

samuel leavitt

apocalyptic prophet in quest of community

solomon gemorah

A controversy exists today over the ideological origins and nature of the Greenback and Populist reform movements. Chester M. Destler observes that the Populist protest was a consequence of the political and economic agitation of the 1890's as well as the preceding two decades; and that Populism drew together both discontented eastern and western groups in American society—farmers, laborers, social reformers and intellectuals.¹ Richard Hofstadter argues the “ambiguous character” of Populism, pinpointing its rational response to actual grievances and its “irrational” elements of fears and anxieties.² Hofstadter's critics respond that certain easterners, often journalist urban intellectuals and labor spokesmen, joined western farmers in a common suspicion and disdain of the plutocracy. Both were also given to “apocalyptic premonitions of direful portent.”³ While Hofstadter and his critics underscore the cataclysmic character of Populism, they neglect its positive, utopian side.⁴ These prophetic ideals—the anti-utopian as well as the utopian—can be epitomized in Samuel Leavitt's works. And it was this apocalyptic viewpoint, with its socially cohesive ideology for the future, which was so effectively utilized by later Populist social critics.

Samuel Leavitt (1831-1899) was born in New York City. He was the son of John W. Leavitt, who came from Litchfield County, Connecticut, and was a leading merchant in the dry-goods business. In the economic panic of 1837, his father's mercantile affairs suffered a severe blow from which the family never recovered. Sternly Presbyterian in his youth, Leavitt first yearned to become an evangelical preacher. He entered New York University, spending much of his leisure in “zealous evangelisms.” Before long he found himself “too liberal” to complete his studies and turned “very reluctantly” from the Presbyterian ministry. Frustrated in his primary occupation, and finding himself “a stranger in a strange

land," Leavitt pledged to devote his life "to the interests of the producing classes." He apparently decided to pursue a literary and journalistic career, for he temporarily left New York to join a publishing house in Cincinnati. Soon afterwards, Leavitt journeyed to Philadelphia to write editorials for the *Philadelphia Bulletin*. Impulsively, in 1862, it was "bourne in upon him" that he must go back to New York—"that center of light and darkness—and enter more completely in the warfare against the devil and all his works." For two years he free-lanced for various periodicals, then found regular employment over a period of twenty years on the staffs of such New York newspapers as the *Tribune*, *World*, *Graphic*, *Advocate* and *Irish World*. Then, as an experienced New York journalist, he went to Chicago as an editor of the *Chicago Sentinel* and the *Chicago Express*, two leading newspapers of the People's Party reform movement. In 1894, he joined the editorial board of the *Joliet News* (Ill.), another Populist newspaper.⁵

Chester M. Destler, in describing Leavitt's place within the late nineteenth-century reform movement, emphasized his contribution as a "veteran reform journalist."⁶ Leavitt first gained esteem as a leading reform figure for his promotion of the cooperative movement in America. He printed one of the first documents ever issued in this country concerning the English Rochdale co-operative stores in 1858, and a sympathetic study of Godin's Familistere at Guise in 1874. "It is a very interesting fact," he noted, "that The National Grange has formerly recommended English co-operative trade to subordinate Granges. . . . The Rochdale Plan is not new, and its introduction [by myself] to the American public was several years ago."⁷

As early as 1874, Leavitt adopted a technique of consciously depicting the nation in a state of crisis. His intent was to stir up the passions of the reader. In a foreboding New York newspaper article, "An Eclectic Reform Platform,"⁸ he presented his assessment of the existing evils in the United States. "In this land," he wrote, "we behold a strong nation drunken with the wine of freedom and external prosperity, and turning its back upon the ways of rectitude in domestic, social, commercial and political life." Congress and the legislatures, he charged, are "fearfully corrupt," while office-holders openly offer themselves for sale and corporations dictate their own terms. At a time when the public domain is being "parcelled out" among speculators, "railroad presidents boast of the control of half a dozen states apiece." Leavitt scourged the venal and corrupt in public life and attacked capitalistic excesses in his best literary-flavored muckraking prose: "Pious usurers rejoice," he proclaimed, since their "lusty cry for specie basis" enables them "to grind the faces of the poor." He accused American capitalists of "robbing our producers and poorer consumers" to spend the plunder upon European middlemen, while monopolistic manufacturers and merchants intentionally crush out small businessmen, and hence "grow fat upon human necessities."

To counter these alleged conditions, Leavitt proposed a number of anti-monopoly remedies which reflected his basic challenge to the dominant laissez-faire philosophy and his over-all commitment to governmental intervention in the economy. First, Congress should institute "a full legal tender government currency." Second, in order to prevent the "alienation of the people's inheritance" in the public lands, the federal government ought to secure limitation to private property in land. Third, all "class laws" need to be abolished, and a general civil service law enacted. Leavitt's program included one of the first experimental plans for a graduated income tax. For labor, he specifically recommended the enforcement of the eight-hour law, and the so-called remedy of the exclusion of "Asiatic and European paupers." If one further adds his conceptions that non-producers "despise the Republic and endanger liberty," and that society is breeding "paupers and millionaires"—two themes that were stressed in Leavitt's works—one possesses an early ideological program for Populist reform.⁹

In his role as a reformer, Leavitt was primarily a political agitator for an independent farmer-labor coalition. Irwin Unger lists him as a New York delegate who participated in The National Independent or Greenback Party Conference in September, 1875; and Leavitt again was one of three delegates from New York at the party's convention in May, 1876. In a letter to Ignatius Donnelly, himself a delegate from Minnesota and then editor of the St. Paul *Anti-Monopolist*, Leavitt analyzed what he saw as the significance of those meetings. "For the first time . . . that old dream [of unity] of the earnest mechanics and laborers of the East and the farmers of the West [has] been realized."¹⁰ Leavitt remained politically active in the 1880's as a delegate-at-large from the New York State delegation to the Greenback Party convention at Chicago—the convention that nominated General Weaver for the presidency in 1880—and then as a supporter of Henry George in the New York City 1886 mayoralty campaign. In 1894, continuing his political activity in the mid-west, he ran for Congress.¹¹

While focusing on Leavitt's journalistic and reform activities, historians neglect to review his literary works. In view of his impact on the social reform movement of the last quarter of the nineteenth century this is a surprising omission. Literature for Leavitt was principally an instrument to promote social change—an additional dimension of reform journalism. Beginning in 1876 and 1877, he wrote his first large literary work, "Peacemaker Grange," as a serial for the *Phrenological Magazine*.¹² Parke Godwin, editor of the New York *Evening Post*, called it a "significant utopian story of a co-operative colony."¹³ In 1879, his best known work, the prophetic story of "Dictator Grant," was published as a serial in the *Irish World*.¹⁴ The world-wide distribution of this book reached one million copies; and its message was said to have been read with "deep interest" especially by the "most thoughtful working people of the

nation." The labor press carried many promotional notices. One from the Lebanon, Missouri, *Anti-Monopolist* proclaimed Leavitt: "The man who did so much to avert the danger of a Dictator or Empire." James B. Weaver, the Populist presidential candidate, stiffly remarked: "I fully appreciate the [sic] *Dictator Grant*."¹⁵ Of particular interest to the intellectual historian is the possible connection between Leavitt's *Dictator Grant* (1879) and Ignatius Donnelly's well-known *Caesar's Column* (1890).¹⁶

In *Dictator Grant; or, The Overthrow of the Republic in 1880*, Leavitt abandoned his role as a moralizing reformer for that of the prophet. His was a tale of an anti-utopian state which suffered an apocalypse. The story reflected Leavitt's conception of revolutionary, religious change. For him, there existed a vast body of aristocratic laws, and nothing but "the sweep of a revolution" could expunge them from the existing system. "Perhaps," he noted earlier, "the shortest way for this country to true liberty is through an imperial epoch."¹⁷ According to Leavitt's vision, evil would be a prelude to salvation. Out of the terrible corruption of the nation would spring forth the good society. Leavitt's revolutionary theory, unlike the Marxist view of historical change, bore a strong religious and utopian stamp.¹⁸ A divine hand would guide the purging of societal evil.

Leavitt's primary thesis was that American civilization was undergoing a "severe crisis," and that a new form of economic and social re-organization was necessary. He acknowledged that his own studies in those years (1855-1875) brought him to "a great respect for the social machinery of Charles Fourier, and the religious teachings of Emanuel Swedenborg and John Wesley." He considered Wesley as "one of the best representatives of evangelical Christianity," and "Swedenborgian doctrine" a significant part of the Christian religious tradition. He contended that had Fourierite Socialists forty years ago "added the doctrines of Swedenborg and Wesley to those of Fourier," and followed the combined teaching, they "would not have so generally failed to realize the associative life."¹⁹

His novel depicts the "irrepressible crisis" as a conflict dating back to the Jacksonian era. He particularly emphasizes the monetary "crime of 1873" as a turning point, causing a "seven year period of famine in a land of plenty." The entire western world, indeed, is shown experiencing an economic, political, social and moral "breakdown."²⁰ The crisis, on a metaphysical level, is spiritual and universal in scope. All of this world is supposedly characterized by conflict and lack of harmony.

For religious social reformers, cataclysmic writing had an admonitive purpose: to provide a warning to embark upon change. Ignatius Donnelly inquired whether anything was being done to avert "the catastrophe" that would result in the ruination of society.²¹ Leavitt, in like manner, asked whether there was a way to prevent the "fearful slaughter"

arising from a civil war. In fact, he replied, there were isolated cases of prophets who did shout: "Shall not the land tremble . . . and every one mourn that dwelleth therein." But they were not heeded and a war followed. Betraying a Gnostic influence, Leavitt argued that Providence seems to have determined that only the "cutting sword" can cause "the necessary separation between the false and the true—the good and the evil. In Biblical times, when the people fell into evil ways, they were "providentially scourged by afflictions" until they returned to right ways of living.²²

According to Leavitt, "chaos" and "immorality" characterize the American political and economic system. The nation was rapidly drifting into "a maelstrom," for he saw "nothing but corruption" in the high places of politics. In this "demoralized Republic" the two major political parties remained indifferent to genuine reform measures. Thus a "growing despair" was developing over the political and commercial "rotteness" in the country.²³ A concern for the morality of the nation was thus a basic aspect of Leavitt's Christian idealism. The nation, he believed, was endowed with a moral principle—Republican virtue—which was inseparable from the societal fabric. To the idealist—Christian or philosophical—corruption was reciprocally related to the lack of unity and order in society.

A number of recent historical studies stress a quest for community and social order as one of the leading themes in American social criticism since the Civil War.²⁴ A reaction to the decline of community and order was certainly an integral part of Leavitt's thinking. Using a Swedenborgian standard of social injustice and evil, Leavitt insisted that "a large part of the woe is an inevitable result of the infringement of that great law of nature, a law which Swedenborg says is operative in the visible as well as the invisible world." He warned that any successful community must allow the "natural play of social life" to maintain order without resorting to forceful authority and individual austerity.²⁵ A community is thus endangered when there is a disharmony between order and individual self realization, and between excessive individualism and lack of social cohesiveness. For Leavitt, Nature demanded cooperation. Competition itself was unnatural.

Leavitt maintained that the breakdown of the communal consensus contributed to the disappearance of the church as an institution as well as the decline of traditional Christian standards of morality. For the sense of degeneration was extended from the social and economic to the scientific, artistic and ultimately to the religious realms. "Our religious creeds," Leavitt cautioned, "brought face to face by science and art, work a mutal destruction of prestige, like the heathen gods brought together in the Pantheon." The Christian churches have failed to bear witness against this inharmonious, oppressive state of affairs. Christendom is waiting for "it knows not what," he charged. Like Donnelly, in

Caesar's Column, Leavitt made a direct attack on the church's implicit Social Darwinist conservative defense of competitive civilization: "They [religious groups] meet to build each other up in the most holy faith, to spend the other six days in pulling each other down by most unholy grab games." He compared the unbridled individualism existing in his society to "an African wilderness where millions of peaceable and useful animals are constantly fleeing from the fangs of ten thousand . . . beef eaters."²⁶

Fundamentally, Leavitt's criticism was an attack on the criteria of progress in modern western civilization. Donnelly, the Populist, had come to feel that western culture had grown to be "a gorgeous shell, a mere mockery, a sham."²⁷ In a similar tone, Leavitt chastized society's boasted modern amenities as being "steeped in fraud." The whole fabric called modern civilization was to him but "a grimacing dance of apes," a "gloomy phantasm." All the ripened fruits of modern invention were but "apples of Sodom—full of bitter ashes." Defiantly he rejected the notion of technology as the primary symbol of progress: "Man must undo three-quarters of what we have been boasting of as proofs of human progress."²⁸

In considering the effects of technological progress on the worker and farmer, Leavitt deprecated its actual accomplishments. Labor's improvement is "more in show than in substance," he insisted. Potentially, there is the capacity to increase per capita production and consumption. But the machines, "grasped by the shrewd and forceful, turn and devour the people as the demon created by Frankenstein destroyed its creator." Acknowledging the inventive genius of the American people, Leavitt nevertheless dissented from the popular notion that technological advancement necessarily meant economic progress for the many. Predating Frederick Jackson Turner's use of the "safety-valve thesis" as a primary explanation for America's past prosperity, he maintained that only the availability of cheap lands in the West prevented wide-spread poverty. But in the next decades, he warned, America's "very survival" will be at stake.²⁹

Cataclysmic writers were concerned with the problem of social survival in a conflict-ridden society.³⁰ *Dictator Grant* stresses an all-embracing sense of disunity and distrust; a "death struggle" is at hand. Amidst the "worst winter" yet there is a general hopelessness among the poor; they fear that "Pharaoh will not let the people go"; and that the patrician will "not voluntarily take his foot from the plebeian throat." Following the tradition of Protestant evangelicalism, Leavitt berated the fortunate class for their "blindness" to the "appalling nature" of the situation. America, he warned, "is fast becoming polarized into "numerous tramps" and decadent "millionaires." The proud farmers are turning into "paupers"; and unemployment and grinding poverty are forcing young girls in the cities "into the abyss." Yet the "greedy non-producers" fail

to heed the signs that “a great black cloud” is settling down upon civilization, that an issue has to be solved. Shall the few continue “to monopolize” the earth and produce “an ever worse hell,” or shall the many “enter into their inheritance in the earth and in the fruits of modern discoveries?”³¹

Protestant evangelical rhetoric tended to symbolize political and social conflict in terms of conspiratorial forces. Leavitt, in *Dictator Grant*, revived a dormant fear in American history of an aristocracy conspiring to establish monarchy. At the same time, he transposed European events and political crisis to the American scene. As the plot was carried forth in the story, the Union League, a coalition of leading wealthy Republicans and Democrats representing the evil side in his vision, issued a proclamation to justify the overthrow of the republic: “It was a last resort, for we saw revolution just at hand in any event. . . . The dream of a democratic republic, having passed away, our most eminent citizens become convinced that only a monarchical government can properly control such a vast stretch of country and such a mixed population.”³²

The overthrow of America’s democratic republicanism initiated a complex dialectical process of change. Domestic repression led to imperialism; force brought forth civil strife. Following the overthrow of the republic, the narrative depicts a period of “absolute intimidation” of all opposing forces. Congress is forcibly adjourned, and the free press and the pulpit completely “cowed”; everywhere justice for the poor and the weak becomes “a mockery”; arrests are frequent for even trivial murmurs against the dictatorship; overt class rule prevails as armed troops prevented strikes by discontented workers. The conspirators proclaim Grant emperor; and aggressive expansionism becomes national policy.³³ Thus the stage is set for the historical confrontation between the two opposition forces.

Leavitt’s philosophy of history was shaped by Emanuel Swedenborg, the eighteenth-century Swedish Christian philosopher, scientist and spiritualist. According to this religious view of history, man on this earth has gradually receded from an original state of innocence which is typified by the garden of Eden during the Golden Age. The Populist conception of an “agrarian myth,” identifiable with the early republic, may well have its origins in this ideal of Christian pastoral paradise. Actually, both Classical and Christian mythology speak of glorious Golden and Silver Ages followed by declining Copper and Iron Ages. The world, moreover, is seen in Manichean terms as an eternal struggle between the opposing good and evil forces. A cataclysm necessarily results because evil is brought to its height. When events reach a crisis of this nature, God passes judgment upon the world and restores the balance. The dispensation comes not as a vindictive judgment but as a merciful intervention in order to save the human race. The judgment involves a gigantic

struggle whereby the forces of good meet the forces of evil in a universal and mutually destructive war.³⁴

In allegorical fashion, Leavitt describes the preparation for the religious war which results in the great popular uprising on "Deliverers Night." The people are led by an "unknown giant" with "The Grasp of an iron hand." Mysteriously appearing from the earth's inner core, he quickly establishes himself as the heroic leader of the "Inner Circle." The battles in the short civil war are also presented allegorically. One may interpret the actual overthrow of the republic as well as the war itself as symbolic portrayals of two classes in conflict—patrician and plebeian or imperialist and communal groups. Figuratively speaking, each side fights "like devils"; Imperialists cry "Down with the Commune!" and the Patriots shout "Down with the Empire!" With mysterious Divine aid the popular revolt succeeds, thus ending "The first and last lesson of the United States in Dictatorship and monarchy."³⁵

That the victory of the "Plain People" is not followed by "Anarchy, pillage and general ruin," Leavitt explains, is due to the leadership of the "Great Unknown."³⁶ But to what extent can this religious view of the divine hand in history be reconciled with the humanist's insistence that man can liberate himself and consciously create his own future? While *Dictator Grant* makes the assumption of divine cosmic law, it is also an act of faith in humanistic, ameliorative social change. What stands out are both an affirmation of man's successful protest against injustice as well as a belief in certain religious limits placed on the human capacity to shape his own destiny. The notion of a "voluntary" return to the "simplicity and square dealing" of the earlier republic is postulated. However, the "Divine regeneration" of the republic is already determined within the historical cycle. For the most part, the problem of determinism and free-will is only partially resolved in this work.

While Leavitt's historical philosophy was a form of messianism combined with a Swedenborgian free consciousness, his social religious ideology was a surrogate of unconventional religiosity akin to early nineteenth-century radical communitarianism. Postwar communitarianism retained a general model for an alternative conception for the development of America. It was intended as an effective response to community changes that disrupted social and moral relationships. In fact, the view that communitarianism lost its edge forever in an industrialized age needs to be seriously challenged.³⁷

What Leavitt and his precursors in the communitarian movement sought was a cultural and moral revolution made possible by the development of new communal institutions. Postwar religious communitarianism rediscovered, within new literary blueprints, the ante-bellum social experimentation with small models of utopian communities in order to secure social and moral order in the new industrial era.

Communitarians did not seek to abolish industrialism. What dis-

turbed them most was the unplanned growth of industrial-urbanism in America. The consequences were community fragmentation and moral "anarchy." New York City was, for Leavitt, the typical example of unnatural spread: "Let me tell you of the terrible city . . . the wicked city, the smoke whose ferment ariseth up, and covers the land, as with a pall."³⁸ A natural social order was dependent on rational planning. A functioning community was based on a rational, harmonious relationship of the self to the environment.

The inspiration for Leavitt's apocalyptic and utopian vision is rooted in his disillusionment with the existing "irrational" as well as "immoral" institutional arrangements.³⁹ Both utopian and anti-utopian writers reflect this concern. For while the utopian ideal itself ordinarily is a medium through which optimism expresses itself, the initial protest stems from a profound dissatisfaction with the social order. Thus the difference between utopian and anti-utopian social criticism appears more spectral than polar. Secular utopias, such as Lawrence Gronlund's *Cooperative Commonwealth* (1884) and Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888), share common apocalyptic visions with the anti-utopian writers. In addition, Leavitt's *Peacemaker Grange* (1881) and Donnelly's *Caesar's Column* (1890) both contain utopian elements that are fundamental to their apocalyptic framework. Utopia merges into dystopia, and the distance between the positive ideal and the negative one is rarely separated; the utopian images are functionally related to the eschatological components.⁴⁰ Significantly, the Christian conception of the City of God is originally a utopian metaphor based on a millennial vision. Similarly, Leavitt's own religious orientation contains a projected utopianism stimulated by an eschatological viewpoint.

Peacemaker Grange emerged as an interesting synthesis of religious and romantic utopian themes. The social organization was in the style of the traditional spatial community, in contrast to the modern non-spatial, technologically united world utopia. Leavitt thus stressed the cooperative structure of the society more than its technological power. The ideal was a projection of a voluntary associated religious community. Starting with the physical setting of the colony based upon Godin's cooperative Familistere at Guise, Leavitt wove a social and economic system around a Christian Fourier nucleus. Through the use of fiction, he presented its associative principle of industry as a model to a western farmer. The Granger, a reformer, is informed that the present trouble is so "interlaced with the wrongs and mistakes" of civilization that no single remedy will remove them; only a revolutionary restructuring of society will suffice.⁴¹

The "Peacemaker" communitarian considered his colony neither communistic nor socialistic, but implicitly recognized the connection between social and economic change for the moral regeneration of man. And the plan for a "co-operative congeries of joint-stock companies" was

intended to enable all the patrons to become owner-participants in the means of production and distribution. Land was to be owned and leased by the town; no man might take more than he could reasonably use. An income-tax was initiated to make large fortunes impossible and, presumably, class conflict improbable. The formula for co-operative existence was to encourage the rich and the poor, the educated and the ignorant to associate in both work and social life. Work, in accordance with Fourier's teachings, was made into co-operative labor and rotated in line with individual aptitude. Above all, the "new community" was to be a religious body, and a universal church, bent on re-establishing "a new Jerusalem—city of Peace."⁴²

Because technical abuse of the environment had "upset" traditional notions of morality," the modern religious communitarian movement sought to create an alternative social foundation for belief "in accord with the laws of social science." Its outlook comprised a radical religious humanism. Communitarianism rejected the existing cultural goals and the institutional means of attaining them; for it was fundamentally a value-oriented movement that sought a new legitimacy for rationally discovered values. Unity was to be achieved through the "natural reconciliation" of all things: the reconciling of "science and religion, capital and labor, conservatives and progressives."⁴³ Thus, Leavitt's claim for the viability of communitarian ideology continued to rest upon the attempt made by the Christian romantic to heal the split between reason and faith, between the productive system and man's natural tendencies, and between the self and the community.

Staten Island Community College

footnotes

1. Chester M. Destler, "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901; Concepts and Origins," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXXI 3 (December, 1944), 335-68.
2. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: from Bryan to F.D.R.* (New York, 1955), 47-48.
3. C. Vann Woodward, "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual," *The Burden of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1960), 141-66. See, also John Higham, "Anti-Semitism in the Gilded Age: A Reinterpretation," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLII, 4 (March, 1957), 559-78.
4. Even Norman Pollack, in his sympathetic study of Populism, *The Populist Response to Industrial America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), omits the utopian and anti-utopian dimensions of Populism.
5. *Social Science*, "Biographical sketch of Samuel Leavitt," September 21, 1887.
6. Chester M. Destler, *American Radicalism, 1865-1901* (New London, Conn., 1946), 206-07.
7. *Workingman's Advocate*, Chicago, January 15, 1876.
8. *The Daily Graphic*, New York, August 17, 1874.
9. See the Omaha Platform, July, 1892, reprinted in John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), Appendix E.
10. Irwin Unger, *The Greenback Era: a Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879* (Princeton, 1964), 300-305; Leavitt to Donnelly, September 16, 1875, quoted *ibid.*, 300.
11. Destler, *American Radicalism*, 207.
12. Leavitt afterwards issued it in pamphlet form entitled *Peacemaker Grange: or, Co-operative Living and Working* (New York, 1881).
13. *The Evening Post*, New York, March 14, 1881.
14. Leavitt issued the story in pamphlet form entitled *Dictator Grant: or, The Overthrow of the Republic in 1880* (New York, 1879).

15. Based on the *Social Science* "Biographical sketch of Leavitt."
16. To this date, the intellectual origins of Donnelly's cataclysmic vision remains mysterious. See Martin Ridge, *Ignatius Donnelly: The Portrait of a Politician* (Chicago, 1962), 267.
17. *Workingmen's Advocate*, Chicago, "A Good Word For Caesarism," February 19, 1876.
18. Norman Pollack, in attempting to equate Populist radicalism with Marxist revolutionary ideology, disregards the Populist romantic and religious ethical orientation.
19. *Social Science*, "Biographical sketch of Samuel Leavitt."
20. *Dictator Grant*, 1-2.
21. Ignatius Donnelly, *Caesar's Column: A Story of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Walter B. Rideout (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), 34-35.
22. *Dictator Grant*, 41-43; *Peacemaker Grange*, 2.
23. *Ibid.*, 22-23, 71.
24. Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York, 1967); *The Search for Community in Modern America*, ed. E. Digby Baltzell (New York, 1968).
25. *Peacemaker Grange*, 47, 44.
26. *Dictator Grant*, 1, 22; *Daily Graphic*, New York, August 17, 1874; *Workingman's Advocate*, Chicago, February 12, 1876.
27. Donnelly, *Caesar's Column*, 34-35.
28. *Dictator Grant*, 43, 71.
29. *Dictator Grant*, 51-52, 59-63.
30. See Frederick Cople Jaher, *Doubters and Dissenters: Cataclysmic Thought in America, 1885-1918* (New York, 1964).
31. *Dictator Grant*, 19, 22-23; Leavitt, "The Tramps And The Law," *The Forum*, 2 (October, 1886), 199-200.
32. *Dictator Grant*, 3-7, 24-25.
33. *Ibid.*, 24-30.
34. Arthur E. Waite, *Three Famous Mystics* (London, 1940), 136-92. See, also Cyriel O. Sigstedt, *The Swedenborg Epic: The Life and Works of Emanuel Swedenborg* (New York, 1952).
35. *Dictator Grant*, 4, 27, 36-37, 65-69.
36. *Ibid.*, 69-71.
37. To examine this prevailing viewpoint see Arthur E. Bestor, Jr.'s, "Patent-Office Models of the Good Society: Some Relationships Between Social Reform and Westward Expansion," *American Historical Review*, LVIII, 3 (1953), 505-526.
38. *Workingman's Advocate*, Chicago, January 8, 1876.
39. *Dictator Grant*, 71; *Workingman's Advocate*, Chicago, January 8, 1876.
40. See Frederick L. Polak, "Utopia and Cultural Renewal," *Utopias and Utopian Thought*, ed. Frank E. Manuel (Boston, 1966), 285; Judith N. Shklar, *After Utopia: The Decline of Political Faith* (Princeton, 1957), 3-4.
41. *Peacemaker Grange*, 2.
42. *Ibid.*, 4-5, 10-14, 53-55.
43. *Ibid.*, 5-6, 12-14.