

radical crusaders and a conservative church: attitudes of populists toward contemporary protestantism in kansas

Ieland I. Iengel

Writers in *American Studies* and its predecessors in the past twelve years have repeatedly suggested, directly or indirectly, the impact of religious and moral motivations on social concern in the popular literature produced during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In their studies several of these writers have illustrated a recurrent theme in that literature.

The theme broadly appears first in Warren Titus' article treating literature at the turn of the century, "The Progressivism of the Muckrakers." In his discussion Titus describes what William Nichols calls the "naive moralism" of the "muckraking" journalists in the period of twentieth-century Progressivism; Nichols himself, in a later essay, analyzes the similar quality in the fiction published by a great national magazine. Roy Meyer and Robert Schneider suggest the presence of a trace of this guileless moral idealism even in the pages of such confirmed literary naturalists as Garland, Crane and Norris. Elmer F. Suderman, whose ideas have particularly aided in the development of this present essay, describes the highly optimistic religiosity of those "social-gospel" novelists who foresaw the Kingdom arriving through the agency of relatively minor social changes. This idealistic optimism also appears, according to Norton Mezvinski, in the rather similar bent to the social gospel manifested in the suffrage movement.¹

Although none of these writers has dealt specifically with the ideological influence of the People's Party in the social and political setting of the late nineteenth century, the Populists certainly exhibited an intense religious concern and a highly optimistic and moralistic idealism.²

A closer inspection of one aspect of that concern, the attitude of members of the People's Party toward contemporary Protestantism, may provide some further insight both concerning the Populists' vision and regarding the larger nature of American social, religious and political reform at the turn of the century.

Nowhere in the United States did Populism have a larger following or a more fervid one than it boasted among Kansas farmers. Hundreds of devotees of the movement proclaimed the righteous cause in newspaper editorials, public letters and campaign songs. Religious terminologies pervaded the movement's literature; among these the word, "crusade," abounded. Annie Diggs, a major Populistic orator and political manipulator in Kansas, described the movement as "a great thrilling crusade."³ Lorenzo Lewelling, Populistic Governor of Kansas during the heyday of the movement, likened the zeal of Populist enthusiasts to "the spirit of the Crusaders."⁴ That divine favor fell overwhelmingly on the Populists' candidates became a commonplace assumption. No Kansan thought it particularly unusual that one Populist, a minister at Larned, attributed political victory to "the Infinite One whose smiles and blessings alone have given us such wonderful success," or that the chaplain of a local Alliance chapter near Wichita prayed that "we know we are right and we appeal to the God of Heaven for victory and we believe we shall gain the battle."⁵ Indeed, even Lyman Humphrey, a Republican and Governor of Kansas during the early crusading days of the Alliance in the state, apparently described the reform movement as being "of a New Testament character."⁶

The movement's crusading ardor, and its claims to divine favor, quite naturally have suggested to some students in the twentieth century its inspiration by and close relationship to the presumably conservative and sometimes literalistic religious beliefs and institutions of the rural South and West, whence it came into prominence. Maurice Latta, writing in 1936 on the backgrounds of the social gospel in America, saw the prairie radicals as typically conformist in their religious conservatism and specifically rejected any influences of that social gospel in Western agricultural reform.⁷ More recently, Richard Hofstadter in *The Age of Reform* described the Populists as "Yankee-Protestant" types and implied a set of religious and moral values characteristic of those rural and conservative inhabitants presumably legion in Midwestern and Southern cultures.⁸ Other writers, observing the highly visible religiosity of the Populists, drew similar conclusions.

Yet, whatever the religious beliefs of the "crusaders" in the typically Populist state of Kansas (and their beliefs apparently varied rather widely), their response to much of Protestant orthodoxy appears essentially negative. Writing in political pamphlets, on editorial pages, and in letters to dozens of Populistically-inclined weeklies, advocates of the

crusade in at least this one commonwealth made clear their rejection of much of institutional Protestantism.⁹

The Populists condemned what they called “churchianity.”¹⁰ They scored Protestant churches for many failures; most of all, however, they condemned church and churchmen for their alleged hypocrisy and corruption. Few villains disturbed the faithful in quite the same way as did those churchmen who promoted selfish causes while claiming adherence to Christian principles. Mary Lease, one of the most famous of those Kansans whose oratory enlivened the movement, proclaimed dramatically against such corrupted vessels. “We have failed,” she wrote,

because we have ignored justice, which is only another name for that old fashioned word Righteousness in the affairs of men, because avaricious Ecclesiasticism has looked more to its own aggrandizement than to the splendid teaching and virtues of Christ. . . . Religion remains blind and mute, while giant Wrong builds up the grandeur of state on the suffering of individuals. The sins expressly forbidden in that theocracy whose constitution was direct from Jehovah, Land Monopoly and Money Monopoly, are condoned with approving silence by a hypocritical Church, that in giving the usurer and bond holder the best pew, and a place at the sacred board, is eternally false to the teaching of the divine master.¹¹

Such observations represented an attitude expressed repeatedly by Populists in Kansas. “Satan,” one editor observed sourly, “is getting a powerful hold on the church.”¹² Another described a group of Kansan Methodists of Republican persuasion as “a lot of political mercenaries whose conduct blasphemes the name of God, and whose religion is born of darkness.”¹³ During hard-fought local campaigns Populists regularly blamed defeat, not on the Satanic manipulations of the “money power,” but on the respectable people who voted this Satanic conspiracy into positions of increasing strength—and only the prostitution of churchmen, in the Populists’ eyes, furnished a reasonable explanation for this electoral behavior.

This theory of a conspiratorial “churchianity” obviously implied a strong conviction that the votes of “Christian people” controlled political and social power in Populists’ communities. Thus the forces of evil, the “money power” and the Republican organization, had to depend on the ostensibly righteous majority for their political existence—and their success infuriated Populists. Reviewing the election of 1894 for the office of state treasurer, a Populistic editor at Hays compared candidates (“Atherton the drunken gambler” and “the farmer and Methodist, populist Biddle”) and explained the outcome succinctly: “The ministers voted for the drunken Atherton.”¹⁴ *The Junction City Tribune*, edited by a well-known Populist, waxed more specific and more bitter. “Saloon and church members formed an unholy alliance,” the writer fumed, “and

ministers of the gospel and deacons mingled freely with gamblers, thieves, thugs and divekeepers in the ghost dance of suffrage debauchery." The conclusion was obvious: "Well had the money power chosen its minions."¹⁵

Populists in Kansas attacked the religious press, too, with enthusiasm and bitterness. O. D. Jones condemned *en masse* the control of "nearly all" of the religious press by "the minions of greed and class legislation . . . the usurers and extortioners . . . the devourers of widows' houses." Jones claimed full membership in the Methodist Episcopal church, as had his parents, and two of his brothers currently worked "in the ministry." Yet "in shame and sorrow [I] am compelled to admit that in the great impending conflict . . . with a very few exceptions, the church press is either silent or in actual sympathy with, and advocates[,] the cruel measures used to grind the spirit, nobler life and independent livings out of the people."¹⁶

Although Populists attacked at once pious laymen and sectarian press, the real brunt of their denunciations fell on those pastors whose attitudes Populistic critics found inimical to the crusade. The party's righteous cause demanded unanimous support by ministers and cast immediate suspicion on those who lacked proper zeal. The resultant condemnations took many forms. Some simply questioned pastoral courage;¹⁷ others attacked more specifically. A Cheyenne County editor plunged his pen deep into those "men of the cloth who pose[d] as dispensers of the holy word," but who simultaneously stooped to "the foulest slanders to carry a political point."¹⁸ When a Baptist minister in Wichita, on the eve of the general election of 1896, extravagantly claimed his preference that God should destroy "the heads of a million families" rather than that Bryan should succeed, he provided an irresistible target. "Was there ever," the *Kansas Commoner* exploded,

a more unpatriotic, a more unchristian or more brutal expression uttered by a demon of hell than the above, and that by one who professes to teach and preach the doctrines of the meek and lowly Jesus. A man brutal enough to even harbor such a sentiment was not only never 'called by God to preach,' but must of necessity resemble an imp of the devil . . . sent forth by the monster to proclaim infidelity, anarchy and all that is vile, disreputable and ungodly.

If there is a hell, it is doubtless paved with better professed christians than one who breathes such sentiments; and if there is no hell, then the maker of the universe failed in not providing a place, separate and apart, from decent people for such creatures as he.¹⁹

Obviously, the language sometimes reeked with bitter alienation. Pastors, named without compunction, stood condemned as "sychophants of public opinion,"²⁰ "aspirants of popular favor," and "songsinger[s] to the republican state central committee."²¹ During the depths of the

depression of the mid-nineties, an Attica, Kansas, writer unequivocally explained its cause. "Mankind will someday wake up and find that preachers are responsible for the condition of depression and stagnation of business by the confusion of their flocks," he predicted, and added:

The preacher works for the glory of God on Sunday and votes for the devil on election days. During the intermediate time they debate with one another. . . . Should the ministry conclude to establish even a second-class heaven on earth the result would be that the devil would hide out when he discovered the preachers were in earnest. The society preacher is the fellow on top riding the popular sentiment without disturbing the under current of alarm or distress. The Lord's people are now sorely distressed and where are the preachers?²²

This tide of angry reaction surged against churches from the banks of the Missouri to the high plains, and steadily eroded the faith of devout Populists in the sincerity of religious institutions and religious leaders. In a passage repeatedly echoed by other Populistic newspapers, one recommended "a new Christ and a new Christianity that will not and cannot be used or twisted to aid in the robbery of the poor, who were made in His image."²³ Another editor summed up what seemed to be a reigning Populistic attitude toward those who failed the cause. "The professor of Christianity who preaches eternal salvation and votes temporal damnation," he observed, "is no better, if as good, as the man who votes for temporal salvation and neglects his soul's eternal welfare. A religion which does not manifest itself at the polls is not Christianity, but hypocrisy."²⁴

Denouncing the hypocritical attitude of the churches, Populists specifically lodged two complementary charges against them. First, hypocritical Christians neglected the glaring evils of the world; secondly, they permitted and even encouraged the practice of usury. The *Concordia Alliant*, echoing the strong note of social reform that characterized the Populists' gospel, suggested that Christianity itself did not stand at fault, but rather its erroneous interpretation. "It is as much a part of Christianity to save the bodies of men, women, and children in this world as it is to save their souls hereafter." Christianity, *The Alliant* argued, waxed in "civilized and enlightened" lands; the Christian religion was essentially humanistic. "The distinctive feature of Christianity which gave it the ascendancy over all other religions was the idea of man's individual value. Its doctrine is that of idealized manhood and womanhood." Thus, the editor concluded, only with material well-being could "true Christianity ever be realized."²⁵ The editor of the *Kansas Commoner* likewise urged Christians not to neglect the evils of this world. "The church," the charge emerged again, "has too long winked at wickedness in high places. She has too long permitted and sometimes encouraged the worship of mammon."²⁶

In the eyes of the Populists, too, hypocritical religionists in the church failed notably to preach against usury. When a local pastor wondered how to combat contemporary irreligious trends, the *American Nonconformist* replied bluntly. Christ, the editor suggested, scourged the money-changers from the temple. "Does christianity to-day," the paper queried, "present such an attitude to the usurers and extortioners of the land?" If what the churches preached in contemporary America attracted "to the front seats and cushioned pews only the wealthy, the usurers and the extortioners,—which you cannot deny is the prevailing fact—why find fault with the common people for rejecting it as a base counterfeit?" The church, the *Nonconformist* implied, contained little in its history suggesting its sympathy "with the oppressed masses as against the lordly domination of the few." It might be rejected, the paper added, because men "are getting their eyes open to the suspicion that the principal purpose of religion is to bolster up oppressors."²⁷

Numerous rank and file party members supported their newspapers' attacks on the churches' failings. From Heber, Kansas, J. M. Henderson waxed wrathful. "My God, how long will the preachers continue to wink at the enormous crime of usury?" If pastors would only follow the example of Christ, driving the moneylenders from the temples, "the church . . . would rise above the stigma" of aiding and abetting robbery. "I have given the last dollar in aid of any church that will not follow the example of our blessed savior."²⁸ T. J. Maxwell defined all interest as usurious—a definition not uncommon among Populists. "If the churches would do their duty in regard to this question, and come out on the side of right and the bible," he wrote, the practice would lose all support. "The trouble with too many of our churches in the opinion of the writer . . . a church member . . . is that they try to make peace with the world, especially if the 'world' is clothed in riches."²⁹

Besides fawning over the moneychangers, the church, in the eyes of many Populists, neglected its original purpose: It failed to advocate a nearer approach to the brotherhood of man. "The minister," the editor of *The Industrial Advocate* snapped, "who preaches the Fatherhood of God and by his acts refuses to recognize the brotherhood of man, is a dastardly hypocrite, whose only stock in trade is buncombe and whose proper sphere is elsewhere than the ministry."³⁰ But even when the church preached a message of social service and human welfare it failed in the Populists' eyes to meet man's basic material needs. The new political movement demanded action in lieu of pulpit preachments. "What is wanted," the Fort Scott *Lantern* explained, "is a better condition of things. . . . And it is to be hoped that any church that will interfere with a movement based on popular sentiment and intended for general benefit without regard to sect . . . will be ignored as unchristian and selfish in its motives."³¹ In a district convention of the Alliance at Holton, Kansas, in 1892, A. P. Bunnell of Jefferson County urged church

members and pastors to join the Populists' efforts to better mankind. "You can get no moral or reformatory ideas into a starving man's head," he argued. "Give a man fair play. Give him his honest earning, an equal share of nature's bounties and he will need neither charity nor prayers."³² In the latter days of the movement, an editorial in *The Advocate* summed up the Populists' argument—that the churches neglected the subject of men's material welfare—in clear and concise terms. Asserting that in Germany common laborers tended to reject the church as a religious institution, the editor called:

American working men generally feel that the church has outlived its usefulness. They look upon it as turning its face more to the monied man . . . rather than teaching the truths that Christ taught. There are few, if any representative American working men who will quarrel with Christ's doctrines as they read them in the New Testament, but there are many who claim that these are not really found in the churches. . . . The ethical movement among the churches has shown that the wage-workers are alive to a teaching of what they feel to be the true Christianity.³³

Certainly, in the eyes of Populists in Kansas, the church deserved reproof for her failure to stand against the usury, selfcenteredness, and selfishness of this world; conversely, however, she overemphasized the concern for the "otherworldly." Thus they also criticized the concern of a hypocritical clergy for the ethereal rewards of another world. Many party organs urged ministers to devote less of their time to future places of paradise or perdition, the writers typically assuming a paradise of earth and time. One suggested that pastors would "employ their time much better if they would devote more of it to preaching against the hell they see all around them instead of the one they don't see";³⁴ the church expended too much energy foolishly attempting to "keep men out of hell in the future world, while the god Mammon peoples this world with hell."³⁵

Populism, then, with its broad concern for religion as social reform, left few aspects of the institutional churches uncriticized. Yet, to most Populists, whatever might be wrong with the Christian churches, the wrongness lay not in the basic ideals of Christianity. Though hypocrisy and corruption pervaded the church, these ideals stood unchallenged. But one of the reasons why the church of the 1890's failed to meet the Populists' standard of "true Christianity" lay in the fact that, to many Populists, "true Christianity" appeared as nothing less than Christian socialism. James H. Lathrop, writing from Oberlin, Kansas, urged reformers and Alliancemen to "hope for the Cooperative Commonwealth dreamed of by Edward Bellamy . . . which has been the dream of every true lover of American liberty from our forefathers."³⁶ H. A. Higgins, using even stronger terms, stated:

The book that records the history of that chain of events that ended with Christ, and then his life, and then the teachings of those who had learned of him, is an impregnable stronghold of what commercial economists have agreed to stigmatize and curse under the name of socialism. . . . The true, ideal, socialistic world would be a perfect theocracy—not a churchocracy, remember, but a theocracy, *the kingdom of God*.³⁷

To Populists of all persuasions in Kansas, the basic religious issues centered about this social message. The editor of the party's paper at Junction City pointedly reprinted a comment that the church would need to solve "the social problem" if it wished not to lose its influence entirely. People would reject "the dry husks of worn-out creeds."³⁸ During 1896, Populists denounced religious as well as political conservatism in the opposition. One editor urged more pastors to "devote some of their time . . . to instructing the people in a method to prevent crime," rather than attempting "to prove the fallacy, that the Garden of Eden was a literal garden."³⁹ "A religion," *The Barber County Index* commented, "which does not recognize man's equality to man, will not do to live by or to die by."⁴⁰

Clearly, Populists in Kansas demonstrated their attitude toward what they denounced as the larger role of Protestant Christianity.⁴¹ Only very occasionally did other partisans publicly protest the wisdom of such assaults. Yet some such protests had a hearing. One, a thoughtful essay from P. C. Branch of Sterling, faced the issue directly and proved so timely as to merit a full-column reply from the editor of *The Advocate*. "I desire to enter my protest," Branch wrote quietly,

against the unjust and unwise, not to say abusive, treatment 'the church' is receiving from Populist speakers and newspapers. Churches are characterized as bands of thieves and robbers. Ministers are called pulpit mountebanks and the most abusive epithets that find their way into Populist speeches are most heartily applauded.

If these utterances are to be believed, the church is utterly corrupt and ought to be swept from the face of the earth.

Branch apparently had hope for churchmen; they could become fine humanitarian reformers, he continued, but not through "abusive epithets" which created "a spirit of obstinate resistance that renders the mind impervious to all convincing argument." Instead, he urged a civilized effort to convince men of the movement's rightness, and closed with a series of arresting questions. "What Populist newspaper or orator," he queried,

has asked the church and the clergy in a friendly and kindly spirit to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty forces of monopoly and plutocratic power? On the contrary,

every paper and speech goes out of its way to abuse and traduce churches and ministers.

Am I to understand that this treatment of organized Christianity proceeds from a latent and unacknowledged hatred of Christianity itself? Or is it only a manifestation of the most egregious folly, such as the hope of winning aid and sympathy from a body of men by treating them abusively and unjustly would be? If it is folly, let us have done with it. If it is the other thing I want to know it.

The urgency and logic of Branch's letter were not lost on the editor; *The Advocate* admitted frankly "a great deal of justice and good sense in the criticisms of this writer which it will be wise to heed." However, the paper then reiterated once again the Populists' long-standing complaints against the church. Although the editorial evinced a thoughtfulness sometimes absent from the pages of this and other partisan sheets, its position remained essentially unchanged.⁴²

In fact, notwithstanding those who pled for tolerance and patience in the party's attitudes toward the church, most of the party's spokesmen remained largely hostile. Although some individual churchmen undoubtedly merited their condemnation, certainly the Populists overstated their case; some tended to regard any opposition, or even any criticism of their position, as inherently diabolical. The party and its members sometimes exercised in their enthusiasm more vigor than judgment. Populists, often accused of a weakness for conspiratorial theories of history, demonstrated this weakness nowhere more clearly than in the party's relations with orthodox Protestantism in Kansas.

In a larger sense, the strong social orientation in the teaching and preaching of the Populists in Kansas demonstrates an entirely different theological and philosophic concern from that traditionally associated with the time, the place and the movement. "Calamity howlers" they may have been; their bitterness toward what they considered Protestant orthodoxy exceeded the level of their reaction against any other religious or ethnic group. They reacted against an alleged conspiracy among the orthodox and their preachers, a conspiracy compounded by the seemingly hypocritical unconcern characteristic of the rank and file of the faithful. But many responded to this alleged "conspiracy" and unconcern, not by a retreat to any basics of the faith or otherworldly alternative, but by an intense ideological allegiance to a peculiarly Western version of the social gospel, or even what Henry May has characterized as "radical social Christianity"—Christian socialism.⁴³ Although the movement created its own naive Biblicist verbiage and eschatological semantics, Populists in Kansas—predominantly rural and agriculturally-based—clearly preferred a religious and theological orientation centered about social concerns and based upon a fundamental interest in human welfare.

McPherson College

footnotes

1. See Warren I. Titus, "The Progressivism of the Muckrakers: A Myth Reexamined Through Fiction," *Journal of the Central Mississippi Valley American Studies Association*, I, 1 (Spring, 1960), 27ff.; William W. Nichols, "A Changing Attitude Toward Poverty in *The Ladies' Home Journal: 1895-1919*," *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*, V, 1 (Spring, 1964), 3ff., esp. 14; Roy W. Meyer, "Naturalism in American Farm Fiction," *JCMVASA*, II, 1 (Spring, 1961), 27ff.; Robert W. Schneider, "Stephen Crane and the Drama of Transition: A Study in Historical Continuity," *ibid.*, 1ff., and "Frank Norris: The Naturalist as Victorian," *MASJ*, III, 1 (Spring, 1962), 3ff.; Elmer F. Suderman, "Criticisms of the Protestant Church in the American Novel," *ibid.*, V, 1 (Spring, 1964), 17ff., and "The Social Gospel Novelists' Criticisms of American Society," *ibid.*, VII, 1 (Spring, 1966), 45ff.; as well as Norton Mezvinski, "An Idea of Female Superiority," *JCMVASA*, II, 1 (Spring, 1961), 17ff., esp. 19-22.

2. For an informative general survey of recent literature on Populism, see Walter T. K. Nugent, *The Tolerant Populists, Kansas Populism and Nativism* (Chicago, 1963), 3-32. Since Nugent's own essay appeared in 1963, a number of other scholars have published additional treatments adding to the literature of the controversy, among which some of those passages most relevant to this essay are Karel Bicha, "A Further Reconsideration of American Populism," *Mid-America*, LIII, 1 (January, 1971), 3-11; O. Gene Clanton, *Kansas Populism: Ideas and Men* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1969), *passim.*; James C. Malin, *A Concern About Humanity: Notes on Reform, 1872-1912, at the National and Kansas Levels of Thought* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1964), *passim.*; W. T. K. Nugent, "Some Parameters of Populism," *Agricultural History*, XL, 3 (October, 1966), 255-270; several essays by Norman Pollack, of which the most important is his monograph, *The Populist Response to Industrial America: Midwestern Populist Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), *passim.*, esp. 63, 103-143; Michael Paul Rogin, *The Intellectuals and McCarthy: The Radical Specter* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), chs. 1-6; and the four papers of a symposium presented at the meeting of the Southern Historical Association at Little Rock, Arkansas, in November, 1964, and published in *Agricultural History*, XXXIX, 1 (April, 1965), 59-85.

3. Annie Diggs, "The Women in the Alliance Movement," *The Arena*, VI, 32 (July, 1892), 165.

4. Lorenzo Lewelling, "Problems Before the Western Farmer," *The North American Review*, CLX, 458 (January, 1895), 19.

5. *The Advocate* (Topeka, Kansas), December 14, 1892; *People's Voice* (Wellington, Kansas), October 31, 1890.

6. *The Advocate* (Topeka), March 25, 1891.

7. Maurice Latta, "The Background for the Social Gospel in American Protestantism," *Church History*, V (1936), 268.

8. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F. D. R.* (New York, 1955), 8-10.

9. In a recent provocative article describing the religious character of the Populists' movement in Kansas, Peter H. Argersinger has briefly treated this rejection, suggesting that the crusading zeal of the Populists in the state arose at least in part from their effort to replace a fading and unresponsive institutional church with a politico-religious ministry which spoke more directly to their needs. Argersinger's treatment sketches the general outlines of the Populists' reaction against churches in Kansas; in a closer examination this essay will attempt to highlight both the vehemence of their condemnation and something of its implications for American religious thought. See Peter H. Argersinger, "Pentecostal Politics in Kansas: Religion, the Farmers' Alliance, and the Gospel of Populism," *Kansas Quarterly*, I (Fall, 1969), 33-35 and *passim.* An even more recent treatment of the subject by Timothy A. Miller, "Religion and Populism: A Reassessment," *Religion: The Scholarly Journal of Kansas School of Religion at the University of Kansas*, VIII (January, 1971), *passim.*, sketches in broad strokes the picture explored more locally in the present article.

10. For one example of the use of this term among many, see *The Hiawatha Journal* (Hiawatha, Kansas), September 29, 1892, as well as Argersinger "Pentecostal Politics," 33. The usage of course implied that "Christianity" was an antonym; spelling usage variously added or omitted an "i" following the first syllable.

11. Mary E. Lease, *The Problem of Civilization Solved* (Chicago, 1895), 13.

12. *The Barber County Index* (Medicine Lodge, Kansas), May 20, 1896.

13. *Clark County Clipper* (Ashland, Kansas), September 18, 1896.

14. *Free Press* (Hays, Kansas), July 11, 1896.

15. *The Junction City Tribune* (Junction City, Kansas), November 5, 1891.

16. *The Advocate* (Topeka), January 23, 1890.

17. *Topeka Hurrykain* (Topeka, Kansas), December 30, 1893.

18. *Kansas Eagle* (St. Francis, Kansas), October 31, 1895.

19. *Kansas Commoner* (Wichita, Kansas), November 5, 1896.

20. *Ottawa Journal and Triumph* (Ottawa, Kansas), September 3, 1891.
21. *Ibid.*, August 27, 1896.
22. Quoted from the *Harper Advocate* (Harper, Kansas), n. d., in *The Topeka Daily Capital* (Topeka, Kansas), July 2, 1895.
23. *Kansas Commoner* (Wichita), August 27, 1896.
24. *The Barber County Index* (Medicine Lodge), December 16, 1896.
25. *The Alliant* (Concordia, Kansas), September 15, 1892.
26. *Kansas Commoner* (Wichita), October 9, 1890.
27. *The American Nonconformist and Kansas Industrial Liberator* (Winfield, Kansas), January 5, 1888.
28. *Ibid.*, March 5, 1891.
29. *The Advocate* (Topeka), February 17, 1892.
30. *The Industrial Advocate* (El Dorado, Kansas), November 26, 1891.
31. *The Lantern* (Fort Scott, Kansas), September 11, 1891.
32. *The Farmers' Vindicator* (Valley Falls, Kansas), February 20, 1891.
33. *The Advocate and News* (Topeka), September 7, 1898.
34. *The Farmer's Friend* (Iola, Kansas), September 5, 1891.
35. Quoted from *The National Economist* (Washington, D.C.; n. d.), in *The Hiawatha Journal*, September 29, 1892.
36. *The American Nonconformist* (Winfield), November 21, 1889.
37. *The Advocate* (Topeka), April 19, 1893. Itails Higgins'.
38. *The Junction City Tribune*, June 9, 1892.
39. *Clark County Clipper* (Ashland), July 3, 1896.
40. *The Barber County Index* (Medicine Lodge), June 3, 1896.
41. Not surprisingly, amid this attack Populism often spared, or at least extenuated, small rural churches. To the Populist, as to many rural dwellers, urban institutions and an urban style of life raised a threat not present in the rural surroundings of his familiar world. The city church, like its wealthy parishioner, posed the problems and practiced the hypocrisy which made reform necessary. See *The Industrial Advocate* (El Dorado), December 3, 1891; *The Advocate* (Topeka), October 11, 1893.
42. Both Branch's letter and the editorial reply appear in *The Advocate* (Topeka), April 25, 1894. For another protest, more theologically oriented, against the movement's tendency to anticlerical and antichurch attitudes, see *ibid.*, October 3, 1894.
43. Henry Farnham May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York, 1963 [1949]), 235.