the Gilded Age and Progressive Era as times when the "Protestant Establishment in America" was living in "the last troubled decades of its hegemony" and turned to nativism, anti-Catholicism, missions, temperance, and multiple reform ventures to preserve its custodial status; *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972), 856. See also Aaron Ignatius Abell, *The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865–1900* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943), 2–5; Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), x, xi; Jon Butler, Grant Wacker, and Randall Balmer, *Religion in American Life: A Short History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 257, 273–75, 292, 296–303, 311, 321, 326.
11. George Hodges, "The New Forces," in *Faith and Social Service* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1896), 8, 9; second quote from George Hodges, *The Heresy of Cain* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1894), 34.
12. Henry May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1949), 181, 207.
13. Hodges, *Heresy of Cain*, 167, 168; Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 38, 42.
14. Edwin Bjorkman, "What Industrial Civilization May Do to Men," *World's Work* 17 (April 1909): 11479–98; Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 35; Ingham, *Making Iron and Steel*, 169–70, 174; Rishel, *Founding Families*, 115.
15. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 39–40, 44, 49; "McClintock, Oliver," *The History of Pittsburgh and Environs* (New York: American Historical Society, 1922), 5.
16. Divine, "Pittsburgh the Year of the Survey," 21; Ingham, *Making Iron and Steel*, 168; Rishel, *Founding Families*, 116, 117.
17. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 144, 147, 148, 163, 164, 165, 173, 177, 182, 184, 192.
18. Steffens, *Shame of the Cities*, 102–4, 118.
19. Bjorkman, "What Industrial Civilization May Do to Men," 11479–98.
20. Divine, "Pittsburgh the Year of the Survey," 3.
21. Ibid., 3, 4, 10, 11; Lubove, *Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh*, 6–11.
22. Divine, "Pittsburgh the Year of the Survey," 223.
23. Roy Lubove, "Pittsburgh and Social Welfare History," in *City at the Point*, ed. Hays, 300.
24. P. W. Snyder, "The Church and the Masses," *Presbyterian Banner* (January 2, 1908): 12; Couvares, *Remaking of Pittsburgh*, 91, 95.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

25. "The Pittsburgh Bribery Scandal," *Outlook* 91 (January 2, 1909): 9, 10; "Our City's Disgrace," *Presbyterian Banner* (December 31, 1908): 974; "Hope for Pittsburgh," *Presbyterian Banner* (April 6, 1911): 5; "Pittsburgh's Moral Crusade," *Literary Digest* 45 (July 6, 1912): 22, 23; "What 'Wide Open' Meant in Pittsburgh," *Survey* 28 (August 24, 1912): 653–55; "Christian Social Service Union," *Survey* (July 25, 1914): 435.
26. W. E. McCulloch, "The Glory of Successful Service: The Good of Others," *United Presbyterian* (June 20, 1912): 20; "The Christian Social Service Union," *Pittsburgh Methodist* (January 1914): 14.
27. "The Police Courts," *United Presbyterian* (April 22, 1915): 4; "The Lines Tightening: Booze, Vice and Graft Organizing to Crush Their Enemies," *Pennsylvania Outlook* (September 1915): 1; Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 127, 129, 131–32, 147, 151; Swetnam, "All Ye that Labor," 467–69.
28. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 13, 16, 18, 226–27; "Pittsburgh as a Center of Presbyterianism," *Presbyterian Banner* 100 (May 28, 1914): 8
29. Charles Reed Zahniser, *Social Christianity: The Gospel for an Age of Social Strain* (Nashville, TN: Advance Publishing Company, 1911), 3, 4, 25, 26, 44.
30. Zahniser, *Social Christianity*, 4, 28, 35, 41, 57, 60, 61, 123, 124, 126.
31. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 227; "Inauguration of Daniel L. Marsh as Fourth President of Boston University, May 15, 1926," *Bostonia: The Boston University Alumni Magazine* 26 (July 1926): 106–9; "Testimonial Dinner and Farewell Reception In Honor of Dr. and Mrs. Daniel L. Marsh," *The Pittsburgh Methodist* 16 (April–June 1926): 1–10; "Who's Who in Pittsburgh Churches," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (May 1922): 2; "Marsh, Daniel L.," *Encyclopedia of American Biography* (n.d.), 133–34.
32. Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 884.
33. Philip Jenkins, *The Great and Holy War: How World War I Became a Religious Crusade* (New York: HarperOne, 2014), 92.
34. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 275; "Marsh, Daniel L.," *Encyclopedia of American Biography* (date of publication unknown), 133–44.
35. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 184.
36. "Church Federation in Pittsburgh," *United Presbyterian* (July 15, 1915): 5; "Church Federation in Pittsburgh," *Pennsylvania Outlook* (November 1915): 1; Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 191; Smith, "Pittsburgh and the Social Gospel," 15–16.
37. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 188.
38. Charles Stelzle, *A Son of the Bowery: The Life Story of an East Side American* (New York: George Doren Co., 1926), 168. One historian has estimated, for instance, that three-fourths of the city's industry was controlled by individuals of a Presbyterian affiliation, helping to explain why labor was such an explosive topic among the region's churches; see Swetnam, "All Ye that Labor," 464.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

39. Montgomery's comments appear in Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 261. Maitland Alexander once said that the church needed to reject "self-centered policy" and embrace the dual aims of "practical, missionary" work as well as "sociological effort," meaning social service. Quote appears in J. M. Duff, *A Record of Twenty-five Years of the Pastorate of Maitland Alexander, D.D., L.L.D., in the First Presbyterian Church in the City of Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh: First Presbyterian Church, 1924), 28–29.
40. *Pittsburgh Methodist* 9, no. 1 (January 1920): 4; Social Service Commission of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, "Report," 1915. Quote appearing in Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 187.
41. Social Service Commission of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, "Report," 1915, cited in Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 187.
42. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 187.
43. "Pittsburgh and Others," *United Presbyterian* (August 15, 1912): 6.
44. Bodnar, Simon, and Weber, *Lives of Their Own*, 22–24.
45. Carman Johnson, "The Pittsburgh Council of the Churches of Christ," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (December 1916): 3.
46. "Mr. Sunday Marching On," *Presbyterian Banner* (May 7, 1914): 6.
47. "Pittsburgh Council of Churches of Christ," *Pennsylvania Outlook* (April 1916): n.p.
48. Frank A. Sharp, "The Development of Protestant Co-Operation in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania," Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1948; Zahniser calls attention to this in *Steel City Gospel*, 191.
49. Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches*, 7; "Pittsburgh Council of the Churches of Christ: Officers and Executive Committee," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (November 1919): 5.
50. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 227.
51. William E. Leuchtenburg, *The Perils of Prosperity, 1914–1932* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 34; cited in Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 882.
52. Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 883.
53. Jenkins, *The Great and Holy War*, 93, 94; Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 885.
54. Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 891.
55. Martin Marty, *Modern American Religion*, vol. 1, *The Irony of It All, 1893–1919* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 277; Ahlstrom, *A Religious History*, 891.
56. Marty, *Modern American Religion*, 1:281.
57. The committee supervising Daniel L. Marsh's authorship of this study comprised George W. Montgomery of the Presbytery of Pittsburgh, R. A. Hutchison of the United Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, H. C. Gleiss of the Pittsburgh Baptist Association, Charles Reed Zahniser of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches, and G. Herbert Elkins, minister of North Side Congregational Church; Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, v.

This content downloaded from 132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

58. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 19, 21, 34, 51, 65, 75, 76, 82, 87, 120, 126, 145, 185.
59. Josiah Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York: Baker and Taylor, 1885), 148.
60. Sacvan Berkovich, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 3, 4.
61. Quoted in Edward K. Muller, "Ash Pile or Steel City? H. L. Mencken Helps Mold an Image," *Pittsburgh History* 74 (Summer 1991): 54.
62. Lubove, *Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh*, 59.
63. George Hodges, *Christianity between Sundays* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1892), 2.
64. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, viii.
65. "The Challenge of Pittsburgh Campaign," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (October 1917): 1.
66. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 145, 209–24.
67. Franklin Hamilton, "The Pittsburgh Council of Churches of Christ," *Pittsburgh Methodist* (October–November–December 1917): 12.
68. "Challenge of Pittsburgh Campaign," 1.
69. "Report of the Pittsburgh Council of Churches of Christ to the Constituent Bodies, December 31st, 1917," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (January 1918): 2, 4.
70. Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches*, 30, 31, 33.
71. "His Honor, the Greatest Gang Leader in the U.S.A.," *Literary Digest* (August 29, 1925): 47.
72. Theodore MacFarlane Knappen, "Tempering Justice with Common Sense: Pittsburgh's Experiment with a 'Morals Court,'" *Harper's Magazine* (July 1920): 211.
73. Ibid., 215.
74. "His Honor, the Greatest Gang Leader in the U.S.A."
75. Quoted in Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches*, 29.
76. Charles W. Collins, quoted in "Child Welfare Activities," *The Survey* (September 24, 1921): n.p.
77. "Summary of Work with Morals Court Boys (Protestant) Period March 14, 1920, to January 31, 1921," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (February 1921): 3; "Child Welfare Activities," *The Survey* (September 24, 1921): n.p.; "The Power of Praying Men," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (November 1921): 7.
78. David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 273–79; David Brody, *Labor in Crisis: The Steel Strike of 1919* (New York: J. J. Lippincott Co., 1965), 113.
79. Kennedy, *Over Here*, 251, 252; Stanley Coben, "A Study in Nativism: The American Red Scare of 1919–1920," in *Causes and Consequences of World War I*, ed. John Milton Cooper Jr. (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972), 194, 195.
80. Coben, "A Study in Nativism," 195.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

81. Kennedy, *Over Here*, 288, 289; Coben, “A Study in Nativism,” 198–200; Charles C. Johnson, *Why Coolidge Matters: Leadership Decisions from America’s Most Underrated President* (New York: Encounter Books, 2013), 1.
82. Kennedy, *Over Here*, 274.
83. Stefan Lorant, *Pittsburgh: The Story of an American City*, 5th ed. (Pittsburgh: Esselmont Books, 1999), 337; Charles H. McCormick, *Seeing Reds: Federal Surveillance of Radicals in the Pittsburgh Mill District, 1917–1921* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997), 123, 124, 128.
84. Couvares, *Remaking of Pittsburgh*, 130; Brody, *Labor in Crisis*, 177–79; Colston E. Warne, ed., *The Steel Strike of 1919* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1963), 33–37.
85. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 90.
86. “Committee on the Steel Strike,” *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (October 1919), 4, cited in Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 194.
87. Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Daniel A. Poling, *Report on the Steel Strike of 1919 by the Commission of Inquiry, the Interchurch World Movement (of North America)* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920), v.
88. Francis J. McConnell, Chairman, *Public Opinion and the Steel Strike: Supplementary Reports of the Investigators* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921), 262.
89. Ibid.
90. “Appeal to Americans,” appearing in McConnell, *Public Opinion*, 144, 145.
91. Foster, letter to Zahniser, dated October 8, 1919, reprinted in McConnell, *Public Opinion*, 302, 303; McCormick, *Seeing Reds*, 125.
92. McConnell, *Public Opinion*, 281.
93. Employers Association italics are in the original memorandum. Ibid.; see also *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (July–August 1921); *The Survey*, June 18, 1921; *Pittsburgh Dispatch*, June 7, 1921; “The Church’s Duty in the ‘World of Work,’” *Literary Digest* (September 3, 1921); all cited in Smith, “Pittsburgh and the Social Gospel,” 30.
94. McConnell, *Public Opinion*, 275, 276.
95. Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 194, 195.
96. Barry Hankins argues this same point, that the twenties were “a microcosm of the central elements of the culture wars of our own time.” See *Jesus and Gin: Evangelicalism, The Roaring Twenties and Today’s Culture Wars* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 213.
97. Butler, Wacker, and Balmer, *Religion in American Life*, 326–28; Donald K. McKim, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Reformed Faith* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 148, 149.
98. George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870–1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 85, 86, 90, 91, 92.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

99. Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 910, 911, 912; Ferenc Morton Szasz, *The Divided Mind of Protestant America, 1880–1930* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1982), 99.
100. Winthrop S. Hudson, *Religion in America* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), 368.
101. Butler, Wacker, and Balmer, *Religion in American Life*, 331.
102. Mark Noll, *Protestants in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 107–9.
103. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 227.
104. Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches*, 2.
105. Pritchard, "Soul of the City," 344.
106. Rev. Maitland Alexander, "The Church and the Parallel Movements of the Day," *Presbyterian Banner* (April 27, 1911): 12.
107. "Pittsburgh and Vicinity," *Presbyterian Banner* (January 25, 1917): 24.
108. Pritchard, "Soul of the City," 344, 345.
109. Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 113, 114.
110. Ibid., 125, 126, 127; B. J. Longfield, "Macartney, Clarence Edward Noble (1879–1957)," in *Dictionary of the Presbyterian and Reformed Tradition in America*, ed. D. G. Hart (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999), 145.
111. Clarence E. Macartney and J. Clyde Henry, ed., *The Making of a Minister: The Autobiography of Clarence E. Macartney* (Great Neck, NY: Channel, 1961), 32.
112. Longfield, *Presbyterian Controversy*, 174, 175.
113. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, vii, viii.
114. "Civic Righteousness," *United Presbyterian* (August 19, 1915): 5.
115. Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 899, 901, 915, 916.
116. Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches*, 3.
117. "The Y.M.C.A. in Morals Court," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (June 1929): 3.
118. Knappen, "Tempering Justice," 211.
119. "His Honor, the Greatest Gang Leader in the U.S.A.," 45.
120. "The Room Registry," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (September 1917): 3.
121. "Who's Who in Pittsburgh Churches, Harry Samson," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (December 1923): 8; "New Penitentiary Board," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (August–September 1923): 3.
122. "Department of Women's Work," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (April 1921): 6.
123. Mrs. Harry G. Samson, "Educational and Civic Action Work," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (May 1927): 5.
124. "The New Negro Population," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (February 1918): 3–7, quotes from page 3; "The Race Riots," *United Presbyterian* (August 14, 1919): 5; "The Negro a Valuable Asset," *Presbyterian Banner* (November 27, 1919): 1.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

125. "Negro Churches Unite for Service," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (March 1918): 4.
126. "Trinity Temple to Be Rebuilt," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (April 1919): n.p.
127. Vaclav Losa, "Fifteen Years of Mission Work," *Presbyterian Banner* (June 17, 1915): 10.
128. "Institutional Church Work," *Presbyterian Banner* (March 14, 1912): 6; J. M. Duff, *A Record of Twenty-Five Years of the Pastorate of Maitland Alexander* (Pittsburgh: First Presbyterian Church, 1924), 59–70.
129. Maitland Alexander, "The Church and the Parallel Movements of the Day," *Presbyterian Banner* (April 27, 1911): 12; Duff, *Record of Twenty-Five Years*, 54.
130. "The Compassion of Jesus," *United Presbyterian* (February 11, 1909): 6; Wallace A. Jamison, *The United Presbyterian Story: A Centennial Study, 1858–1958* (Pittsburgh: Geneva Press, 1958), 27, 39, 53, 61, 97, 108, 109, 218.
131. Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 271; "United Presbyterian Church News," *United Presbyterian* 73 (October 28, 1915): 10; "Citizens League Still Functioning" *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (June–July 1927): 1.
132. H. C. Gleiss, "Baptist Churches," in Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 240–44.
133. "Pittsburgh Preachers," *Presbyterian Banner* (December 23, 1909): 6; Smith, "Pittsburgh and the Social Gospel," 49; Zahniser, *Steel City Gospel*, 103, 123.
134. Cortland Whitehead, "Protestant Episcopal Church," in Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 266.
135. Carman Johnson, "The Lutheran Inner Mission," *Pittsburgh Christian Outlook* (September 1917): 3; Ambrose Hering, "Lutheran Church," in Marsh, *Challenge of Pittsburgh*, 227, 246–50.
136. McKinney, ed., *Presbyterian Valley*, 553.
137. Zahniser, *Pittsburgh Council of Churches*, 9, 25.
138. McKinney, ed., *Presbyterian Valley*, 553.
139. Michael J. Sider-Rose, *Taking the Gospel to the Point: Evangelicals in Pittsburgh and the Origins of the Pittsburgh Leadership Foundation* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Leadership Foundation, 2000), 18, 26, 29, 31, 32, 37.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.159 on Tue, 03 Jan 2023 19:33:14 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms