

The Integration of Fourierism into Brook Farm

Dan Threet

Brook Farm stands as one of the most prominent utopian communities of the nineteenth century, famous through its association with Boston Transcendentalists like Ralph Waldo Emerson and Margaret Fuller. Between 1841 and 1847, it evolved from “an experiment in practical Christianity” based on Transcendentalist ideals into a progressive center for social reform.¹ The small community in West Roxbury, Massachusetts shifted from a focus on the individual to a communitarian vision that seemingly defied its founding principles. Understanding what propelled the Brook Farmers from simple, applied Christian ethics to socialist millenarianism is crucial to any historical account. What initially appear as contradictory phases in its existence reveal themselves to be part of a natural growth.

After the Transcendentalists made public their break with liberal Unitarianism in the 1830s, there was a growing demand for a practical application of their beliefs. Communities for alternative living were forming throughout the nation, and the pragmatic emphasis in Transcendentalism lent itself to such endeavors. Former Unitarian minister George Ripley seemed to be the ideal person to lead an effort like this. In the preceding years, he had given Transcendentalists a wide audience in his published debate (over the importance of miracles in Christianity) with professor Andrews Norton. Additionally, Ripley was instrumental to the formation of the Transcendental Club. As Richard Francis says, he gave the movement coherence through this explication and involvement.²

In November of 1840, Ripley outlined the intent of his nascent community to friend and fellow Transcendentalist Ralph Waldo

Chrestomathy: Annual Review of Undergraduate Research, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Charleston

Volume 4, 2005: pp. 241-256

© 2005 by the College of Charleston, Charleston SC 29424, USA.

All rights to be retained by the author.

Emerson, making the now-famous statement of purpose of Brook Farm:

Our objects, as you know, are to insure a more natural union between the thinker and the worker, as far as possible, in the same individual; to guarantee the highest mental freedom, by providing all with labor, adapted to their tastes and talents...opening the benefits of education and profits of labor to all; and thus to prepare a society of liberal, intelligent and cultivated persons. . . . I wish to see a society of educated friends, working, thinking, and living together, with no strife, except that of each to contribute the most to the benefit of all.³

The vision he lays out seems consonant with Transcendentalist beliefs; the projected society aims for the full development of individuals and imagines the possibility that everyone might become what Emerson called “Man Thinking” in “The American Scholar.” In this letter, Ripley places equal emphasis on the mixing of social classes (in both directions, allowing the working class to educate themselves and the educated class to work), the attractiveness of voluntary labor, and the individualism that remains intact inside his strong community. Compared to a community like Fruitlands, where the structure was established by fiat, this vision seems democratic; the “friends” are unified in spirit but open to variety.

Compared to this hopeful picture of self-reliant individuals communing and spurring each other’s growth, what became of Brook Farm is bewildering, or so it seems on the surface. In 1844, Brook Farm reconstituted itself in accordance with the writings of French theorist Charles Fourier. Brought to Boston by acolyte Albert Brisbane, Fourierism suggested that a communal restructuring of society into property-sharing phalanxes would benefit all. Fourier predicted that allowing everyone to pursue their passions in desirable labor would result in a golden age for humanity. The birthday celebration for Fourier in 1845 shows the changes in the West Roxbury community:

There [at Brook Farm] one can unite in offering up the incense

of hearts overflowing with gratitude to him who consecrated his life to the holy purpose of elevating mankind to their destiny on earth, in admiring that exalted genius which has comprehended and revealed the sublimest truths of nature, and in invoking...the speedy coming of that era of Harmony and Love and Peace...which will be realized in Association.⁴

The celebration was characterized by lofty speeches honoring the “chosen leaders of the human race”; participants decorated the dining-hall with busts of Fourier, icons symbolizing his theories and other items of religious or ornamental significance (a lyre, strands of myrtle, and a large Biblical passage are examples). The scene more resembles the esoteric practices of a cult than what one would expect of Transcendentalists, who eschewed rituals and their trappings. There is an air of deference to a thinker who tapped into truths the celebrants acknowledged had not been available to them, contradicting the very arguments Ripley made to Norton about universal powers of intuition. The language itself is filled with religious allusions (“consecrated his life” surely echoes descriptions of Christ) and Fourierist jargon (“the era of Harmony”) that sound mystical and dogmatic compared to the simplicity of Ripley’s description to Emerson. The acknowledgement of central, irrefutable truths is at odds with how Brook Farm intended to adapt to “tastes and talents” and simply replaces Christian dogma with another revered text. “Association” is not merely a “society of friends,” but the example for a new world. As such, there is clearly not as much room for disagreement.

Given this disparity between the original vision of Brook Farm and its transformation into a Fourierist enterprise, scholars have wrestled with how to account for the changes at Brook Farm, how to explain why it shifted to programmatic Fourierism. As several have noticed, George Ripley shared many ideas with Fourier about ways to improve the world. Ripley’s conception of Transcendentalism differed from Emerson in the scale of reform it called for, and some of the Fourierite elements of Brook Farm are evident from its inception. Nevertheless, it did undergo rather sweeping structural changes in its seven years, changes that might have alienated or estranged a few of Ripley’s original associates. The reconstitution of the group did not

poison the community, prostitute its ideals, or spoil its integrity, as some have claimed,⁵ but the shift in emphasis did obscure the importance of the individual as valued in Transcendentalism.

According to Richard Francis, there was an inherent struggle between the importance of society and the individual in Transcendental thought, and much effort was expended in trying to find a balance. This struggle is most apparent in the Transcendentalists' varying opinions on where reform should begin, with the inner character of the individual or with the surrounding environment through the founding of utopian communities. It would be unfair to place thinkers wholly on one side of the conflict or the other, as each Transcendentalist tried to find a compromise between the two.⁶ Francis draws a clear division between Emerson and his communitarian friends: "In 'History' Emerson tells us that the universe is 'represented in an atom.' For the Brook Farmers and the Fruitlanders one might argue, though in terminology they would not have been able to understand, that the fundamental unit of serial law was a molecule, a cluster of individuals."⁷ Each Transcendentalist personally engaged the philosophy and theology of the movement, so it would be silly to assume that there one set of beliefs defined Transcendentalism. In seeking to understand what motivated the reconstitution of Brook Farm, in determining whether the changes were organic and embedded from the beginning or imposed by external forces, it is necessary to examine its founder's conception of Transcendentalism.

Though Ripley made few statements about Transcendental philosophy while running Brook Farm (besides the Articles of Association and Constitutions that contained brief statements) he was particularly vocal in the 1830s, defending Emerson against Unitarian critics and explicating the Transcendentalist position for the public at large. His pamphlets and newspaper pieces are what give Francis reason to say Ripley was vital to the Transcendentalist movement. In "Discourses on the Philosophy of Religion," one of his responses in 1836 to "Unitarian Pope" Norton's attacks on Transcendentalism, Ripley argues for free rational inquiry into the evidences for Christianity. The Transcendental assertion that miracles were unnecessary for religious faith provoked this debate. Ripley says, "The religious man need not see less, in the sphere of the senses, than any other man... The

present, with its duties, its enjoyments, and its dangers, is not to be forgotten, amid the hopes and prospects of the future.”⁸ The language echoes Emerson’s “transparent eyeball” idea in “Nature,” in which the individual is open to the revealing presence of God, but it also adds the implication that awareness of the surrounding world imposes demands on humans. It is in a mindset similarly concerned with the environment that Ripley envisioned Brook Farm as an escape from oppressive, competitive capitalism. This is not to say that Emerson would deny the present has duties; he exhorted men to take action and be “Doers,” but Ripley’s emphasis on duties and dangers hints at sensitivity to societal problems. Secular socialism is likewise focused on reshaping the outside world before dealing with inner character. (In fact, both trains of thought hold that proper environmental factors can influence and improve the individual.)

In “The Latest Form of Infidelity Examined” (1839), Ripley places an even stronger emphasis on the practical application of ideas: “I honor the learned, when they devote their attainments to the service of society; when they cherish a stronger interest in the welfare of their brethren, than in the luxury of their books.”⁹ Perched on the edge of his utopian endeavor, he declared the absolute necessity of serving the common good; there is an element of early pragmatism in his call to apply the Transcendentalist beliefs. Anne Rose believes that the debates with the Unitarian church gave Transcendentalists the impetus to start social projects, as alternatives to their hostile surroundings.¹⁰ Regardless, one can see in Ripley’s texts that he is imagining a society that will honor human equality and allow all to develop to the fullest extent possible.

His “Letter to the Church in Purchase Street” (Oct. 1840), though, is the best articulation of his own conception of Transcendentalism. While he and Emerson share an “aversion to human authority for the soul” and argue for the intuitive capacities of the individual,¹¹ Ripley thinks that current society is a hindrance to the growth of the soul: “I cannot behold the degradation, the ignorance, the poverty, the vice, the ruin of the soul, which is everywhere displayed in the very bosom of Christian society...without a shudder” (254). This letter coincided with his resignation from the ministry and preceded the formation of Brook Farm only by a few months; besides the invitation he extended

to Emerson, it is the clearest picture of the community's early ambitions. Emerson, who would stay at home in Concord, made the claim that an individual can find fulfillment regardless of circumstance. Though Ripley was no Fourierist at the time, his logical development is clear from the outset. Although it is only a matter of emphasis, he placed greater importance on the influence of a well-structured society on the individual. Charles Crowe argues that Ripley definitively broke with Emersonian Transcendentalism in seeing the "social communion of aspiring individuals as the ultimate good," whereas Emerson thought one individual alone could bring divinity into the world.¹² Certainly, it is clear that the creation of any community is a departure from Emersonian individualism.

Carl Guarneri contends that "it is not so much that early Brook Farm was closer to Fourierism than Transcendentalism [as Crowe has suggested] (one can only say this by equating Transcendentalism with Emerson) but rather that Ripley's 'fraternal' or social version of Transcendentalism meshed remarkably well with Fourierist ideas."¹³ Passages like the letter to Emerson support this claim; Ripley's original aim was not so much to reformulate society and bring on millennialist hopes as it was to provide a quiet alternative path to fulfillment. If he was closer to Fourierism from the beginning, one might expect more promotion of Brook Farm and effort to expand it. Crowe suggests that historical developments influenced Ripley's thoughts; after the economic Panic of 1837, slums began encroaching upon the Purchase Street church, and evidence of dehumanizing industrial labor must have had some influence on Ripley's founding an agricultural society.¹⁴ This too seems eminently plausible, as Ripley had for years been exhorting his congregation to see the dangers and duties of the present. The religious quarrels between Unitarians and Transcendentalists certainly had political implications; Ripley's friend Orestes Brownson's claim that "our business is to emancipate the proletaries" was founded on a radical application of Christian equality common to many Transcendentalists.¹⁵

Since Emerson wrote that "Mr. and Mrs. Ripley are the only ones who have identified themselves with the Community,"¹⁶ it seems fair to see Brook Farm as the expression of Ripley's beliefs and analyze it in that manner. This is not to say that he was the sole influence —

Lewis Ryckman's introduction of shoe manufacturing at Brook Farm is an example of how outsiders and other members contributed to its direction.¹⁷ Nevertheless, Ripley's departure from Emersonian individualism helps to explain Brook Farm's later stages. The differences between the two thinkers are best illuminated in Emerson's rejection of the invitation to Brook Farm and his comments on that decision.

Before Ripley wrote the invitation to Emerson, as plans for Brook Farm were circulating among his associates, Emerson was apprehensive at the thought of any communal society, as evidenced in a letter to acquaintance Caroline Sturgis in October of 1840: "Plainly then, do you think George & Sophia Ripley can by any arithmetic or combination give anything to me which with a little resolution & perseverance I cannot procure for myself? Will any arrangements elude the good & evil which exist in all the persons?"¹⁸ It is unlikely that Emerson predicted the extremes to which Brook Farm would go, as when fellow Transcendentalist John S. Dwight, a Brook Farmer, would declare, "there is not and never can be Individuality, so long as there is not Association."¹⁹ Still, he did recognize the divergent thought that foreshadowed things to come.

Ripley, unlike Emerson, believed that the community could not be ignored while personal growth was sought, and in this regard, he was receptive to the Fourierist demand to leave corrupting capitalism for a purer social structure. Moreover, his belief in human unity harmonized well with Fourier's groups and series.²⁰ In 1840, though, when he first read Albert Brisbane's *Social Destiny of Man* (an introduction to Fourier), he was "put off by the Frenchman's numerical formulas and pseudoscientific prose."²¹

At the heart of Fourier's theory is the idea that that a perfect world is achievable by reconstructing society in accordance with human needs and desires. Fourier argued that all humans were motivated by the same inborn "passions," among which were needs for sensual gratification, friendship, and variety.²² His imagined society was then designed to cater to this human nature: material needs were to be taken care of, fraternal organization and cooperative labor would provide for men and women socially, and the continual shifts in occupations were to keep work interesting. The "pseudoscientific

prose” came from Fourier’s claims to a scientific basis for his vision and insistence on rather arbitrary numbers as the key to the success of his scheme. In addition, he added fantastical, unbelievable elements onto his utopian vision: he claimed the Moon lay barren because it died of a fever, he predicted that in the period of Harmony (that is, the utopian result), men would grow tails with eyes, and somehow the sea would turn into lemonade.²³ It is unclear if Ripley ever ran into the more questionable sections of Fourier, as Brisbane excised some of the more offensive and dubitable points when translating. Understandably, some portions of Fourier’s writings were not embraced as enthusiastically as others.

Despite the doubtful claims about future events, the Brook Farmers found a complementary outlook in Fourierism, as evidenced in the reforms they already introduced before converting to the Phalanx. The new Fourierite society would eliminate distinctions of class, and the Brook Farmers aimed to educate and “level up” the worker.²⁴ Guarneri points out that they had a communal ethos from the beginning, with flat wages, a common table, and an emphasis on applied Christian ethics rather than pure self-reliance (50). Both Fourier and the Brook Farmers were concerned about exploitation, objectification, and poverty.²⁵ Both wanted to make labor voluntary, attractive, and beneficial to the worker.

Admittedly, the Articles of Association — Brook Farm’s first formal charter — preserved private property and defined the group as a joint stock company.²⁶ Elements of class snobbishness might have crept in through the sale of stocks, which created inequalities in power.²⁷ At the start, only those who could afford to buy stocks gained the right to vote on decisions regarding Brook Farm; later, members were allowed to work for stocks, but resident Sophia Eastman still claimed that an aristocracy prevailed over the community.²⁸ Irrespective of their failures to translate theory perfectly into reality, the Brook Farmers had similar aims to Fourier, and thus Fourierism became a promising option when they sought more structure.

Clearly, there were similarities between the pre-existing Brook Farm arrangements and the later Fourieristic ones, but what were the immediate causes of the 1844 conversion? Lindsay Swift blames outside influences for Brook Farm’s transformation, calling Fourierist

visitor Albert Brisbane “the evil genius of Brook Farm.”²⁹ Brisbane was the principal promoter of Fourierism in America, and he clearly targeted Brook Farm. It might be tempting to see Brook Farm’s change as the result of a conspiracy hatched on the community. Originally rejecting Fourierism in the early 1840s, the Brook Farmers were, according to this theory, infiltrated by socialists like Lewis Ryckman and lobbied by convert Horace Greeley. Brisbane began visiting in May 1843, giving lectures and explaining Fourierism (doubtless editing out what his audience might find unsuitable), and by January of 1844 Brook Farm was reconstituting itself in line with Fourierist principles.³⁰ Brisbane was committed to starting a large Fourierist movement in America, and a good working example was needed; as Brook Farm was already a well-known community, its conversion would bring Fourierism new levels of respect and prestige.

Such an explanation fails to explain why the Brook Farmers took up Fourierism with such enthusiasm and ignores the similarities in place before Brisbane arrived. Certainly there was an element of outside influence; the shifting profile of the average visitor to Brook Farm became less Transcendentalist and more socialist as the years progressed. The reaction of several Brook Farmers to the introduction of Fourierism shows well that they were not of one mind on the issue and supports the argument that Brook Farm would not have naturally developed in this direction without an influx of Fourierists.

Brief Brook Farm resident George W. Curtis wrote to Dwight after the conversion, “The new order will systematize your course; but I do not see that it aids your journey...Fourier seems to have postponed his life, in finding out how to live.”³¹ Curtis left in late 1843, as the changes were being formulated and mulled over. Much later, young Amelia Russell claimed, “the new Fourierite system began to be organized, and the poetry of our lives vanished.”³² George Bradford said a month after the reconstitution, “this crisis seems the good time for me to leave,” and of the Transcendentalists like Emerson and Fuller that visited frequently in the early days, not many returned afterwards. For the most part, though, the Brook Farmers were receptive to the ideas of attractive labor in close-knit groups, and few members deserted specifically because of the 1844 conversion. If it were to be blamed entirely on conspiring socialists, one could expect more resistance.

Another reason that has been offered as to why Brook Farm converted is financial exigency. Sterling Delano has suggested that Brook Farm sought New York Fourierists to support it.³⁵ While it is true that Brook Farm never produced a profit before the conversion and even suffered a “retrenchment” to a spartan diet in 1843,³⁴ it is implausible to think the reconstitution was a calculated, acquisitive maneuver because it was taken up with such fervor; the members even used Fourier’s jargon in their private discourse. It does seem suspect that their “concerted effort to attract outside capital” in the summer of 1843, necessary to the survival of the group, was directed at New York Fourierists.³⁵ On the other hand, these New York socialists were the crowd most likely to sympathize with utopian ambitions. Brook Farm’s need for outside investment was real, and it is quite possible that these trips to New York coincidentally led to the travelers’ greater exposure to Fourierism. Despite their close connection and frequent visits, evidence that the Brook Farmers deliberately adopted Fourierism for pecuniary gain is scant. Furthermore, such action seems entirely out of character for the Brook Farmers. Ripley had an astute business sense and kept an interest in the community’s potential for self-sustainability, but he was by no means greedy. In December of 1845, he wrote, “the man who is so devoted to gaining wealth...was not born to be a muck-worm...[he] might have been a worthy, useful, and happy man, instead of being a little above the vilest reptile.”³⁶ That he would have compromised his vision for the survival of Brook Farm seems alien to his nature. It is safe to assume that whatever their reasons for converting to Fourierism, it was on principle and not with the bottom line in mind.

Even in their most fervent moments, though, the Brook Farmers took a realistic view of their abilities to live up to Fourier’s vision. Webber is incorrect when he asserts that “they were carried away by the idea of being the ideal community at the head of what promised (to their minds) to be a triumphant social movement.”³⁷ Unquestionably, an air of optimism pervades the letters of Brook Farmers immediately after the conversion, and they might well have entertained hopes that their communitarian ideals would spread. Still, they must have known that their limited resources and small size kept them from being the “ideal community.” The third constitution reflects

this recognition, claiming to follow Fourieristic labor practices “as far as practicable.”³⁸ Brisbane tempered and abridged much of Fourier’s theories before importing them, so the Brook Farmers probably did not even discuss his cosmogony, imaginative prophecy, or liberal sexual exhortations; if they were aware of any of this, though, they did not adopt his system wholeheartedly.³⁹ Doubtless, Fourierism was a supplement to an already existing community, and as such was adapted to their needs.

Beyond that, there were other pieces inapplicable to Brook Farm. Fourier called for phalanxes of 1,620 members, to ensure that someone would be attracted to every job the community needed to undertake.⁴⁰ As Brook Farm had roughly ninety members at its peak, certain compromises had to be made.⁴¹ They did attempt to build a large communal home called the Phalanstery to bring members into a closer union. The labor was reorganized into Fourieristic groups and more carefully recorded, and a variety of small industries beyond agriculture and education were introduced. The 1844 renaming of the community to “The Brook Farm Association of Industry and Education” emphasized the importance of manufacturing. They made efforts to make labor attractive by offering multiple groups (such as waiters, field vegetable workers, and the fancy work group) that were completely voluntary.

Still, the association remained a joint stock proprietorship with its attendant, if quiet, snobbery. Families were resistant to dissolving their smaller groups into the larger body, and intense religious emotions persisted outside the system, expressing the imperfect harmony of the group.⁴² The new organization certainly retained much of the original financial foundation (as evidenced by the similarities in the Articles of Association and the 1844 constitution) from what had preceded it, and the new ideas were implemented in a “cautious experimentation.”⁴³ One of the most visible changes of the conversion was in the form of membership. In 1844 alone there were sixty-seven new members, more than twice the number that had joined in the previous two and a half years.⁴⁴ These were mostly working-class families, rather than ministers, educators, or well-bred students preparing for Harvard, and the changing demographic might well have eased the presence of a prevailing aristocracy that Sophia Eastman saw.

Did the movement to a Fourieristic phalanx, as Sterling Delano claims, “cost Brook Farm its individual integrity,” or was it able to maintain a commitment to the fulfillment of the individual, as outlined by Ripley in 1840?⁴⁵ Hindsight sometimes obscures this question as critics blame the collapse of Brook Farm on the shift to Fourierism itself. Had they not reconstituted themselves, the argument proceeds, then there would have been no reason to build the Phalanstery, no large fire would have taken \$7,000 of investments, and Brook Farm might have survived. Of course, scholars such as Delano also believe that core values of Brook Farm were abandoned when it began to participate in a national movement, but it hardly seems to have been subsumed entirely, and its latter behavior was consistent with the principles espoused at its beginning. Had there been no Phalanstery fire, Brook Farm might have offered a unique perspective into the movement, and if interest in Fourier still dissipated by 1850, the community might very well have continued to provide a model for all utopias.

Richard Francis suggests that the Transcendentalists made a conscious effort to bridge the values of individualism and communal unity,⁴⁶ and Brook Farm can be seen as the ultimate effort to allow for their coexistence. George Ripley built a society in which close living and shared ideals were combined with voluntary labor, the promotion of education for all, and a respect for free inquiry. The shifts into a more programmatic socialism can be seen, in Francis’s view, as ever-widening circles of inclusion, beginning with a few isolated Transcendentalists, expanding to an awareness of Boston poverty and finally taking on a project of global ambition.⁴⁷ In this view, the conversion to Fourierism is not only an organic development, it is a necessary one. Certainly, their use of jargon and overzealousness seems out of character, and the emphasis on structure and ritual reveals inconsistencies in the application of theory. Ripley said in 1832 that Pestalozzi, the celebrated European educator, had recognized “that the amelioration of outward circumstances will be the *effect*, but can never be the *means* of mental and moral improvement.”⁴⁸ Because he gave no lengthy expositions of theory during the years spent managing Brook Farm and abandoned Transcendentalist theories in later years,⁴⁹ it is impossible to tell if he was truly swayed by Brisbane and Fourierism

into thinking social reconstruction the more important project. It is entirely possible that the fragility of such experiments required practices that did not harmonize well with Ripley's philosophy. Charles Crowe suggests that passionate religious emotions already existing in the reformers found expression in their enthusiasm for Fourier,⁵⁰ which might explain the strange birthday rituals. To say that such practical problems reflect a betrayal of the original theoretical beliefs is to speculate, though. Without knowing Ripley's thought processes, one must look to his writings for connections, and there is no evidence in them to suggest he underwent a fundamental transformation in the 1840s. Even disregarding this, the aims of Transcendentalism and Fourierism seem compatible when viewed from the perspective of the pragmatic nineteenth-century Christian socialist, for both looked for a better society in the full and unfettered development of humans, whether it be in divine intuition or attractive labor.

Notes

¹ Anne C. Rose, *Transcendentalism as a Social Movement, 1830-1850* (Yale University Press, 1981), p. 131.

² Richard Francis, *Transcendental Utopias: Individual and Community at Brook Farm, Fruitlands, and Walden* (Cornell University Press, 1997), p. 39.

³ George Ripley, "Letter to Emerson, Nov. 9, 1840," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials*, (Prentice-Hall, 1958), pp. 5-8.

⁴ "Celebration of Fourier's Birth Day at Brook Farm," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials*, (Prentice-Hall, 1958) pp. 134-136.

⁵ For examples, see the works of Lindsay Swift and Sterling Delano cited in this paper. See also Ada S. Rodgers, *The Influence of Fourierism Upon Transcendental Efforts of Group Living at Brook Farm*, (University of Texas, 1969), Microfilm.

⁶ Thoreau might safely be labeled an individualist, but even Emerson makes concessions to the societal strain, mulling over the value of community and attempting minor social reforms in his house.

⁷ Francis, *Transcendental Utopias*, p. 33.

⁸ George Ripley, "Discourses on the Philosophy of Religion," in Perry Miller (ed.), *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology* (Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 132-140.

⁹ George Ripley, "The Latest Form of Infidelity Examined," in Perry Miller (ed.), *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology* (Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 213-220.

¹⁰ Rose, *Transcendentalism as a Social Movement*, p. 93.

¹¹ George Ripley, "Letter to the Church in Purchase Street," in Perry Miller (ed.), *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology* (Harvard University Press, 1967) pp. 251-257.

¹² Charles R. Crowe, "Christian Socialism and the First Church of Humanity," *Church History* 35:1 (1966), pp. 93-106.

¹³ Carl J. Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative: Fourierism in Nineteenth-Century America*, (Cornell University Press, 1991), p. 52.

¹⁴ Charles R. Crowe, "This Unnatural Union of Phalansteries and Transcendentalists," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20:4 (1959), pp. 495-502.

¹⁵ Orestes Brownson, "The Laboring Classes," in Perry Miller (ed.), *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology* (Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 439.

¹⁶ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Entry in *Journals*, 22 June 1843," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958) pp. 79-80.

¹⁷ Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, p. 57.

¹⁸ Ralph Waldo Emerson, in Ralph L. Rusk and Eleanor Tilton (ed.), *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, vol. 2, (Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 350.

¹⁹ John S. Dwight, "Individuality in Association," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958), pp. 144-146.

²⁰ Ripley believed that humans were connected spiritually in a way belied by physical individuation, not unlike Emerson's Oversoul. This Transcendental belief lent itself especially well to philanthropic and socialist movements, as it stressed interpersonal obligations. That such a belief was common to all Transcendentalists should not suggest, however, that they would all lean toward Fourierism, as each Transcendentalist had a unique conception of the world.

²¹ Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, p. 46.

²² Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, p. 18.

²³ Everett Webber, *Escape to Utopia; the communal movement in America* (Hastings House Publishers, 1959), p. 187.

²⁴ Francis, *Transcendental Utopias*, p. 47.

²⁵ Charles R. Crowe, "This Unnatural Union of Phalansteries and Transcendentalists," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20:4 (1959), p. 498.

²⁶ "Articles of Association of the Subscribers to the Brook Farm Institute of Agriculture and Education," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958), pp. 144-148.

²⁷ Rose, *Transcendentalism as a Social Movement*, p. 136.

²⁸ Sophia Eastman, "Letter to Mehitable Eastman, 25 July, 1843," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958), pp. 80-82.

²⁹ Lindsay Swift, *Brook Farm: Its Members, Scholars, and Visitors* (Macmillan, 1908), p. 281.

³⁰ Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, p. 51.

³¹ George W. Curtis, "Letter to John S. Dwight, 3 March, 1844," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958), pp. 106-108.

³² Amelia Russell, "Home Life of the Brook Farm Association," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958) pp. 220-221.

³³ Sterling Delano, "Brook Farm," in Wesley T. Mott (ed.), *The Dictionary of Literary Biography: The American Renaissance, Second Series*, vol. 223, (Gale Group, 2001), p. 50.

³⁴ Rose, *Transcendentalism as a Social Movement*, p. 137.

³⁵ Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, p. 51.

³⁶ George Ripley, "Life in Association," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958). pp. 158-160.

³⁷ Webber, *Escape to Utopia*, p. 190.

³⁸ Clarence Gohdes, "Getting Ready for Brook Farm," *Modern Language Notes* 49:1 (1934), pp. 36-39.

³⁹ Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, pp. 19, 94.

⁴⁰ Guarneri, *The Utopian Alternative*, p. 122.

⁴¹ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Historic Notes of Life and Letters in New England," in Henry W. Sams (ed.), *Autobiography of Brook Farm: A Book of Primary Source Materials* (Prentice-Hall, 1958), pp. 221-226.

⁴² Crowe, "Christian," p. 95.

⁴³ Gohdes, "Getting Ready," p. 297.

⁴⁴ Rose, *Transcendentalism as a Social Movement*, p. 152.

⁴⁵ Delano, "Brook Farm," p. 51.

⁴⁶ Francis, *Transcendental Utopias*, p. xi.

⁴⁷ Francis, *Transcendental Utopias*, p. 40.

⁴⁸ George Ripley, as quoted in Arthur R. Schultz, "George Ripley: Unitarian, Transcendentalist, or Infidel?" *American Literature* 14:1 (1942), p. 15.

⁴⁹ Crowe, "Christian," p. 105.

⁵⁰ Crowe, "Christian," p. 96.