

2019

A Capitalist's Social Gospel: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus and the Promise of Upward Mobility, 1875-1921

Joshua Pretzer

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

 Part of the [History of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pretzer, Joshua, "A Capitalist's Social Gospel: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus and the Promise of Upward Mobility, 1875-1921" (2019).
Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 11369.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/11369>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

A CAPITALIST'S SOCIAL GOSPEL:

FRANK WAKELEY GUNSAULUS AND THE PROMISE OF UPWARD MOBILITY, 1875-1921

By

JOSHUA MICHAEL PRETZER

Bachelor of Arts, Alma College, Alma, MI, 2017

Associate of Arts, Mid-Michigan Community College, Mount Pleasant, MI, 2015

Thesis

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in History

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

May 2019

Approved by:

Scott Whittenburg, Dean of the Graduate School
Graduate School

Kyle G. Volk, Chair
History

Jody Pavilack
History

Tobin Shearer
African American Studies

A Capitalist's Social Gospel: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus and the Promise of Upward Mobility, 1875-1921

Chairperson: Kyle G. Volk

Abstract:

Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus was a preacher who began his ministry in 1875 as a little-known itinerant Methodist in rural Ohio. Within two decades, he became one of America's most influential religious figures with a popular style and message of hope for the future. This paper examines the mission of this pulpiter, who believed Jesus and industrial capitalism could solve the problems of labor conflict, poverty, and sin as the kingdom of God was gradually realized on earth. Where many social gospelers challenged the interests of capital to varying degrees, Gunsaulus was both the businessman's firm defender and an advocate for social and cultural transformation. His social gospel was the gospel of upward mobility. His vision was pursued through Christian missions and the work of the Armour Institute of Technology, where Gunsaulus served as president from 1892 until his death in 1921, overseeing the training of thousands of engineers. Tracing his thought and practice, this project examines what Gunsaulus's specific case reveals about the social gospel, arguing that the social gospel bolstered industrial capitalism. This work also adds to the scholarship on this understudied but influential preacher with a narrative biographical approach, making use of Gunsaulus's writings, press coverage, personal correspondence, and institutional records. Archival sources are primarily drawn from the Illinois Institute of Technology and the University of Chicago.

Introduction

In 1898, the influential preacher Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus was interviewed by the young reporter Theodore Dreiser. Dreiser, who less than two years later would author the classic novel *Sister Carrie* about a young woman's pursuit of the American dream, called the preacher "one of the sincerest friends of young men striving to climb upward, that America has ever produced."¹ Early in his career, Gunsaulus determined he must combat cynicism about the future to help young men succeed. He found his success in ministry by keeping to his "true ideal." When Dreiser asked him what that was, Gunsaulus answered, "That the question to be handled by a preacher must not be theological, but sociological." He went on to explain that, "any place may be a pulpit,—editorial chair, managerial chair, almost anything. I began to realize that a whole and proper work would be to get hold of the Christian forces outside the ecclesiastical machine and get them organized into activity." The popular preacher believed that upward mobility was within reach of all determined young people willing to go out into the world and fill a need, and he staked his message as a minister on that idea.²

Gunsaulus's vision of marshalling the forces of Christian civilization to spur young people to achievement was far from a mere idea or theory by 1898. As the president of the Armour Institute of Technology (AIT), the precursor of the modern Illinois Institute of

¹ Theodore Dreiser, *A Book About Myself* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922), 3; Some identify Dreiser with the social gospel due to his religiously themed reflections on morality, most apparent in the 1890s when, early in his career, he frequently attended the sermons and lectures of Chicago's best orators, including Gunsaulus. Robert Forrey, "Dreiser and the Prophetic Tradition," *American Studies* 15, no. 2 (fall 1974), 22-24; Theodore Dreiser, *Dawn* (London: Constable, 1931), 555; quote from Theodore Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," in *Theodore Dreiser's Uncollected Magazine Articles, 1897-1902*, ed. by Yoshinobu Hakutani (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), 60; Theodore Dreiser, *Sister Carrie* (New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1900); Annemarie Koning Whaley, *The Trouble With Dreiser: Harper and the Editing of Jennie Gerhardt* (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2009), 22-23.

² Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 62-64.

Technology, he was determined to implement his vision of channeling young people into successful careers in America's growing industrial economy. For Gunsaulus, the educational, civilizing, and moneymaking promise of upward mobility within industrial capitalism was not just a worthy goal, but a hallmark of the progress of Christian civilization, a mission that encompassed all of society in a grand narrative combining industrial capitalism and postmillennial expectations of the kingdom of God on earth.³

Defining the social gospel is no easy task. Many historians have noted a diverse Protestant movement united by a broad desire for social action but not necessarily by theology. In order to pick out the social gospel, categorical distinctions have attempted to separate social and theological conservatives from progressives, diverse strains of broadly understood social Christianity, and messages focused on individual salvation from those concerned with social salvation. At the heart of many of these distinctions lay competing reactions to industrial capitalism. Gunsaulus blurs some of these lines, challenging the dichotomies sometimes suggested by established categories.⁴ Gunsaulus held a lofty view of the potential for individual

³ In one typical example of Gunsaulus's postmillennial thought, he quoted the Old Testament prophet Amos in order to frame thousands of years of providential history as a march from a paradigm of scarcity to a paradigm of plenty. He implicated industrial production in themes of civilization's moral progress, progress that was furthered by great individuals such as Abraham Lincoln. "Dr. Frank Gunsaulus's Sermon," *New York Times* (April 26, 1897), 3.

⁴ On individual versus social salvation, and the theological diversity of social gospelers, see Gary Scott Smith, *The Search for Social Salvation: Social Christianity and America, 1880-1925* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2000), 3-5; as Smith points out, some of the earliest explicit attempts to provide a theological definition for the social gospel came late to the period, such as Washington Gladden's attempt in 1913 and Walter Rauschenbusch's in 1917. Washington Gladden, *Present Day Theology* (Columbus, OH: McClelland & Company, 1913); Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917); Robert T. Handy notes that the term social gospel was not in common use until after 1900. Other similar or related terms had previously been more commonly used, such as practical Christianity or social Christianity. Robert T. Handy, ed., *The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 5; an early example of dichotomy entering the historiography is provided by the theologian and ethicist H. Richard Niebuhr, where Niebuhr imagines a dichotomy between those who reacted against Gilded Age fatalism and ineffectual religion and those who embraced the bourgeois virtues of industrial capitalism. Such categories leave little room for examples such as Gunsaulus, who was both opposed to any religion unwilling or unable to change the world, and

achievement, believing in the power of reformed individuals to transform social realities. Critical of the pessimistic inaction suggested by laissez-faire, he nonetheless believed in upward mobility within industrial capitalism as the means of individual attainment and social transformation. He also consistently sided with the interests of capital over labor.⁵ In contrast to examples of the social gospel that might be viewed as a challenge to industrial capitalism, this work argues that Gunsaulus's support for upward mobility illustrates the case of social gospel reform that dovetailed closely with the interests of industrial capitalism.⁶

Growing ranks of historians have pointed out a long and diverse history for the social

also largely wedded to bourgeois virtue. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America*, reprint 1959 (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1937), 179, 181, 185; Henry F. May provided three categorizations for social Christianity, composed of conservatives on one hand and radicals on the other, with liberal progressives in the middle representing the social gospel. In some ways this middle road characterization is quite fitting, but an individual like Gunsaulus can blur the line between the provided definitions for the conservative and progressive camps. Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), 163; for more on how broad the term social Christianity can be, including radical and secular expressions, see David Burns, *The Life and Death of the Radical Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); like May, Charles Howard Hopkins views the social gospel as arising from a broad spectrum of social Christianity, which was born in the aftermath of the Civil War and was a reaction to the challenges of industrialization. Hopkins views the rise of the social gospel as an oppositional reaction to “the assumptions of the new capitalism.” Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940), 11-12; Christopher H. Evans restates the classic interpretation of the social gospel as a reaction to industrialization, immigration, and urbanization, while noting that most social gospelers maintained middle-class sensibilities, conservative views on race, anti-Catholicism, and Christian nationalism or triumphalism. He also notes that many leading social gospelers were loyal to their denominational establishments, which became more centralized during the period of the social gospel, which Evans places between 1880-1920. Christopher H. Evans, *Histories of American Christianity: An Introduction* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013), 221-23.

⁵ Heath W. Carter, *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 140, 156-57; where Carter highlights Gunsaulus's loyalty to the interests of capital, Gary Scott Smith credits the preacher with promoting “social amelioration through nondenominational” ministry at Central Church in Chicago, where he was pastor from 1899-1919. Smith, *The Search for Social Salvation*, 455.

⁶ Gunsaulus provides a contrast to some more commonly studied examples of the social gospel, such as those cited by Susan Curtis. Curtis interprets the social gospel partly as a challenge to industrial capitalism. Her intellectual and cultural history explores the social gospel through the lives and articulations of fifteen key expositors, examining the rise of modern consumer culture alongside theological trends. Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 3.

gospel, going beyond white middle-class men such as Gunsaulus to include many women, African Americans, and people from diverse regions of the country.⁷ While it is difficult to summarize the movement, one definition is provided by the theologian Shailer Mathews. In 1921, Mathews defined the social gospel of preceding decades as Christian salvation completely applied to all of society, including the state, the family, the economy, and the individual. The rise of sociological studies at the end of the nineteenth century together with popular interest in the gospel message provided a “conjunction of the modern spirit with the gospel of Jesus himself.” Recognizing that individuals are conditioned by their social environment, social gospelers opposed collectivist “revolution” but supported “social reconstruction.”⁸ While this is far from a final or universal definition, it illustrates one prominent description of the social gospel that serves here as a useful point of reference.

Arguing that Gunsaulus provides an example of the social gospel that bolstered industrial capitalism, this work interrogates how his pursuit of social uplift through Christian philanthropy, urban missions, and practical education aimed at vocational training led to the work of AIT. Gunsaulus began his preaching career in 1875 as a Methodist circuit rider evangelizing small Ohio towns. By the time he retired from fulltime pulpit ministry in 1919, he had graduated

⁷ Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, eds., *Gender and the Social Gospel* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 2-5; John Patrick McDowell, *The Social Gospel in the South: The Woman's Home Mission Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1886-1939* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 2-5, 143; Ralph E. Luker, *The Social Gospel in Black & White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 1-6, 28-29; while pointing out the diversity and origins of social gospel influences, Ronald C. White, Jr., also notes that casting the social gospel as a response to urban industrialization contributes to the obscurity in much of the historiography of African Americans, whose expression of the social gospel often differed from white social gospelers. Ronald C. White, Jr., *Liberty and Justice for All: Racial Reform & the Social Gospel* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1990), xviii-xix; Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 173.

⁸ Shailer Mathews, “Social Gospel,” in *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, ed. by Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921), 416.

thousands of engineers from AIT. This thesis examines how exactly Gunsaulus's life and ministry bridged nineteenth century evangelism and social uplift with twentieth century technical education and industrial capitalism. In the process, this work also adds to the very limited scholarship currently available on Gunsaulus, delving into his story to find out why one of America's most influential preachers at the turn of the twentieth century was largely forgotten and overlooked by later generations.

Chapter I:

Christianity and Capitalism at the Center of the Storm

The 1893 World's Columbian Exposition drew an incredible number of people to Chicago. Visitors made their way through the sights and sounds of the city and added substantially to the crowd of churchgoers on Sunday mornings. While many pastors initially complained that the World's Fair would hurt church attendance, the controversial decision to require the fairgrounds to close on Sunday ensured that some number of tourists would find their way into crowded pews. So would some working-class Chicagoans for whom Sunday was the only time when they might have been free to enjoy the festivities.⁹ For Chicago's most popular pulpits, the crowds far exceeded the room available. The line in front of Plymouth Congregational Church often blocked the street, where the preacher Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus was a top Sunday attraction. Gunsaulus often filled churches even without the World's Fair in town. Latecomers might give up in the face of long lines or even try to audaciously cut the crowd by climbing through the windows.¹⁰ One visiting tourist in 1893 made a scene by shoving others out of his way as he fought to the front of the line, suffering glares and protests as he declared, "I came to Chicago to see the World's Fair, and Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show and to hear Dr. Gunsaulus, and I must get in."¹¹

Another example of the tourist's Sunday experience is provided in the travel accounts of John Hickson. A resident of Sydney, Australia, he traveled to Chicago with his daughter, Alice.

⁹ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Sunday at the World's Fair," *The North American Review*, 154 no. 423 (Feb., 1892), 254-56.

¹⁰ Theodore Dreiser commented on the phenomenon of churchgoers climbing through windows to see Gunsaulus in the winter of 1898. Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 60.

¹¹ A. W. Williams, ed., *Life and Work of Dwight L. Moody, The Great Evangelist of the XIXth Century: The Founder of Northfield Seminary, Mount Herman School for Boys and the Chicago Bible Institute* (Chicago: P. W. Ziegler & Company, 1900), 275-76.

Like many fairgoers, the father and daughter took time on Sunday to visit the notable preachers of the city. After crossing two oceans and getting a taste of the fairgrounds, their first Sunday sermon was in Dwight L. Moody's big tent.¹² The evangelist Moody made the most of the opportunity that summer, launching a six-month crusade called the World's Fair Gospel Campaign. One of his many venues was a massive circus tent capable of holding fifteen thousand people, a far larger audience than could fit in any church building in the city.¹³ After experiencing Moody, John and Alice's second sermon in Chicago was by Gunsaulus. At these Sunday sermons, Mr. Hickson eagerly pressed through crowds to shake hands with Moody, noted Gunsaulus as a "polished and able preacher," and also caught the message of one Baptist minister before he and his daughter left Chicago to see Niagara Falls on their way to New York.¹⁴ In 1893, Chicago became the premier U.S. destination for a global audience, an audience that often counted Gunsaulus among the city's must-hear pulpiteers. His preaching fit into itineraries alongside the World's Fair, Buffalo Bill, and Niagara Falls. But as grand as these Sunday crowds were, they were not Gunsaulus's most time-consuming preoccupation in the summer of 1893. He was also in the midst of opening a new school dedicated to technical education, the Armour Institute.

Gunsaulus's success was nothing short of remarkable. At the age of thirty-one, he had assumed the pastorate of one of Chicago's most affluent churches, making a strong impression

¹² J. C. Hickson, *Notes of Travel: From Pacific to Atlantic, with Description of the World's Fair at Chicago; Also Travels by Land and Sea Around the World* (Parramatta, Australia: Fuller's Lightning Printing Works, 1894), 19.

¹³ H. B. Hartzler, *Moody in Chicago, or The World's Fair Gospel Campaign: An Account of Six Months' Evangelistic Work in the City of Chicago and Vicinity During the Time of the World's Columbian Exposition, Conducted by Dwight L. Moody and His Associates* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1894), 64.

¹⁴ Hickson, *Notes of Travel*, 19.

from his first sermon in the city.¹⁵ Within another six years he became a leading advocate of technical education in Chicago, the overseer of one of the most ambitious educational investments in American history at the time, and one of the most recognizable voices for attendees of the 1893 World's Fair. Gunsaulus's meteoric rise to prominence, first as preacher and then president of the Armour Institute, built on the promise of national Christian leadership to address wide-ranging social problems, most notably the divide between labor and capital and the threat posed by anarchism. Within this framework of social activism, Gunsaulus provided a message of upward mobility, especially popular among his predominantly middle-class congregants. The trajectory of his career reveals a preacher in service to the interests of business, one particularly capable of marshalling people and money for reform-minded causes in a mission to transform America with the transcendental power of Christianity, via industrial capitalism.

Gunsaulus was born in Chesterville, Ohio, on January 1, 1856. American Protestantism during his early childhood was honing social and theological narratives of national purpose that would later inform Gunsaulus's work and ministry. Foreshadowing later calls for middle-class social activism, publicists of the Prayer Meeting Revival in New York City in 1857-58 suggested that the power of the movement stemmed from rational and educated urban professionals. The revival received credit for making evangelists out of "those who move in the various circles of business life... preachers and laymen, doctors, lawyers, merchants, manufacturers, and mechanics."¹⁶ These professionals included some who would later join the ranks of America's most well-known preachers, men such as D. L. Moody and Lyman Abbott, who were inspired by

¹⁵ "Church Gleanings," *The Christian Union* 35, no. 12 (March 24, 1887), 21.

¹⁶ S. S. Packard, "Personal and Miscellaneous," *American Merchant* 1, no. 1 (May 1858), 37; see also Kathryn Teresa Long, *The Revival of 1857-58: Interpreting an American Religious Awakening* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

the revival to leave their previous professions for ministry.¹⁷ The revival also showcased mid-nineteenth century postmillennial narratives. The most liberal of these narratives suggested that modern Protestants, i.e. an educated urban-industrial middle class, were the culmination of providential history educating the human race to better understand divine revelation on the way to realizing the kingdom of God on earth.¹⁸

Millenarian hopes of the future kingdom of God were common to the U.S. in the mid-nineteenth century, with some looking to the industrial age as a sign of providential progress to be helped along by Christian social reforms and educational initiatives.¹⁹ Broadly shared social ideology, formed around general commitments to “republicanism, Protestantism, and capitalism” emphasized Christian social responsibility to educate the individual, believing that individual character determined social realities.²⁰ Likewise, the ultimate purpose of the Civil War, according to the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1865, was to give Christians unprecedented opportunities for usefulness. For these white Protestant leaders, God did not free formerly enslaved people for their own sake, but rather, God freed the church to a more ambitious national role and mission.²¹ Many ministers of the 1850s and 1860s increasingly viewed national challenges as problems to be solved by Christian effort, even as they viewed educated middle-

¹⁷ Ira V. Brown, *Lyman Abbott, Christian Evolutionist: A Study in Religious Liberalism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1970), 20-23; Rick Ostrander, *The Life of Prayer in a World of Science: Protestants, Prayer, and American Culture, 1870-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 9.

¹⁸ William C. Conant, *Narratives of Remarkable Conversions and Revival Incidents: Including a Review of Revivals, from the day of Pentecost to the Great Awakening in the Last Century – Conversions of Imminent Persons – Instances of Remarkable Conversions and Answers to Prayer – An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Great Awakening of 1857-’8* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1858), 1.

¹⁹ Brett H. Smith, *Labor’s Millennium: Christianity, Industrial Education, and the Founding of the University of Illinois* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 1, 4-5, 19-21.

²⁰ Carl F. Kaestle, “Ideology and American Educational History,” *History of Education Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1982), 127-28.

²¹ “Meeting of Ruling Elders,” *New York Evangelist* 36, no. 21 (May 25, 1865), 1; for more on abolition and interpretations of the Civil War as part of providential history, see Nicholas Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607–1876* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 295.

class citizens in America's urban industrial centers as ideal Christian workers and incorporated modern industry into their thinking on ministry and progress.²²

Among white Protestants of the era, Gunsaulus's unusual name immediately sets him apart. His family descended from a colonial-era Spanish settler to upstate New York, though it is unclear when the name became anglicized. Family tradition, publicized in biographical sketches, held that the family traced back to a Spanish Protestant martyred by the Inquisition in the sixteenth century, "Reginald Gunsaulus Montanus."²³ In this way, the family's Spanish heritage represented a proud Protestant tradition, where it otherwise might have been associated with Catholicism. Gunsaulus's grandfather, Joseph, a veteran of the War of 1812, relocated the family from New York to Ohio in 1837, and passed away in 1848. Gunsaulus's father, also named Joseph, was born in 1825 and temporarily lived in a log cabin when the family moved to Ohio. He practiced carpentry, later learned the legal profession, engaged in land speculation and stock trading, and maintained a small farm. When Gunsaulus's hometown of Chesterville formally incorporated in 1860, his father served as one of the community's first councilmen, served at various times as president of the county school board, and eventually served a total of about two decades as Chesterville's mayor. During the Civil War, Joseph Gunsaulus also served as a Republican representative in the Ohio state legislature for two terms, from 1862-1865.²⁴

Gunsaulus grew up in a rural but prosperous middle-class family where the written and spoken word were prized. He studied law and oratory as his father groomed him for the legal

²² For more on the evolving concept of "Christian work" after the Civil War, see Timothy E. W. Gloege, *Guaranteed Pure: The Moody Bible Institute, Business, and the Making of Modern Evangelicalism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 25.

²³ J. W. Luccock, "Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher," *The American Illustrated Methodist Magazine* 4, no. 3 (Nov., 1900), 211.

²⁴ W. H. Perrin and J. H. Battle, *History of Morrow County and Ohio* (Chicago: O. L. Baskin & Co., 1880), 247, 367, 601, 783.

profession. His father was also a capable public speaker, and to encourage his son's learning they would frequently travel "as many as twenty miles to hear a good oration."²⁵ Gunsaulus's grandmother, Nancy, lived with the family, and had a lasting influence on him. Nancy possessed both a great love of literature and a great memory for recitation, two qualities she instilled in her grandson. From an early age, Gunsaulus impressed with his ability to recall and perform speeches and sermons verbatim.²⁶ In Chesterville, Gunsaulus attended the district schoolhouse until he was twelve, then studied evenings while working on the family farm until he went to college. He ultimately decided he could do more as a minister than as a lawyer. Recalling later that he had not been an especially pious young man, he nonetheless felt "a burning desire to do something, to achieve something for the benefit of my fellowmen..."²⁷ A conversion experience at the age of fifteen followed the sermon of a Methodist minister, which convinced him of "the power of consecrated oratory," and reportedly led to his decision to enter ministry.²⁸ Preaching apparently promised greater fulfillment for Gunsaulus than a career in law. He attended Ohio Wesleyan University, where he studied the poetry he and his grandmother loved while honing his oratory, debating sermons, and practicing the preacher's craft. He graduated and was ordained in 1875, in debt but eager to pursue the first opportunity that came his way.²⁹

Gunsaulus married the same year he became an itinerant Methodist minister, though there is no mention of the circumstances that brought him and his wife together. With few exceptions, the women in Gunsaulus's life, such as his sister or his wife Georgeanna, who went by Anna, are nearly invisible in print sources. This omission is no less vexing to historians for being common

²⁵ Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 61.

²⁶ Luccock, "Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher," 211.

²⁷ Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 61-62.

²⁸ Luccock, "Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher," 211.

²⁹ Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 61-62.

in the period. It is unclear how much debt Gunsaulus owed at the time he and Anna were starting their family, but his first annual salary was \$320. His first assignment as a circuit rider was to what was known as the “Harrisburgh circuit,” followed the next year by the “Worthington circuit,” near enough to Columbus to grant Gunsaulus coveted access to the Ohio State Library. His first regular pastorate, and his last Methodist appointment, took him to the “Main Street Methodist Church at Chillicothe, Ohio.”³⁰

It was during these early years that Gunsaulus was finding his own distinct approach to ministry. His first public sermon was in the village of Stratford, where he impressed with his oratory and ability to preach from memorized notes, but blew through his material in less than ten minutes. He tried to recover by simply repeating the sermon a second time, weaving it together so that the repetition was not obvious until near the end. In addition to managing time, Gunsaulus also learned to avoid traditional revivals, a mainstay of other Methodist itinerants. He called off his first series of revival meetings part way through out of embarrassment. His optimistic style failed to make his listeners “feel sorry for their sins,” netting only three conversions. When asked about it by a friend and colleague fresh from a more successful revival of their own, Gunsaulus remarked, “I held my meetings until I got the three I wanted, and then I closed them for fear I would get some I didn’t want!”³¹ This is not to say that he was unsuccessful as a preacher. If he did not often provoke tear-stained repentance, he nonetheless became known for growing church attendance. He reportedly brought community members into church who had never attended before, and who stopped attending when he was gone. He captivated and entertained audiences with a message both optimistic regarding the potential for

³⁰ Luccock, “Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher,” 212.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 212-13.

human achievement and ambitious regarding the essential social responsibilities of Christians.³²

Gunsaulus wrote his first book just as he was about to transition from Methodism to Congregationalism.³³ *The Metamorphoses of a Creed* chronicled his personal theological journey. Published in 1879, it described his youthful infatuation with Unitarianism, and how he ultimately came to reject theological liberalism for orthodoxy. The book's premise was that orthodoxy could and should be innovative, and that transcendentalism properly understood should not be consigned to an association with Unitarianism. The book attempted to suggest an innovative orthodoxy that repudiated the narrow confines of both traditional Calvinism and any liberalism completely unmoored from tradition. Gunsaulus believed Calvinism had largely been repudiated in the first half of the nineteenth century, and it remained for Christians to repudiate overzealous rationalists in the second half, keeping a place in theology for the trinity and Christ's atonement.³⁴ In his view, the two extremes of Calvinism and Unitarianism, too much tradition and too little, robbed faith of its potency and stymied human potential by promoting cynical and fatalistic worldviews.³⁵ In defense of transcendental idealism, Gunsaulus stated in his preface, "Unless we desire a great Brook Farm Community we must avoid the reduction of God's universal politics to the constitution of that West Roxbury experiment," referring to failed utopian idealism.³⁶ Gunsaulus was determined to articulate a radical modern idealism apart from both stern rationalism and failed utopias.

³² *Ibid.*, 212; Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 63.

³³ "Other Methodist Conferences," *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel* (Oct. 3, 1879), 2.

³⁴ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, *The Metamorphoses of a Creed: An Essay in Present Day Theology* (Chillicothe, Ohio: Gould & Kello, 1879).

³⁵ These concerns mirror the cynicism Gunsaulus interpreted in some of his parents' teachings, where his father would quote Emerson as a fatalist, and his mother leaned towards the traditional Calvinist doctrine of predestination. In terms of actual church membership, his father did not maintain any, and his mother was a devout Presbyterian. Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 61-62.

³⁶ Gunsaulus, *The Metamorphoses of a Creed*, vii.

The Brook Farm community in West Roxbury, Massachusetts, was a short-lived effort, 1841-47, by some transcendentalists to build an egalitarian utopia. Though transcendentalism was often extremely individualistic, the Brook Farm community attempted to create a new kind of society where all would work together to produce income and have as much leisure time as possible. Ultimately unable to support itself financially, the community struggled with internal divisions and lack of practical solutions to sustain itself, leading to its collapse, with some help from fire and smallpox.³⁷

Gunsaulus's first book was notably influenced by two recent publications, R. Andrew Griffin's 1877 title, *From Traditional to Rational Faith: or, The Way I Came from Baptist to Liberal Christianity*, and the 1878 novel, *Bluffton*. Together, these three works illustrate a theme of theological odyssey. Where Gunsaulus goes from liberalism to orthodoxy, Griffin's earlier work marks progression in the other direction, from orthodoxy to rationalism.³⁸ At a glance, the premise suggests that *The Metamorphoses of a Creed* was a response to, and attempted repudiation of, *From Traditional to Rational Faith*. However, Gunsaulus also pays homage to the earlier work, claiming he is not as heroic as Griffin.³⁹

In *The Metamorphoses of a Creed*, Gunsaulus identifies with the protagonist preacher from the 1878 novel, *Bluffton*, with the caveat that he does not have "such absurd faith" in himself as the novel's hero.⁴⁰ In *Bluffton*, the titular town is rapidly growing due to westward settlement. The hero, Mark Forrest, is among the newcomers. Fresh from a New England seminary, Forrest is zealous but intellectually curious, eager to test how his "theology works in

³⁷ Sterling F. Delano, *Brook Farm: The Dark Side of Utopia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).

³⁸ Richard Andrew Griffin, *From Traditional to Rational Faith: or, The Way I Came From Baptist to Liberal Christianity* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1877).

³⁹ Gunsaulus, *The Metamorphoses of a Creed*, v.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, v-vi.

practical life” out West.⁴¹ Thinking that “every man ought to be a practical Christian” and that doctrinal disputes should be set aside so all can help build up the kingdom of God on earth, Forrest’s earnest morality is tested by unrequited love and theological doubts.⁴² Confronted by controversy between the staunchly orthodox and the strictly rationalist camps, a heartbroken Forrest travels the world seeking answers. The story concludes with Forrest and his love finding each other and confessing their mutual feelings. The preacher resolves his doubts and the couple adopts a faith that rejects both rationalism and orthodoxy for “faiths and hopes and sentiments and poetry,” but without turning their beliefs “into sharp stones” that harm others.⁴³

What *Bluffton* has in common with Griffin and Gunsaulus is that they all present the romanticized idea that painfully wrestling with one’s own personal theology is a heroic and manly odyssey. While one is a novel, the three books all illustrate a broad, late-nineteenth century genre of theological progression as an intellectual masculine journey, with preachers navigating the tensions between traditional orthodoxy and modern rationalism. Gunsaulus saw himself as engaged in the same type of heroic journey as Griffin. There is also the implication, provided most strongly in *Bluffton*, that authentic lived religion is found in the worldly West as opposed to the hidebound East. However, Gunsaulus’s writing reveals one surprising departure from the normal romanticizing of the West. While Christianity offered a universal political message, that message could be rendered impotent if reduced to collectivism or agrarianism. Gunsaulus’s objection to a Brook Farm community as the goal of transcendental Christian idealism implied a future in which a more practical Christian idealism needed to be rooted in industrial capitalism.

⁴¹ M. J. Savage, *Bluffton: A Story of To-Day* (Boston: Lee and Shepherd, 1878), 27.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 85.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 247-48.

While Gunsaulus continued to develop his articulation as a theologian, his first book illustrates two enduring aspects of his ministry. He would maintain a romantic view of Protestant orthodoxy as an innovative but measured force for good, and he would continue to write in difficult, rambling but dense prose requiring special effort to follow his line of thought. As one reviewer of his first book bluntly stated, “We are inclined to doubt whether the life or opinions of Mr. Gunsaulus required an apology so extended.”⁴⁴ A more sympathetic review still conceded that it was difficult to summarize the ideas of *The Metamorphoses of a Creed*. Gunsaulus used endless references to history, literature, and philosophy in presenting a theological argument, putting it beyond “the easy grasp of the intelligent common reader,” while making those references so dense and varied “as to tax, a little, the thought even of the well-informed.” The editors of *The Congregationalist* saw Gunsaulus as a very promising and dynamic young preacher capable of growing their ranks, but they nonetheless admitted that “it is not always an easy volume to be read.”⁴⁵

In keeping with many preachers, the ideas Gunsaulus published were often first presented as a series of sermons. His second book, *November at Eastwood*, presented a compilation of seven sermons published to similarly poor reviews. The content was deemed “vague” and “rather too ambitious in manner,” focusing overly much on “the development of a noble manhood...”⁴⁶ While his sermons were, like his books, full of dense and varied references and convoluted arguments, the unreadable became highly engaging for listeners when Gunsaulus stood behind the pulpit, giving life to his illustrations. He increasingly became known for his messages on Christian social responsibility, with the sermon, “What We Owe; or, Christian Giving,”

⁴⁴ “Literature,” *Sunday Afternoon: A Monthly Magazine for the Household*, Vol. 3 (January—September, 1879), 862.

⁴⁵ “Literary Review,” *The Congregationalist* (Sept. 3, 1879), 6.

⁴⁶ “Literary Review,” *The Congregationalist* (Nov. 10, 1880), 6.

garnering enough interest to be distributed by pamphlet.⁴⁷

Gunsaulus's early transcendentalism resulted in him leaving Methodism after the elder in his district confronted his unrealistic visions of human progress and perfection. Gunsaulus recalled, "After one of my flights, in which I advocated perfection far above the range of humankind, he came to me and said: 'My dear young man, don't you know that people have to live on this planet?' The rebuke struck me as earthly then, but it has grown in humor and common sense since."⁴⁸ Gunsaulus chose to leave Methodism. Entering Congregationalism thus chastised, he preached at a series of pulpits in Columbus, first at Eastwood Congregational Church and soon after at High Street Congregational Church.⁴⁹ Despite the brevity of each successive pastorate while in Ohio, some lasting less than a year, he found that his fantastic visions of progress and human potential struck a chord with his parishioners in Columbus, increasing church attendance.⁵⁰ By the time he was at High Street, the terrible reviews of his written work did not prevent him from selling his printed sermons for five cents at the door each Sunday morning.⁵¹ Gunsaulus stuck to a message with a core mission of challenging cynicism about the future. What the young preacher observed of the world made him worry that he ought to be cynical, and he "had to battle this down and convince myself that we are what we choose to make ourselves."⁵² The brief setbacks owing to his unconventional preaching were not enough for Gunsaulus to give up his lofty views of possible human achievement. He was determined to find ways to practically realize those ideals as a minister.

⁴⁷ "Literary Review," *The Congregationalist* (Jan. 26, 1881), 6.

⁴⁸ Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 62.

⁴⁹ "Weekly Register," *The Congregationalist* (July 7, 1880), 4; Luccock, "Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher," 212.

⁵⁰ "Lake States," *The Congregationalist* (Aug. 27, 1879), 5; "Literary Review," *The Congregationalist* (Sept. 3, 1879), 6.

⁵¹ "Lake States," *The Congregationalist* (Feb. 23, 1881), 4.

⁵² Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 62-63.

Gunsaulus experienced the first of numerous health breakdowns in his life while at High Street Congregational Church. His first publicly admitted complications were referred to as a case of “sunstroke” in 1881, followed by personal trips for his health.⁵³ Thinking that the air of the Atlantic coast might be good for him, he accepted a call in 1883 to Newtonville, Massachusetts, “one of the most cultured and aristocratic churches of suburban Boston.”⁵⁴ The annual salary of \$3,000, with the month of August for vacation time, complimented the fresh Atlantic air.⁵⁵ While in Ohio, the preachers who impressed him the most were Wendell Phillips and Bishop Matthew Simpson. Once in the Northeast, he came to admire the preaching of Phillips Brooks and Henry Ward Beecher.⁵⁶ The move brought him into connection with widening circles of increasing influence, circles that in turn heard Gunsaulus’s patriotic appeals to republicanism and Western character, declaring that “to be a true American, one must be a true Christian.”⁵⁷ Gunsaulus soon took an active role in the Boston area, along with Phillips Brooks, in endorsing and promoting prohibition candidates.⁵⁸

A call like the one Gunsaulus received to Massachusetts, or like the various calls he had received in Ohio, were usually trying to steal a minister away from their previous church. The preacher’s reputation would spread within the right circles, or he might happen to make an impression on certain members of another church, and a call could be extended if that

⁵³ “Lake States,” *The Congregationalist* (July 20, 1881), 4; “Lake States,” *The Congregationalist* (Aug. 3, 1881), 4; “Lake States,” *The Congregationalist* (June 14, 1882), 4; “Boston and Vicinity,” *The Congregationalist* (Aug. 9, 1882), 4; “Boston and Vicinity,” *The Congregationalist* (Dec. 6, 1882), 4.

⁵⁴ The quotation is taken from a letter published in the *Oberlin Weekly News* from Rev. F. A. Gould, who met Gunsaulus at Ohio Wesleyan University in 1872. “Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus,” *Oberlin Weekly News* 31, no. 6 (April 3, 1890), 2; Dreiser, “A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus,” 62; Luccock, “Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher,” 212.

⁵⁵ “Massachusetts,” *The Congregationalist* (Jan. 17, 1883), 4.

⁵⁶ Dreiser, “A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus,” 61.

⁵⁷ “Ladies’ Night,” *The Congregationalist* (June 7, 1883), 3.

⁵⁸ “Boston, Thursday, Sept. 25, 1884,” *The Congregationalist* (Sept. 25, 1884), 4.

congregation was hunting for a new pastor. Gunsaulus continued to receive calls to prestigious congregations while at Newtonville. He ultimately turned down a call to the First Dutch Reformed Church in Albany, with it being reported at the time that Gunsaulus's "popularity in the church is only equaled by the enthusiasm of the young people who see in him one who is fondly devoted to their interests, and should he decline the call, which it is hoped he will, it will be very largely on account of his love for them and theirs for him."⁵⁹ Each move tended to take Gunsaulus to a larger, more urban, and more affluent congregation, where he would work with home missions, mentor young men, and hone his message of addressing social evils through national Christian leadership.

Though Gunsaulus declined the call to Albany, he soon after accepted a call to the prestigious Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church in Baltimore. Brown Memorial had faced a prolonged hunt for a new preacher. The politics of the matter delayed things, with multiple ministers being asked to provide trial sermons. Some preachers apparently declined Brown Memorial's eventual offer, even though it included a parsonage and a \$5,000 salary. Asking too many preachers to audition for the same job before deciding who to call made the matter of acceptance socially awkward within certain well-heeled circles. On April 6, 1885, the belabored search finally called Gunsaulus, who "had captivated the congregation" during an earlier visit and was considered "a pulpit orator of distinction."⁶⁰ The declined offer from the First Dutch Reformed Church in Albany included a salary of \$5,500, revealing that Gunsaulus did not accept a call based solely on the offered salary.⁶¹

Joseph T. Smith was among those present when Gunsaulus was formally installed at

⁵⁹ "The Suburbs," *Boston Daily Advertiser* (Dec. 31, 1884), 8.

⁶⁰ L. Irving Pollitt, *A History of Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church, 1870-1945* (Baltimore, MD: Thomsen-Ellis-Hutton Co., 1945), 39-41.

⁶¹ "Weekly Register," *The Congregationalist* (Jan. 1, 1885), 5.

Brown Memorial. Smith later wrote that the preacher's "peculiarities of style" gave him the "charm of novelty..." He "was averse to all definitions, impatient of precision in thought, and unskilled in logical discussion. He reached and moved his hearers through the imagination and heart." Gunsaulus's words gave "cold abstractions and dead dogmas the breath of life," and "the music of his sentences, never failed to charm the ears of his hearers."⁶² The preacher's work went beyond his pulpit oratory, including impressive financial management at Brown Memorial, teaching classes on the great English poets at Johns Hopkins University, and being a father. Gunsaulus and Anna's family had been growing throughout the first decade of ministry, and the youngest of their five children, Helen, was born in Baltimore.⁶³ Gunsaulus also published his third book, *The Transfiguration of Christ*, revealing that with greater fame, accruing social capital, and a higher salary came more positive reviews. Editors of *The Congregationalist* generously described the writing as "uncommonly vigorous, and often strikingly brilliant, in respect to both special phraseology and general style... Its only fault of importance is some lack of clearness... even the accomplished scholar will regret that comprehension of the writer's plan has not been rendered easier."⁶⁴ Yet for all this activity, Gunsaulus would remain in Baltimore for a little less than two years, frustrating the congregation which would once again have to hunt for a new pastor. This time, the call was to Plymouth Congregational Church in Chicago, where the orator from Ohio would reach the heights of his fame and influence.⁶⁵

At least one reference work has incorrectly stated that Gunsaulus assumed the pastorate of Plymouth Congregational Church in New York City as a successor to the celebrated Henry

⁶² Joseph T. Smith, *Eighty Years: Embracing a History of Presbyterianism in Baltimore* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1899), 108; Pollitt, *A History of Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church, 1870-1945*, 47-49.

⁶³ Pollitt, *A History of Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church, 1870-1945*, 43, 47, 49.

⁶⁴ "Literary Review," *The Congregationalist* (July 15, 1886), 6.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 47.

Ward Beecher.⁶⁶ Beecher commanded the greatest fame of any American preacher in his day, but in 1887 the national figure passed away. The pulpit of Plymouth Congregational Church in New York was filled by his longtime colleague Lyman Abbott. Because the Chicago and New York churches both bear the name of Plymouth Congregational, and because Abbott and Gunsaulus assumed their new roles at nearly the same time, one can see how such a mistake might be made. Surprisingly, given Beecher's immense stature, the young Gunsaulus was apparently considered for the position at Plymouth Church in New York. By one account, he visited New York to preach from the late Beecher's pulpit and was even offered the job, but chose the opportunity in Chicago instead.⁶⁷

It is hard to decide which claim is more shocking, that Gunsaulus was purportedly offered Beecher's pulpit, or that he declined it in favor of Chicago. If the first fact is true, the second may make sense in light of the politics of accepting a call. Many preachers might have wanted to avoid being measured against Beecher's success, and in a situation where more than one minister was known to be under consideration, Gunsaulus may have felt it would be an insult to the older, highly respected Abbott for him to take the position. The two certainly knew each other. Gunsaulus and Abbott would meet occasionally over the years, and Abbott eventually produced a volume titled, *Henry Ward Beecher as His Friends Saw Him*. He accepted Gunsaulus as one of the titular friends, had him contribute to the work, and mentioned him in the foreword as an example of one whose genius was shaped by Beecher.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ J. Gordon Melton, *Religious Leaders of America: A Biographical Guide to Founders and Leaders of Religious Bodies, Churches, and Spiritual Groups in North America*, Second Edition (Detroit: Gale Research, 1999), 474-75.

⁶⁷ "Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus," *Oberlin Weekly News* 31, no. 6 (April 3, 1890), 2.

⁶⁸ Lyman Abbott, *Henry Ward Beecher as His Friends Saw Him* (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1904), 3; Duncan C. Milner to Frank W. Gunsaulus, July 12, 1898, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 3, number 1998.24, Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology (hereafter IIT Archives).

Gunsaulus was a great admirer of Beecher's oratory. The New York preacher had studied elocution, drilling gestures and body language to accompany his enunciation, using his whole frame and making each small movement intentional to empower his message. Gunsaulus marveled at the performance, himself a popular and skilled speaker, appreciating probably the greatest pulpit orator of a generation.⁶⁹

Whether or not Gunsaulus was actually offered the New York pulpit in 1887, he had clear financial and vocational incentives to choose Chicago. His base salary would be \$6,000, increasing to \$8,000 if he provided Sunday evening sermons in addition to the morning services.⁷⁰ Going to Chicago was certainly more in keeping with the narrative of *Bluffton*. While in the Northeast, Gunsaulus preached that the "storm center" in the labor conflict would be in the West, and that was where the future of national Christian leadership would be found. Home missions would provide the highest form of statesmanship, addressing questions of labor, temperance, and the home. Christians must prove their values, addressing social problems by putting their money where their mouths were.⁷¹ Such mission work beckoned in Chicago. According to Gunsaulus, "Plymouth Church offered an absolutely free pulpit, and an opportunity to work out some plans that I thought desirable."⁷² The freedom to preach what he wanted and the opportunity to engage in ambitious work beyond the pulpit may have been as important to

⁶⁹ Jeremy C. Young, *The Age of Charisma: Leaders, Followers, and Emotions in American Society, 1870-1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 15.

⁷⁰ "Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus," *Oberlin Weekly News* 31, no. 6 (April 3, 1890), 2; there is at least one newspaper account of how Gunsaulus was supposedly scouted by Plymouth Church in Chicago, and how his salary was determined. Many of the details of that story appear to be fictional and the source unreliable. Even so, it does paint a picture of how some affluent churches might search for prospective ministers. "Highway and Byway," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (June 3, 1890), 4; the truth appears to be that the terms of Gunsaulus's salary were simply the same as Plymouth Church's previous pastor, Rev. Dr. Scudder. "A Call to Chicago," *The New York Times* (March 8, 1887), 1.

⁷¹ "Massachusetts," *The Congregationalist* (Aug. 2, 1883), 4; "The Massachusetts Home Missionary Society," *The Congregationalist* (June 5, 1884), 2.

⁷² Dreiser, "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus," 63.

Gunsaulus as the financial incentives. These twin priorities were reflected in Brown Memorial's attempted counter offer, an increased salary with fundraising for missions.⁷³ For Plymouth Church's part, the congregation appreciated Gunsaulus's abilities, and admired his resume as a "reverend gentleman" with dozens of letters of recommendation from "every part of the East," together expressing class affiliation and respect for the pastor of "one of the most aristocratic" churches "in the South."⁷⁴

Within only twelve years, Gunsaulus had passed through half a dozen pastorates in three denominations. He attained an annual salary of \$8,000 by the age of thirty-one, an income twenty-five times the salary he started at in 1875.⁷⁵ As one socialist in Chicago later criticized, "the author of this pitiful twaddle enjoys a greater annual income than the combined wages of half a dozen skilled mechanics."⁷⁶ Gunsaulus may have been eyed as a possible successor to the pulpit of the nation's most famous religious figure, and he assumed one of Chicago's most affluent pastorates. But even with such material success, it remained for Gunsaulus to work out how to put his ideals into practice. Chicago would give him greater opportunities to put his gospel to work in what he saw as the epicenter of the tensions between labor and capital, where national Christian leadership was most needed.

During the years that Gunsaulus kept advancing his career, others were noting the challenges of labor and inequality in America and providing their own prescriptions. A common

⁷³ "Brevities," *The Daily Inter Ocean* (March 25, 1887), 8.

⁷⁴ "The City in Brief," *The Daily Inter Ocean* (March 8, 1887), 6.

⁷⁵ An annual report in 1890 revealed that Gunsaulus's \$8,000 salary made him one of the six highest paid Congregationalist pastors in America. Only four Congregationalists enjoyed higher salaries, all of them in New York. The single highest salary was \$16,000, with three others, including Lyman Abbott, tied at \$10,000. The editors of *The Congregationalist* made a point of noting that the highest earning physicians and lawyers still made much more than comparatively modest preachers. "Salaries and Benevolence," *The Congregationalist* (Sept. 11, 1890), 5.

⁷⁶ "Pulpit Puerilities," *Chicago Daily Socialist* 4, no. 160 (March 29, 1902), 1; see also, Carter, *Union Made*, 140.

viewpoint was that civilization must progress or move backward, lending a sense of urgency to proactively addressing social concerns. Within this genre, Henry George's book, *Progress and Poverty*, focused on how civilization could be progressing materially even as the gap between rich and poor increased. Written at the same time that Gunsaulus was penning his less influential and less comprehensible first book, *Progress and Poverty* proposed the abolition of all taxes except a tax on land, the one commodity producers could not take credit for. George promised a laissez-faire method of achieving the goals of socialism. The classic example of Rome warned that a civilization could be at the peak of greatness even as the seeds of its destruction were sown by greed. Following the example of Rome further, George identified the private ownership of land as the cause of the paradoxical relationship between material progress, with increasing productivity, and the prevalence of subsistence wages. He rejected both the Malthusian principle of subsistence as a natural consequence of population growth, and the notion that progress was inevitable. George asserted that it was not primarily individual characteristics that governed the progress of civilization, but social organization.⁷⁷

However radical George's indictment of inevitable progress was, it echoed popular discourse on the need for public virtue. The decline of the finer things in life, class signifiers such as art and literature, remained intertwined with declining morals. The problems of an industrial age demanded a response, but the solution was to discourage private control of land rather than to tax or regulate other forms of modern industry. The greed of an urban-industrial "ruling class" must be confronted, but George identified that ruling class as "gamblers, saloon keepers, pugilists, or worse," scheming to control votes.⁷⁸ The fate of the nation must be decided

⁷⁷ Henry George, *Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial depressions, and of Want with Increase of Wealth* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881), vii-xi.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 480.

in America's cities, where this new urban class possessed power without virtue, and undermined faith in vital republican institutions as industry adopted the relationship of master and servant, instead of free individuals. Just as Rome fell to barbarians, the "gathering hordes" of "new barbarians" could be found in the "squalid quarters of great cities..."⁷⁹ It was for lovers of God, justice, and liberty to renew the progress of civilization by ensuring that all shared the fruits of material progress, avoiding the fates of Rome and of France in 1789, and realizing "the culmination of Christianity—the City of God on earth..."⁸⁰

George's radicalism sparked debate and discussion. While some disagreed with his perceived attack on private property, many of the major points of *Progress and Poverty* were either mainstream sentiments, or quickly becoming mainstream. It was widely accepted that urban centers had a decisive role to play in shaping national culture, and that something must be done to address social problems and avoid class conflict. The minister Charles Oliver Brown labeled George's ideas extreme in 1886, but noted that *Progress and Poverty* reached a wide audience, with more than a hundred editions in its first three years in the U.S. alone. Whatever one might think of George's views, "they are being read as a new social gospel by hundreds of thousands of people and they are affecting the views of millions."⁸¹ Brown argued that, in the face of this revolutionary rhetoric, religious men could no longer allow "blatant socialists, like those who address the crowds who flock to hear them in Chicago," monopolize themes of social justice. The churches must reclaim their place as the laboring man's true friend and avert the violent schemes of socialists and communists, who Brown categorically grouped with anarchists. The churches must address the grievances of honest working people who struggled to achieve

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 481-84.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 493-496.

⁸¹ C. O. Brown, *Talks on the Labor Troubles* (Chicago: F. H. Revell, 1886), 9.

anything more than subsistence.⁸²

Brown did not go so far as to concede that the grievances of workers were always correct, only that a sense of grievance in honest workers was understandable. In condemning George's revolutionary extremism, he failed to credit the author with making a fundamentally similar argument, that revolution should be avoided by addressing grievances. Brown described what he saw as a potentially dangerous working-class response to George's writing. It was in reference to those working-class readings of George that Brown is credited with coining the term *social gospel*. In the decades to follow, a wide spectrum of ministers would ultimately fall under the label of social gospeler, all of them trying to promote varying degrees of social reform and social justice as part of an essential Christian mission, and most if not all of them opposing ideas of revolution. Gunsaulus fit within this emerging movement that looked to Christian leadership to rescue national progress from derailment.

The 1886 Haymarket Riot provided a picture of the radicalism that Brown and others feared. A worker protest in Chicago's Haymarket Square resulted in a confrontation with police when officers marched into the remains of an already dispersing crowd at the end of the peaceful gathering. Then someone threw a bomb of dynamite at them. The police exchanged gunfire with some members of the crowd, described the next day as a mob "crazed with a fanatic desire for blood..."⁸³ These news stories exaggerated the number of bombs, reporting three instead of one, and often skimmed the reason for the initially peaceful Haymarket gathering, to protest police killings of striking workers the previous day who challenged long hours and harsh conditions, advocating an eight-hour workday. Of the seven policemen killed in the Haymarket Riot, officer Mathias Degan died when the bomb went off. Most of the shooting that followed, including of

⁸² *Ibid.*, 10-13.

⁸³ "Dynamite Bombs," *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (May 5, 1886), 1.

fellow officers, was done by police and not the crowd. Nonetheless, the incident quickly took on a narrative of violent mobs viciously attacking gallant policemen, sparking an intense reaction against perceived radicals that included mass arrests, censorship, and political suppression. When Gunsaulus came to Chicago in 1887, four of the men convicted in the Haymarket Riot awaited their hanging, Albert Parsons, August Spies, George Engel, and Adolf Fischer. Even though the bomb thrower was never identified, the court eagerly sought to punish supposed ringleaders of violent anarchism. Skilled middle-class laborers united against the perceived threat of the poor and immigrant populations, those who fit the popular image of the dangerous anarchist.⁸⁴

The eight-hour movement faced public discredit as a consequence of the bombing and subsequent accusations. The trial of suspected plotters was a theatrical show of competing narratives in which the accused had little chance for a fair trial from the beginning. Dividing Americans largely along class lines, the accused were presumed guilty by Chicago's elite, including Gunsaulus.⁸⁵

Chicago had experienced serious labor tensions before. When Gunsaulus and others referred to the center of the labor conflict being in the West, they likely thought of the Great Railroad Strike of 1877.⁸⁶ No less than Lyman Abbott predicted ahead of the Haymarket Riot that violent and atheistic anarchists, armed with dynamite and drawn from the immigrant population, posed a grave threat. Middle-class preachers and laymen were primed to expect as much. Abbott condemned anarchism while arguing that industry did need to be more

⁸⁴ Jeffery A. Clymer, "The 1886 Chicago Haymarket Bombing and the Rhetoric of Terrorism in America," *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2002), 315; Richard Sennett, "Genteel Backlash: Chicago 1886," *Trans-action* 7, no. 3 (Jan. 1970), 41-44.

⁸⁵ James Green, *Death in the Haymarket: A Story of Chicago, the First Labor Movement and the Bombing That Divided America* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2006), 209-230.

⁸⁶ Clymer, "The 1886 Chicago Haymarket Bombing and the Rhetoric of Terrorism in America," 316.

democratic.⁸⁷ Gunsaulus celebrated his first Thanksgiving in Chicago less than two weeks after the hangings of Parsons, Spies, Engel, and Fischer.⁸⁸ That Thanksgiving, when clergymen shared what they were grateful for, they gave thanks that the anarchists had been dealt with. Gunsaulus expressed thanks for activism addressing “pauperism” and “intemperance,” and also “the victory of law over anarchy.”⁸⁹

Gunsaulus’s first sermon in Chicago addressed the need to innovatively go into the future with a firm respect for tradition, rejecting modern scientific rationalism and philosophy for a necessary foundation in orthodoxy. He spoke to the need to overcome sin, represented most clearly in America by anarchy.⁹⁰ The counterpoint to anarchy was “heroic manhood” fostered by the church. The church must perfect the lives of men and apply the Christian life to society without any reservations. As Gunsaulus put it, the church must realize its own “revolutionary” purpose, its “right to control everything that has to do with the life of man, to influence art, literature, politics, trade, and commerce.”⁹¹ To this end, Gunsaulus continued his advocacy for prohibition. Despite his frequent emphasis on the role of men, some of his most important platforms included speaking before the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union at the invitation of the influential suffragist and reformer Frances Willard.⁹² He addressed groups of white women alongside leading female educators and temperance advocates, preaching that moral “culture and intelligence” must overcome “saloon-keepers” in the battle for the minds of children.⁹³ The issues of the day would be decided by the next generation.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 316; Lyman Abbott, “Danger Ahead,” *Century Illustrated Magazine* 31, no. 1 (Nov. 1885), 53-57.

⁸⁸ Clymer, “The 1886 Chicago Haymarket Bombing and the Rhetoric of Terrorism in America,” 315.

⁸⁹ “Grateful Clergymen,” *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Nov. 24, 1887), 2.

⁹⁰ “The City in Brief,” *The Daily Inter Ocean* (March 14, 1887), 8.

⁹¹ “Plymouth’s New Pastor,” *The Daily Inter Ocean* (May 30, 1887), 3.

⁹² “W. C. T. U.,” *The Daily Inter Ocean* (June 18, 1887), 13.

⁹³ “Supplementary Meeting,” *The Daily Inter Ocean* (July 16, 1887), 2.

Gunsaulus's 1887 Thanksgiving sermon laid out his position on labor. He believed that American labor would reliably reject anarchism's "hideous monstrosities of wickedness and crime" if people clearly understood the situation. To be an anarchist was to be an enemy of God, on the wrong side of history. Gunsaulus compared anarchists to the biblical antagonist, Sisera, an obstacle to progress who was murdered while he slept. The preacher lost no sleep over the recent executions of those questionably convicted in the Haymarket Riot, but he agreed there were more effective solutions to combatting anarchism. While hanging anarchists worked, "it will be wiser to meet all those orderly people who think thus with argument rather than with rope. The question presses against our industrial system. 'Are you creating war between the classes, the employer and the employed?' If so, the stars in their courses are against you." Gunsaulus praised the white, skilled workers of the Knights of Labor who condemned anarchy, and saw religious leaders winning over the middle class.⁹⁴ He preached, "one of our great reasons for Thanksgiving to-day is this, that the strongest thinkers are seeing... Christianity is able to furnish lines and motives for needed reform. Professorial socialism is said to have come to the feet of Christ. One idea after another which promises peace has been forcing itself to the front, and each is a Christian idea." God's "highest possible manhood" rejected both the viciousness of laissez-faire, doing nothing to address social problems, and the viciousness of socialistic government, destroying private enterprise. The Christian life alone could produce "true socialism," the work of Christ reconciling the individual and society.⁹⁵

Where historians have often looked at the work of white, middle-class social gospelers as a reaction to the excesses of industrial capitalism, Gunsaulus illustrates a view of an active Christian reform movement eager to mold all of society, and attacking the excesses of labor in

⁹⁴ "The Triumph of Right," *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Nov. 25, 1887), 3.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.

defense of capital. Such attitudes toward labor are, by themselves, unsurprising from affluent clergy of the period. But one understands the possible dimensions of the social gospel differently if the demand for social reform, with its challenge to laissez-faire, was also an effort to win credibility for middle-class virtues and industrial capitalism, as in Gunsaulus's case.

Despite Gunsaulus's claims of a true, middle-class socialism arising from the Christian life, the ones responsible for class conflict were always and inevitably laborers, never capital or law enforcement. Both during his Thanksgiving sermon and in later years, Gunsaulus articulated the idea that "capital is coined labor," and "the capitalist's coined labor" must be equally as respected as "the laborer's labor in right and influence."⁹⁶ The enemies of God were rarely businessmen, unless they happened to sell alcohol. The poor, mistreated capitalist apparently needed defending against the privileges of labor. In one sermon a few years later, Gunsaulus preached that God indiscriminately gave all men a throne with which to realize their potential. The throne being the power to work and make money.⁹⁷ While those found guilty of anarchy hung from ropes, Gunsaulus believed in Christian-minded reforms to make individuals better, eventually attaining the perfection that would bring about the social reality of the kingdom of God.

Plymouth Congregational Church already had its hands in many forms of social work and activism when Gunsaulus first arrived. The recently deceased Joseph Armour willed \$100,000 to establish the Armour Mission, appointing his brother Philip to carry out his wish. The wealthy meatpacker Philip D. Armour added \$150,000 to the fund, and a new mission building was constructed in 1886 to provide Sunday school, a free kindergarten, and a free dispensary.⁹⁸ While

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3; on Gunsaulus expressing the idea of "coined labor" in later years, see Carter, *Union Made*, 157.

⁹⁷ "A Sermon on Thrones," *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Dec. 15, 1890), 3.

⁹⁸ "The Armour Mission in Chicago," *The Milwaukee Sentinel* (Dec. 6, 1886), 2.

the opportunity of the new mission likely played a significant role in attracting Gunsaulus to Chicago, it was far from the only effort of its kind. Plymouth Church in 1887 maintained charitable work on multiple fronts, totaling thousands of dollars in annual costs. Those expenses were sustained through impressive fundraising networks running through the city's upper crust. The generosity of such religious philanthropy only thinly masked the sharp class divides within Chicago churches. Separate mission buildings served those who did not always belong in the genteel setting of Plymouth Congregational Church itself, where those who fell short of social expectations could be dismissed from membership, and where the most affluent church members, including Armour, paid \$200 a year to rent their pew.⁹⁹ Construction of the mission school at the corner of Thirty-third Street and Armour Avenue occurred in the same year as the nearby construction of the Armour Flats. The Armour Flats were 194 of the finest apartments in Chicago, built at a cost of \$1,000,000 to accommodate upper-level employees of Armour & Company.¹⁰⁰ Within seven years, the land between the mission and the flats became the site of a third Armour-funded project, the Armour Institute.

In 1890, Gunsaulus preached the sermon widely credited with inspiring Armour to create a new school dedicated to technical education. Historian Mark P. Hutchison calls it “one of the most famous sermons of the late Gilded Age.”¹⁰¹ No transcript of this famous sermon seems to exist. This sermon, and Armour's reaction to it, formed the popular creation story of the Armour Institute. A characteristic telling related how the liberally minded Armour, while not one for “rigid creeds,” faithfully attended Plymouth Congregational Church. The “brilliant young liberal

⁹⁹ “Plymouth Congregational,” *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Dec. 22, 1887), 7.

¹⁰⁰ Franz Schulze, *Illinois Institute of Technology: An Architectural Tour* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2005), 2.

¹⁰¹ Mark P. Hutchison, “Dissenting Preaching in the Twentieth-Century Anglophone World,” in *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions, Volume V: The Twentieth Century—Themes and Variations in a Global Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 171.

preacher Gunsaulus” came to pastor the church, delivering a sermon titled, “What I Would Do with a Million Dollars,” focused on the need for technical training for young men. Armour’s supposedly spontaneous reaction led him to say, “Young man, if you mean what you’ve preached today, I’ll give you that million in return for five years of your life.”¹⁰² As a more recent publication puts it, “Gunsaulus told his parishioners... that a rapidly industrializing society—one being shaped by new technologies—depended on technicians for continued progress. If he had a million dollars... he would create a school for young people who wished to train as technicians but could not otherwise afford to do so.”¹⁰³

In an interview with Theodore Dreiser, Armour gushed about his love of oratory. His response to Gunsaulus’s 1890 sermon reflected genuine admiration, and Dreiser observed that the businessman often remarked “that he would have preferred to be a great orator rather than a great capitalist.”¹⁰⁴ Whatever he might say, Armour’s wealth doubtless counted for more than Gunsaulus’s voice, and the idea for the Armour Institute probably did not come only from one sermon. In an interview for *McClure’s Magazine*, Armour mentioned being inspired by the work of industrialists around the world, and asked Gunsaulus if he believed in building a school in Chicago, based partly on Christian philanthropist Quintin Hogg’s Polytechnic school in London. In this less repeated telling, Armour adopted his educational vision independently of his pastor, but sought Gunsaulus’s partnership before deciding to commit to the investment.¹⁰⁵

In 1890, one did not need to go as far as London to find examples of educational

¹⁰² Ernest Poole, *Giants Gone: Men Who Made Chicago* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1943), 155.

¹⁰³ Schulze, *Illinois Institute of Technology*, 1.

¹⁰⁴ Theodore Dreiser, “Life Stories of Successful Men—No. 10,” in *Selected Magazine Articles of Theodore Dreiser: Life and Art in the American 1890s, Volume 1*, edited by Yoshinobu Hakutani (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1985), 126.

¹⁰⁵ Arthur Warren, “Philip D. Armour: His Manner of Life, His Immense Enterprises in Trade and Philanthropy,” *McClure’s Magazine* 2, no 3 (Feb. 1894), 274.

philanthropy. The Baptist preacher William Rainy Harper was raising money for the new University of Chicago, to which John D. Rockefeller had pledged a large sum if the Baptists could raise a portion of the necessary funds on their own. Gunsaulus praised the efforts of his fellow Christian reformers, and newspapers commented on the immortality to be won by wealthy men who founded great educational institutions.¹⁰⁶ Rockefeller beat Armour to the punch in Chicago's philanthropic race for immortality. But if Rockefeller's investment relied on the preacher Harper, who served as the first president of the University of Chicago, then Armour certainly had his own ambitious, Bible carrying, business friendly, and reform-minded potential school administrator in the wings.

From the end of 1892 through the following year, Gunsaulus stole headlines with an unexpected series of announcements. A new five-story building rose near the corner of Thirty-third Street and Armour Avenue, which locals assumed to be another one of Armour's tenement projects. Gunsaulus instead introduced the Armour Institute, claiming it "will be to this city all that the Drexel Institute is to Philadelphia and the Pratt Institute is to Brooklyn." If Armour and Gunsaulus could help it, the institute would be "the greatest institute for manual training, science, and art in this country. It will be a school good enough for the richest, but it will reach out for the poorest."¹⁰⁷ Armour initially provided a \$1,400,000 endowment for the school, more than twice what Rockefeller had originally pledged to the University of Chicago.¹⁰⁸

For Gunsaulus, industrial capitalism itself represented God's work. Industrial education and upward mobility provided the means of individual improvement, and individual improvement the means to the social goals of Christianity. The preacher explained the aim of the

¹⁰⁶ "Churches and Colleges," *The Daily Inter Ocean* (May 22, 1890), 4.

¹⁰⁷ "Armour to Chicago: He Gives a Manual Training School and Endowment," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 13 1892), 1.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*; "Rockefeller's Generous Gift," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (May 19, 1889), 9.

wealthy industrialist, a seeming match to his own, that through education “the problems of labor and capital can best be solved,” turning “young people into true Americans with all the possibilities, hopes, and inspiration of citizenship...”¹⁰⁹ By renewing faith in individual agency among working people in Chicago, so often a center of labor unrest, hope in the promise of upward mobility would reconcile the disruptive forces of modern industrial capitalism with its malcontents.

Though the origin story involving Gunsaulus’s 1890 sermon should not be taken entirely at face value, the preacher did personally commit to serving as the Armour Institute’s president for five years as a precondition to Armour’s historic investment.¹¹⁰ Armour trusted his pastor with managing this educational enterprise based on apparent confidence in the preacher’s vision, energies, and administrative capabilities, even as he clearly drew further inspiration from other wealthy businessmen creating urban technical schools. In the planning for their new school, both Armour and Gunsaulus traveled to learn from other institutional models and programs, and corresponded with philanthropists George W. Childs, Anthony J. Drexel, and Charles Pratt.¹¹¹

By April, 1893, the papers had announced most of the teachers and programs for the Armour Institute’s first schoolyear. The advertised courses covered interests in art, business, and science, featuring liberal education for both young men and women. The planned courses for men included many options for technical training, such as woodworking, metallurgy, and

¹⁰⁹ “Armour to Chicago,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 13 1892), 1.

¹¹⁰ In later years, Gunsaulus would be asked to confirm for reporters the story of how Armour had first approached him following his 1890 sermon. Gunsaulus thought the sermon had gone poorly, but Armour unexpectedly greeting him afterward, offering to invest his money in a new school if Gunsaulus would invest his time. Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Merle Crowell, Oct. 20, 1916, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 5, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*; “He Gets an Assistant,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 22, 1892), 1; “May Go to the Armour Institute,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 21, 1892), 1; “The Armour Institute and Its New President,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 23, 1892), 4; “Armour to Chicago,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 13 1892), 1.

mechanical training, while offering women courses in domestic economy, millinery, dressmaking, and library science, the last of which was open to both sexes. The school also promoted physical training for both men and women.¹¹² Students could be admitted into either the Scientific Academy or the Technical College of the Armour Institute. The Scientific Academy offered a four-year degree, and featured an entrance exam that tested students on their grammar. In keeping with the practical mission of the school, students could be admitted to some advanced programs in the Technical College while enrolled in the Scientific Academy, based on individual aptitude. The Technical College offered programs in mechanical, electrical, and mining engineering, programs which taught practical skills but also required advanced work not only in mathematics and science, but in civics, history, literature, and modern languages. The entrance exams for the Technical College required knowledge of algebra, geometry, physics, and a modern language chosen from English, French, or German. With the possibility of free tuition, these entrance exams were the most obvious barrier for prospective students. The 1893 entrance exams were held on three dates, June 20 and September 11 and 12.¹¹³

Confusion about the new school's mission followed from its broad educational agenda and evolving priorities, as well as the disconnect between fundamental class barriers and the claimed desire to help the poorest Chicagoans. By the time the school admitted its first students in 1893, the institution still struggled to brand itself as a full-fledged school of technology. Early on, both the department of "mining engineering and metallurgy" and the "department of

¹¹² "Work of the Armour Institute: President Gunsaulus Tells What It is Proposed to Accomplish," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 25, 1892), 6; "Fingers and Brains," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Dec. 10, 1893), 41.

¹¹³ "Is Getting Ready: Preparing to Open the Armour Institute," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Jan. 20, 1893), 9; "Additions to Armour Institute," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (March 10, 1893), 9; "To Take First Rank: Armour Institute Practically Ready for Fall Work," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (April 20, 1893), 13; "Good Homes Its Aim: Work of the Domestic Department of Armour Institute." *Chicago Daily Tribune* (May 24, 1893), 11.

domestic arts” drew disproportionate attention and interest to the school, while its advertised interest in the urban poor led some to think of it as a reform school. Gunsaulus found himself trying to correct public perception. The Armour Institute was not a reform school, but a prestigious school of technology supposedly open to the poorest Chicagoans. It offered low tuition, even free tuition “for deserving pupils” who could not afford it, in order to educate them “in the splendid practical sciences of this nineteenth century.”¹¹⁴ No mere free school for the poor, the Armour Institute, Armour and Gunsaulus insisted, would serve young working people and the children of millionaires, offering an education equal to any obtainable elsewhere.¹¹⁵

During that first year at the Armour Institute, editors of *The Altruistic Review* praised the meritocratic model. Even with free tuition, poor students would be handed nothing they did not earn through entrance exams and study. The school thus helped “the deserving to help themselves.” More than this, it offered Chicago a way to protect “life and property” by Americanizing these immigrant youth who otherwise threatened to make of Chicago a new “Sodom and Gomorrah,” a “wasteland of forgotten glory and enterprise.” The Armour Institute might become like one of the handful of righteous men who, if they had lived in Sodom, would have saved the entire city. But even if there was an emphasis on Americanizing Chicago, they appreciated the distinctions that separated the Armour Institute from a mere reform school for the poor or a school for the very rich. Writers at *The Altruistic Review* initially feared the institute would be aristocratic, noting, “it is, but it is that wholesome aristocracy of true manhood and womanhood, of intellect and of high ideals, not that other deteriorating sort, the cod-fish or

¹¹⁴ “Two Courses Fixed: Important Departments of Armour Institute Outlined,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (April 6, 1893), 6.

¹¹⁵ “A Notable Partnership,” unidentified article, Gunsaulus Family Scrapbook. Frank W. Gunsaulus collection, 1878-1948. Paul V. Galvin Library. University Archives and Special Collections. Illinois Institute of Technology.

moneyed aristocracy.” If Chicago’s young people could pass an entrance exam and claim one of the limited spots at the new school, they became part of the new, professional, and meritocratic aristocracy on which so many hopes for the future depended.¹¹⁶

Gunsaulus spent the years between 1875 and 1893 developing his message, and finding audiences for his brand of transcendental Christian idealism. As an entertaining and engaging speaker, he rose to the top echelons of prestige and compensation for an American preacher. His vision of individuals as perfectible, and industrial capitalism as the God-given means to that perfection, throws a twist into the social gospel narrative of reform. After 1893, Gunsaulus faced a new set of challenges as the president of the Armour Institute. Having marshalled support for an ambitious educational project, together with one of America’s wealthiest businessmen, the very real barriers of class, race, and gender were on a collision course with the promises of indiscriminate, meritocratic upward mobility. Those tensions, together with the pressures on educational funding that depended on the good graces of the Armour family, would test the practicability of Gunsaulus’s idealism as never before.

¹¹⁶ “One of the Ten Which May Prove Chicago’s Salvation,” *The Altruistic Review* 2, no. 1 (Jan. 1894), 2-3.

Chapter II:

The Armour Institute of Technology and the Social Gospel

The Armour Institute first opened its doors on a blistering summer day to “throng[s] of would-be students” who filled the hot corridors with energy and noise.¹¹⁷ Gunsaulus and Armour had only expected around three hundred applicants, but found themselves facing three times that many. The Institute’s German instructor, Rosa C. Lang, later recalled, “Who could forget that noisy, eager crowd of nine hundred applicants which filled the large auditorium and galleries, while many hung over the railings, all clamoring for admission?” Lang noted a religious significance as a “hushed silence and awe... came over that vast multitude as Dr. Gunsaulus raised his hand invoking a blessing upon this undertaking. Then came the separation of the sheep and the goats. Many had come in answer to the call, but not all could be chosen.” The religious feeling extended beyond Gunsaulus’s blessing. Even weeding out the goats produced an unexpectedly large incoming class, beyond the ability of the school to properly accommodate. To address the issue of class space, all language courses were moved to the “holy walls of the Sunday school rooms” in the nearby Armour Mission. While Lang remembered the Mission classrooms fondly, she also regretted “profaning those hallowed precincts with secular teaching,” as well as having her lessons interrupted by organ music.¹¹⁸

Armour arranged for the school to have an annual operating budget of \$50,000. To this could be added any additional funds drawn from tuition or other sources. Initially unspecified was how much money would continue to be spent on the nearby Armour Mission, which also continued to depend primarily on his largesse. Armour suggested that more money could be

¹¹⁷ Jessie S. Van Vliet to the Editors of the 1898 *Integral*, undated. In *Integral: The Book of the Class of '99* (Chicago: J. W. Franks & Sons, 1898), 201.

¹¹⁸ Rosa C. Lang to the Editors of the 1898 *Integral*, Jan. 15, 1898. In *Integral: The Book of the Class of '99*, 203-5.

found for the Mission and the school if the first year's budget was insufficient.¹¹⁹ Gunsaulus had managed affairs at the Mission, and while he continued to be involved, the day-to-day administrative responsibilities were taken off his shoulders as he assumed the role of President of the Armour Institute. The pastor Duncan C. Milner was hired to manage regular work at the Mission. Within a year of opening the Armour Institute, budgetary concerns proved more serious for both the school and the Mission than previously imagined.

The Armour Institute and the Armour Mission quickly became so entwined in their activities that Gunsaulus often felt the need to reckon their operating costs together. The Mission's budget was eventually set at \$25,000, for a combined \$75,000. Professors were involved at the Mission, and Mission staff such as Milner and librarian Julia A. Beveridge were involved at the Armour Institute. As Gunsaulus noted when reviewing their combined budgets, "These institutions have so coalesced in their work that it is impossible to divide them in their activity." Gunsaulus further boasted that this marriage of mission outreach and technical education would distinguish the Institute over other technical schools. He assured Armour that the school bearing his name would be just as much a brand leader as the wealthy meatpacker's "Armour Star Ham" and "Armour Bacon" brands. With an evolving emphasis on mechanical and electrical engineering, the school's "preparatory work" would "reach the ignorant and train them," while advanced "technical work" would "prepare them for good work in the world."¹²⁰

The matter of Mission and Institute blurring together is significant in what it says about Gunsaulus's ministry and the role of capitalism in the urban missions that played such a large role for Christian reformers. Missions provided all manner of help to the urban poor, contingent

¹¹⁹ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, undated letter, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹²⁰ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Philip D. Armour, Nov. 5, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

of course on funds and personnel. Missions often provided free educational and vocational opportunities, as well as other resources. They represented a crucial source of social gospel ministry. The Armour Mission boasted of being open to all, regardless of race or religion. Though Gunsaulus often received the credit for work at the Mission, much of it owed to Julia A. Beveridge. The Mission librarian not only served visitors and members with literature but spearheaded manual training for the kids who needed something to do with their hands, finding an instructor to introduce wood carving. Within a few years, the Armour Mission was the largest institution of its kind in the country, which historian Maureen A. Flanagan has called “a non-sectarian experiment in Christian democracy.”¹²¹

The Armour Institute was not merely near or incidental to the Mission, but grew out of the mission impulse to educate, uplift, and better communities by improving individuals. It also depended on the same source of funding. Armour intended that revenue from his apartments would cover the operating costs of both the Mission and the Institute, making it essential to consider their costs together. Being related so closely to the work of the Mission, it seemed as though the Armour Institute might actually succeed in some measure at bridging social class. Gunsaulus pledged as much, publishing in circulars that the Armour Institute would take any deserving students and provide them with a liberal education, training “the head, the hand, and the heart,” as “*Knowledge, skill, and culture* are the three constituent elements of a liberal education...”¹²²

¹²¹ Maureen A. Flanagan, “Frank W. Gunsaulus and the Armour Institute of Technology,” *Faith in the City: Chicago's Religious Diversity in the Era of the World's Fair*, <http://publications.newberry.org/faith-in-the-city/essays/frank-w-gunsaulus-and-armour-institute-technology> (accessed April 19, 2019); Irene Macauley, *The Heritage of the Illinois Institute of Technology* (Chicago: Illinois Institute of Technology, 1978), 11.

¹²² Armour Institute catalog (n.p., 1895), from *Faith in the City: Chicago's Religious Diversity in the Era of the World's Fair*, <http://publications.newberry.org/faith-in-the-city/resource/christian-education-armour-institute> (accessed April 18, 2019).

While a close connection between Christian mission and education was notable at the Armour Institute, similar religious ties were noticeable elsewhere in Chicago as well. The Baptist minister William Rainey Harper preceded Gunsaulus as a preacher and scholar who took up the administrative reigns of a new school. He was to John D. Rockefeller and the University of Chicago what Gunsaulus became to Armour and the Institute. The two were close friends, and were often on the same page in their views on education and the future of Chicago. When Gunsaulus worried that a religious Sunday evening lecture series would be discontinued at Chicago's Central Music Hall, he confidently appealed to Harper to use University money to pay a minister to take up the task. A preacher "with popular gifts" could provide "spiritual education" to Chicagoans "as a University Extension work..." The matter of moral and spiritual education in the city carried a sense of urgency for these reformers, and Gunsaulus pressed Harper, "I cannot rest until I feel that the work of the theatres, saloons, and other worse places is at least properly met by such a healthful and inspiring feature of our city life, as would be a grand University Extension work at Central Music Hall."¹²³ In the mind of Gunsaulus, education was always tied to broad issues of moral reform and Christian leadership, albeit with a nonsectarian approach and embrace of secular institutions. Harper in turn considered this normal practice, and an excellent use of the University's time and resources.¹²⁴ Harper later requested that Gunsaulus take the University's money for a year as the paid lecturer for the extension work. Gunsaulus

¹²³ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, Oct. 29, 1894, University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912, Box 47, Folder 14, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library (hereafter UC Archives).

¹²⁴ University Extension work was often paid for in part by special fundraising efforts. A previous example was partially funded by the University of Chicago, with the rest of the funding coming from the sale of \$20.00 tickets to Chicago's affluent and sympathetic ministers and churchgoers. This fundraising effort was also taken on by the University, with Harper personally reaching out to likely supporters of the work. William Rainey Harper to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, June 29, 1892, Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932, Box 2, Folder 14, UC Archives.

apologetically turned down the request despite believing strongly in the cause. He lamented that he was too busy to accept new engagements, and had recently been forced to turn down roughly \$10,000 in speaking fees at a rate of \$150 per lecture.¹²⁵

The cause of cultural renewal and moral progress was key to much of Gunsaulus's thought and action. Like many liberal Protestants of his time, he believed in divine immanence, the idea that God was present in and revealed through culture.¹²⁶ Connecting this to education, he once wrote Harper, "I have something to put into the lives of students which this divine culture has made clearer to me and I yearn to cast these seeds which fairly burn with harvests into the waiting soil."¹²⁷ Whether mentoring young people through missions or the Institute, the young were full of potential in realizing liberal Protestant conceptions of progress. Gunsaulus compared training young men for the workforce with the baptism of Christ. Upward mobility not only made better citizens, but made proper moral actors within providential history. Jesus provided the ultimate example for all upwardly mobile young men when he, though destined to rule the world, submitted to baptism. In the same way, young people would renew America's faith in the future and realize their own greatness by properly consecrating themselves to their work. Entering the industrial workforce was not just a pragmatic career choice, but a calling. Industrial education was not just a material concern, but a baptism.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, Dec. 5, 1896. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912, Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

¹²⁶ On divine immanence among theologically liberal American Protestants, see Rick Ostrander, *The Life of Prayer in a World of Science: Protestants, Prayers, and American Culture, 1870-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 76-79; also, William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992), 2.

¹²⁷ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, Dec. 7, 1897. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912, Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

¹²⁸ Frank W. Gunsaulus, *Young Men in History* (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1898), 5-7, 9-10, 18-19, 21-23, 25-27, 29-30, 32-34, 36-40, 42-45.

On top of his commitments to church, mission, and school, Gunsaulus found time to invest in art for the public's benefit. He supported the creation of such institutions as the Art Institute of Chicago, the Field Museum, and the Toledo Museum of Art.¹²⁹ This moral and cultural renewal that Gunsaulus sought touched on many areas of life. It demanded confronting evil, in the forms of alcohol, general vice, anarchism, and other sins. It required working towards the kingdom of God on earth, an aspirational goal for society that Gunsaulus imagined would result from the upward mobility of individuals. At the same time, the preacher's capitalist theology was more than pro-business and anti-sins. His notion of upward mobility included assumptions about cultural refinement and aesthetics. Moral progress was fueled by great art, great music, great literature, and great men.

The cultural capital of civilizations, their great works, had a role to play in teaching the American people what was good and noble, containing the immanent divine power to call society to higher things. Cultural and social progress wrought by the Reformation and Enlightenment were, in Gunsaulus's words, a "fresh and omnipotent vision of the real Christ..."¹³⁰ The progression of history from ancient empires to modern republics was part of the same divinely guided phenomenon as the progression from the Old Testament to the New.¹³¹ Modernity and tradition were complimentary forces in this view of progress, straddling the line between modernist trends in art and intellectual discourse on the one hand, and religious tradition on the other. Gunsaulus frequently insisted on a middle ground that rejected dichotomy, or at least the dichotomies he was uncomfortable with. In his words, "It is the most mischievous

¹²⁹ Quentin R. Skrabec, Jr., *Edward Drummond Libbey, American Glassmaker* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011), 115, 118, 139, 153-57.

¹³⁰ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, *Monk and Knight: An Historical Study in Fiction, Volume I* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1891), 19.

¹³¹ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, *The Transfiguration of Christ* (Cambridge, MA: H. O. Houghton and Co., 1886), 11.

of errors... for historians to seek to separate the intellectual from the spiritual elements which coexist within that vast and chaotic solution out of which ultimately came the order and power of modern life.”¹³²

Gunsaulus’s insistence on this ambiguous middle ground was such that, even when one of his intellectual influences, the Chicago Unitarian, theologian, educator, and pacifist Jenkin Lloyd Jones, believed Gunsaulus should abandon his association with Protestant orthodoxy, he refused.¹³³ Gunsaulus wrote that while he believed orthodoxy must change, he also found faults in liberalism. Having been born into the orthodox camp, he would not disassociate unless forced to. Where Jones felt the interests of inclusive liberal piety should make it impossible to identify with exclusionary orthodoxy, Gunsaulus believed the two camps shared a common cause of practical work for cultural transformation.¹³⁴

This belief in cultural progress and renewal was certainly on display at the 1893 World’s Fair, where the Armour Institute’s students began their education by helping their professors hunt for supplies, equipment, and items worthy of display in their new school’s museum.¹³⁵ When they were allowed to wander away from the fair’s engineering marvels, they targeted the free food stands and created traffic jams for pedestrians on the Midway who could not get around large groups of students.¹³⁶ The idea that God was revealed through culture, which could be

¹³² Gunsaulus, *Monk and Knight*, 11; on religious influences on modern art and aesthetics, see Jonathan A. Anderson and William A. Dyrness, *Modern Art and the Life of a Culture: The Religious Impulses of Modernism* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2016), 18-19.

¹³³ On more than one occasion, Gunsaulus acknowledged Jones as “an inspiration” to the work of the Armour Institute. Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Jan. 10, 1893, Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932, Box 2, Folder 7, UC Archives; Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Dec. 4, 1893, Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932, Box 2, Folder 7, UC Archives.

¹³⁴ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, March 18, 1899, Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932, Box 2, Folder 7, UC Archives.

¹³⁵ “Collecting for Armour Museum,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Oct. 28, 1893), 1.

¹³⁶ J. Richard Sloan to the Editors of the 1898 *Integral*, Jan. 25, 1898. In *Integral: The Book of the Class of ‘99*, 201.

displayed, suggested connections between the divine and material prosperity. Like Gunsaulus, Jenkin Lloyd Jones connected moral development with the arts, education, and material culture. According to Jones, a crucial lesson to be taken from literature was “that education is salvation, that culture is character, that refinement on earth is refinement for heaven, that usefulness is piety.” Any exposure to literature could only “enforce this religion of character, the gospel of education, saving men by training men.”¹³⁷

Both at the World’s Fair and the Armour Institute, the idea that divine influence was found in material culture was a telling conceit of class, allowing those with material means to claim greater experience with the divine in American culture. It was for this very reason that art for the public was so vital to Gunsaulus. Those without material means should still have opportunities to experience materially supported revelations of the divine, the good, and the noble. Gunsaulus and Jones were both well aware that the working classes could seldom afford the aesthetics they cherished. In a sermon originally preached in Chicago’s Central Music Hall, Jones acknowledged that “religion of outward form is very expensive. It is a luxury that demands very good clothes, and a costly church to show them off in. Impressive architecture, beautiful interiors, artistic music... are all desirable, but they are scarcely for those who are struggling to feed and train growing families.” Not all could partake of the more costly “phases of religion” defined by such material aesthetic. Even so, such an aesthetic was an aspirational moral good, as long as it did not get in the way of more fundamental priorities. Jones preached sincere and righteous indulgence, stating, “I believe in this material world and all the good it contains. I believe in creature comforts. I have never seen a house too elegant... I believe in silks and

¹³⁷ Jenkin Lloyd Jones, *The Education of the Soul: A Study of Goethe’s “Wilhelm Meister”* (Chicago: Unity Publishing Company, n.d.), 8-9. Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932. Box 6: Folder 4. UC Archives.

satins... when they are not procured at the cost of higher interests and universal sympathies. I believe in no religion that advocates mendicancy.”¹³⁸ Though some forms of materialism were driven by greed, and therefore evil, there was also a liberating materialism to end poverty, a materialism that “makes thrift a religious duty, industry a grace, garnered stores gospel forces.” This materialism would “make for conscience, develop character, speed the gospel of brotherhood and bring in the kingdom of God on earth.”¹³⁹

The connections made by Jones and Gunsaulus between material culture and a sense of human brotherhood and progress linked their material aesthetic with a liberal sense of cosmopolitanism.¹⁴⁰ The historian Martin E. Marty once began a four-volume series titled, *Modern American Religion*, with the observation that religious expression at the 1893 World’s Fair in Chicago illustrated a new era for faith, the beginning of twentieth-century religious cosmopolitanism. Marty argues that this modern religious expression was best seen in the World’s Parliament of Religions, which convened at the fair, marking an emergent interfaith effort to unite all religion against irreligion.¹⁴¹ The gathering failed to bring about any such consensus, but did speak to modern trends. To the spiritual orientation noted by Marty can be added the aesthetics of material progress, which accounts for part of this religious cosmopolitanism of the 1890s. There was a willingness to see God in the world’s diverse cultural

¹³⁸ Jenkin Lloyd Jones, *Practical Piety: Four Discourses Delivered at Central Music Hall, Chicago* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1887), 5-6. Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932. Box 6: Folder 15. UC Archives

¹³⁹ Jenkin Lloyd Jones, *The Dual Mystery: Matter and Spirit* (Chicago: Unity Publishing Company, n.d.), 12-14. Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932, Box 6, Folder 5, UC Archives.

¹⁴⁰ While Gunsaulus himself was not a Unitarian, unwilling to separate himself from at least a veneer of orthodoxy, he was by the 1890s pointedly critiquing those who looked down on Unitarians, and helped found Chicago’s Undenominational Club, a group dedicated to bringing together the city’s Christian leaders. “Rare Bigots,” *New York Times* (May 17, 1894), 6; “Chicago Ministers Form a Club,” *New York Times* (Aug. 25, 1895), 14.

¹⁴¹ Martin E. Marty, *Modern American Religion, Volume I: The Irony of It All, 1893-1919* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986), 10, 18-19, 23.

and material attainments, if not always in every profession of faith. Jones, a Unitarian who believed in the cause of the World's Parliament of Religions, preached that education of the individual spirit would eventually bring about a united world, describing culture as an inner calling that produced material progress.¹⁴²

One of the places Gunsaulus found to appreciate culture in Chicago was the rare books corner of McClurg's Publishing House. There, he joined a close-knit but vocationally diverse group of bibliophiles who appreciated the classics, preferably expensive and scarce original editions. Together, these men formed the Saints and Sinners Club, a running joke that described the group's members who were mostly journalists and clergymen, with a smattering of businessmen, scholars, playwrights, and others. Gunsaulus embraced this good humor, affectionately referring to his friends as "the most interesting group of liars ever assembled."¹⁴³

The Saints and Sinners Club further illustrates self-awareness regarding the tensions between religious spirituality and the material aesthetic. The writer and journalist Eugene Field came up with the name for the group. A good friend of Gunsaulus, Field shared the preacher's addiction to rare books but not his income. The writer gained a reputation for starving himself, trying to live on an all bread diet so he could save enough money add to his collection. Gunsaulus would often treat him to lunch or dinner to address this unhealthy diet, and the two debated, in the humor of the Saints and Sinners Club, whether modern material desire was the enemy of spirituality. Field lamented that the modern world had exhausted the traditional emotional appeals of things like love, or fear, or worship. One of the few appetites left that could still make one feel alive was "wanting a book we can't get, or can't pay for." Desires for material

¹⁴² Jones, *The Education of the Soul: A Study of Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister,"* 9, 20. Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932. Box 6: Folder 4. UC Archives.

¹⁴³ "Corners in Books," *New York Times* (Feb. 25, 1899), BR120.

attainment were eclipsing the traditional role of religion. Gunsaulus reminded Field that he seemed plenty alive whenever they went out to eat, so perhaps traditional appetites for things like meat pie were alive and well.¹⁴⁴ Behind this exchange was Gunsaulus's belief that some human appetites were eternal and unchanging. Just as Eugene Field could not live on bread or books alone, so modern materialism could not dull the power of the Christian life.

For all of their back and forth, Field left the most colorful mark on these debates about modern materialism and spirituality through his satirical short story, *The Temptation of Friar Gonsol*. When tempted by the devil over a rare book, Gonsol found himself unable to resist. In the story, Friar Gonsol and another man of God race each other to be the first to acquire the valuable book from Satan. Launching a crusade against the devil, the two clergymen appear pious in their zealous offensive, even though they are both after material gain.¹⁴⁵ Field's satire called into question the relationship of modern material pursuits to piety.

When remembering Field, who died in 1895, Gunsaulus shared his satire with Harper, admitting that he and Reverend Frank Bristol were the two satirized clergymen. True to the story, "we were running afoul of one another constantly in our search for rare books, and oftentimes it was a race between us to some distant country town where we might find some hidden treasure..." While they did not mean to forget "the Golden Rule," they covetously searched for literary troves, hoping the other would not come across the same discoveries.¹⁴⁶ Gunsaulus's searches to acquire art, literature, and other forms of material culture took him throughout the country and sometimes abroad. He well understood the hunger for rare books that

¹⁴⁴ Cleveland Moffett, "O Rare 'Gene Field!'" *Godey's Magazine* 132, no. 788 (Feb. 1896), 155-56.

¹⁴⁵ Eugene Field, *The Complete Tribune Primer*, illus. by Frederick Burr Opper (Boston: Mutual Book Company, 1901), 127-134.

¹⁴⁶ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, Dec. 18, 1895. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14. UC Archives.

Field referred to, but disagreed about whether it was necessarily in conflict with spirituality. He often viewed it as a sincerely pious pursuit.¹⁴⁷

While the cultural productions that most interested liberal American Protestants as symbols of progress were often European in origin, the cosmopolitan potential of such interest extended to the cultural achievements of diverse peoples from around the world. A general sense of divine immanence and desire for cultural education could overlap with cultural appropriation and condescending anthropological fascination and exoticism. Rosa C. Lang and her German language students experienced how Gunsaulus's convictions about the importance of art and cultural production alternatively romanticized and exoticized other peoples. When they finally moved their classes from the Armour Mission to the campus proper, space was made for them in the Institute's museum, on the fifth floor of the main building. Instead of being interrupted by organ music, Lang's students were now distracted by "the South African collection of deadly weapons and feminine adornments," as well as other curiosities.¹⁴⁸

As seen in his associations with Jones and Field, there was no mistaking that social class determined the viability of Gunsaulus's material aesthetic, and his ideal forms of social transformation required proving. The preacher knew that upward mobility through industrial education was not just a practical, uplifting, and Americanizing program. It was essential for Christianity as he envisioned and practiced it to continue at all. Most Americans needed to experience upward mobility if they were ever to share the middle-class values and presumptions

¹⁴⁷ In one letter to a fellow book lover, Gunsaulus shared a prospective find involving a supposedly ancient manuscript from the holy land. The remarkable description of the unlikely manuscript is absurd, though the letter is not obviously satirical. Using the American Consul in Jerusalem to gather information, the preacher was prepared to buy and resell a rare find that stretched even his budget. Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Frank Jay, Nov. 21, 1896, Frank. W. Gunsaulus Collection, shared box, folder 4, number 1998.60, IIT Archives.

¹⁴⁸ Rosa C. Lang to the Editors of the 1898 *Integral*, Jan. 15, 1898. In *Integral: The Book of the Class of '99*, 205.

of Gunsaulus and his peers. Even if some working-class Americans believed in the Protestant Christianity modeled by Gunsaulus, they would need a higher salary just to afford it.

While Gunsaulus's material aesthetics and cultural presumptions separated him from working-class Americans, he also conveyed an earnest message of social uplift, a desire to democratize culture and learning. As one scholar later remembered him when recalling his aesthetic taste, "If his preaching was based on religion and was clothed in beautiful garments, it was also a very human preaching."¹⁴⁹ This human message was no doubt appreciated by attendees and beneficiaries of the Armour Mission, but some felt that there must be more to social uplift. One poor man attending the Mission suggested he could do even more for the world, if only Armour would give him \$50,000 to do it. Apparently inspired by the story of Gunsaulus's million-dollar sermon, the man did not get the same response to his pitch. It was reported that he threatened to target Gunsaulus, Armour, and their establishments with dynamite if the money was not provided, though Gunsaulus denied that part of the story.¹⁵⁰

Even as the Institute opened and the World's Fair spoke to the progress of civilization, the United States faced the 1893 recession. In the beginning, the close association of the Armour Institute and Mission seemed a promising sign of the work to be done. Armour had previously suggested that the school's funding could increase over time as needed. In the face of recession, he soon began wondering where they could cut expenses or raise other sources of revenue. Perhaps the children of the wealthy could be charged more, he suggested, even as he continued to refer requests for financial aid to Gunsaulus.¹⁵¹ The irony is that while Armour believed

¹⁴⁹ Charles Franklin Thwing, *Guides, Philosophers, and Friends: Studies of College Men* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927), 214.

¹⁵⁰ "Philip Armour's Life Threatened," *New York Times* (Dec. 25, 1893), 5.

¹⁵¹ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Dec. 5, 1893, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives; Philip D. Armour to F. Faddey, Jr., Jan. 18, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

wealthy families should be able to pay more, it was to prevent the school from costing him more. Professors in need of equipment for their unfinished departments were caught in the crosshairs of this penny pinching. In particular, Dr. Stine, the head of the Electrical Engineering Department, found himself fighting the Armour & Company Purchasing Department, through which all of his orders for equipment and supplies were to be placed. Stine asked Gunsaulus to intervene as they were ordering lower quality supplies than he had asked for.¹⁵² Gunsaulus repeatedly tried to rectify the situation, but found Armour distrustful of every new educational expenditure. The industrialist rebuffed his chosen administrator's concerns, explaining, "professors are not good business men, and if they are not held well in hand, they would soon bankrupt a packing house..."¹⁵³ The school needed to run itself like a business.

Gunsaulus had obtained Armour's historic investment in the name of creating a world-class technical school to bolster Protestant capitalism and address social needs. Despite this, the five years of his life that he initially promised to the Armour Institute would witness a near constant string of fiscal roadblocks in the way of that vision of a preeminent institution of learning. While Armour wanted to further stamp his name on Chicago, he was less interested in financial sacrifice during periods of recession. By the start of the Institute's second year, Gunsaulus already had grave doubts about Armour's commitment to what they had started together. Armour reassured him that he would reliably supply the \$50,000 operating budget, and that he remained confident in the preacher's administration. Armour had intended to provide the operating budgets for the Institute and the Mission from the revenue of the Armour Flats. Now instead of killing three birds with one stone, many apartments remained vacant following the

¹⁵² N. M. Stine to Frank W. Gunsaulus, Sept. 24, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁵³ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Sept. 29, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

onset of recession, falling short of projected revenue. Armour told Gunsaulus not to worry about the future, as it was normal for a businessman to be frugal. It did not mean he no longer believed in the educational enterprise. As the meatpacker put it, “it is perfectly natural for me to feel a little more liberal at some times than others, and I believe this is the pulse that surrounds any good successful man.”¹⁵⁴

While unable to move Armour to greater expenditures, Gunsaulus did not meekly accept conservative belt-tightening from his congregation in the midst of the 1893 recession. He told his church that he expected them to answer the call to Christian giving even in economic hard times. Gunsaulus recognized Armour as his employer at the Institute, where he did his best to cope with the financial situation. Behind the pulpit, he railed against any stinginess, telling his flock to stand with the “men and women” doing the work of Christian missions in Chicago. Over time, Gunsaulus’s congregation had given \$220,000 to the City Missionary Society, \$2,500 of it the previous year, helping pay for charity centers around Chicago that gave out coats, clothing, food, and other supplies. They needed to give as much or more during the recession, to unite “the spiritual and earthly, the ideal and the practical, the vision of our civilization to come with the fact of our reality here...” And Gunsaulus drove the point of class home, telling his church, “You and I have money. This congregation is rich yet, in spite of the panic... Some of you sit here Sunday after Sunday and let great causes go by. I do not stay here in this pulpit because I have to avoid telling the truth.” Yet for all of his zeal, Gunsaulus did not specifically call out his wealthiest congregants, beyond suggesting everyone give more. He pointed to young men and women that had not developed the habit of giving to missions. To them the preacher said, “this City Missionary Society means civilization. It means to bridge the abyss between the rich and the

¹⁵⁴ Philip D. Armour to Frank W. Gunsaulus, Oct. 2, 1894. F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

poor. It means to take the fire out of the tongue of the anarchist.”¹⁵⁵

Gunsaulus believed not only in the need for material giving, but in the people doing the work of urban missions. As invested as he was in an affluent material aesthetic, Gunsaulus also believed that it needed to be accompanied by a living faith. Money and beautiful church buildings alone could not save anyone. Christians needed to be personally invested in the missionary goal of cultural transformation. Disgusted with those prepared to contribute money but not people, Gunsaulus wrote the theologian Graham Taylor, lamenting that the hidebound “traditional church is always opposed to the living Christ.”¹⁵⁶ If respectable Christians of social standing did not invest themselves as well as their money, or at least expect their pastors to invest themselves, the hope of Christian missions faced a serious stumbling block.

The challenges to upward mobility posed by class divides were persistent even when Gunsaulus was aware of them and wanted to address them. While relatively few could attend the Armour Institute, the Mission was one way for poorer Chicagoans to gain some education and networking opportunities. Armour occasionally used the Mission like a hiring agency, funneling qualified candidates into openings at Armour & Company. Even in these cases, however, preference was given to people with some minimal social class, not the poorest attendees of the Mission.¹⁵⁷

As the primary patron of the Mission bearing his name, Armour at least appeared to want to bridge class divides. In one case, the millionaire wrote a letter of introduction for a woman

¹⁵⁵ *Eleventh Annual Report of the Chicago City Missionary Society, 1893* (Chicago: Mize & Stearns, 1894), 31-34, from *Faith in the City: Chicago's Religious Diversity in the Era of the World's Fair*, <http://publications.newberry.org/faith-in-the-city/resource/frank-w-gunsauluss-million-dollar-sermon> (accessed April 18, 2019).

¹⁵⁶ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Graham Taylor, Nov. 27, 1895, Chicago and the Midwest, Graham Taylor Papers, Midwest MS Taylor, Box 15, Folder 811, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois.

¹⁵⁷ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Oct. 13, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

named Miss Harrison, who had attended classes at the Mission. Such letters of introduction were often necessary to be taken seriously in polite society, particularly when looking for work. Armour undermined his seeming empathy by writing to Gunsaulus, telling him to disregard all of his letters of introduction. Armour explained the case of Miss Harrison, saying, “she asked me for the letter, and I had to give it to her... She is all right, a good woman, and all that, but I don’t want you to consider her because I wrote the letter...” Armour would write letters of introduction when cornered by hopefuls in need of such an endorsement, but only for appearance’s sake. He instructed Gunsaulus to ignore such letters unless he conveyed special interest through his choice of words. In this way, a coded language always allowed a magnanimous front that was rarely as generous as advertised, eagerly seeming to bridge social class while maintaining firm but discreet barriers.¹⁵⁸

The importance of letters of introduction and the class-based system of patronage they represented is further illustrated by two other cases. One of Armour’s letters of introduction was preceded by a direct letter to Gunsaulus asking him to admit the young woman concerned to the Armour Institute. Her acceptance would count as a favor to her brother, the Vice President of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad, with whom Armour maintained important business relations.¹⁵⁹ Sincere letters of introduction were crucial for establishing credibility among the well-heeled sectors of middle and upper-class America. Among the families of the successful, such letters often acted like bank notes in the currency of personal favors. For those without respectable social standing, they were necessary to even enter into affluent social circles without seeming improper, offensive, or suspicious. Armour doubted the correspondence of one minister

¹⁵⁸ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Nov. 9, 1893, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁵⁹ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Oct. 19, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

because he lacked a letter of introduction and had previously been a simple butcher. The man confidently wrote Armour in the hopes of meeting with him over lunch, and this confidence was interpreted as “cheeky” for someone with a background as a common laborer. Armour wrote Gunsaulus, “although I know nothing about him...if a butcher wrote me that kind of letter without any backing, I should keep my hand on my watch.”¹⁶⁰

The fact that class barriers made upward mobility difficult did not prevent struggling Chicagoans from seeking out educational and job opportunities, even if they seemed like long shots. The Institute’s librarian recalled mothers with thick accents inquiring about the cost of a boy’s education, uneducated visitors asking for well-known books by the wrong names, and women looking for work opportunities in the library. Any woman in the last group would often come with no letter or credentials, her “only stated qualification being that she is ‘fond of reading,’ or ‘likes the aroma of a library,’ or is ‘a widow with six small children.’”¹⁶¹

The difficulty of overcoming class divides was not just about endorsements and jobs. It would have been an accomplishment just to get people of different social stations to attend the same church. The Armour Mission would doubtless bring in more money, freeing up funds for the combined work of the Institute, if middle-class Chicagoans attended. After all, the fine apartments nearby that were supposed to fund the Mission and the Institute housed plenty of financially stable Christians who could contribute to the good work. Milner responded to Gunsaulus’s questions along these lines, noting that residents of the Armour Flats would never attend the Mission as it was. The Mission conveyed an image of poverty, and was beneath any respectable person’s social station. To ask them to attend was like begging for money. At best,

¹⁶⁰ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Oct. 5, 1893, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁶¹ Jessie S. Van Vliet to the Editors of the 1898 *Integral*, undated. In *Integral: The Book of the Class of '99* (Chicago: J. W. Franks & Sons, 1898), 202.

middle-class residents might attend on special occasions to be recognized as patrons. If the Mission could be rebranded as a respectable nonsectarian chapel, ending much of its role as a mission, it might better attract a self-sustaining congregation. After all, the Institute now overshadowed the Mission, so there was little publicity to be had from its work. Costs of repairs to the building and replacement of furniture added to the pressure to find new sources of funding, ideally from the membership. Perhaps the Mission could serve as a church for the generation of kids, now grown, who attended Sunday school there. While Milner credited the original combined plan of the Flats, the Institute, and the Mission with “transforming power” for “community uplift,” the only way he saw to attract the middle class was through a rebranding that appealed “to the wealth and respect of the people...” Before sending the letter, Milner crossed out “wealth” and amended the thought to, “the self-respect of the people...”¹⁶² Cost-cutting measures were already forcing a curtailment of the Mission’s activities, ending the work of the kindergarten and sparking the idea that they begin charging money for the dispensary.¹⁶³

By the summer of 1895, the school officially took the name of the Armour Institute of Technology (AIT), following the example of MIT.¹⁶⁴ As friction continued to build over Armour’s frugal expectations and the reality of the Institute’s needs and wants, with a growing gap between original stated ambitions and actual practice, Gunsaulus felt the need to defend his administrative record. He reminded Armour of the expectations they had when they began, and the unexpected fiscal situations encountered. Nonetheless, AIT’s president swore to see a

¹⁶² Duncan C. Milner to Frank W. Gunsaulus, Dec. 13, 1895, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁶³ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, May 11, 1895, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives; Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, May 13, 1895, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁶⁴ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to the Faculty of the Armour Institute of Technology, Aug. 30, 1895, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

successful completion of his five years, stretching every dollar for maximum value.¹⁶⁵ While Armour evidently valued Gunsaulus, who threw himself into his work so as to give the businessman a good return on his investment, he sent one of his trusted men, Frederick U. Smith, to more closely keep an eye on the budget of the Armour Institute. Smith was a hard-nosed money man who had previously managed the Mission's budget. Gunsaulus was perhaps too soft hearted, too quick to believe professors when they said they needed equipment, and too quick to ask for more money. Gunsaulus's defense of his record was a response to Smith's new oversight role. Armour insisted that he had full confidence in Gunsaulus, and Smith was there simply because Armour was treating the school like any of his business interests. He responded to Gunsaulus, "I simply expect to have good judgement used about the place... I can only say go right along, and do not refer to the matter again, and do the best you can."¹⁶⁶

In addition to the many other challenges standing in the way of realizing meritocratic technical education and upward mobility, racial discrimination played a large role in Chicago. While the recessions of the 1890s hurt the revenues of the Flats, Armour became convinced that it was more than just recession. Nearby black neighborhoods were diminishing the desirability of the area for white renters. Early on, Armour discussed the possibility of buying up nearby tenements in order to force out black residents, thereby removing "the objectionable view" for white middle-class tenants.¹⁶⁷ To try to improve interest in the apartments, steam heating was installed in 1895.¹⁶⁸ When vacancies persisted, Armour returned to the problem of the black

¹⁶⁵ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Philip D. Armour, April 16, 1896. F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁶⁶ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, April 17, 1896, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁶⁷ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Dec. 21, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁶⁸ Philip D. Armour to Frank W. Gunsaulus, April 10, 1895, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

community. He noted that his tenants lacked a quality school, and wondered if they could cheaply provide a few teachers for the Flats. In fact, there was a free public school right next to the Flats and the Institute. The problem was that the Keith School, named for Chicago milliner Elbridge G. Keith, held a mostly black student body.¹⁶⁹ Gunsaulus seemed unalarmed by the prospect of white and black children attending school together. At any rate, he did not provide Armour with the desired solution of alternative schooling for the children of white tenants. Like the oversight of AIT's budget, this matter was turned over to Mr. Smith.¹⁷⁰

Despite the barriers represented by racial prejudice, Gunsaulus welcomed Ida B. Wells to his church when she reached out requesting to speak against lynching. It was her "first attempt in Chicago to reach public sentiment," and she chose to contact Gunsaulus for his liberal reputation. Upon arriving on the scheduled Sunday, however, no one greeted the members of the Anti-Lynching Committee or prepared to introduce Wells. The courtesies that would have been shown to a white speaker seemed not to occur to Gunsaulus until his offended guests were prepared to leave. Finally putting in an appearance, he recovered the situation, offering "no explanation, but his introduction was hearty enough and his denunciation of lynching was all that could be expected."¹⁷¹

Several African Americans attended AIT in its first decade, outliers among an otherwise white, mostly middle-class student body. Among them was Charles Pierce, who graduated in

¹⁶⁹ *In Memoriam: Elbridge Gerry Keith* (Chicago: C. L. Ricketts, 1906); in December 1927, Maudelle Brown Bousfield was appointed principle of Keith Elementary School, becoming the first African-American principal in Chicago's public schools. By that time, the campus of AIT had grown to nearly surround the Keith School, with an all-white student body contrasting most of Bousfield's students. Dionne Danks, "Thriving in the Midst of Adversity: Educator Maudelle Brown Bousfield's Struggles in Chicago, 1920-1950," *The Journal of Negro Education* 78, no. 1 (Winter 2009), 7.

¹⁷⁰ Philip D. Armour to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, April 14, 1897, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁷¹ Ida B. Wells, *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells*, ed. by Alfreda M. Duster (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), 233-34.

1901 with a chemical engineering degree. Believed to be the first African American to earn an engineering degree in the country, he obtained not only the first chemical engineering degree conferred by AIT, but the first chemical engineering degree conferred in the United States. Despite this, because of his race, he was unable to pursue the same opportunities as his white peers. After graduating, he taught at Booker T. Washington's Tuskegee Institute as an instructor of electrical engineering, followed by a return to Chicago as a high school teacher.¹⁷² After Pierce graduated in 1901, it would be decades before AIT had another black student. During those early years, Gunsaulus supported integrated classrooms. One enraged father confronted Gunsaulus over his son being in the same class with a black student, failing a test that the black student had passed. Gunsaulus assured the father that, with his son's test score of fifty percent and the black student's ninety-eight percent, they would no longer be in the same class.¹⁷³

As Gunsaulus's five years at AIT neared an end, he looked to his own options for upward mobility. While it would not be easy to top his previous accomplishments, there were other great cities where he could apply his approach to ministry. A speaking engagement at the Broadway Tabernacle in New York in 1897 signaled his intentions. The day before he was to speak, it was already being reported that he had accepted a call to pastor the New York church. He would leave Chicago the following month. The gifted orator reportedly wanted to "be brought closer to the masses."¹⁷⁴ No doubt the stress and frustration he had faced at AIT played a role as well.

Gunsaulus denied that there was any official call from the New York church. Their talks

¹⁷² Charles W. Pierce, "How Electricity is Taught at Tuskegee," *The Technical World* 1, no. 4 (June 1904), 425. Charles W. Pierce collection, Shared Box, number 2009.004, IIT Archives; Christopher Robert Reed, *The Rise of Chicago's Black Metropolis, 1920-1929* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2011), 55.

¹⁷³ Peter Clark MacFarlane, "Frank Wakely Gunsaulus: The Premier Pulpititeer of Chicago—a Man of Many Manifestations." *Collier's: The National Weekly* 49, no. 20 (Aug. 3, 1912)," 17.

¹⁷⁴ "Dr. Gunsaulus Coming East," *New York Times* (April 24, 1897), 1.

were merely informal. About his ambitions and hopes, he said only, “I like Chicago, and should like to remain here – if there is not a larger field for my work.”¹⁷⁵ Despite these misleading statements, the Broadway Tabernacle had clearly reached an understanding with the man who would be their new pastor.¹⁷⁶ Chicago was a rapidly growing city, but in 1897 was still hard pressed to offer venues as grand as New York might be able to provide. Nonetheless, they were going to try. Gunsaulus’s congregation announced their determination to keep their pastor. They even suggested that a larger venue might be rented for the preacher’s services as an inducement to stay.¹⁷⁷ Plymouth Church was already one of the largest and most influential congregations in Chicago. Just a couple of months before Gunsaulus’s trip to New York, Plymouth Church hosted the largest charity fundraising event to be held in Chicago in a generation. The event revealed that nearly three thousand respectable Chicagoans could squeeze themselves into the church at one time.¹⁷⁸ Gunsaulus seemed to have his mind set on even larger audiences and opportunities for influential ministry in a fresh mission field.

The pull between Chicago and New York soon ceased, but not in the expected way. The week after returning to Chicago, Gunsaulus fell “suddenly and almost mysteriously” ill.¹⁷⁹ In an anticlimactic turn of events, it became clear that the preacher would not be able to continue any of his regular engagements. A bout of “nervous prostration” was initially blamed on “rheumatism brought on by years of overwork.”¹⁸⁰ While he did struggle with rheumatism throughout his life, which permanently dislocated his right hip and left him with a limp,

¹⁷⁵ “Current Notes,” *New York Times* (May 5, 1897), 8.

¹⁷⁶ “The Broadway Tabernacle,” *New York Times* (Jan. 20, 1898), 3.

¹⁷⁷ “Dr. Gunsaulus Coming East,” *New York Times* (April 24, 1897), 1; “Current Notes,” *New York Times* (May 5, 1897), 8.

¹⁷⁸ “Chicago’s Charity Meeting,” *New York Times* (Feb. 1, 1897), 1.

¹⁷⁹ “Rev. Dr. Gunsaulus Resigns,” *New York Times* (Nov. 26, 1897), 9.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*; “Dr. Gunsaulus At Home Again,” *New York Times* (Dec. 27, 1897), 5.

Gunsaulus also indicated that he suffered a paralytic stroke in 1897, which he believed to be a consequence of working twelve to eighteen-hour days for years.¹⁸¹ He spent nine months recovering and repeatedly attempted to resign from Plymouth Church, which refused to replace him.¹⁸²

During his agonizing recovery, Gunsaulus wrote Harper, “You can never know how blessed has been the ministration of your friendship in these long and weary months... O, it has been hard to read and be told continually of my sin of overwork and that this illness has been it’s consequence.”¹⁸³ Even once he returned home from the sanitarium where he spent his recovery, he was too weak to immediately resume any work, having recently traded a wheelchair for a crutch.¹⁸⁴ Gunsaulus asked Harper to send him information on the “educational influence” of Frances E. Willard’s life.¹⁸⁵ The recently deceased Willard would be the subject of his first sermon since May of the previous year, preached to the public at the Armour Mission on February 28, “with all of his old-time fervor and eloquence.”¹⁸⁶

With AIT and Plymouth Church unwilling to let him go, and his poor health derailing any immediate relocation at the end of five years, Gunsaulus returned to trying make AIT a force for cultural transformation and upward mobility. Though the Institute had started with prospects comparable to those of the University of Chicago, the University had significantly added to its

¹⁸¹ “Dr. Gunsaulus’s Lameness Incurable,” *New York Times* (Oct. 23, 1902), 2; Dreiser, “A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus,” 64.

¹⁸² “Rev. Dr. Gunsaulus Resigns,” *New York Times* (Nov. 26, 1897), 9.

¹⁸³ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, Dec. 7, 1897. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

¹⁸⁴ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, Dec. 29, 1897. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives; “Dr. Gunsaulus At Home Again,” *New York Times* (Dec. 27, 1897), 5.

¹⁸⁵ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, March 24, 1898. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

¹⁸⁶ “Dr. Gunsaulus Again in His Pulpit,” *New York Times* (March 4, 1898), 2.

endowment, while AIT's endowment was largely stagnant. Gunsaulus and Harper believed the ideal plan was to combine the two institutions rather than compete, with AIT providing technical education under the University's umbrella. Gunsaulus had been trying to push Armour in this direction right before his health breakdown, when he thought he would be leaving the Institute.¹⁸⁷ Following his stroke, Gunsaulus confessed his hope that Armour "would see how almost necessary it is for us to associate our work with the work of the University," and promised Harper he would "spare no strength" in getting the wealthy industrialist to support "what I believe to be the cause of learning in these parts."¹⁸⁸

Though the idea of a merger remained alive in the mind of Gunsaulus for many years, the Armour family was unwilling to make their name subordinate to the Rockefeller name.¹⁸⁹ Failing a merger, the other option was to focus the Institute's resources on a narrower range of activities, ending programs unrelated to engineering. This was more in keeping with the business-minded approach of Mr. Smith, who took on the roles of comptroller and secretary of the board of trustees. Smith's new role at AIT aligned with the end of the Library Science program and preceded the expansion of student athletics.¹⁹⁰

The School of Library Science at the Institute, under the leadership of Katherine L. Sharp, was the first of its kind in the Midwest.¹⁹¹ During the planning of the Institute, Gunsaulus

¹⁸⁷ Frank W. Gunsaulus to Philip D. Armour, Feb. 1, 1897, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁸⁸ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William Rainey Harper, June 17, 1898. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

¹⁸⁹ Harry P. Judson to Harold H. Swift, June 9, 1921. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Armour Institute of Technology, 1902-1924. Box 9, Folder 9, UC Archives.

¹⁹⁰ *Integral 1901: The Book of the Class of '02* (Chicago: The Blue Sky Press, 1901), 110. IIT Archives.

¹⁹¹ Jody Newmyer, "The Image Problem of the Librarian: Femininity and Social Control," *The Journal of Library History* 11, No. 1 (Jan. 1976), 47.

consulted his friend Melvin Dewey over who should head a new School of Library Science. Their relationship began during Gunsaulus's time in the Northeast, when he served as Dewey's pastor and joined the Boston Shakespeare Club where Dewey was president. Gunsaulus wanted "the best man in America" for the Institute, and he suspected that was Dewey. Dewey instead introduced him to Katherine Sharp, telling him, "The best man in America is a woman..." In 1896, Miss Sharp relocated her school to the University of Illinois, where it could continue to grow.¹⁹² Letters suggest that following the Institute's first school year, Gunsaulus went against Armour to grant salary increases to two women working under Sharp.¹⁹³ Armour had personally sent Sharp's request for the raises back to Gunsaulus without action from the Board of Directors, recommending a salary freeze. The businessman both suggested that the Institute's employees were not working hard enough and that Gunsaulus was working too hard and should take some time off.¹⁹⁴

These tensions between educational priorities and business-minded efficiency continued until 1901, when the Institute ceased to be coeducational. The Domestic Art program moved to a new facility where it was taken over by the Chicago Women's Club. The curriculum would focus entirely on training male engineers. The Institute's 1919 student yearbook reflected on these past changes, boasting that the school pursued rational industrial progress "with no hesitation induced by false sentiment."¹⁹⁵ Within the school's first decade, the Institute lost Katherine Sharp, a pioneer who had been recruited when the idea was still to build one of the world's greatest

¹⁹² Laurel A. Grotzinger, "Melvil Dewey: The 'Sower,'" *The Journal of Library History* 3, no. 4 (Oct. 1968), 319-22.

¹⁹³ Katharine L. Sharp to the Board of Directors of the Armour Institute, May 17, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁹⁴ Philip D. Armour to Frank W. Gunsaulus, May 24, 1894, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

¹⁹⁵ *The Cycle, Volume Seven: Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen* (Chicago: Armour Institute of Technology, 1919), 31.

centers of practical learning for more than just engineers. The student body became more exclusively affluent, white, and male, moving even further from the original mission of meritocratic upward mobility theoretically open to all.

Frustrated on several fronts in the early years of the Institute, Gunsaulus nonetheless remained a force in Chicago's culture and politics. His brand of Protestant republicanism spoke to both Enlightenment idealism and Christian nationalism. Throughout his career he frequently used the examples of Lincoln and Grant to typify the moral influence of history's great individuals, helping along God's progressive plan. A "simplicity of righteousness" and "love of justice" provided vague platitudes representing a view of Christian federalism that condemned the past mercantilism of slaveholders and the present commercialism of unregulated monopolies.¹⁹⁶ Of course, God's progressive federalism was carefully measured. Those irresponsibly calling for radical change, like William Jennings Bryan in 1896, were borderline treasonous and unmanly.¹⁹⁷ Using force to quell labor unrest was also part of the federal government's righteous mandate, later earning former President Grover Cleveland rare praise from Gunsaulus for a Democrat.¹⁹⁸ One of Gunsaulus's boldest political causes in the 1890s, and the cause most consequential for AIT, was support for Cuban independence.

Mass meetings in support of Cuban independence were held in Chicago on September 30, 1895. Resolutions called on the government to recognize Cuban revolutionaries as belligerents, patriots resisting their Spanish colonizers rather than criminals. The Central Music Hall was filled to overflowing, with those unable to get in gathered in the auditorium of the Young Men's Christian Association Building, filling that venue as well. Around "4,600 persons yelled

¹⁹⁶ "Exercises at Galena, Ill.," *New York Times* (April 28, 1901), 3.

¹⁹⁷ "The Bible on Sound Money," *New York Times* (Aug. 21, 1896), 5.

¹⁹⁸ "Cleveland Ovation at Beecher Meeting," *New York Times* (March 9, 1903), 1.

themselves hoarse... in the cause of Cuban independence.” The first speaker of the night was Gunsaulus, who declared that in spite of his own Spanish heritage he must support the righteous Cuban revolution as a fight of the oppressed against their oppressors. The walls of the event halls were lined with inspiring slogans and quotes from the likes of Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Harriet Martineau, Edmund Burke, and John Milton, all extolling the virtues of liberty or condemning tyranny.¹⁹⁹ The eventual Spanish-American War witnessed twenty-two of AIT’s young men volunteer to fight. Gunsaulus’s students came home with stories of war on land and sea.²⁰⁰

The aftermath of the war witnessed the United States projecting power across the globe in new ways. Gunsaulus stood alongside McKinley during a presidential visit to Chicago in 1899, on the occasion of the new Federal Building’s dedication. An unfinished “steel skeleton” loomed over streets packed with onlookers, hundreds even daring to climb onto the steel beams to secure a better view of the proceedings. Actual viewing stands were erected for VIPs, including dignitaries from Canada and Mexico, Senators and Congressmen, and members of the President’s cabinet. Given the immense crowds, police and assembled cavalry struggled to clear a path wide enough for the presidential entourage. Deafening rounds of applause signaled the approach, to which President McKinley responded by frequently standing in his carriage and removing his top hat. Whatever setbacks he had faced, it was a shining moment for Gunsaulus, who had campaigned for McKinley, now participating in the ceremony alongside the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Postmaster General.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ “Appeal for the Cubans,” *New York Times* (Oct. 1, 1895), 3.

²⁰⁰ *Integral '99, Volume II: Class of 1900* (Peoria, IL: J. W. Franks & Sons, 1899), 148-172.

²⁰¹ “Laying the Cornerstone,” *New York Times* (Oct. 10, 1899), 3; “Dr. Gunsaulus’s Views,” *New York Journal* (Aug. 4, 1896), 1; Richard J. Jensen, *The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888-1896, Volume 2* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 284.

The major speech of the event was given by the Postmaster, emphasizing that since 1870 the U.S. post office grew nearly fivefold. The number of Americans entrusting their savings to a bank account grew from 1,600,000 to over 5,000,000. Aggregate deposits nearly quadrupled. But even so, the best was yet to come. The great frontier of America's growth would continue in the form of commercial expansion in the orient and around the globe. Greater even than wealth was the glory of America's values, extending the nation's beneficent rule always in the name of "freedom, progress, and enlightenment to the fortunate peoples who were brought under its" protection. What citizen would dare suggest that America's rule over "rude and remote peoples means wrong and oppression and spoliation?" No true American could question the ability of the nation to morally exert its authority around the globe. The foundation being laid for the Federal Building was the meeting point between an "inspiring past" and "the prophecy of our glorious future." With that, the actual laying of the foundation was presided over by the President, which involved McKinley throwing a trowel into a bed of mortar before the actual workmen set large quarried blocks of limestone. Afterwards, Gunsaulus formally closed the ceremony with a benediction.²⁰²

The Postmaster's speech insisted that America had no reason to apologize for its commercial and imperial projects, implying that some thought it did. When Philip D. Armour died in 1901, creating a moment of uncertainty for the future of AIT, Gunsaulus remembered him in glowing terms, with a similar suggestion that there need be no apologizing for industrial capitalist power. In memory of Armour, the preacher wrote, "Through him has come to us a new revelation of the power God has lodged in humanity." Armour was like a great oak tree, spreading his branches and roots with sovereign authority. Indeed, the long branches and tangled

²⁰² *Ibid.*

roots of Armour's power and wealth stretched around the world, especially visible in Chicago. But Gunsaulus used the picture of an oak only as a positive metaphor, with no need to "apologise for its gnarled and twisted trunk and its knotted limbs, as we seek to remember more kindly influences..."²⁰³ Much like McKinley's postmaster, Gunsaulus provided credibility to American capitalism and commercial expansion by clothing it in high ideals of moral and cultural progress. The answer to the excesses of capitalism and unregulated monopoly was upward mobility, increasingly of the technocratic male variety, and ongoing commercial expansion with a Protestant Christian ethic.

Before Armour's death, Gunsaulus had again been contemplating leaving AIT to focus on preaching.²⁰⁴ In 1899, he answered a call to Central Church in Chicago to pursue nondenominational ministry, and he worried that his health could not support both occupations.²⁰⁵ The Armour family convinced Gunsaulus to remain at AIT with an added endowment of \$1,000,000, and the understanding that the future of the Institute was exclusively as a school of engineering to meet the demonstrated demands of industry and ensure upward mobility for its young men.²⁰⁶

While AIT did not live up to the promise of reaching out to the poorest Chicagoans, neither was it without any sincerity or uplifting results. In the school's first decade, AIT

²⁰³ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, "Memorial Address of P. D. Armour," in *Integral 1901: The Book of the Class of '02* (Chicago: The Blue Sky Press, 1901), 21. IIT Archives.

²⁰⁴ "Dr. Gunsaulus's Resignation," *New York Times* (Sept. 12, 1900), 1.

²⁰⁵ "Succeeds the Rev. Dr. Hillis," *New York Times* (Feb. 9, 1899), 2; Smith, *The Search for Social Salvation*, 455.

²⁰⁶ "Armour Gives \$1,000,000," *New York Times* (April 11, 1901), 1; Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to the Board of Trustees, Oct. 9, 1901, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 13, number 1998.24, IIT Archives; on the demands and concerns of industry for technically skilled labor, and Gunsaulus's determination to make education practical and effective, see S. Alexander Rippa, "The Business Community and the Public Schools on the Eve of the Great Depression," *History of Education Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (March 1964), 34.

graduated first generation college students from diverse walks of life. This included young women who would not have traditionally attended college, such as Myrtle Agnes Barbe. Even though she was from a prominent middle-class Jewish family, her mother had never completed high school.²⁰⁷ There are also cases like Anna H. Schneider. Schneider was a teacher in Chicago who obtained part of her education at AIT. She appealed to Gunsaulus directly when she feared class discrimination against her in the school system. However, she feared that she was being discriminated against because she was affluent and educated, claiming that rank and file educators in Chicago's schools resented anyone with special credentials from AIT or the University of Chicago.²⁰⁸

Making sure AIT students made it into successful careers required careful navigation of class, and Gunsaulus himself was clearly not immune to classist preference. AIT's Frederick Valentine Battey was a high school graduate, coming from a family that expected their son to study and go to college. He attended church regularly, was a member of the YMCA, and edited a church paper. He graduated from AIT in 1903 as president of his class, with a B.S. in electrical engineering. Gunsaulus helped him secure a job at the McCormick Harvesting Company.²⁰⁹ AIT's first waves of graduates found jobs working for the Chicago Telephone Company, the Anaconda Copper Mining Company in Montana, the Pullman Palace Car Company, the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, and engineering work abroad in Mexico, to name a few examples.²¹⁰ Alumni job placement testimonials in the early yearbooks were all from male students, despite the female graduates in the first decade who trained in programs in domestic arts, teaching, or

²⁰⁷ Melissa Klapper, "'A Long and Broad Education': Jewish Girls and the Problem of Education in America, 1860-1920," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 22, no. 1 (Fall 2002), 20.

²⁰⁸ Anna H. Schneider to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, undated, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 10, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁰⁹ *Integral 1904: The Book of the Class of 1905* (Chicago: Pettibone, Sawtell & Co., 1904), 212.

²¹⁰ *Integral: The Book of the Class of '99* (Chicago: J. W. Franks & Sons, 1898), 171, 200-1, 206-8, 297.

library science. If the school struggled to bridge social class in its first decade, this was even more true going forward.

With a narrowing technical focus, Gunsaulus still connected his work at AIT with Christian mission. A supporter of the Tuskegee Institute, Gunsaulus invited Booker T. Washington, in many ways a likeminded believer in the power of education to solve social problems, to address his students. Just as Gunsaulus preached that technical education could solve the class divide, so Washington preached that technical education could solve the problem of racial inequality and prejudice in America.²¹¹ Inviting speakers to AIT was likely a matter that Gunsaulus retained large discretionary control over. The same year that Washington gave an address on the problem of race, Senator Marcus A. Hanna told students that the educated must meet “employees more than half way,” taking responsibility as the educated class to understand the laboring conditions of the immigrant, “wholly unused to liberty as we know it...” The students of AIT, the nation’s “young men of energy and education” must provide “growth and reform.”²¹² Still another prestigious visitor, former President Grover Cleveland, pointed to the future that belonged to the young, the educated, and the technically capable.²¹³

In addition to inviting Booker T. Washington to discuss race at AIT as a fellow educator, Gunsaulus worked with African-American peers in Chicago’s churches. He formed a friendship with the black social gospeler, Reverdy C. Ransom, supporting his work to combat sin and serve communities in Chicago.²¹⁴ Ransom had a similar educational background in that he had

²¹¹ *Integral 1904: The Book of the Class of 1905* (Chicago: Pettibone, Sawtell & Co., 1904), 156.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 155.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 157.

²¹⁴ According to Gary Scott Smith, Ransom’s friendship with Gunsaulus was even more beneficial to his work than his connections with noted reformer Jane Addams, the theologian Graham Taylor, or the influential Robert Lincoln, president of the Pullman Company and son of Abraham Lincoln. Smith, *The Search for Social Salvation*, 216-17.

attended Oberlin College. Unlike Gunsaulus at Ohio Wesleyan, Ransom was kicked out for protesting racial policies at his school.²¹⁵ In Chicago, Ransom found he could count on Gunsaulus and the attorney Clarence Darrow, both fellow native-born Ohioans who were drawn together by “kindred interest in public social service...” Together, the three worked to settle a violent stockyard strike in 1902, in which black laborers attempting to go to work while whites were on strike were being attacked by the strikers. Meeting with representatives of labor in Ransom’s church, Ransom, Gunsaulus, and Darrow helped negotiate an end to the strike and the violence.²¹⁶

During his years in Chicago, Ransom pastored the Institutional Church, the largest black congregation in the city. In April 1903, in retaliation for his anti-gambling campaign in the black community, Ransom’s church was dynamited. From that point on, Ransom kept a loaded revolver underneath his Bible.²¹⁷ The day after the bombing, Ransom met with Gunsaulus. He recalled, “when I entered the room, he greeted me in a rather gruff way, ‘Good morning Ransom, you are the only preacher in Chicago of whom I am jealous.’ I said, ‘Oh!, that’s nonsense,’ he said, ‘I mean it. According to the newspapers you are the only preacher in Chicago whose sermons got beyond the front door of his church yesterday.’”²¹⁸ Gunsaulus and Ransom shared enough in common to work for shared goals in the city. At the same time, Gunsaulus’s reaction to a black preacher stealing headlines, and only by having his church bombed no less, betrayed a jealousy likely owing to race.

Though it came at a cost, AIT succeeded in distinguishing itself by honing its curriculum,

²¹⁵ Reverdy C. Ransom, *The Pilgrimage of Harriet Ransom’s Son* (Nashville, TN: Sunday School Union, 1949), 33-34.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 86, 113-14.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 117-134.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 134.

introducing the chemical engineering program in 1901, one of the first in the country. A few years later, in 1903, AIT became the first school to create a fire protection engineering program.²¹⁹ These developments not only bolstered the school's reputation, increasing enrollment, but continued a trend of Christian mission despite a narrowing technical focus. A secularized sense of this mission could point to the work of AIT alumni, employed throughout the country, who "by helping to decrease the cost of commodities and to increase the wage of the laborer... are contributing largely to the prosperity of the country."²²⁰ Gunsaulus continued to make a more explicitly religious connection.

On December 30, 1903, over five hundred people died in the Iroquois Theater fire in Chicago. The city's New Year's Eve celebrations were canceled. The mayor called the fire Chicago's greatest disaster in a generation. Gunsaulus's nephew William McLaughlin was among the dead. Reports contained many tragic accounts of losses and anxious searches for the bodies of loved ones. McLaughlin had reportedly tried to help others escape the theater, failing to make it out himself. He was in Chicago for his cousin's wedding, that of Gunsaulus's daughter, Martha. The afternoon wedding that was to be held at the Gunsaulus residence had to be moved to the evening, making time for William's wake and turning celebration into grief.²²¹ The fire so shocked the nation that municipal governments and private establishments were forced to rethink building construction and safety regulations.²²² This was hardly the first, nor the last, deadly fire in the nation, but it claimed many affluent young people from middle-class

²¹⁹ *Integral 1904: The Book of the Class of 1905* (Chicago: Pettibone, Sawtell & Co., 1904), 200-5.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 203.

²²¹ "Chicago Silently Mourns Its Dead," *New York Times* (Jan. 1, 1904), 1; "Dr. Gunsaulus's Nephew Dead," *New York Times* (Jan. 2, 1904), 2.

²²² Comedian Eddie Foy, who survived the Iroquois Theater fire, described the national reaction in his memoir. Eddie Foy and Alvin F. Harlow, *Clowning Through Life* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1928), 291-93.

families, forcing the powerful to take notice.

In the wake of his nephew's death, Gunsaulus doubled-down on civic-minded Christianity, saying, "Our pulpits—mine with the rest—have had too much to say about the New Jerusalem and not enough concerning the vital needs of Chicago. I have neglected my duty. I have seen abuses, lawlessness... negligence... and have not lifted my voice against them. Hereafter, with God's help, I will do my duty as a citizen."²²³ In fact, AIT created its fire protection engineering program shortly before the Iroquois Theater fire, displaying a proactive innovation that was a credit to the school and Gunsaulus, who was the driving force behind the new course of study.²²⁴ But many, including the preacher, felt more could have been done.

The magazine *Current Literature* in 1904 cited Gunsaulus's contrition as an example of the social gospel. The story sought to define this modern force in religious life, placing the Chicagoan's determined civic duty alongside the thinking of Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, a resident of London, who defined the "spirit of the age" as "(1) a revolt against materialism; (2) a passion for the practical; a mystic and strange feeling everywhere of some coming dawn."²²⁵ How something could be practical and mystic seems counterintuitive, but in line with the work Gunsaulus had been doing, both preaching the coming kingdom of God and training young men for industrial capitalism.²²⁶ In Gunsaulus's case, however, the message was far from condemning materialism.

²²³ "The Social Gospel," *Current Literature: A Magazine of Contemporary Thought* 36, no. 3 (March 1904), 341.

²²⁴ Mrs. F. W. Gunsaulus, ed., *In Memoriam: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, 1856-1921* (Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1921), 101; in later years, AIT graduates of the Fire Protection program would play active roles in citizen groups monitoring and performing building inspections. *A.I.T. Senior Class Book, Volume 2* (Chicago: Senior Class of the Armour Institute of Technology, 1912), 130. IIT Archives.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*,

²²⁶ After temporarily filling the pastorate of City Temple in London, England, Gunsaulus was encouraged to permanently accept the position. His popularity abroad and the goodwill received there was reciprocated. While Gunsaulus did not relocate, his positive impression was reflected in his theology. He

As editor-in-chief for a ten-volume series of engineering textbooks, the social gospeler endorsed correspondence schools, such as the one partnering with AIT to produce and distribute the series. The idea was to make engineering education available to people by mail, making technical training more accessible. And the more Americans who could obtain technical training, the better. Gunsaulus provided the introduction to the series, writing that this new technical era for education was training the hand, just as intellectual and religious eras in education had trained the mind and heart. The technically trained citizen was crucial to America overtaking the great powers of Europe. The engineer was conquering nature at home and extending American commerce around the world, including in “her new realm abroad,” through “ideas and ideals” rather than violence.²²⁷

The future that Gunsaulus’s gospel envisioned would be defined not only by an aristocratic material aesthetic and progressive social engagement, but an ever advancing and nationalistic industrial capitalism. Gunsaulus’s idealism embraced many of the trends cited, now and in his day, as evidence of the social gospel. Yet in the example of Chicago’s most influential preacher, the material and the moral were seemingly impossible to separate in his vision of the coming kingdom of God.

Gunsaulus’s ongoing advocacy of technical education grew out of urban missions, and that same idealism, which might call for measured reform and regulation of industry’s excesses, readily embraced American imperialism and commercial interests. Violence and coercion in the Philippines were easy to overlook, and expanding commerce represented the path not just to

speculated on whether the kingdom of God would first be realized in the American republic or in the enlightened monarchy of Britain. He was confident it would be one of the two. “London Religious Notes,” *New York Times* (Aug. 17, 1902), 4.

²²⁷ Frank W. Gunsaulus, ed., *Modern Engineering Practice, Volume I: Mathematics* (Chicago: American School of Correspondence, 1903), xvii, xix.

material prosperity, but moral progress.²²⁸ Gunsaulus's habit was often to suggest a middle-ground position, between liberal and orthodox theologies as between capital and labor, albeit leaning heavily in the direction of pro-capital liberalism. Attempting to bridge conservative and progressive wings of the Republican Party in 1911, divided as they were over the eight-hour work day and direct election of Senators, Gunsaulus preached on the measured example of Abraham Lincoln, always pushing forward but not too fast. Teddy Roosevelt cited the minister's words, assuring his fellow Republicans that he likewise believed in the "sane progressivism" of Lincoln.²²⁹

While social progress needed a measured pace, industry needed to speed up. During a visit to AIT from President William Howard Taft, Taft told the assembled students, "I have no doubt that I am looking into the faces of a number of constructors of the Panama canal," or possibly future discoverers of wondrous new manufacturing and technological advancements, "all based upon the principles of application, investigation and adherence to truth that you are learning here..."²³⁰ In the 1912 election that divided the Republican Party, Gunsaulus was firmly in support of Taft.²³¹

Throughout the progressive era, Gunsaulus maintained his measured discourse on how to go about social and cultural transformation. He remained at AIT, though he had opportunities

²²⁸ As historian Paul A. Kramer has noted in detail, the U.S. occupation of the Philippines relied on violence, racial hierarchies, and tactics similar to the previous Spanish colonizers, despite the claimed ideals behind the American presence. This included campaigns of dehumanization, torture, and armed conflict, claiming tens of thousands of lives in the early years of the occupation alone. Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 111-158.

²²⁹ "Roosevelt and the Old Guard Make Peace," *New York Times* (Feb. 14, 1911), 3.

²³⁰ *A.I.T. Senior Class Book, Volume 2* (Chicago: Senior Class of the Armour Institute of Technology, 1912), 152.

²³¹ "Roosevelt the User of 'I,'" *New York Times* (Sept. 2, 1912), 3.

elsewhere, such as an offer in 1903 to become the president of Boston College.²³² His view of the relationship between labor and the church remained one of seeking harmony, rather than something as radical as economic justice.²³³ His engagement in civic life continued to promote art and industry as essential pillars of a strong nation, measures of civilization, while educating the young as a way of combatting social evils and urban vice.²³⁴ The city of Chicago regarded Gunsaulus as commanding expertise on problems of urban vice and how to solve them, and he was included in advisory commissions which issued reports to city officials.²³⁵ Gunsaulus was especially impressed with the marriage of new industrial and material aesthetic in Germany, and what that could do for training school children in Chicago. He hoped teachers could be trained “to bring the principles of aesthetics into association with our social dynamics” through “the teaching of Industrial Art.”²³⁶

In Gunsaulus’s final two decades, the cause of upward mobility remained his passion. Though AIT seemed less accessible to the poor than ever, his ongoing participation in summer lecture circuits brought him into contact with young men in country towns who he sometimes recruited to the Institute with the promise of an opportunity. The preacher’s contemporaries romanticized his example, holding him up as proof of the power of upward mobility, a man made great by a lifetime of useful service.²³⁷ Gunsaulus also recruited foreign students from around the

²³² “Organization of Educators,” *New York Times* (May 10, 1903), 8; “May Choose Dr. Gunsaulus,” *New York Times* (Nov. 13, 1903), 1; “Rev. Gunsaulus Declines a Call,” *New York Times* (Dec. 6, 1903), 10.

²³³ “Labor’s Relation to Church,” *New York Times* (Sept. 4, 1911), 3.

²³⁴ “Would Fight Vice by Teaching Young,” *New York Times* (Oct. 15, 1913), 17; Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to J. Ogden Armour, March 17, 1911, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 15, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²³⁵ “Chicago to Learn of Vice,” *New York Times* (March 6, 1910), 1.

²³⁶ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Harry P. Judson, Feb. 9, 1912. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

²³⁷ Ralph Parlette, *The University of Hard Knocks: The School That Completes Our Education*, eighth printing, 1920 (Chicago: Parlette-Padget Company, 1914), 55-57.

world. In 1908, AIT recorded one or two students each from countries that included Turkey, Russia, Mexico, Japan, China, the Philippines, and others. The Philippines were listed as a foreign country despite the U.S. occupation.²³⁸

While Gunsaulus may have had less sway over matters of tuition and policy than in the first years of the Institute, he pressed J. Ogden Armour for financial aid to allow some of AIT's foreign students to attend.²³⁹ He also tried to ensure that Ogden, who together with his mother had provided the \$1,000,000 contribution following his father's death, did not lose interest in the cause of education. He urged one of the heirs to the Armour industrial fortune, "do not, for Heaven's sake, get soured by the awful stupidity and wicked folly of these anarchic times. We are passing through a transition. Every man must be conservative and keep a level head... I have done everything I can to keep city friends from the wrong path."²⁴⁰ When the Armour Flats were set to become vacant, having been in use by the American School of Correspondence, Gunsaulus aggressively fought for the Flats to be turned into desperately needed student housing. While promising future consideration, Ogden failed to hide his present impatience with these requests, replying, "I know you are crowded for room and I also know that you could use to advantage more buildings—and I hope some day that I shall feel like giving them to you..."²⁴¹ Gunsaulus responded that, just in case anyone were again thinking of renting out the Flats for profit, he'd be camped outside them, sitting with "a shot gun in one hand and a Prayer book in the other. The shot gun is for the purpose of keeping anyone away who wants to rebuild them for renting

²³⁸ *The Integral: Class of 1909* (Chicago: The Integral Board for the Junior Class of the College of Engineering, 1908), 207. IIT Archives.

²³⁹ Frank W. Gunsaulus to J. Ogden Armour, Sept. 27, 1905, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁴⁰ Frank W. Gunsaulus to J. Ogden Armour, May 4, 1905, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁴¹ J. Ogden Armour to Frank W. Gunsaulus, June 13, 1907, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

purposes and the Prayer book is for the purpose of beseeching heaven that we may use them for the Institute.”²⁴² As favorably as Gunsaulus viewed capital, profit-motives had no place getting in the way of his school’s needs. He had already been down that road with Ogden’s father.

The outbreak of World War I threw much of Gunsaulus’s progressive vision into question. At first, he condemned the European war. If men simply did what was right the war would end. He condemned each nation invoking God as if each had their own. All nations were subject to the same God.²⁴³ His colleague Jenkin Lloyd Jones joined the Henry Ford Peace Expedition, a flashy and moralistic public relations campaign for the automaker, or “international peace pilgrimage,” meant to bring together neutral countries in the cause of peace.²⁴⁴ Shockingly, the fighting continued. In the face of doubts raised by the war about liberal assumptions of progress, Gunsaulus declared that Christianity and democracy had not failed. Militarism had failed, while Christian democracy, built on persuasion rather than coercion, was destined to be victorious.²⁴⁵ By the end of March 1917, shortly before U.S. entry into the war, Gunsaulus clearly believed that God favored one side after all. He rallied crowds in Chicago, declaring, “I would give more tonight for the old felt hat of a President of these United States than for all the headgear of all the kings across the Atlantic.”²⁴⁶

While the U.S. still remained out of the fighting, the times saw a \$500,000 increase to AIT’s endowment.²⁴⁷ Along with the enlarged endowment, total enrollment climbed from 1,558 students in the 1916-17 schoolyear to 1,979 the following year, a twenty-one percent increase

²⁴² Frank W. Gunsaulus to J. Ogden Armour, June 21, 1907, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁴³ “Pastors Take War Topics,” *New York Times* (Sept. 13, 1915), 2.

²⁴⁴ Memo, “Outline of the Plan for the Henry Ford Peace Expedition,” Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932, Box 5, Folder 18, UC Archives.

²⁴⁵ Mrs. F. W. Gunsaulus, ed., *In Memoriam: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, 1856-1921*, 75.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

²⁴⁷ “New Armour Gift, \$500,000,” *New York Times* (May 26, 1916), 6.

and new enrollment record.²⁴⁸ During the war, the Student Army Training Corps (SATC) was introduced, converting colleges into military camps to train officers, building up a critical mass of capable leaders for the continuation of the war. AIT was among the colleges doing their patriotic duty. Students in uniform alternated between drills throughout the day, and evening classes taught by AIT faculty on such themes as the causes of the war. SATC was a voluntary eight-week intensive course, which enlisted young men but kept them on the home front for the duration of their officer training. Introduced late in the war, with the official beginning of training on October 1, 1918, the war ended before the SATC's officer candidates could finish their program. With a patriotic intent that consumed and transformed the campus of AIT, the actual outcome was that participants never left for the front.²⁴⁹

While the SATC program never sent anyone to the front, many AIT students and graduates did go to war. A common type of correspondence for Gunsaulus during those years were requests for endorsements from current and former students, seeking various positions as they enlisted. AIT's young, upwardly mobile engineers could look forward to the war providing valuable experience. The educator wrote many letters like the one typed for Claude Alling, a member of the class of 1907, who would make "a worthy candidate for a commission in the Navy" thanks to his "high place among us as a Fire Protection Engineer. I can conscientiously recommend him and know he will do his duty wherever he may be placed."²⁵⁰

Gunsaulus tried to do his part, though not always in ways that seem admirable in retrospect. Among his many patriotic wartime associations was the American Protective League,

²⁴⁸ "Enrollment," Armour Institute of Technology Records, Box 9, Folder "Enrollment Statistics 1908/09-1940/41," IIT Archives.

²⁴⁹ *The Cycle, Volume Seven: Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen* (Chicago: Armour Institute of Technology, 1919), 95-97, 108.

²⁵⁰ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to the Reserve Examining Board, Dec. 7, 1917, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder A, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

a covert citizen association reporting to federal authorities on draft dodging, disloyalty, and possible foreign agents. Encouraging spying on fellow Americans, secretive bulletins were sent out to area members from the American Protective League's Chicago headquarters at the Federal Building, where Gunsaulus had blessed the dedication two decades before. McKinley's trowel was presumably still there, beneath the sealed envelopes coming and going, asking Americans to keep an eye on their fellow citizens for the sake of national security.²⁵¹

By far, the preacher's most time-consuming contribution to the war was fundraising. As someone who had something of a reputation for raising money, he received many appeals from charities, particularly after the U.S. entry into the war. Gunsaulus donated money, as well as time and energy as a speaker, supporting organizations such as the Armenian and Syrian Relief Fund and the Queen Elizabeth Fund for Belgian Babies, among others.²⁵² This support continued after the war, with Gunsaulus offering in one letter, "I have been speaking for Armenia for so long that it will not be much of a change for me to help in the drives as my engagements permit... I will continue in the way in which I have... and I will require nothing for my expenses."²⁵³ He found himself keeping busy with speaking engagements in 1919 in order to make up large advancements he had given to Armenian and Belgian relief, practicing the ethic of Christian giving he had preached for four decades.²⁵⁴

²⁵¹ Charles Daniel Frey to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, American Protective League Bulletin no. 2, Aug. 4, 1917, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder A, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁵² Receipt for \$30 contribution from Frank W. Gunsaulus to the Armenian and Syrian Relief Fund, June 19, 1917, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder A, number 1998.24, IIT Archives; American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, June 13, 1918, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder A, number 1998.24, IIT Archives; Mrs. A. P. Shaver to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Nov. 6, 1918, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder B, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁵³ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to James H. Shaw, Jan. 4, 1919, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder A, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁵⁴ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Henry F. Burt, March 8, 1919, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder B, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

Among the various types of fundraising he engaged in, perhaps the one that most fit Gunsaulus's skill as an orator was his promotion of Liberty Loans, calling upon Christians to participate in supporting the war just as he had always preached generous giving. Raising funds for charities and promoting Liberty Loans fit a lifetime of traveling Chautauqua lecture circuits. His traveling addresses aided the Liberty Loan committees of Midwestern counties in reaching or exceeding their quotas. The committee chair from Mahoning County, Ohio, wrote after the close of the Fourth Liberty Loan to thank Gunsaulus for his visit to Youngstown to successfully jumpstart their campaign. The county had ultimately surpassed their \$10,848,700 quota with a total subscription of \$15,200,900.²⁵⁵

While Gunsaulus was famous as an effective speaker, being sought out for that purpose for all manner of wartime promotions, it was young men who were considered the most effective at encouraging support for the war, as they would do the fighting. The Four-Minute Men were established to build a network of reliable, young speakers who would share engaging patriotic messages in four minutes. Like the minute men of the American Revolution, they were to be ready at a moment's notice to call Americans to national duty, be it Liberty Loans or support for the draft or any other matter that the government might instruct. With around 15,000 speakers at the height of participation, Four-Minute Men became ubiquitous wartime preachers, heard in theaters, places of worship, and on street corners. The original idea for the program came from a small group of Chicago businessmen right before American entry into the war, meeting in March 1917. Donald M. Ryerson founded the movement and delivered the first four-minute address, getting the idea to go into theaters from Senator Medill McCormick.²⁵⁶ In correspondence with

²⁵⁵ Chairman of the Mahoning County Liberty Loan Campaign to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, Oct. 28, 1918, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder U-W, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁵⁶ Labert St. Clair, *The Story of the Liberty Loans* (Washington D. C.: James William Bryan Press, 1919), 135, 153.

the director of the Four-Minute Men just days before the end of the war, Gunsaulus claimed that the idea for the program began in his house, “baptized in my parlor in the presence of Mr. David Ryerson and George Jones...”²⁵⁷ If that is the true origin, it would certainly be fitting. What was a Four-Minute Man except a circuit rider, looking to a cause greater than himself and taking direction from on high?

Gunsaulus retired from Central Church in 1919, finally making the choice to narrow his responsibilities.²⁵⁸ After his death in 1921, he was called “the first citizen of Chicago, and one of the first hundred of the nation.”²⁵⁹ It was said he embodied the city itself in aspiration and achievement, and was the greatest of a class of Chicago reformers who took the energy of a city that otherwise would have been “merely sordid commercialism” and made it something more by contributing so much to “the whole higher life of Chicago since the World’s Fair...”²⁶⁰ Preaching to an estimated aggregate of 1,500,000 people during his time in the city, he taught the people what culture was, and without being the most intellectual or trailblazing liberal preacher, he made them want it.²⁶¹ While his memory was lauded for social and cultural uplift, the nature of that uplift was not fundamentally at odds with industrial capitalism or commercialism, instead seeking to make capitalism culturally respectable as a means of uplift. He made commercialism into a vision of purpose and promise, and industrial progress into a spiritual calling.

²⁵⁷ Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to William H. Ingersoll, Nov. 8, 1918, F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, Box 2, Folder F, number 1998.24, IIT Archives.

²⁵⁸ Mrs. F. W. Gunsaulus, ed., *In Memoriam: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, 1856-1921*, 115; Harry P. Judson to Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, April 4, 1918, University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912 [Box 47, Folder 14], Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

²⁵⁹ Mrs. F. W. Gunsaulus, ed., *In Memoriam: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, 1856-1921*, 7.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 16-17

Conclusion

Gunsaulus's life represents a complex combination of ideas, involvements, and trends. Writer Peter Clark MacFarlane once complained that this famous "merchandiser in moral values" was too complicated to write a complete biographical sketch for.²⁶² As a merchandiser in moral values, Gunsaulus needs to be understood in terms of what he was selling.

During Gunsaulus's lifetime, he not only collected books and art, but liberally donated his collections to schools and museums throughout the country. In Chicago, the Art Institute and the Field Museum found his giving especially generous. The Art Institute received entire collections of Near-East pottery, Wedgwood, handwoven American coverlets, colonial-era glass, and rare manuscripts. When the wealthy industrialist and inventor William H. Miner donated an entire exhibition hall to the Art Institute for industrial art, he insisted that the new hall be named not after himself, but after his inspiring friend Gunsaulus.²⁶³ The Field Museum was not far behind in gifts, acquiring "two valuable Chinese embroidered panels, a precious rosary of amber beads, Persian glazed tiles, a celadon flower-vase, and a remarkable ethnological collection from the aboriginal tribes of Formosa," not to mention an impressive collection of Japanese artifacts.²⁶⁴

The sinologist Berthold Laufer, head of the Anthropology Department at the Field Museum, said that Gunsaulus's "profound interest in the achievements of oriental nations was

²⁶² Gunsaulus's diverse interests and involvements variously classified him as a preacher, educator, writer, poet, book collector, art collector, patriot, man of affairs, and more besides. MacFarlane tried to touch on these many facets of a peculiarly influential life, saying at one point, "the first idea to grasp is that he is a preacher—and one of the world's great preachers. But beyond this he is one huge psychic complication." MacFarlane, "Frank Wakely Gunsaulus: The Premier Pulpit of Chicago—a Man of Many Manifestations," 16.

²⁶³ "The Gunsaulus Memorial," *The American Magazine of Art* 12, no. 6 (June 1921), 214-215.

²⁶⁴ Berthold Laufer, preface to *Japanese Collections*, by Helen C. Gunsaulus (Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1922), 1.

not purely academic, but... an earnest striving toward the realization of world peace.”²⁶⁵ Far from merely intellectual or material, Laufer claimed Gunsaulus’s accumulated anthropological troves represented a desire for international understanding, as well as crucial education for future generations. He quoted Gunsaulus, who said that the “future-man” would scientifically mold tomorrow’s societies, relying more than ever on a firm knowledge of natural and cultural history to understand past social evolution. Just as the nation needed libraries for “popularizing intelligence,” museums provided scientific training that even children could easily grasp, preparing men of the future. The Field Museum represented the consummation of this educational effort, a legacy to benefit “the poorest child and... exalt the richest...”²⁶⁶

Gunsaulus’s educational platitudes did not always match AIT’s trajectory, which came to exclude African Americans and women. Nor did they match his endorsements of the abuses of labor. But there was a consistent underlying democratic theory to his platitudes. One did not need to be a millionaire’s son to succeed. The rational man of the future solving society’s problems could be any child with access to a good museum or school. Despite this male-centric rhetoric of the rational man, the young citizen of the future who probably gained the most from Gunsaulus’s view of museum education was not a man, but his youngest daughter, Helen. Helen developed her own curiosity and intellectual passions for culture and art while growing up with access to her father’s collections. Learning how to manage those collections allowed her to transition into professional museum and curatorial work. Graduating from the University of Chicago in 1908, the University later became her first source of professional employment.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 2-3

²⁶⁷ Helen C. Gunsaulus to Harry P. Judson, June 16, 1911. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

University President Harry Judson congratulated her, “I am greatly pleased with the arrangement made, and am sure that you will enjoy continuing your work not merely as your father’s worthy representative but as an officer of the University.”²⁶⁸ Her father supported Helen’s own art collecting, helping her gather hundreds of traditional Japanese commemorative prints, called *surimono*. After his death, Helen honored him by donating her collection to the Field Museum, where she was employed.²⁶⁹

While Gunsaulus valued rationalism as a marker of human potential, he deplored what seemed like strict, irreligious, or unemotional rationalism without room for tradition. His advocacy married the idea of a rational future with the aesthetics of traditional cultural achievement and religious faith. Those who knew him insisted that he was always a preacher first, despite his many interests. The clergyman Charles Thwing found cause to reflect back on what made Gunsaulus great. As a preacher, what distinguished him was not intellectual rigor or wit or consistency, where other great preachers outperformed him. His sermons “created vision. They had affluence, intellectual and emotional.”²⁷⁰ The Christian faith was, according to Thwing, the creative force Gunsaulus used in all of his diverse endeavors, making every platform a pulpit. He “quicken[ed] one for service,” so that just as Demosthenes made the Athenians say, ““Let us go and fight Philip!,”” so Gunsaulus made Americans say, ““What can I do to make this a better world?””²⁷¹

The affluence Thwing credits to Gunsaulus served as a source of credibility, a justifying aesthetic that could be worked into any sermon to make a moral case. Themes of nationalism,

²⁶⁸ Harry P. Judson to Helen C. Gunsaulus, June 17, 1911. University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Box 47, Folder 14, UC Archives.

²⁶⁹ Laufer, preface to *Japanese Collections*, by Helen C. Gunsaulus, 1.

²⁷⁰ Thwing, *Guides, Philosophers, and Friends: Studies of College Men*, 211.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 212, 215.

praise for capital, or help for the poor could each benefit from that affluent cultural credibility.

Where some challenged the excesses of industrial capitalism, Gunsaulus's social gospel provided it with cultural legitimacy. This was the likely role of a significant number of white, middle-class Christian reformers. Even when speaking out against greed, laissez-faire, or unregulated monopolies, social gospellers like Gunsaulus performed a legitimizing role by softening the edges of industrial capitalism. Gunsaulus was just more successful than most.

While the malleability of Gunsaulus's affluent cultural aesthetic played a role in his influence, it also made his legacy ambiguous and indistinct, blending with larger cultural forces. The influence Gunsaulus commanded in his day makes his absence in historical discussions strange, but it is also true that he was not an original thinker. For all of his influence and ability as a preacher, for all of his power to marshal millions of dollars for ambitious reform efforts, Gunsaulus's writing was a pale, turgid reflection of his legendary oratory. His force as a speaker could not outlive him, making it difficult to grasp the power Gunsaulus once commanded from print sources, or to understand the vision he articulated, so influential to his hearers but often convoluted on paper. As Gunsaulus's friend and fellow traveler on the summer lecture circuits, Loyal Lincoln Wirt, said of his writing, "I wonder why this fascinating book has not been republished... but, perhaps I am prejudiced—I heard the author call his own characters up out of the past, and they knew his voice."²⁷²

The ambiguity and indistinct nature of Gunsaulus's legacy, but also its influence, is seen the parallels to twentieth century market liberalism's visions of progress and civilization.

Gunsaulus clearly had opinions on what constituted progress and what benefitted civilization, though he often expressed those thoughts in platitudes. In the years shortly after his death, one

²⁷² Loyal Lincoln Wirt, *The World is My Parish: An Autobiographical Odyssey* (Los Angeles: Warren F. Lewis, 1951), 156.

AIT student's award winning 1924 essay illustrated educated opinion on those vital subjects. Elihu Orson Pierce's Cooley Prize essay was titled, "Old Civilizations and Our Own."²⁷³ Pierce identified instability caused by inequality as a threat to civilization, suggesting that the erosion of religious values leads to unchecked greed.²⁷⁴ But that sense of culture and virtue is restored when families have material means. Pierce describes the working man of the United States who must first provide for essentials needs like food and shelter, but then "will want more and better food, clothing, and lodgings, a telephone, an automobile, and so on—indicating a progressive taste which is in itself cultural." After pursuing these material appetites, the working man "will also want his children to go to college, to study science, music, art..."²⁷⁵

Economic development, according to Pierce, was necessary for social progress and culture. The secret to preserving American civilization lay in "the teachings of the three greatest religions the world has ever known—Christianity, Buddhism, and Confucianism..."²⁷⁶ Referencing the golden rule, Pierce assured readers that this did not equate to socialism, as "socialism assumes a change only in society as a unit; the above requires a change in the individual."²⁷⁷ A religious ethic together with material prosperity could provide a cultural basis for sustained civilization within a capitalist society. The engineers trained at AIT had a crucial role to play in this effort to preserve American civilization. Engineers had always been the builders of civilization, and the work of engineers according to Pierce was encouraging economic development that benefitted all people, postponing any decline of civilization.²⁷⁸ In

²⁷³ Elihu Orson Pierce, *Old Civilizations and Our Own* (Chicago: Armour Institute of Technology, 1924), Armour Institute of Technology Records, Box 2. IIT Archives.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 19.

many ways, Pierce's thesis was not so different from that of Gunsaulus, preaching the social gospel of upward mobility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Archival Sources

- A.I.T. Senior Class Book, Volume 2.* Chicago: Senior Class of the Armour Institute of Technology, 1912. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Armour Institute of Technology records, 1882-1947. Paul V. Galvin Library. University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Frank Jay, Nov. 21, 1896. Frank. W. Gunsaulus Collection, Shared Box, Folder 4, number 1998.60. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus to Graham Taylor, Nov. 27, 1895. Chicago and the Midwest, Graham Taylor Papers, Midwest MS Taylor, Box 15, Folder 811, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois.
- F. W. Gunsaulus Papers, number 1998.24. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Gunsaulus Family Scrapbook, number 1991.10. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Integral: The Book of the Class of '99.* Chicago: J. W. Franks & Sons, 1898. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Integral '99, Volume II: Class of 1900.* Peoria, IL: J. W. Franks & Sons, 1899. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Integral 1901: The Book of the Class of '02.* Chicago: The Blue Sky Press, 1901. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Integral 1904: The Book of the Class of 1905.* Chicago: Pettibone, Sawtell & Co., 1904. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Jenkin Lloyd Jones Papers, 1861-1932. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Illinois.

Pierce, Charles W. "How Electricity is Taught at Tuskegee." *The Technical World* 1, no. 4 (June 1904): 425-30. Charles W. Pierce Collection, Shared Box, number 2009.004. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.

The Cycle, Volume Seven: Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen. Chicago: Armour Institute of Technology, 1919. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.

The Integral: Class of 1909. Chicago: The Integral Board for the Junior Class of the College of Engineering, 1908. Paul V. Galvin Library, University Archives and Special Collections, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.

University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Armour Institute of Technology, 1902-1924. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Illinois.

University of Chicago. Office of the President. Harper, Judson and Burton Administrations. Gunsaulus, F. W., 1894-1912. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Illinois.

Other Primary Sources

Armour Institute catalog (n.p., 1895). From *Faith in the City: Chicago's Religious Diversity in the Era of the World's Fair*, accessed 4/19/19, <http://publications.newberry.org/faith-in-the-city/resource/christian-education-armour-institute>.

Abbott, Lyman. "Danger Ahead." *Century Illustrated Magazine* 31, no. 1 (Nov. 1885): 53-57.

Abbott, Lyman. *Henry Ward Beecher as His Friends Saw Him*. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1904.

Boston Daily Advertiser. Articles: 1.

Brown, C. O. *Talks on the Labor Troubles*. Chicago: F. H. Revell, 1886.

Chicago Daily Tribune. Articles: 14.

Chicago Daily Socialist. Articles: 1.

Conant, William C. *Narratives of Remarkable Conversions and Revival Incidents: Including a Review of Revivals, from the day of Pentecost to the Great Awakening in the Last Century – Conversions of Imminent Persons – Instances of Remarkable Conversions and Answers to Prayer – An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Great Awakening of 1857-'8.* New York: Derby & Jackson, 1858.

- Dreiser, Theodore. *A Book About Myself*. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922.
- Dreiser, Theodore. "A Leader of Young Manhood: Frank W. Gunsaulus." In *Theodore Dreiser's Uncollected Magazine Articles, 1897-1902*, ed. by Yoshinobu Hakutani. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.
- Dreiser, Theodore. *Dawn*. London: Constable, 1931.
- Dreiser, Theodore. "Life Stories of Successful Men—No. 10," 120-29. In *Selected Magazine Articles of Theodore Dreiser: Life and Art in the American 1890s, Volume 1*. Edited by Yoshinobu Hakutani. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1985.
- Dreiser, Theodore. *Sister Carrie*. New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1900.
- Eleventh Annual Report of the Chicago City Missionary Society, 1893*. Chicago: Mize & Stearns, 1894. From *Faith in the City: Chicago's Religious Diversity in the Era of the World's Fair* (accessed April 18, 2019). <http://publications.newberry.org/faith-in-the-city/resource/frank-w-gunsauluss-million-dollar-sermon>.
- Field, Eugene. *The Complete Tribune Primer*, Illus. by Frederick Burr Opper. Boston: Mutual Book Company, 1901.
- Foy, Eddie and Alvin F. Harlow, *Clowning Through Life*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1928.
- George, Henry. *Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial depressions, and of Want with Increase of Wealth*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881.
- Gladden, Washington. *Present Day Theology*. Columbus, OH: McClelland & Company, 1913.
- Griffin, Richard Andrew. *From Traditional to Rational Faith: or, The Way I Came from Baptist to Liberal Christianity*. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1877.
- Gunsaulus, Frank W., ed. *Modern Engineering Practice, Volume I: Mathematics*. Chicago: American School of Correspondence, 1903.
- Gunsaulus, Frank Wakeley. *Monk and Knight: An Historical Study in Fiction, Volume I*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1891.
- Gunsaulus, Frank Wakeley. *The Metamorphoses of a Creed: An Essay in Present Day Theology*. Chillicothe, Ohio: Gould & Kello, 1879.
- Gunsaulus, Frank Wakeley. *The Transfiguration of Christ*. Cambridge, MA: H. O. Houghton and Co., 1886.

Gunsaulus, Frank W. *Young Men in History*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1898.

Hartzler, H. B. *Moody in Chicago, or The World's Fair Gospel Campaign: An Account of Six Months' Evangelistic Work in the City of Chicago and Vicinity During the Time of the World's Columbian Exposition, Conducted by Dwight L. Moody and His Associates*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1894.

Hickson, J. C. *Notes of Travel: From Pacific to Atlantic, with Description of the World's Fair at Chicago; Also Travels by Land and Sea Around the World*. Parramatta, Australia: Fuller's Lightning Printing Works, 1894.

In Memoriam: Elbridge Gerry Keith. Chicago: C. L. Ricketts, 1906.

Laufer, Berthold. In preface to *Japanese Collections*, by Helen C. Gunsaulus. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1922.

"Literature." *Sunday Afternoon: A Monthly Magazine for the Household*, Vol. 3 (January—September, 1879): 862.

Luccock, J. W. "Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, the Poet-Preacher." *The American Illustrated Methodist Magazine* 4, no. 3 (Nov., 1900): 210-16.

MacFarlane, Peter Clark. "Frank Wakely Gunsaulus: The Premier Pulpiteer of Chicago—a Man of Many Manifestations." *Collier's: The National Weekly* 49, no. 20 (Aug. 3, 1912): 16-17, 25.

Mathews, Shailer. "Social Gospel." In *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, ed. by Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.

Milwaukee Daily Sentinel. Articles: 1

Moffett, Cleveland. "O Rare 'Gene Field!'" *Godey's Magazine* 132, no. 788 (Feb. 1896): 155-56.

Mrs. F. W. Gunsaulus, ed. *In Memoriam: Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, 1856-1921*. Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1921.

New York Evangelist. Articles: 1.

New York Journal. Articles: 1.

New York Times. Articles: 34.

Oberlin Weekly News. Articles: 1.

"One of the Ten Which May Prove Chicago's Salvation." *The Altruistic Review* 2, no. 1 (Jan. 1894): 2-3.

- Packard, S. S. "Personal and Miscellaneous." *American Merchant* 1, no. 1 (May 1858): 37.
- Parlette, Ralph. *The University of Hard Knocks: The School That Completes Our Education*. Eighth printing, 1920. Chicago: Parlette-Padget Company, 1914.
- Perrin, W. H. and J. H. Battle, *History of Morrow County and Ohio*. Chicago: O. L. Baskin & Co., 1880.
- Poole, Ernest. *Giants Gone: Men Who Made Chicago*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1943.
- Ransom, Reverdy C. *The Pilgrimage of Harriet Ransom's Son*. Nashville, TN: Sunday School Union, 1949.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter A *Theology for the Social Gospel*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917.
- St. Louis Globe-Democrat*. Articles: 1.
- Savage, M. J. *Bluffton: A Story of To-Day*. Boston: Lee and Shepherd, 1878.
- Smith, Joseph T. *Eighty Years: Embracing a History of Presbyterianism in Baltimore*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1899.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. "Sunday at the World's Fair." *The North American Review* 154 no. 423 (Feb., 1892): 254-56.
- The Christian Union*. Articles: 1.
- The Congregationalist*. Articles: 19.
- The Daily Inter Ocean*. Articles: 11.
- "The Gunsaulus Memorial." *The American Magazine of Art* 12, no. 6 (June 1921): 214-215.
- The Milwaukee Sentinel*. Articles: 1.
- "The Social Gospel." *Current Literature: A Magazine of Contemporary Thought* 36, no. 3 (March 1904): 341.
- Thwing, Charles Franklin. *Guides, Philosophers, and Friends: Studies of College Men*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927.
- Warren, Arthur. "Philip D. Armour: His Manner of Life, His Immense Enterprises in Trade and Philanthropy," *McClure's Magazine* 2, no 3 (Feb. 1894): 260- 280.

Wells, Ida B. *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells*. Edited by Alfreda M. Duster. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Williams, A. W., ed. *Life and Work of Dwight L. Moody, The Great Evangelist of the XIXth Century: The Founder of Northfield Seminary, Mount Herman School for Boys and the Chicago Bible Institute*. Chicago: P. W. Ziegler & Company, 1900.

Wirt, Loyal Lincoln. *The World is My Parish: An Autobiographical Odyssey*. Los Angeles: Warren F. Lewis, 1951.

Secondary Sources

Articles

Clymer, Jeffery A. "The 1886 Chicago Haymarket Bombing and the Rhetoric of Terrorism in America." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2002): 315-44.

Danns, Dionne. "Thriving in the Midst of Adversity: Educator Maudelle Brown Bousfield's Struggles in Chicago, 1920-1950." *The Journal of Negro Education* 78, no. 1 (Winter 2009): 3-16.

Flanagan, Maureen A. "Frank W. Gunsaulus and the Armour Institute of Technology." *Faith in the City: Chicago's Religious Diversity in the Era of the World's Fair*, accessed 4/19/19. <http://publications.newberry.org/faith-in-the-city/essays/frank-w-gunsaulus-and-armour-institute-technology>.

Forrey, Robert. "Dreiser and the Prophetic Tradition." *American Studies* 15, no. 2 (fall 1974): 21-35.

Grotzinger, Laurel A. "Melvil Dewey: The 'Sower,'" *The Journal of Library History* 3, no. 4 (Oct. 1968): 313-328.

Kaestle, Carl F. "Ideology and American Educational History." *History of Education Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 123-137.

Klapper, Melissa. "'A Long and Broad Education': Jewish Girls and the Problem of Education in America, 1860-1920," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 22, no. 1 (Fall 2002): 3-31.

Newmyer, Jody. "The Image Problem of the Librarian: Femininity and Social Control." *The Journal of Library History* 11, No. 1 (Jan. 1976): 44-67.

Rippa, S. Alexander. "The Business Community and the Public Schools on the Eve of the Great Depression." *History of Education Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (March 1964): 33-43.

Sennett, Richard. "Genteel Backlash: Chicago 1886." *Trans-action* 7, no. 3 (Jan. 1970): 41-50.

Books

Anderson, Jonathan A. and William A. Dyrness. *Modern Art and the Life of a Culture: The Religious Impulses of Modernism*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2016.

Brown, Ira V. *Lyman Abbott, Christian Evolutionist: A Study in Religious Liberalism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Burns, David. *The Life and Death of the Radical Historical Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Carter, Heath W. *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Curtis, Susan. *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

Delano, Sterling F. *Brook Farm: The Dark Side of Utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Edwards, Wendy J. Deichmann and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford. eds. *Gender and the Social Gospel*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Evans, Christopher H. *Histories of American Christianity: An Introduction*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013.

Gloege, Timothy E. W. *Guaranteed Pure: The Moody Bible Institute, Business, and the Making of Modern Evangelicalism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Green, James. *Death in the Haymarket: A Story of Chicago, the First Labor Movement and the Bombing That Divided America*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2006.

Guyatt, Nicholas. *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607–1876*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Handy, Robert T., ed. *The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks. *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Hopkins, Charles Howard. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940.

- Hutchison, Mark P., ed. *Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions, Volume V: The Twentieth Century—Themes and Variations in a Global Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Hutchison, William R. *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992.
- Jensen, Richard J. *The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888-1896, Volume 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Long, Kathryn Teresa. *The Revival of 1857-58: Interpreting an American Religious Awakening*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Luker, Ralph E. *The Social Gospel in Black & White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Macauley, Irene. *The Heritage of the Illinois Institute of Technology*. Chicago: Illinois Institute of Technology, 1978.
- Martin E. Marty. *Modern American Religion, Volume I: The Irony of It All, 1893-1919*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- May, Henry F. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- McDowell, John Patrick. *The Social Gospel in the South: The Woman's Home Mission Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1886-1939*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Melton, J. Gordon. *Religious Leaders of America: A Biographical Guide to Founders and Leaders of Religious Bodies, Churches, and Spiritual Groups in North America*. Second Edition. Detroit: Gale Research, 1999.
- Niebuhr, Richard H. *The Kingdom of God in America*. Reprint 1959. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1937.
- Ostrander, Rick. *The Life of Prayer in a World of Science: Protestants, Prayer, and American Culture, 1870-1930*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Pollitt, L. Irving. *A History of Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church, 1870-1945*. Baltimore, MD: Thomsen-Ellis-Hutton Co., 1945.

- Reed, Christopher Robert. *The Rise of Chicago's Black Metropolis, 1920-1929*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2011.
- Schulze, Franz. *Illinois Institute of Technology: An Architectural Tour*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2005.
- Skrabec, Jr., Quentin R. *Edward Drummond Libbey, American Glassmaker*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011
- Smith, Brett H. *Labor's Millennium: Christianity, Industrial Education, and the Founding of the University of Illinois*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.
- Smith, Gary Scott. *The Search for Social Salvation: Social Christianity and America, 1880-1925*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2000.
- Whaley, Annemarie Koning. *The Trouble with Dreiser: Harper and the Editing of Jennie Gerhardt*. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2009.
- White, Jr., Ronald C. *Liberty and Justice for All: Racial Reform & the Social Gospel*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1990.
- Young, Jeremy C. *The Age of Charisma: Leaders, Followers, and Emotions in American Society, 1870-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.